

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DRS. ROY F. AND JEANNETTE P. NICHOLS' GIFT TO FEDERAL CITY COLLEGE

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Media Services Division of the Federal City College has acquired the library of Drs. Roy F. and Jeannette P. Nichols of the University of Pennsylvania, it was announced today. The college succeeded in a competition which involved major universities in every part of the country.

The scope and emphases of the 5,000-volume working collection of these eminent historians make it a particularly valuable resource for Federal City College students. At the same time, it contains much of the basic resource material essential to research in the Civil War period, in the political history of America and in American economic history of the late 19th and 20th centuries, making the collection a national asset to scholarly research.

The newly established Federal City College, which opened its doors to students in September 1968 is the first new land-grant college in 68 years as well as the Capital of the Nation's first comprehensive public institution of higher education. Already, there are 4,500 students. Designed to meet the higher educational needs of Washington citizens, the college has adopted an "open admissions" policy. The Media Services Division, Federal City College's innovative multimedia learning resource and library unit, has made wide use of paperback material and has eliminated much traditional redtape in an effort to make resources immediately available to students.

The joint career of the husband-and-wife historians, which, in Dr. Roy Nichols' words, "cannot really be thought of in two parts," began in 1919, when both were doctoral candidates at Columbia University. Their subsequent life together has proven to be a unique working relationship in historical scholarship. The dynamic human behavior approach introduced by them has transformed historiography.

It is particularly appropriate that the Nichols' collection should come to Washington, which has been a second intellectual home to the scholars; they have actually made thousands of trips to Washington over a 50-year period of time. They have been frequent visitors to the White House since the days of Harding.

The emphasis of Dr. Roy Nichols' scholarship has been on the political history of America, as it demonstrates the evolution of American democratic systems. He has been particularly interested in the psychology and behavior of Congressmen. Among his many published works are: "The Disruption of American Democracy," a political his-

tory of the Civil War period for which he received the Pulitzer Prize in 1949; "The Growth of American Democracy," 1939, written with Mrs. Nichols; a biography of Franklin Pierce, 1931; "Advance Agents of American Destiny," 1956; "The Stakes of Power," 1961. In addition to his educational activities with the University of Pennsylvania, as professor of history, dean of the graduate school of arts and sciences, and vice-provost, Dr. Nichols was Pitt professor of American history and institutions at Cambridge University and a Fulbright lecturer in India and Japan. From 1949-53 he served as chairman of the Social Science Research Council. In 1966 he was president of the American Historical Association. He has also served as trustee of Rutgers University, since 1950.

Dr. Jeannette Nichols has established her expertise in the area of American economic and monetary history. She has also written the first authoritative history of Alaska, has further demonstrated her versatility by writing several general histories with her husband, and has recently completed another joint project with her husband on the history of the University of Pennsylvania. Mrs. Nichols has also served on the history faculty of that institution as associate professor of American economic and diplomat history and has traveled with her husband as a visiting professor and Fulbright lecturer.

The historian Allan Nevins has greeted the news of this acquisition as follows:

All scholars of both Americas, Britain and other lands . . . interested in international friendship, cultural as well as political, will welcome the acquisition by Federal City College of the rich collection of books and papers . . . reflecting the devoted and versatile career and original insight of Roy Franklin Nichols as educator, college administrator, promoter of better international relations and author of enduring, thoughtful and penetrating studies of the period of sectional conflict and the disruption of our democratic organization, written from the sources with rare skill and stylistic distinction.

"The Federal City College," agrees Paul L. Ward, executive secretary of the American Historical Association, "can count itself honored to be the repository of the working library of these two distinguished scholars."

HARRY L. YOST: A REMARKABLE MAN

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on October 22, one of Idaho's most remarkable men died in Boise. Harry L. Yost, who came to our State in 1906 from Oklahoma, carved for himself a life of achievement that spanned more than half a century. He will be missed.

A few years ago, when Harry Yost was honored by the Greater Boise Chamber of Commerce as its Man of the Year, a biographer noted that he was "one of those rare individuals who is not afraid to dream the impossible dream—then transform it to reality."

These words represent the measure of the man—a leader who devoted an entire life to the benefit of his fellow citizens.

The list of his achievements is long. He helped to establish Boise Junior College, which has since become one of Idaho's largest 4-year colleges. He was a former postmaster of Boise; he led the development of Boise's first commercial airport; he served as director of the Idaho-Eastern Oregon district of the Office of Price Stabilization.

In his early life, he is credited with popularizing the Idaho Russett potato—the Nation's finest—and with being the first to open up nationwide markets for this famous Idaho product by shipping them on ice. One of the first customers for these iced carloads was the U.S. Army in Texas, which was then engaged in pursuit of Pancho Villa.

Mr. President, the Idaho Daily Statesman in Boise devoted a long article to the life of Harry Yost. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

HARRY L. YOST, 89, DIES AT BOISE NURSING HOME AFTER LIFE AS GEM LEADER

Harry L. Yost, 89, former Boise postmaster and a leader in state and community projects for more than half a century, died Wednesday morning at a Boise nursing home.

Yost came to Idaho from Oklahoma in 1906 and established the "home place" on Ustick Road near Meridian.

He is credited with starting an obscure potato on its climb to prominence as the Idaho Russett. He was instrumental in the establishment of Boise Junior College, Anderson Ranch and Lucky Peak dams, and the Bogus Basin ski area.

As president of the Boise Chamber of Commerce he was a leader in the development of the city's first airport, and later, Gowen Field.

When Mr. Yost was honored in 1967 as the Greater Boise Chamber of Commerce's "man of the year" a biographer wrote that "he is the first to disclaim sole credit for such accomplishments. In his own words, he fondly remembers the many, many friends who worked together on such projects." But he is one of those rare individuals who is not afraid to "dream the impossible dream"—then transform it to reality."

Mr. Yost was born in Houcktown, Ohio, where he attended grade school. Following high school in Mt. Blanchard, Ohio, he taught a term in a one-room school. His 65 pupils ranged from the "primer grade" to those who were exposed to "Ray's Higher Arithmetic."

At age 20 he left Ohio for the opening of the Kiowa-Commanche Territory in Oklahoma. He drew a 160-acre tract, but never saw his land because he took a job with a telephone company. He married a telephone operator, Miss Clara Hayden, at Guthrie, Okla., Dec. 11, 1902.

Two children, George and Hester, were

born in Oklahoma and two other sons, Harry Jr. and Max, were born after Mr. Yost moved the family to Idaho, built the home place and started an orchard.

He took other jobs, with the Independent Telephone Co. in Boise and as a motorman, conductor and troubleshooter for the Boise Valley Traction Co., which operated trolley service through the valley.

In 1912 Mr. Yost entered the fruit brokerage business in association with C. J. Sewell and promoted the planting and use of the proper seed to produce what was then known as the Idaho Nettle Gem.

His brokerage shipped the first carload of Nettle Gems to Memphis, Tenn., where a marketing problem developed. Dealers said the potatoes were spoiled because they looked rusty. Mr. Yost gave away half the carload and undertook an intensive advertising campaign to point out that these were bakers, not potatoes to be boiled. The Nettle Gems have since gained fame as the Idaho Russet.

Mr. Yost shipped the first iced carloads of potatoes from Idaho. One of the first carloads was delivered in Texas for the U.S. Army expedition that was to move into Mexico in pursuit of Pancho Villa.

As president of the Boise Chamber of Commerce in 1929 he worked for development of an airfield on what is now the Boise College campus. The first bond issue failed but a second passed. Mr. Yost said opponents felt that "airplanes just didn't have any future."

Later as Boise postmaster Mr. Yost persuaded a representative of the U.S. Department of Commerce to look at the present Gowen site. After the site was approved, Boise found it had used up its local matching funds for the WPA project and was \$12,000 short. Mr. Yost put in a telephone call to a United Air Lines official in Chicago, and he sent a check for \$12,000 made out to Harry Yost.

After retiring as Boise postmaster he served two years as Idaho-Eastern Oregon director for the Office of Price Stabilization.

He was a director and former chairman of the board of Booth Memorial Hospital and a director of First Federal Savings and Loan Association. He was past president of the Kiwanis Club of Boise and a former district lieutenant governor. For 47 years Kiwanis members from Ontario to Mountain Home were invited to the annual Yost chicken and corn picnic.

He also was a member of the Methodist Church, Meridian Lodge Number 47 AF&AM, Scottish Rite Bodies, El Korah Temple of Boise and the Poachers' Club.

Survivors include a daughter, Hester A. Benn, Sequim, Wash.; three sons, George L. Yost of Emmett and Harry L. Yost Jr. and Max Yost of Boise, six grandchildren and 20 great-grandchildren.

Services will be at 2:30 p.m. Friday at Summers Funeral Home with the Rev. Ralph Fothergill of the Meridian Methodist Church officiating. Interment will be at Cloverdale.

CALL FOR QUICK ACTION ON WELFARE REFORM

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, in this week's edition of a weekly column that I send to newspapers in the Second District of Indiana, I expressed my sentiments on President Nixon's family assistance program. I would like now to pass these sentiments on to my distin-

guished colleagues for their information and, hopefully, their speedy action. I insert the entire column at this point in the RECORD:

THIS WEEK IN WASHINGTON

(By Congressman EARL LANDGREBE)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—As hard as it is to get politicians to agree on anything, everyone—liberal, conservative, Republican, Democrat—agrees on one thing: Our nation's present welfare picture is a mess.

Welfare costs have doubled since 1960, and the number of welfare recipients has grown from 5.8 million to more than 9 million. At the present rate, there would be 4 million more welfare clients by 1975, and the cost to the American taxpayer would be 11 billion dollars! And, remember, this is happening at a time of relatively low unemployment.

In many cases, a person can make more on welfare than he can at a job. The system encourages continued dependency, which not only drains the public treasury, but also robs the poor of their self-respect.

Many states give no benefits to families where a father is present. A system intended to help American families has actually broken them up, as many fathers tearfully leave home so that their wives and children may eat.

Everyone agrees that this is wrong and should be changed. They disagree on how to change it. President Nixon has an idea which would radically reshape the whole structure and philosophy of welfare; it deserves attention.

The heart of the President's welfare reform package is his Family Assistance Program, now being studied in the House Ways and Means Committee.

This new approach does several things:

First, it removes the requirement found in many places for a family receiving welfare to have no man in the house. A father would no longer have to desert his loved ones.

Secondly, it puts a "floor" of \$1,600 in Federal money under welfare payments in all 50 states. This move, hopefully, would stop the trend of poor people moving from states with low welfare payments to states which pay more and adding a massive burden to our nation's already overcrowded cities.

Third, if a person is unable to work—disabled, blind or aged—he will receive a standardized welfare payment. If, however, he can work, he must accept an available job or training program or he receives no payment.

The "carrot" that balances the "stick" is a graduated system of diminishing benefits that makes a job always more profitable than the dole. A man with a low-paying job will still receive an income supplement, so that he will always make more than the \$1,600 minimum if he works.

In fact, a man can earn up to \$60 a month with no reduction in his welfare payments; the President has recognized that it costs some money to be employed today. Only half the earnings over \$60 would be deducted from the payments. Only those earning \$4,000 or more a year would be removed from the assistance rolls. This marks the first time in memory that the working poor have been offered help in pulling themselves up and out of poverty.

Welfare mothers would not be required to work, but day-care centers for their children would allow them to hold a job if they wish.

The present welfare system offers the poor no way out of continued dependence, and it encourages unemployment. President Nixon's program gives new hope for those poor who desire self-respect and a better life.

Congress now must thrash out the details of this unique approach to an old, unsolved problem. If the moribund 91st Congress can

shake off the cobwebs and give speedy, reasoned consideration to this program, perhaps it can be forgiven its earlier lethargy.

WALTHAM HIGH SCHOOL

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most impressive school dedication programs that I have ever attended took place in Waltham, Mass., recently, when the beautiful new high school was dedicated in that city.

The program was arranged with rare skill and was attended by a large crowd of enthusiastic people in the beautiful new auditorium.

The occasion was in the best American tradition, and started with a devotional prayer by the esteemed Rev. Donald H. Freeman, Ph. D., of Immanuel United Methodist Church, which was followed by the singing of "The Star-Spangled Banner" by the talented Mr. James F. Murray. The distinguished, able vice chairman, Paul A. Connolly, of the Waltham school committee, made a very gracious, meaningful speech of welcome, and Mr. George E. P. Husson, Jr., the esteemed, able principal of the high school, introduced the guests with most appropriate remarks.

Next, the distinguished, beloved and learned Rt. Rev. Edward T. Harrington, of Our Lady Comforter of the Afflicted Church, delivered a most eloquent, dedicatory prayer, and the Honorable Richard F. Dacey, the able and distinguished mayor of Waltham, made some very significant, inspiring remarks regarding this outstanding occasion.

He was followed by the very able and beloved Mr. James FitzGerald, superintendent of the Waltham public schools, a recognized leader in education, who delivered a very scholarly talk.

The principal dedication address, which was mastery and appropriate in every respect, was delivered by Dr. Donald Davidson, eminent lecturer on education at Harvard, whose remarks were admirably adapted to the occasion, and were a remarkable compendium of experience, wisdom, and good common sense, applied to modern education and its contemporary problems, about which so many of us are so deeply concerned and eager to help to solve.

The benediction was delivered by a very distinguished, spiritual leader, Rabbi M. Aaron Kra, spiritual director of the Hebrew Rehabilitation Center for the Aged.

All told, this program was one of the most inspiring of its kind that I have ever attended, and I want to compliment the educational leaders in Waltham, and all those who assisted them in arranging and conducting this memorable event in the annals of the great city of Waltham, where outstanding educational and political leadership combine with dedicated community and public leadership to insure one of the finest school systems in the Nation.

I heartily congratulate the school leaders, the distinguished mayor and distinguished city councilors and the people of Waltham upon this impressive dedication and for this excellent, modern high school and I hope and pray that it will serve this noted city and its wonderful, young people for many years to come.

I am grateful indeed to the committee for the honor and privilege given me to attend this very rewarding event which I shall always remember with special pride.

IMPORT LEVELS AND PREDATORY PRACTICES IMPERIL DOMESTIC CERAMIC TILE INDUSTRY

HON. EARLE CABELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with 27 of my colleagues in sponsorship of a concurrent resolution which urges the adoption of policies to offset, in part, the adverse effects of governmental monetary restrictions upon the housing industry. I do so because of the specific impact these anti-inflation measures have had on the ceramic tile industry, which has not only been critically affected by the decline in housing starts but severely weakened by the improper trade practices of foreign tile manufacturers engaged in exporting to the United States.

The resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that the executive branch, under its existing authority, should take steps to prevent injury to U.S. industries and provide temporary relief from the undue competitive advantage now enjoyed by firms and industries engaged in exporting to this country. It calls for an equitable reduction in imports until current monetary restraints are removed and new construction levels are determined by free market conditions.

It is not the purpose of the resolution to exempt the ceramic tile industry, or other industries similarly dependent upon new housing, from monetary restraints or other necessary anti-inflationary measures. It simply provides that, in a market that has been curtailed by governmental action, imports of the same products or commodities should be reduced to a level that will assure the continued existence of domestic firms in the period of contraction.

Today, the housing industry is facing a most urgent crisis, and there is a clear danger that manufacturing plants dependent upon housing construction will be forced to reduce operations or go out of business. In the case of ceramic tile, 13 plants closed their doors permanently during the housing collapse of 1966. In that critical period, Japanese producers sought to gain a competitive advantage by engaging in a dumping campaign of great magnitude, and the Bureau of Customs was required to proceed against them under the Antidumping Act. Now imports of

ceramic tile are rising again, and have reached an all-time high, notwithstanding the severe cutback in housing. Once again, the Bureau of Customs has been forced to intervene, this time against a giant British tile cartel which has doubled its shipments in a 12-month period. Reports from the Japanese industry indicate that, following the 1970 exposition in Osaka, some Japanese firms also intend to direct larger quantities to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge bipartisan support for this resolution as a means of assuring that the history of the 1966 housing crisis and dumping campaign will not repeat itself. Appropriate trade agreements or voluntary quota arrangements are clearly the most suitable means of minimizing the injury and damage now occurring.

When the battle against inflation has been won, and the inevitable boom in housing is upon us, we will need strong viable firms to meet the growing demand. It is for this reason that I believe this measure is reasonable and merits the careful consideration by each Member in this body.

A CRITIQUE OF THE PENNSYLVANIA FOREIGN LANGUAGE RESEARCH PROJECT

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues and other educational-minded citizens who will be taking note of this edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a critique by Dr. Robert F. Roeming of the University of Wisconsin, in Milwaukee, on the Pennsylvania foreign language research project. The entire report on this project is contained in the October 1969 edition of the *Modern Language Journal* of which Dr. Roeming is managing editor.

I feel that the *Modern Language Journal's* evaluation of the Pennsylvania project can be of value to those engaged in the field of education, both in research and teaching.

The critique follows:

CRITIQUE OF THE PENNSYLVANIA PROJECT

(By Robert F. Roeming)

This issue of *The Modern Language Journal* is devoted primarily to an evaluation of the Pennsylvania Foreign Language Research Project based on the following documents which are referred to throughout by the abbreviations given in parentheses:

(P) Proposal to the Commissioner of Education, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for a Grant to Support a Research Project under the Provisions of Title VII of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (P. L. 85-864). Title: An Assessment of Three Foreign Language Strategies Utilizing Three Language Laboratory Systems. Submitted by The Department of Public Instruction, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

(I) Phillip D. Smith, Jr. and Emanuel Berger, *An Assessment of Three Foreign Language Teaching Strategies Utilizing Three*

Language Laboratory Systems, Final Report, Project No. 5-0683, Grant No. OE-7-48-9013-272, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, January, 1968 (ED 021 512, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, microfiche \$1.00, hard copy, \$11.55).

(II) Phillip D. Smith, Jr. and Helmut A. Baranyi, *A Comparison Study of the Effectiveness of the Traditional and Audiovisual Approaches to Foreign Language Instruction Utilizing Laboratory Equipment*, Final Report, Project No. 7-0133, Grant No. OEC-1-7-070133-0445, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, October, 1968.

(TM) *Teachers Manual for An Assessment of Three Foreign Language Teaching Strategies Utilizing Three Language Laboratory Systems*.

My original intention, as managing editor of this journal, was simple and indeed (in retrospect) naive. I had assumed that a published report, like a book, should be responsibly reviewed. Obviously the report—in this case (I)—covered a variety of areas of specialization within the field of foreign language teaching, learning and research. I, therefore, asked a group of colleagues to review this report in order that the most reliable evaluation of the results be obtained and that this evaluation be established as a permanent record. Since I had been involved in the attempts to correct the record after the "Keating Report" had been published, I sought to avoid a repetition of the same confusion. Unfortunately, the confusion has not been avoided.

Nevertheless, those who have contributed to this issue have maintained with me an attitude of aloofness to the claims and counterclaims. The papers that follow are intended to be an objective analysis of the texts studied and related data accumulated. Perfect objectivity is not possible since anyone who writes authoritatively does so under the inspiration of his own convictions. But a judicious tempering through critical review of the combined results by all the members of this group has produced at least a statement which can be relied upon as a valid guide to an understanding of this research project.

During the months that I have been working on this material, I have been finding myself impressed by the implications of the short story by Albert Camus, "Le Renégat ou un esprit confus," in which a priest subjects himself willingly to the power of the Fetish. The malaise of the last quarter century, since the perfection of the atom bomb, has been the abject veneration of the fetish "Research" and the gold which supports it. In fact the affluence of this society has already placed such vast sums at the disposal of research that human ingenuity is faltering in finding sufficient researchers and projects to maintain this "inanimate object regarded with awe as being the embodiment or habitation of a potent spirit, or as having magical potency because of the materials and methods used in compounding it."¹ The two reports of the Ninetieth Congress of the United States entitled "The Use of Social Research in Federal Domestic Programs"² and "Study of the United States Office of Education"³ demonstrate on the one hand the meager results obtained from vast distribution of research funds and on the other the number and variety of research projects being financed for one investigator. Where common sense formerly was a reliable guide in all human activity and the base upon which man reached the frontiers, now study, research and experimentation destroy its last vestiges.

We cannot escape what is obvious: teaching has a humane quality which will never be analyzed, statistically evaluated, and

Footnotes at end of article.

computerized. The great teachers I have met and sat with can never define their influence on their students or even determine whether any really existed and yet they can identify persons with whom a liaison of spirit and *humanitas* exists, which draws them together, even across time and space.

It is still my illusion that the purpose of foreign language study is to gain, as an intellectual accomplishment, a full command of the language as possible. It is still my reliance on common sense which prods me to ask students, who speak a second language well enough to be at ease, how they learned it. In many cases they claim they had a good teacher in high school and cannot define what these qualities of goodness were in other than the exuberant succinct categories of youth—"the teacher was just great!"—or in other cases their own idealistic enthusiasm was not to be defeated by the poor teaching and boredom to which they were condemned. But the system, the methodology, the content is still fashioned by the teacher. A good teacher and a good system are an unbeatable combination and these are evaluated solely by the standard of Jesus Christ. By their fruits ye shall know them!

Research in itself is not to be condemned because of past failures and inadequacies. It is essential that the qualities of bona fide research be redefined in terms of techniques, tools, and objectives in relation to the precise discipline to be served. But research is a process of discovery of the unknown and to recognize the unknown it must be measurable in some manner. It is essential, therefore, that the techniques of measurement and the meaning and implication of these measures be fully established before any research is begun.

As my contributing colleagues state in the following articles, the project under discussion perhaps will have far greater importance in aiding the foreign language teaching profession in determining the qualities and limits of classroom research than in the effectiveness of specific teaching strategies or language laboratory systems.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Clarence L. Barnhart, editor, *The American College Dictionary*, New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1948, p. 447.

² *The Use of Social Research in Federal Domestic Programs* (Four Parts). A Staff Study of the Research and Technical Programs Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, Henry S. Reuss, Chairman. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

³ *Study of the United States Office of Education*, Report of the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House Document No. 193, Edith Green, Chairman. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

THE FEDERAL SALARY COMPARABILITY ACT

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, it has often been said that an organization is only as good as its people. In passing H.R. 13000, the Federal Salary Comparability Act, we have shown Federal, and especially postal employees, many of whom could pursue more lucrative vocations had they not deferred to the service of their country and their fel-

low citizen, that we are indeed aware of their contribution to our Government.

This bill establishes a permanent method of adjusting salaries of Federal employees paid under any of the four statutory pay schedules. The bill also provides for upgraded pay schedules and for other changes related to the compensation of Federal employees under special circumstances.

These revisions are indeed heartening. I receive letters daily from postal employees and their families in my district concerning the financial burden borne by all Federal employees as a consequence of inadequate pay scales. These people are the victims of inflation, Mr. Speaker, not the cause.

Section 2 of the bill responds directly to this condition and to the widespread agreement that Federal employees should not be the ones to suffer the effects of a budget limitation, nor should their salary be determined by the principle of pay comparability only when a budget surplus permits.

It provides for the establishment of a Federal Salary Commission composed of executive branch and employee representatives which would annually review and adjust pay rates for Federal employees. These salary comparisons are now made periodically by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

The salary schedules determined by the Federal Salary Commission would be subject to review and revision by a board of arbitration in case of disagreement and would be submitted to Congress on February 1 of each year. The bill allows both Houses 60 days in which to reject or revise the salary adjustment plan. Should Congress not act within this time limit the plan would automatically go into effect.

Section 5 of the bill provides that each employee in levels 1 through 11 of the Postal Field Service Schedule and each employee under the Rural Carrier Schedule shall be advanced the equivalent of two within-level steps. Mr. Speaker, this adjustment is imperative. The quality of the postal service depends on the quality of the people who work for it. The present postal wage structure is simply not adequate to compete in today's labor market. Given the 4.1-percent pay increase which the administration supports, the starting wage of a letter carrier or clerk would still be \$3,000 less than the starting salary of many municipal workers in New York City or any of our other large metropolitan areas. Policemen, firemen, and busdrivers, as almost all Americans employed in public service, are paid more than our postal clerks and letter carriers.

In addition to salary inequities, new employees must work for a minimum of 21 years to reach top pay in their level. Some postal employees have worked 25 years, and are still far short of the top pay level. Is this practice an attractive career inducement?

In almost every city firemen and policemen receive higher salaries at the start of their careers and reach the top

pay level in 3 or 4 years. With this before us, it is not hard to explain the difficulties in recruiting and holding top-flight individuals in the postal service. H.R. 13000 eases this injustice, making it possible for an employee to reach top pay within 8 years instead of the present 21-year schedule.

During the debate of this proposal, there were hints of a Presidential veto if the bill were passed. Indeed, it has passed by a 311 to 51 vote. Congress has made programs in correcting the inequities which threaten our postal service. I am sure the President will not delay this progress.

PRAYER IN SCHOOLS

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, each week I am placing five children's prayers in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the purpose of providing a source for our public schools where morning prayers are desired.

The Supreme Court, in one of the most infamous decisions in history, barred voluntary prayer and Bible reading from our public schools.

At a time when the Nation's very foundations are under attack from all quarters, the Court has assisted this slide to immorality with propornography, pro-Communist, and antireligion decisions.

The Court has not yet sought to ban prayers from the sessions of Congress, and I offer these children's prayers in order that schoolchildren may read them without violating the law.

The prayers follow:

I

For the beauty of the earth,
For the beauty of the skies,
For the love which from our birth,
Over and around us lies;
Lord of all, to Thee we raise,
This our hymn of grateful praise.
For the wonder of each hour,
Of the day and of the night,
Hill and vale, and tree and flower,
Sun and moon, and stars of light;
Lord of all, to Thee we raise
This our hymn of grateful praise.

II

Winter day, frosty day!
God a cloak on all doth lay;
On the earth the snow He sheddeth,
O'er the lamb a fleece He spreadeth;
Gives the bird a coat of feathers,
To protect it from the weather;
Gives the children home and food;
Let us praise Him, God is good!

III

What can I give Him,
Poor as I am?
If I were a shepherd,
I would bring Him a lamb;
If I were a wise man,
I would do my part;
But what can I give Him?
Give him my heart.

IV

So we Thy people
And the sheep of
Thy pasture, will give
The thanks forever:
We will show forth
Thy praise to all
Generations.

—The 79th Psalm.

V

The fear of the Lord
Is the beginning of wisdom:
A good understanding
Have all they that do
His commandments:
His praise endureth forever.

—The 111th Psalm.

BUFFER FOR EVERGLADES PARK?

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, conservationists and nature lovers have written in large numbers of their concern for wildlife particularly in the Everglades area due to the planned jetport. They will find the following article regarding a buffer proposal of interest:

PLAN TO SAVE WATER—BUFFER FOR EVERGLADES PARK?

(By Robert Cahn)

WASHINGTON.—A new solution from an unexpected quarter is being offered to help save the Everglades National Park threatened by commercial encroachment on its northern border.

The answer: have the State of Florida provide a natural water-conservation area out of one-half million acres in and near Big Cypress Swamp, north of the western half of the national park.

This buffer zone would prevent any commercial development around the 39-square-mile site north of the park on which a training airport has just been built, and where the Dade County (Miami) Port Authority proposes to build a major international jetport 5 miles west of Miami.

The conservation area also would prevent commercial and residential development in and near the swamp from adversely affecting the quality and quantity of water flowing into the park. And it would provide needed water for population growth along Florida's southwestern coast.

SIX-MONTH STUDY

So says a blue-ribbon group of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering, which has spent six months making a case study of the Everglades and south Florida as an example of why more effective methods are needed to manage the environment.

The environmental-studies group concluded that halting construction of the major international airport, which conservation groups and Interior Secretary Walter J. Hickel have been trying to do, would not in itself save the national park from the major threats of water pollution, cutoff of water, and effects of commercial development. Even without the jetport, residential and commercial development would eventually take place on the land north of the park.

OTHER CONCLUSIONS LISTED

Commercial development of this conservation area would lower the level of fresh water and allow heavier salt water to push in from the west and ruin the Big Cypress

area. This area is the source of fresh water to the coast and to the southwestern part of the national park. Such commercial development—even with second- and third-stage sewage treatment—would still produce nutrients which would pollute national park waters, the group said.

The study group also concluded that: The training airport alone without surrounding development would not pose severe environmental problems to the park and adjacent areas, provided flight patterns are controlled to prevent flying over the park at low altitudes;

Either a major international airport or eventually urban development in the Big Cypress area would present a potential public-health hazard because of the proximity to disease-carrying insects within certain sections of the national park.

The environment study was initiated and directed by Dr. Gordon MacDonald, vice-chancellor of the University of California at Los Angeles, and Dr. Marvin Goldberger, Higgins professor of physics at Princeton University.

The study is highly unusual in that it was not ordered by the government, normally the case with National Academy of Science investigations. Dr. MacDonald also arranged for financing by four foundations.

In addition to research in Florida and Washington by Dr. MacDonald, the two scientists directed a month of seminars this past summer at Stanford University, where additional information was gathered and solutions discussed. About 60 physical, social, medical, and political scientists, lawyers, economists, conservationists, and congressional staff assistants took part in the discussions.

SECOND REPORT PLANNED

A later report will present recommendations on how to bring about more effective systems and institutions for managing the environment.

Dr. MacDonald said that a natural water-conservation area in and around Big Cypress Swamp would extend the water-conservation areas already established by the state which protect the water supply for the southeastern coastal areas and the eastern part of the national park.

The state could then issue bonds to purchase water easements on land and the bonds could be paid off over a long term by charges to water users in southwestern coastal areas. Dr. MacDonald estimated it would require from \$100 million to \$150 million to purchase the water easements.

At present there are more than 40,000 individual land owners in the area in and around Big Cypress Swamp—6,000 of them in Brazil, and many in Japan. Americans in many states have bought lots in the area.

AIRPORT NOT RULED OUT

Dr. MacDonald said he believes another site might be preferable for a major airport to serve Miami. But he does not specifically rule out the possibility of the present site, if no commercial development takes place around the airport.

It might be possible, Dr. MacDonald said, for all the normal air-passenger services to be provided in the Miami city area and passengers transported right to the aircraft in some type of rapid-speed system.

Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe has declared that no additional federal funds will be provided for the training airport until environmental studies are completed on potential damage that airport development could do to the national park. Florida Gov. Claude R. Kirk Jr. is proposing alternate sites for the jetport.

Earlier this week in Chicago, the trustees of the National Recreation and Park Association voted a resolution urging the federal or state government, individually or together, to purchase all the land necessary to pro-

tect Everglades National Park and that an alternate site be found for the international jetport.

GEN. HUGH MILTON

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, many men become successful in a single field in their lifetime. Some reach the heights of accomplishment in two endeavors, but only a very few reach the top rung in three or more pursuits.

Hugh M. Milton, II; major general, U.S. Army, retired, of Las Cruces, N. Mex., is one of those very few. Hugh Milton is an outstanding citizen, scholar, historian, husband, father, civic leader, statesman, patriot, soldier, businessman, educator, and gentleman.

A former Under Secretary of the U.S. Army, Hugh Milton was born in Lexington, Ky., and received his master's degree in mechanical engineering from the University of Kentucky.

Later, after serving an engineering instructor, professor, and dean, he served as president of New Mexico University, 1938-47; president of New Mexico Military Institute, 1951-53; Assistant Secretary of the Army, 1953-58; Under Secretary of the Army, 1958-61; and now as vice president of the First National Bank of Dona Ana County, N. Mex.

As a military man, Hugh Milton distinguished himself in World Wars I and II by his courageous leadership and was cited with numerous military decorations. He has been awarded several honorary degrees by leading universities across the United States and has served in many leadership positions in civic and fraternal organizations.

Recently, Hugh Milton addressed the New Mexico constitutional convention delegates convened in our State capitol at Santa Fe. His words, the historic review and his challenge to them is most appropriate and worthy of review for the Members of Congress. I present it as follows:

SPEECH BY GEN. HUGH MILTON BEFORE NEW MEXICO STATE CONSTITUTION CONVENTION

You assemble today to begin deliberation upon a new constitution for our State of New Mexico. I doubt not that each is fully impressed with the obligations which rest like a mantle upon your shoulders. You doubt not, also, that there are many who envy you this tremendous challenge to bring into a formal document: the aspirations that have been enshrined in the hearts of man from the beginning of time; those inexorable lessons of history; the philosophy of man which has found expression in various forms of government and which has been tried in the crucible of time. You also realize the priority of the economic element of civilization; the necessity of a strong polity and equally important elements of morality and the pursuit of knowledge and the arts. And, coupled with this is the acceleration of the day in which we live. Truly a great challenge, and I would like to feel that today I serve as a spokesman for our million residents of this Land of Enchantment and express to you our appreciation of your willingness to assume this task. In you we have great faith, as evidenced by

the fact that you were elected by the people who believe firmly in government by law.

Of all the states in the Union, none can boast of a greater heritage than can our own. Leave to Virginia her Jamestown Colony; to Kentucky her Daniel Boone; to Indiana her George Roger Clark; and to the Northwest, Lewis and Clark. But leave to us the spectacle of the Sandia Cave and Folsom man; the pre-pueblo Hohokam and Salado Indian, and the stories of the Navajo and Apache. Leave to us, also, the six year journey of Cabeza, Dorantes and Estevan; the colorful journey of Coronado from the south seas and his fruitless search for the Seven Cities of Cibola. The stories of the priest, Friar Marcus, who came into this land to Christianize the heathen, equals in interest similar stories of western Europe. And Onate, flanked by his caballeros in silken hose and doublet and plumed helmet, equals in splendor the scenes of Camelot. And all of this occurred before the Pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock. To study the history of New Mexico is to open the door to world history. Charles V, grandson of Ferdinand and Isabella, and his son Phillip II, were on the Spanish throne during the 16th century. The former, beset by the Lutheran Revolution and the powerful onslaught of the Turks, exhausted his treasury and induced his subjects to pour out their wealth. Under the latter, Philip II, the ceaseless war against the Turks continued to exhaust the economy, which not even the rich imports of silver from New Hispana could defray. As I have studied the time frame of Spanish exploration, I have often wondered why the hiatus between 1540 and 1598. There were apparently two reasons; one, that Spain could not afford to push further exploration; and, two, that a religious debate was in progress as to whether the Indians of the new country were animals with souls. England, during this period, was ending the reign of Henry VIII; endured the short term of Mary Tudor and Lady Jane Grey; and for 45 years enjoyed the queenship of Elizabeth. The court of Henry VIII saw a flourish of poetry and the translation of the *Aeneid*. Edmund Spenser gave to the English speaking world the *Faerie Queen*; Chapman, the translation of Homer; and Christopher Marlowe expressed the feeling of the day in these lines—

"Nature has formed us of four elements
Warring within our hearts for regiment
Doth teach us all to have aspiring minds."

At the time Onate was pushing north from Compostella, Shakespeare wrote "Much Ado About Nothing", "Twelfth Night" and "As You Like It." And, too, old Ben Johnson gave us of his wisdom and Sir Walter Raleigh his history.

The opening of the 17th century found three nations—France, Spain and Great Britain—contending for the North American continent. Great Britain was the tardiest on the scene, but finally gained control of the eastern part of what is now the United States. The French, troubled by foreign wars and internal religious quarrels, failed to realize the possibilities of the new continent and their settlements in the bleak St. Lawrence grew feebly. The British, after initial failure by Raleigh, planted firm settlements from Maine to Florida. Spain concentrated her efforts on the lands washed by the Caribbean and the Gulf of Mexico. New Spain was left to the priests, who by various means impressed their religion upon the heathen. This led to native revolt in 1680 and the Spaniards were driven south, to return in 1692 under De Vargas.

The 18th century saw New Mexico as a Vice Royalty of New Spain and it continued as such until 1821 when Mexico attained its independence. New Mexico had been carrying on trade with the Missouri Valley town, and such trade had been frowned upon by Spain, but after independence Mexico legalized it. Fifteen years after Mexican inde-

pendence, the Republic of Texas was established and claimed all the land to the Rio Grande. Coveting the rich trade between Santa Fe and Missouri, a Texas-Santa Fe expedition moved north to the City of our Faith, but was defeated by Governor Armijo.

In 1846, the Mexican War came and Kearney moved into Las Vegas on Aug. 15 and claimed the territory for the United States. In 1848, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo relinquished the claim of Mexico, and 5 years later the disputed territory in Hidalgo, Luna, and Dona Ana counties was ceded by the Gadsden Purchase.

Here was a mingling of different cultures. Here from out of the distant past was the culture of the Pueblo with his basket making art; pottery; masonry; and communal living; the Hohokam (people who have gone) who taught us the first of irrigation; and the Anasazi—of whose culture little is known. Then came the Spaniards from the south with the mixture of Greek, Roman, Carthaginian and Moorish culture; and finally the English, with their Celtic and Anglo-Saxon background. It is a well established tenet of historical philosophy that it is the cross-fertilization of minds, where cultures intermingle, that intelligence is quickened and stimulated to creative power. Durant, in his *History of Greece*, attributes its success in government, trade, etc. to this principle. Certainly, all of us will admit that the vitality and richness of the United States has resulted from a fusing of many nationalities. When people of different cultures meet, there are three courses open: 1) To hold aloof, one from another; 2) To avidly accept the new order; or 3) To hold fast to that which is good in one and to absorb that which is good in the other. It seems that New Mexico strove to follow the last course, but it is surprising that in the history of our efforts at statehood, the other states felt otherwise.

The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo specified that New Mexico "shall be admitted at the proper time (to be adjudged by the Congress of the United States) according to the Constitution." For three score and four years our statesmen made the attempt until their efforts were successful. The first Constitution was presented to the people of New Mexico in 1850 and passed, but when presented to Congress, after much debate Congress gave New Mexico territorial status (September 9, 1850) and settled the boundary between Texas and New Mexico. The War clouds were becoming ominous, and New Mexico aligned itself with the anti-slavery group and during the 1860's, believing its loyalty to the Union would enhance its chances for statehood, again took its case to Congress. But that body complained that New Mexico was a land of vast cultural, religious, racial and economic differences. This was a diplomatic way of saying that we were not very good. General Sherman was more blunt. Appearing before a committee of the House, he suggested that Congress take back the territory! No doubt the people of the state were becoming discouraged, for in 1872, when another Constitution and Statehood was proposed, it was defeated at the polls. Another factor which should be mentioned as influencing Congress was the Apache War. From 1837, the Santa Rita Massacre, to 1885, surrender of Geronimo, the State was constantly beset with Indian troubles. The failure of the petition of 1875 and 1887 could probably be laid to the Apaches, however, one of the most telling arguments was that New Mexico had adopted no Constitution. The *Chicago Tribune* labeled New Mexico as a land of "lazy, shiftless, grossly illiterate and superstitious" people. I wonder if the same writer could in all conscience say the same thing today. He would indeed have to be blind to all those fine ingredients which have been melded into New Mexican blood.

New Mexico in the last quarter of the last century was a large gold and silver produc-

ing area. In the three decades before 1880, over 10 million dollars in gold and over 3 million in silver was mined. But in 1885, the ratio was reversed and silver production was three times that of gold. It will be remembered that it was about this time that the "free silver" clause of the Sherman Act was under discussion, and so, too, New Mexico's production of the metal became a factor of statehood. In 1890, 1892 and 1898, efforts were made—again—for statehood, and failed. President Roosevelt (Teddy, that is) recommended statehood, but it was not until President Taft was elected that the light of success began to glow.

I have at various times tried to catalogue the arguments that were made against statehood by the Congress of the United States. Sometimes it was the apathy of the people, lack of a Constitution, religion, schools, land, not prepared for self government, the speaking of Spanish, the silver issue—and many others. But the one which a perceptive person would see is that it would upset a political balance in Congress. Arizona and New Mexico were authorized to establish a Constitution by the Enabling Act signed by President Taft on June 20, 1910. One of the arguments against it was that New Mexico would have two representatives and Arizona, one. Both states being Democratic, this would throw the majority of the House of Representatives Democratic. Nevertheless, a Constitutional Convention election was called for Sept. 6, which met October 6 and adjourned November 21. On January 21, 1911 was the day calling for ratification. There were many objections voiced, probably the most significant was the difficulty to amend. However, it carried. Of course there were cries of fraud, violence and intimidation, mostly from the prohibitionists.

When the Constitutions of Arizona and New Mexico went to Congress, there was objection to Arizona's provision for recall of judges, and New Mexico's difficulty to amend. Congress passed the Smith Bill, which provided that the recall of judges in Arizona would have to be eliminated by a vote of the people, and New Mexico should vote on an easier clause for amendment, but this would not preclude statehood. President Taft signed the bill providing both states compiled. New Mexico made the change on November 7, 1911; and on January 6, 1912 President Taft affixed his signature, saying, "I give you life—I hope you will be healthy." With this, the 47th star was placed in the National banner.

There is a story told of a mythical god, Tantalus, who displeased old Zeus. For punishment, he was exposed to the sun, but placed in a pool of water. The beating sun caused excessive thirst, and as he cried for water, the liquid would come almost to his lips and then recede. From this myth came our word "tantalize." It seems to me that this typifies New Mexico's quest for statehood.

Many changes have come about in 57 years. Not only the changes but the velocity with which the changes have occurred has increased. The tempo of life is manifold what it was in 1910. We no longer think or speak in terms of earthly dimensions, but of illimitable space; of harnessing cosmic energy; of searching ocean's depth for new sources of food; yes, we even speak of chemicals which will prolong human life. Just a few weeks ago, two of our countrymen set foot on the moon, while another cruised around to pick them up. Mariner VI is now taking pictures of Mars, which will incite the curiosity of the young, and who dares predict that someday someone will go there. Not only in science but all other phases of life are in a state of flux. Morals and religion are having a new transfusion, good or bad; and the economy is under a microscope. Let me ask a question which may sound facetious, but it is not so intended. If there were no acceleration in the tempo of change, if it retained its present velocity, and if we accept that we will change the Constitution

every three score years, is it possible to frame a basic law that will meet the requirements of the year 2030? It would seem to me that the only answer would be to make it easy to amend—and yet not too easy.

Man is of the earth. All of our exploration of outer space has failed to reveal any algae which would support life. And being earth-bound, man looks to experience of those who have gone before for his guidance. Here I am reminded of the mythical god, Janus, who holds the scepter as guardian of things past and the key to the future—all in one body and one mind. This is your position today.

In its broadest sense, the word "Constitution" means the whole scheme by which a country is governed. The general terminology is to apply it to the leading rules upon which subsequent laws shall be based, and is venerated in our Nation in a written document known as "The Constitution." As we so well know, the English have no one written document designated as "The Constitution," such as conditions leading to the observation of De Tocqueville, that it had none. In our own Nation, one was written in the summer of 1787 and signed by 38 delegates of the colonies. In making a comparison of the two methods, one unwritten, the other written, the Rt. Hon. William E. Gladstone said that "the British Constitution was the most subtle organism which has proceeded from the womb and long gestation of progressive history, so the American Constitution is, so far as he knew, the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." One may well draw the inference that our written document was a sudden inspiration. It was not. The germ was in man when he first walked along the shores of the Mediterranean. It saw expression in the Great Charter, signed by King John at Runnymede in 1215. It was added to by the "Petition of Rights" framed by Lord Coke in 1628; the Habeas Corpus Act of 1679; and the English "Bill of Rights" in 1689; and by our own Declaration of Independence. Madison, the father, and Franklin, the sage, as well as the others, were fully conversant with these documents. They had studied Montesquieu's "Spirit of Law" and they knew the philosophy of John Locke. They fully realized the strength of brevity and the adherence to fundamentals. They, too, knew that the strength of a nation rested not upon the superstructure but upon the people who were the foundation stones. Resounding in their ears were the words of Pitt: "The poorest man in his cottage can bid defiance to all the forces of the crown. It may be frail; its roof may shake; the wind may blow through it; the storms may enter, the rain may enter—but the King of England cannot enter. All his forces dare not cross the threshold of a ruined tenement." Our Founding Fathers knew the timelessness of this philosophy. Lord Coke is often quoted as saying that "The home of everyone is his castle and his fortress, as well for his defense against injury as for his repose." Long before Coke adorned the bench, this was a fundamental law. Thomas Jefferson, the framer, and Patrick Henry, the woodland Demosthenes, saw that the basic rights of man were not adequately protected and insisted upon the first ten amendments, commonly known as the "Bill of Rights." There are many other important areas of our national document, such as the delicate "Separation of Powers" and "Due Process" clause, all of which will be considered by you as you deliberate upon our new Constitution.

As we fly from the Atlantic to the Pacific and look down upon the diverse life of our people, we ponder the secret of our success as a nation. One hundred and ninety years is a short period to gain the wealth and reach the pinnacle among the nations of the world. Is it our resources? A study of other areas of the world will show equal potential.

Is it to be found in the laborious toil of the people? I think not, for on other continents we find men performing the work of animals. Then, what can be the secret? It is found in the philosophy of our Constitution, and here I use the word in its broadest sense, including the whole of law, state papers, the words of great men—Jefferson: "Upon the altar of Almighty God I swear eternal hostility against all forms of tyranny over the minds of men." Washington's Farewell Address to his countrymen: "The benign influence of good laws under a free government." Lincoln's Second Inaugural: "With malice toward none, with charity for all." It is this philosophy which alone has given us a nation as powerful as the blast furnaces of Pittsburgh; as serene as the rolling hillsides of Kentucky and as ever-flowing as the mighty Mississippi.

We are all students of history. We pause in our daily tasks to pull back, one by one, the folds of time and gaze upon the goings and comings of nations. We see them rise from slavery by spiritual revival to positions of opulence; and thence, if not vigilant, decay again to slavery. We walk the Apollonian Way and view the remains of a once powerful Roman Empire; we visit the Parthenon and think of the richness of Greece in the Golden Age of Pericles; and the many others that lived for a short span and then sank beneath the waves. We ponder the rise and decline, and the only answer which history can give is that they forgot the genesis of their birth. As I have sailed the Aegean Sea and gazed at Mt. Olympus, I always think that when the old gods sat in disclosure they must have reasoned that man's search for a polity that would give him his desired freedom would some day find fruition. And I like to think that day came with the founding on the shores of the North American Continent of a social order that gave to man this fulfillment of his age-old aspiration. And here in this land of Enchantment—with its majestic mountains, colorful skies and vast desert—where passed a dramatic human procession and where is embodied age-old charm; here, the physical provides spiritual companionship for those who study and create and engage in the world's work. This is our heritage—our State, our Nation. This treasured inheritance you will preserve in the document which you will submit to the people—not only for themselves but for the generations to follow.

Good-bye and God speed you on your way!

LOW MAN ON THE TOTEM POLE— YOU

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, for years many of us have maintained that liberal spenders have a scrupulous desire to right the wrongs of small minorities by perpetrating grievous wrongs on the majority—the majority, incidentally, which is paying profusely through the nose to have wrong done to it.

That buffeted and baffled group—the taxpayers—can hardly be blamed if they begin to wonder at the spending priorities of Congress—priorities which leave them in a hole at the bottom of the ladder of goodies, looking up and holding the empty bag.

An editorial, from the Indianapolis Star of Monday, October 27, illustrates this continuing predicament and explains the growing uneasiness on the part

of the taxpayers—the taxpayers who will have an opportunity to rectify the situation in 1970. The editorial follows:

LOW MAN ON THE TOTEM POLE—YOU

"To put it bluntly, the frequent failure to balance the Federal budget over the last five years has been the primary cause for unbalancing the family budgets of millions of Americans." So said the President of the United States in his recent anti-inflation message.

Well, with the present Democratic-controlled Congress, it already looks as though that process of unbalancing our family budgets is going to continue. Look what has already happened. The record shows that this Democratic Congress has a list of priorities only of minorities it intends to serve.

First come members of Congress. They have first priority. They increased their annual income "to meet inflation" from \$30,000 to \$42,000 a year. That is really meeting the problem handsomely. Next they voted themselves the best kind of anti-inflationary (for them) pension system possible—one which guarantees that their pensions will always go up faster than inflation. Note that now the maximum pension for congressmen and senators has risen from \$24,000 to \$34,000 a year!

So the inflation problems of No. 1 minority group—congressmen—have been solved.

Second priority goes to another minority group—Federal employees. They have all been voted handsome pay increases because of inflation. They have also been included in the "anti-inflationary" new pension system that congressmen have. Their pay and pensions will always stay ahead of the cost of living, too.

Solved—The inflationary problem of government workers.

Third priority apparently goes to people on Social Security. President Nixon has proposed for them a 10 per cent increase. The Democratic leaders in Congress—mindful of the problems of inflation—say they intend to increase the President's proposal to 15 per cent. That would "solve" the inflationary problems of the retired.

Who's next?

Nobody.

The rest of us are going to have higher taxes—the 10 per cent income tax surtax and then the 5 per cent surtax. To pay the Social Security benefits our maximum payroll taxes are going to be jumped from \$374 in 1970 to \$397 in 1971 to \$459 in 1972 to \$495 in 1975 to \$513 in 1977. Of course, Congress is not going to guarantee us an increase in salary to pay these bigger taxes.

Nor is this Democratic-led Congress planning to balance the budget that has "unbalanced your family budgets." Almost every appropriation bill so far provides more, not less, money for Federal spending.

President Nixon has tried to slow down Federal spending. He reduced former President Johnson's budget requests. He has now cut back on military spending by billions, by halting construction projects and reducing procurement programs. Yet this Congress goes right on raising the spending of most everything else.

This will mean continued inflation if the budget stays unbalanced.

The prices you pay for food, clothing, rent, and everything else except nylon stockings, have all increased in the last two years—according to the Department of Labor. Unless President Nixon can reduce the spending, he can control, enough to cancel out the spending Congress is increasing this year, the spiral of prices and wages will continue. Nobody but congressmen, government employees and Social Security recipients can benefit from that.

The majority group—the taxpayers—have no priority at all with this Democratic Congress in 1969. Nothing in any proposed "tax reform" bills will benefit the majority group.

Doesn't it look as though the only way the majority group can get first priority with Congress is to elect a new one in 1970?

VETERANS DAY—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a most distinguished organization, the American Legion, is focusing attention on November 11, Veterans Day, by urging all patriotic citizens to "show their colors" on that national observance.

The American Legion has stood in the forefront in support of practically every movement for good in this Nation since the Legion was founded 50 years ago.

Paramount among its community programs are those which foster patriotism and love of country. Following through with this theme Legion Commander J. Milton Patrick of Skiatook, Okla., has issued the following urgent appeal to all citizens concerning the observance of Veterans Day:

AMERICAN LEGION NATIONAL COMMANDER J. MILTON PATRICK URGES PATRIOTIC CITIZENS TO "SHOW THEIR COLORS" ON VETERANS DAY, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

WASHINGTON, D.C., October 24, 1969—American Legion National Commander J. Milton Patrick, today issued the following statement:

"The American Legion calls upon the uncounted millions of patriotic citizens to show their colors on Veterans Day, November 11, 1969, in a salute to the men and women who have served their country in the Armed Forces and who have given something of themselves in the preservation and extension of American freedoms.

"A vast outpouring of patriotic public opinion can establish once and for all where America's sentiments lie in the matter of accomplishing our purposes in Vietnam, and can serve notice on the world that the will of the American people demands an honorable conclusion to hostilities there.

"Each generation of American veterans from the days of America's war for independence to the present day members of our Armed Forces, has made a significant contribution to the winning and holding of freedom.

"Veterans Day, 1969, is the day when all good Americans can help accomplish many things for the good of the nation and for the cause of freedom, and we call upon all good Americans this day to raise their colors to the top of the staff, both at private homes and places of business, to participate in public observances of Veterans Day, whatever form that observance may take in the local community.

"A great public display of patriotic unity can:

"1. Reassure our fighting men in Vietnam that people back home are with them.

"2. Reassure the enemy that dissent is the position of a tiny minority.

"3. Restore the resolve of some wavering politicians who think they have heard the call of their constituents when it was really just the loud voices of a few dissidents.

"4. Reassure the President that the clear desire of the American people is for peace with honor in Vietnam for the further insurance of American freedom.

"So we ask our fellow Americans to unite on this day in a tribute to our servicemen past and present, and a pledge to them and to our country that this nation, under God,

will always be the citadel of freedom which they helped to make it.

"Show your colors, show your allegiance, offer your prayers for your country and those who helped to make it free and those who yet today offer themselves to help to keep it free."

HOUSING GAP IN CITIES NO. 1 SOVIET PROBLEM

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I enter here-with articles 5 and 6 in the series entitled "Soviet Scent 1969," in which Charles L. Bennett, managing editor of the Daily Oklahoman, Oklahoma City, gives his impression of Russia after a recent 16-day visit. He traveled with a group of 10 members of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

Today's articles discuss housing, education and health. They follow:

[From the Daily Oklahoman, Oct. 2, 1969]

HOUSING GAP IN CITIES NO. 1 SOVIET PROBLEM—V

(By Charles L. Bennett)

Number one problem for government officials in nearly all Soviet cities is the housing gap. Everywhere our group of American editors went—Moscow, Minsk, Leningrad and Siberia's Novosibirsk and the other cities—the story was the same.

Deputy Premier Nikolai Baybakov, chief planner for the entire Soviet Union, said the nation currently is producing about 3,500,000 housing units a year. "This high rate will continue for 15 to 20 years," he said. "We must hold such high rates until we reach a good, sanitary norm."

One of our editors said he had been told 10 years ago that the housing shortage would be over in seven or eight years, meaning that the country would have reached the point of having only one family in each apartment and every family would have an apartment.

"Now," he said, "in the cities where we've been it appears that 30 to 40 per cent of the families are still sharing apartments. What happened?"

"There is no such situation, as 30 to 40 per cent," Baybakov responded. "In various cities there may be variations, but 10 to 15 per cent of families sharing apartments might be an overall average. We normally allot an apartment to a family. New apartments are given to families and to those who now share apartments. That leaves only one family in the one previously shared. In Moscow, in the next two or three years, we won't have this problem at all.

"We will not solve it all quickly, because the appetite grows with the eating. Many people want larger apartments than those they now have."

Tremendous war damage, in which as many as 80 per cent of all buildings—including homes—were flattened, was one cause of the vast need for housing in the U.S.S.R. In many cases, officials pointed out—even in Moscow—much of the destroyed housing would have had to be replaced anyway because it consisted of old, one-story wooden homes far from modern standards. We saw a number of these old homes, still in use, in several of the cities we visited.

Changes in the nation's economy, bringing thousands of former rural people into the cities for jobs in factories and businesses, put added pressure on housing. All Soviet cities have strict population controls now, preventing immigration from outside the city or creation of new enterprises in the

urban areas unless governmental approval is obtained.

We said no American city had such population controls and one planner commented: "That underlines the difference between a 'free market' system and a 'planned' system like we have."

The Byelorussian Republic bore the brunt of the first German attack in 1941, when 51 German divisions marched in, and Minsk lost 70 per cent of its housing in the battering that followed. It came out of the war with only 50,000 people, a fraction of its pre-war population. (One of every four Byelorussians died in the war.)

Population is now 900,000 and they are building 16,000 to 17,000 new apartments a year, 65 per cent of them pre-fabricated. About 25 per cent of the families still share at least the kitchens of their apartments, Chief Planner Victor Chernishov said.

"Moscow is just one big construction site," Mayor Vladimir Promyslov told us. "It's not industry but homes, hospitals, schools, cultural centers etc."

He said Moscow's 1966-70 five-year plan called for 600,000 apartments and they have been building from 100,000 to 220,000 units a year. They still need about 1,500,000 more and plan to build these by 1980, he added.

In Novosibirsk, where there was no war damage, the housing problem stemmed from planned growth of this Siberian industrial, educational and cultural center. Population was 400,000 in 1939 but has grown to 1,115,000 now. Nearly all the houses being replaced there are old one-story frame and log dwellings. "They're picturesque," our genial newsman host, Nikolai Bezraydin agreed, "but they lack amenities."

Gorda Skoblikov, chief architect of Novosibirsk, estimates his city's housing program will take 10 to 15 years and cost 137 million rubles (\$150,700,000).

We asked what happened if a family didn't want to move into an apartment. "The houses will have to be removed," Skoblikov said, "because we need to fill in those ravines (where most of the houses are). Besides, the new homes will be much better."

He said there had been "three or four cases" in which families did not want to move into apartments. "In that case," he said, "they would be paid the value of the house torn down and could get a family plot on the outskirts and build their own house." These plots would have water service, but no sewers, electricity or central heating.

Apartments are viewed as the only answer to Soviet housing needs, even being built on many of the farms, because they can be pre-fabricated. That way, housing units can be created more economically and swiftly, by far, than could be done by building individual homes.

The quality of their apartments is a sensitive point with Soviet officials. "It still leaves much to be desired," Promyslov commented. He said there had been four different stages of upgrading. Our visit to a pre-fab housing plant outside Leningrad disclosed evidence of continuing redesign and upgrading.

"We will have to stick to pre-fabs, though," Promyslov said, "because otherwise we couldn't build them nearly fast enough.

"Standards of construction are being raised all the time," he added. "All apartments now have gas for cooking and heating, plus electricity. No more communal apartments—designed to be shared by more than one family—are being built. We are aiming for a comfortable apartment for each family, with a goal of one room for each family member plus a common room and a kitchen, bathroom, closets, halls, etc.

"Quality of workmanship is one problem in improving apartments," he said, "and others include material and financial abilities plus the skill of labor. According to modest estimates, we lack 50,000 construction workers that we could use. Interior decoration would

be better," he added, "if we had more skilled workers."

Deputy Premier Baybakov later supported the need for better quality, saying: "I think the critical remarks coincide with reality. The planning of apartments has been improved, such as the kitchens and wiring. Costs of housing have increased 15 per cent to provide this better quality. We are becoming a bit richer and, therefore, can build better. Compared to what you have in your apartments, especially the richer ones," he said, "ours are more modest."

"Rents for Soviet apartments are scaled strictly to the family's earnings and currently cost about 4½ percent of the family income," Moscow's Vice-Mayor Vasily Isayev told us.

We had several chances to see what Soviet apartment-dwellers get for their money.

In Alma Ata, we visited an apartment occupied by a Korean family, in a complex under the control of the new textile mill we had just inspected. Its two bedrooms were small but the living-dining room appeared to be about 12 by 16 feet. Kitchen fixtures and plumbing were simple but modern. A small balcony provided storage space for the family's books and magazines and home-canned vegetables. The mother and father, employed in the textile plant, her sister and two daughters occupied the apartment.

Planner Chernishov took us to see an unfinished apartment building in a well-spaced complex on the outskirts of Minsk. The building has 216 apartments in its nine floors and such a structure normally takes about five months to complete, Chernishov said.

A one-bedroom (about 8 by 15 feet) apartment, this one had a two-burner gas stove in its kitchen (about 8 by 10 feet). The two-bedroom apartments in the same building have four-burner stoves. The living room appeared to be about 17 by 10 feet and there was a small balcony. Storage space seemed to be scarce. The wall and woodwork finish looked plain but adequate, as did the plumbing.

This apartment building and the others around it are part of one of the latest developments in Soviet city-building—a micro-district.

Designed, eventually, to house about 12,000 people, the complex is to include a shopping center with stores, theater, service shops etc. . . . When needed, high-rise garages will be built among the apartments.

Chernishov said they expected completion of the entire district to take 2½ years, including all the apartments around the city.

The Obukhovskiy House Building Combine, in Leningrad, is one of six plants in the city building the concrete slabs for apartment buildings there. Open since 1959, it has produced 55,000 units, providing housing for from 220,000 to 230,000 people. Its integrated operation includes casting the basic panels containing all the wiring, plumbing, doors, windows and other fixtures, assembling all other materials, erecting the buildings and providing supervision and maintenance for a year after occupancy.

The factory currently is making nine-story buildings. No steel framing is used for this particular design. Instead, steel hooks are cast into the corners of the panels and these hold together the walls and floors as the building goes up to make a rigid construction. One of our editors commented that such construction would never pass the building codes in the United States, but they apparently are proving satisfactory to the Soviets.

Plant Manager Nikolai Yakoblev, only 29, said there have been three basic design changes since the plant has been in operation. Starting next year, this factory will be making 16-story apartment buildings.

In their design, Yakoblev said, an apartment of one bedroom, living room and kitchen would provide 410 to 420 square feet of living space, not counting bathroom, halls

etc. Cost of such a unit is 1600 rubles (about \$1750), a cost per square foot of just over \$4.

Our guide and interpreter in Leningrad, Galina Shevanova, was the one who tipped us off to the fact that some Soviet citizens have second homes outside of the city limits, in recreation or rest areas. They can lease a plot of land for a nominal sum of 8 or 9 rubles a year, she said, and then put up a summer home or dacha. These can be bought as pre-fabs, starting at about 1,000 rubles (\$1,100, at the current exchange rate) or they can build for themselves.

While she said this was done quite frequently, it's apparent most Soviet families would be happy just to have an adequate apartment to themselves, without worrying about a second house.

An editor asked Deputy Premier Baybakov: "Once housing is taken care of, what will be the next high priority task for these huge resources you're now putting into housing?"

Baybakov threw back his head in a hearty laugh and said, "I won't live to see that day!" Baybakov is 58.

[From the Daily Oklahoman, Oct. 3, 1969]
SOVIETS PUT EMPHASIS ON EDUCATION, HEALTH
(By Charles L. Bennett)

In the Soviet Union, you might say, education is highly competitive and health services definitely are not. In any case, whatever the Soviet citizen gets of either, it's free.

Student revolt is "illogical" in the words of one U.S.S.R. leader and the experience of one of our roving editors with the Soviet medical system was logical but left him shaken—and improved.

Educational policy decisions, on methods of teaching and subjects to be taught, are handed down for the whole nation from the U.S.S.R. ministry of education. But administration of the schools—from elementary to the most advanced research-teaching institute—is the responsibility of the republic and city where the institution is situated.

With pre-revolution education limited almost entirely to the Russian aristocracy, the Soviet Communists put intense and early emphasis on general education and that pressure is maintained today. Magazine editor Atina Zhaketova told us in Alma Ata that only two percent of the people in Kazakhstan could read and write 50 years ago and "now illiteracy is less than 1 per cent."

One current goal of Soviet education is to complete the establishment of ten-year compulsory education, already in general effect in the larger cities. The previous compulsory level has been eight years.

Most Soviet youngsters start regular school when they're seven, most having been in government pre-school institutions for two to four years prior to that. Their first eight years in school follow strict standard courses in effect all over the country. Then varied courses begin to appear, if they can pass the necessary qualifying tests.

Some take two more years of high school, and then try for colleges, or special institutes for advanced training. Others go into four or five-year technical schools. They, too, may go on to universities or advanced institutes, if they qualify.

Byelorussia's Deputy Prime Minister Filipp Kokhanov testified to the competitiveness of the exams. "My son was a good student," he said, "and wanted to go to medical school. Five is a high mark on the scale. He scored a three and barely got in."

"The medical school here has three applicants for every vacancy and most of the colleges have anywhere from two to seven at the Technical Institute for Light Industry."

Students who don't make it to college have a choice of going to work, going to a technical school, or studying at night and trying again. They can take the exams as often as they're held, until they reach 35.

The free education, for those who qualify, can go on through advanced degrees and 75

per cent receive government grants for living costs, on a scale that rewards those making the highest grades with more spending money. Many students at the college level work part-time in technical and research institutes. These institutions frequently are teaching centers, too, related to nearby universities. Their research ranges all the way from theoretical work to practical applied studies of specific problems faced by industry or agriculture.

When we asked about student unrest in the U.S.S.R., Nicolai Meshkov, minister for higher education in Byelorussia, made a very brief response: "We think the students in the West have a function that is counter to society. It is illogical for the best part of society to revolt."

"City and country students get about the same level of education," Kokhanov said, "but some have better-qualified teachers than others. To attract teachers to the villages, we guarantee them new homes or apartments and give them other incentives."

"On the examination," he added, "the village and city youngsters score at about the same levels."

We asked what happens when a bad teacher shows up?

Kokhanov said, "It IS a problem!"—and all the Soviet leaders laughed. He said one remedy lies in the refresher courses conducted for teachers.

Educational television is not in direct classroom use yet, but Soviet officials said this would start soon. Many educational programs are carried on the regular television channels, and some are tied directly to the wide-spread evening and correspondence courses that many workers take.

Pay for college and university teachers and research people of similar academic level has a wide range, we were told at the university in Novosibirsk's "Science City". It may be anywhere from 130 rubles to 600 rubles a month, which would be about \$143 to \$660 at current exchange rates. A professor with ten years experience, for example, would get 450 rubles (\$495) a month.

"Science City" started during World War II when the Soviets set up a branch of their Academy of Science there. It was expanded rapidly after the war, on the strength of a decision to move some of the key research and academic leaders out of Moscow. From the original mathematics and physics institute, the complex has spread to all of the physical, technical, chemical and biological sciences, with 15 universities and colleges now operating in the Siberian city.

Close relationships between the many research institutes and the colleges and universities is a trademark of the complex.

One feature at Novosibirsk is the third largest library in the U.S.S.R., with five million volumes and heavily oriented to science. We saw scores of American scientific and medical publications in the reading room and were told an exhibit of American science books would be opened soon.

In the midst of all this knowledge, the simpler accounting—as we saw everywhere we went in the U.S.S.R.—was being done with an abacus.

One of the relatively few requests to our hosts that they couldn't find time to arrange was a visit to a Soviet hospital. But, true to his devotion to digging out information, Editor Norman Isaacs of Louisville, found a way. He had been feeling ill and by the time he got to Irkutsk, in eastern Siberia, it was obvious he needed some medical attention.

I think the best way to describe his trouble would be to call it a delicate problem. But Norman and the U.S. Embassy doctor figured out, after it was all over and he was back in Moscow, that he must have had an infection or else passed a small kidney stone.

Anyway, his emergency call went out and a young male doctor and a nurse showed up at his hotel at 11 p.m.

He reported at a hospital-clinic for tests the next morning. That evening, he was in the hospital attended by five doctors—the chief surgeon, the deputy head of the clinic, an assistant surgeon and two other doctors—all women.

When he had been treated—and it helped—Norman paid 55 cents for a prescription and that was the only charge. When I last saw him, though, he was still suffering from the emotional trauma of his confrontation with the woman medics.

The complex of medical care in the Soviet Union literally does extend from before the cradle, with extensive pre-natal care and maternity benefits for women, all the services we're accustomed to, and a variety of health and rest centers where people may go for a day, a weekend, a month or longer for rest and health care.

We saw one sanitarium at Sochi, the resort center on the Black Sea coast. Started by a miners' union, it now accommodates workers from a variety of enterprises and specializes in therapeutic baths utilizing the sulphur waters of the area. Other kinds of health treatment also are available in a daily regimen that combines vacation pleasures with the treatments.

It also has its own beach, and can accommodate 400 visitors at a time. Its staff of 200 includes 17 physicians and 40 nurses.

Most of the workers who come to Sochi do so on their vacations and have to be certified for health care by the doctor where they work. Once this happens, they can come to the resort for 26 days. The cost is 170 rubles (\$187) and the worker pays a third of that, with his trade union or enterprise paying the remainder. Even his transportation may be paid if he comes from far away.

Other sanitariums along the 90-mile seacoast specialize in various kinds of treatments and the whole combination—bathing, recreation, health services and fun in the sun—attracts a total of nine million visitors to the Sochi region every year.

Moscow's Deputy Mayor Vasily Isayev summed up the general picture of the Soviet's health and education when he commented: "The Soviet is responsible for everything that happens to every citizen, from the day he is born until the day he dies."

On the surface, at least, the service looks complete. Its real quality certainly couldn't be evaluated with the sketchy look we had at it. But as one of our traveling editors said, speaking of Norm Isaacs' experience, "In the Soviet Union, where there's an ill, there's a way."

PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN CONGRESS AND THE ADMINISTRATION

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the issues President Nixon has put before us in his message earlier this month are beyond partisanship. He has called for the continuance of the working partnership between Congress and the administration—for the sake of national reforms, many long overdue. These reforms are needed in areas which concern every American. We have hunger in the midst of plenty—crime striking fear in every heart—inflation shrinking every hard-earned dollar. These are among the problems we must solve together—Congress and the administration working harmoniously for the sake of the country.

The President deserves high praise for his candor in seeking our cooperation. He

has said he is willing to travel more than halfway to work with Congress to accomplish what needs to be done. Let us travel with him on the road to national reforms we must have if we are to make this Nation all it should and can be.

ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL TRENDS IN THE 1970'S

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that Mr. James G. Morton of the Manufacturing Chemists Association, Washington, D.C., recently made a speech before the Arkansas Petroleum Council at Hot Springs, Ark. His remarks were complimentary of my good friend and colleague, Congressman DAVID PRYOR. His subject is timely and thought provoking. I recommend it to my colleagues:

ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL TRENDS IN THE 1970'S

(Remarks by James G. Morton before the Arkansas Petroleum Council at the Velda Rose Tower, Hot Springs, Ark., on Oct. 15, 1969)

It is a pleasure to be here today to pinch-hit for my friend David Pryor. I always welcome the opportunity to return to this land of scenic wonders and warm-hearted, down-to-earth people. The new dynamism in Arkansas is as invigorating as the mountain air; it gives exciting promise to your future. Congressman Pryor has earned a reputation in Washington for wit, charm, and eloquence—all of which are well known to the people of Arkansas. He is one of the bright young leaders on the national scene. It thus took considerable temerity on my part to agree to appear in his place.

For me to come here was like a bench warmer replacing Bill Montgomery in the backfield of the Razorbacks. But, come to think of it, it is a more welcome assignment than Wichita State faces a week from Saturday.

Economic forecasting is being followed with no less enthusiasm than football predictions these days, even in Arkansas. So I shall try to sketch a few dimensions of our economic future and also size up the changing shape of American politics in the 1970's.

As our country proceeds into the final third of the 20th Century swift and sweeping changes are occurring in our economic life as well as in our politics.

Powerful forces of growth and change produced by the wave of new technology are, indeed, remaking America. We should welcome the challenges of change, not fear them. But the transition will be more satisfactorily negotiated if we achieve an adequate measure of control over the forces affecting our future.

This is easier said than done, of course, as one perceives in our frustrated efforts to end the war in Vietnam and dampen the fires of inflation. These two complicated and difficult tasks relate in various ways to nearly all our other major problems.

President Nixon is finding, like Lyndon Johnson, that unless he succeeds in ameliorating the Vietnam situation there are narrow limits on what else he may accomplish.

Equally vital to our nation's future and to each of us as individuals is the urgent need to curb inflation. The noted economist Carl Hagedorn recently penned a proverb for our times when he wrote: "Fear of inflation is the beginning of economic wisdom."

The Administration is following a carefully gauged path of gradualism to contain inflationary forces rather than risk disrupting the economy by slamming on the brakes.

The object is to lessen inflationary pressures effectively while minimizing the price which must be paid in reduced employment. The President must negotiate the difficult passage between the Scylla of unemployment and the Charybdis of inflation, either of which could prove ruinous in the election year of 1970.

A return to normalcy could well result in an unemployment rate of four and a half to five percent in the first half of next year. That might be tolerable in some circumstances, perhaps, but under present conditions it would have to be offset by governmental actions to alleviate the effects on the ghettos. Increased idleness among Negroes could be explosive.

The unemployment rate reached four percent in September, the rate which prevailed during the high employment economy prior to escalation of the military effort in Vietnam.

This sign was read with much hope by the Nixon Administration that restraints are working and the economy is cooling off.

One hopes the return to more normal, sustainable employment levels indicates that we are getting inflation under control but there is no firm evidence that increased unemployment will spell the end of either inflation or high interest rates.

The experts now think they see the top of the price spiral but this kind of forecasting is at best chancy business. A certain amount of wishful thinking influences economic analysis when one is fighting inflation psychology. It is, in fact, essential in striving to dispel hedge buying and other inflationary practices.

The picture at this point is mixed and one can interpret the indicators either way. Several basic indicators clearly suggest undiminished strength in the economy. Personal income is expanding and further large increases are in prospect during the coming months. A continuing strong flow of income will be translated into large spending by consumers.

Industrial production has been increasing at a brisk pace and new orders show no slackening. Consumer spending, marked by increased purchases of services of all kinds, continues strong. There are scant signs of a moderating economy in these key indicators.

The root-cause of inflation is rising costs—labor costs, interest rates, insurance, construction costs, but especially labor costs. In key industries the two and three year contracts provide wage hikes substantially in excess of productivity increases.

Taking the steel industry, as an example, workers were granted a 7-8 percent wage increase last year. The contract automatically gave them another six percent rise on August 1 of this year and another sizable increase will take effect next year. Steel prices have been rising as a consequence and the effects are felt in widening circles throughout the economy.

In assessing the economic outlook one can reasonably anticipate that inflationary restraints will take hold in a significant way in the period ahead, most pronouncedly in the first quarter of next year.

It is predictable that—

The unemployment rate will continue its uptrend.

Plant and equipment spending will head downward after this quarter.

Housing will suffer the effects of credit restraints for a prolonged period.

Corporate profits will lag as a result of the tightening squeeze.

On the other hand, the cost of living is likely to continue upward after the end of the year. Some easing may be expected if food prices cease to rise. Costs of services will continue their 9% inflationary pace. Wage increases are apt to counteract some

of the anti-inflationary gains as they are translated into consumer spending.

While we will continue to feel the troublesome effects of inflation for some months to come, it appears at least to be slowing from a gallop to a trot. The consequences of the readjustment will be painful to many Americans, most particularly in lost jobs.

The Administration has failed to utilize moral suasion and public opinion to help hold the line on wages and prices. The failure to act will draw mounting criticism unless the President takes the inflation issue to the people. It is my belief he will not delay longer in employing the power and prestige of this office to demand price and wage restraints, the latter being related to productivity increases.

The passing problems we are experiencing, however, should not obscure the long-term prospects of the giant American economy. In any direction we look the potentials are breathtaking.

Sometime next year or the year after—depending on the rate of growth and the rate of inflation—the Gross National Product of the United States will cross the trillion-dollar mark.

That is a fantastic figure, far beyond the comprehension of the ordinary mortal. It will be an economic high water mark for all history. It could be achieved only by a fantastically productive economy like ours.

It will be more than a tribute to the American system; it will provide us the means to better that system for ourselves and for every citizen.

The petroleum industry will play its full part in this economic miracle, in the future as in the past.

The total value of crude, natural gas liquids, and natural gas produced in the United States last year topped \$14 billion—some \$83 million produced by you here in Arkansas.

Crude oil is the leading mineral product of the United States in value—as it is also in our own state.

Our increasingly industrialized, increasingly mobile society will continue to demand energy in enormous quantities. This is no less true of the rest of the world as living standards rise and mobility becomes an imperative.

Oil and gas will supply nearly three quarters of the world's demand for energy in the foreseeable future particularly since the prospects for nuclear energy, while they remain bright, are not as glowing as once appeared.

Moreover, petroleum is growing in significance as a life stream of the burgeoning organic chemical industry. It provides the basis for almost nine-tenths of the organic chemicals manufactured in the United States—and the demand for petrochemicals is expanding at the rate of 9% to 10% a year.

I might finally add that oil and gas account for nine-tenths of the space heating that keeps Americans living and working in comfort.

There has been so much controversy over import quotas lately that people forget that petroleum and petroleum products contribute to our export performance as well—\$350 million last year in the face of the stiffest kind of foreign competition.

The most sensational new development is, of course, the emergence of the North Slope of Alaska with its tremendous potential for production. That prospect has already resulted in bringing to reality the dream of explorers over the centuries—the commercial use of the Northwest Passage. The maiden voyage of the S.S. Manhattan was clearly an outstanding success, and she will be repeating that trip this coming spring.

In the years to come, a fleet of giant tankers will carry fuel to the oil-hungry East Coast. Alaskan oil will also be going by pipe-

line and tanker to our rapidly growing and rapidly industrializing Pacific Coast states.

Do any clouds darken the far horizon? Some of you I suspect, are already worrying about the electric automobile. But the best forecasts I can get from experts in and out of government is that this is many years—fifteen at a minimum—away from being a practical possibility for the many millions of American drivers. That gives ample time for the scientists and technologists to develop a smog-free fossil-fueled automobile engine—and I have enough confidence in the creative ingenuity of Americans to believe they will find the answer.

It is exciting to consider the majestic panorama of the American economy in the year 1975—only half a decade from now. Our population will number more than 218 million. This means an average increase of 2.4 million a year between now and then, portending very large market growth.

On the assumption we will maintain a 4% annual rate of real GNP growth and prices increase only moderately, the Gross National Product in 1975 would soar to \$1,200 billion—that's one trillion, 200 billion or, putting it in a time frame, \$2 million per minute.

Projections of the National Industrial Conference Board show that less than one-fourth of the families will have incomes of less than \$5,000 in 1975, down from one third in this decade. The proportion of families falling within the \$5,000 to \$10,000 range will be only 34% in 1975, down from 43% a decade before.

But the dramatic shift takes place in the proportion of families with incomes over \$10,000: an increase to 42% in 1975 from 25% a decade earlier.

Thus, a substantial shift into upper income ranges is expected in the 1970's—a fact with far reaching implications for the kinds of consumer goods and services which will be in future demand.

Petroleum will have a prominent place in this stupendous market growth. One needs only consider the housing demands and transportation required of this kind of economy to gain perspective of the potential. It will not be surprising if new car purchases exceed 13 million in 1975.

I would like to turn now briefly to the political scene. Perhaps one of the most profound changes which will occur in politics in the 1970's will be in the makeup and in the philosophies of the major political parties themselves.

The political landscape today is cluttered with obsolescent and decaying structures which are giving way to the new ideas and the realities and the challenges of our times.

In the South, for example, we see the emergence of a two-party system in place of the monolithic structure which had prevailed for nearly a century following the Reconstruction. The term "the Solid South" is a political anachronism buried under the economic and social upheavals of the new day. This will benefit the South because it will no longer be politically like the good wife who is taken for granted.

We see a spreading revolt against some of the outworn political machines which once held many of our major population centers in the tight grip of powerful big city bosses.

We see a decline in the political power of the agricultural bloc as more than seventy percent of the American people now live on one percent of our land area in dense urban concentrations.

We see a breaking up of the old coalitions and alliances of minority groups, hyphenated Americans, the underprivileged and the exploited who were joined by common fears and misery.

The broadening stream of a well educated, industrious, and prospering Ameri-

can middle class is producing an evolution, if not a revolution, in the ideologies, philosophy, and assumptions which had cast the mold of politics in America since the Roosevelt years.

There are few indications that the Nixon domestic program will differ to any substantive degree from the Johnson domestic program. One might conclude that in the present day of complex, difficult, and costly national problems, disagreement centers not only the definition of fundamental objectives but on the approach for attaining the objectives.

This could well mean that politics in the 1970's will be strongly influenced by demonstrated management ability in government. Certainly more and more Americans are going to insist on more efficient and economical management of the Federal Government from planning and the ordering of priorities to productivity and cost effectiveness.

There are clear signs of this in the debate over reform of the postal system, as an illustration.

There seems to be a turning of the tide in the flow of organized labor towards one political party and business towards the opposing party. This is a welcome development because it would prove extremely unfortunate if labor and business were to become polarized into opposing political parties which would thus become their captives.

We have only to consider the difficulties of England today to comprehend the danger. The strength of our society rests to an important degree on our broad diversity and the free running stream of pluralism. We invigorate and enhance our two-party system by ensuring that each preserves diversity and a certain universality within its framework.

Both the Republican and the Democratic parties need the wisdom, experience, innovative talents, and resourcefulness of businessmen. The problems of our times are of such scale and complexity that we shall not find satisfactory solutions to many without the full participation of businessmen.

American businessmen have had a leading role in building for our nation the world's largest, strongest, and most productive economy. Without our great economic leaps forward there would be small hope of eliminating squalor and want.

The government cannot decree economic success; but it can help set the conditions for businessmen to achieve it. This is the essence of the constructive partnership that holds real hope for the attainment of our social objectives as well as continued economic progress.

It is extremely unfortunate that so many people in public life who should know better persist in pursuing a business-baiting course which too often exaggerates the shortcomings of the industry while obscuring its towering contributions to social and economic gains which have made our country the envy of the world.

To the well-intentioned but misguided business-baiters I say let's cease those tactics which tend to create general distrust of the business community and undermine confidence in our economic system.

We should and must continue to eliminate abuse and shoddy practice wherever we find it but let us reject those who paint businessmen as villains in order to obtain headlines.

Our system isn't perfect; nor will it ever be. But no system has worked so well for so many. We must exercise great care in our actions affecting the economic engine that has taken us so far so fast.

In assessing the shape of politics in the 1970's I predict that businessmen will take a broader, more energetic and enlightened role in public affairs than at any time in the past.

It is also predictable that businessmen will increasingly support candidates of both parties who understand the problems and the needs of business. I think the healthy pragmatism which has characterized business decision-making will assert itself in the political sphere. It is difficult to conceive of modern day business executives persisting in dogmatic loyalties which have come to be empty of meaning.

In the 1970's the business executive will not buy dogma and demagoguery; he will be issue-oriented and will carefully assess the plans and alternatives proposed by the candidates. His loyalty will be less to a political party and more to those who set the conditions that are good for our economic system irrespective of political affiliation.

Finally I would like to say that I feel we are approaching a new political epoch in the 1970's. Perhaps at this moment there is not apparent on the scene the ideas and the inspirational drive which mark great political movements.

But it is my belief that a powerful new political movement is in the making.

There has never been a great civilization which has not had as its seat great cities. We cannot continue as the world's leading nation if we permit our cities to decay.

Rather must we build cities of beauty and splendor worthy of the real America. These cities must be more than the mirror of our advances in science, medicine, the arts, architecture, literature, commerce and industry.

They must shine as examples for the world that in a free society all things are possible—and that they are possible for all. The next truly great political movement in America will in my judgment embody this assumption.

This movement is now awaiting its leader who may well become the next political giant in our history. He will succeed only if he draws from the strengths of the great mainstream of middle class America which, in truth, provides the foundations for building a renewed and better nation.

NEED FOR REFORM IN OUR ADMINISTRATIVE AND GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I have studied with great interest President Nixon's appeal for reason to the Congress and the Nation, submitted to this Congress earlier this month.

President Nixon is a good man, a good President and a good American. His message—a plea to hasten the reform and modernization of our federal system—is reasonable, valid and as nonpolitical as it is possible to make any communication from the White House to the Congress.

I urge all of my colleagues to read it and study it. I urge them to rise above politics and personal advantage when they do so. It is a message that was designed to help all of us do so. In the face of today's ferment and turmoil we cannot afford to cling stubbornly to the past. We cannot afford as citizens and Members of Congress to ignore this well-reasoned plea from the President of the United States. We need reform in our administrative and governmental structure. We need it now. I urge it now.

GREEN THUMB PROGRAM DEEPLY APPRECIATED

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago one of our colleagues, Hon. TIM LEE CARTER of Kentucky, called to our attention the outstanding approval of the Green Thumb program by the people in Estil County, Ky. I wish to invite the attention of the House to a large group of letters which I have received from Haskell County, Okla., which also point out the great work being done by the Green Thumb organization in that Oklahoma county.

The overall supervision of Green Thumb programs has been lodged in the Office of Economic Opportunity and is administered by the Department of Labor with the assistance of the National Farmers Union. Green Thumb would never have become a reality had it not been for the leaders of the National Farmers Union who fight the battles of the small farmer.

Green Thumb provides supplemental income for needy rural residents with agricultural backgrounds. It is now implemented in seven Oklahoma counties of which Haskell county in the Third Congressional District is one. To demonstrate what the people of that county think of the work of Green Thumb, I wish to quote from letters written by some of its good citizens.

The Honorable O. L. Sherley, superintendent of Haskell County Schools, thinks the Green Thumb program very worthwhile. He writes:

The people who were employed in this project took a very personal pride in their work and were very happy to be doing something worthwhile and constructive.

Mr. Fred R. Ward of Stigler wrote to the Haskell County Community Action Foundation, and part of his letter follows:

May I take this opportunity to express my appreciation for the improvements made at Lake John Wells through the Green Thumb project. Progress at the lake has far exceeded my expectations.

Mr. Ross Billingsley, also of Stigler, was of a similar opinion because he states this in his letter:

The value received from the results of the Green Thumb project at the Stigler City Lake has far surpassed my expectations. A great service has been rendered to our community by these old timers, and I, for one, heartily congratulate them.

And Eulis Lafave, Stigler, has written: We appreciate the good job that has been done there—

Meaning the new City Lake.

Reba Dunn, the Headstart director of the KiBois Community Action Foundation, Inc., also wrote:

The men employed through Green Thumb are doing work they enjoy and doing it with pride in a job well done. I feel this is a most worthwhile program and hope to see it continue.

The Honorable Clifton Few, sheriff of Haskell County, has also noted the fine job done by the Green Thumb workers, and for this reason stated in his letter:

One can definitely see the improvements upon entering the area. I would like to see the project continued because of the benefit derived not only by the public but workers as well.

The Honorable Fannie Renfrow, city clerk of Stigler, in her letter added these words:

Because of the dedication to their work, our Park has received First Place Award in a fourteen-state region. We are very proud of this achievement which could not have been done without the assistance of Green Thumb members.

Mr. and Mrs. Roy Highfill, Stigler, have been impressed by the good work of Green Thumb. They joined in this statement:

We are very grateful for the Green Thumb Project work which has been done this year at Lake John Wells, which we usually refer to as Stigler's new city lake. The work done by Green Thumb has made it one of the best.

Mrs. Hazel Killian added:

We think the Green Thumb Project is wonderful. It has certainly made our City Park an asset to the Community.

Nellie Beller and Mrs. Buie Kirkpatrick and Mrs. Deward Martin made similar statements. All wrote that they "appreciate all your efforts given to this program."

Mr. Hercul W. Hickman, who lives on Route 3 outside of Stigler, also said:

The City Lake Park Project deserves and is receiving praise from people all over the county and from others who visit our City Lake Park.

Mr. M. H. Dunn holds a similar opinion. He wrote:

Besides providing supplemental income to the elderly men of our community, we now have a beautiful picnic, camping, and swimming area adjacent to our new city lake.

Becky Hickman writes:

As Social Worker for Head Start in Haskell county it was my privilege to go with our Head Start children to the City Lake Park for a picnic in the spring. This summer our church has been to the Park for several picnics and on each occasion I have heard so much praise for the beautiful rock work, landscaping, and beach improvement.

The Honorable Ruby Rainwater, county treasurer of Haskell County, writes:

I think the Green Thumb Project at the new City Lake has made a wonderful improvement on the area. This summer, we attended a picnic supper with a group of church people. While we were there there were two different groups on the grounds. All those in our group remarked numerous times on the wonderful work the Green Thumb workers had done.

And now, I will quote from a letter signed by many members of the New Century club of Stigler:

How we enjoy taking visitors for picnic, boating, swimming, skiing and fishing to Lake John Wells. Our thanks to the Green Thumb men for putting forth that little extra labor, which caused this part to be selected "best."

The letter was signed by Fred R. Ward, Dolores I. Williamson, Mrs. James D. Love, Mrs. O. L. Sherley, Mrs. W. H. Mc-

Collum, Mrs. Michael Howard, Mrs. William E. Cox, Jr., Mrs. M. H. Dunn, Mrs. Rex Pettyjohn, Miss Modena Mitchell, Hazel Killian, L. M. Smithy, Ann Henderson, Mrs. John Aston, Mrs. Grady Ollin, president, Mrs. Connie Tucker, Pauline Strombaugh, Mrs. Ruth Gulley, Mrs. A. D. Waltz, and Mrs. Burl Grubbs.

I proudly salute the Green Thumb program.

A CIVIC GROUP WITH VISION

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, civic groups come and civic groups go. Some leave only the lightest impression on the life of the community they would serve. Others thrive, perhaps because in the beginning they set themselves more realistic goals, or had a firmer vision of community need.

One civic organization in California which has thrived as the community has grown is the San Fernando Valley Industrial Association. This group is about to mark its 20th anniversary.

Twenty years ago the founders of this organization, a group of clear-thinking businessmen, recognized that the San Fernando Valley had a tremendous growth potential. It had a favorable climate, a stable labor market, good industrial transportation, and the essential public utilities. With unusual foresight, however, they realized that uncontrolled industrial growth would blight this lovely valley and the lives of its inhabitants. So they dedicated themselves to building a well-balanced community, with individual values carefully guarded while they worked to foster the conditions that would attract industry.

Their credo reads:

This organization has a three-fold purpose . . . to bring more desirable industries to the Valley . . . (to) create more jobs for residents in the Valley . . . (and to) protect the interests of property owners and investors in the Valley.

In the 20 years of this organization's existence, the population of San Fernando Valley has increased 750 percent. In 20 years its economy has changed from a predominantly agricultural base to a well-balanced industrial-commercial-residential area.

Most of the credit for the phrase, "well-balanced," must go to the San Fernando Valley Industrial Association, with its larger, and future-oriented view, of the whole area.

But they have had their struggles. The San Fernando Valley is a clearly defined geographical area. Within this large area there are numerous clusters of homes which over the years have become recognizable, separate communities. Like people the world over whose primary interests lie in their own homes and neighborhoods, the residents of these communities have sometimes been myopic, their vision of the whole valley blurred by this overriding, but limited, interest.

As a result, when the industrial association proposed a land development program in 1952 which set aside carefully identified areas for future industrial development, strong opposition arose. Even after the city of Los Angeles had adopted the zoning ordinances recommended by the association, some civic groups—the kind that "come and go"—brought legal action to overturn them.

Eventually the assault was turned aside, and today, an 1,100-acre tract of land set aside under the association's land development program which houses enormous industries surrounded by hundreds of smaller supporting facilities is regarded as a model for industrial zoning throughout the Nation.

The San Fernando Valley is not blighted by these industrial giants. On the contrary, it is a homogeneous region of quiet residential areas, united by a sense of being a part of the 20th century, and unobtrusively supported by thriving industries. Most of the workers are homeowners. But now, instead of identifying themselves as residents of Van Nuys, or Pacoima, or Reseda, or Northridge—to list a few of the community names—most regard themselves primarily as "valley residents."

I think it is fair to say that this broader view derives in large measure from the work of the San Fernando Valley Industrial Association. And I think most residents would agree with me when I say, I am glad this is one civic group that "came and stayed."

SENATOR BOB DOLE OF KANSAS

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, some little known facts about that great American, Senator BOB DOLE of Kansas, were revealed last Sunday in the Chicago Tribune.

Senator DOLE arranged to present an autographed photograph of President Nixon to Dr. Hampar Kelikian, on the occasion of a testimonial dinner, and DOLE's war injuries were revealed in some detail. I am confident our colleagues in both the House and Senate are interested in the following account:

SENATOR BOB DOLE OF KANSAS

(By Philip Warden)

WASHINGTON, October 25.—A personally autographed picture of President Nixon went in the mail this week for Dr. Hampar Kelikian, the senior orthopedic surgeon at Wesley Memorial hospital, Chicago.

The presentation of the photo was expected to be one of the highlights of a dinner at the Palmer House, last Saturday night, at which Dr. Kelikian was the guest of honor.

But, the Nixon administration, like its predecessors, sometimes encounters foulups, and the photo did not reach Sen. Robert Dole (R., Kan.), who was to make the presentation, until late this week.

AN ARMENIAN-AMERICAN

Dr. Kelikian, an Armenian-American, was honored both as "a great Armenian and outstanding American" in connection with his

appointment to the President's task force on problems of the physically handicapped.

Dr. Ralph De Forest of the American Medical Association, Chicago, is president of the task force which is expected to suggest ways to the President for getting the physically handicapped more involved in community life and training them for jobs.

Sen. Dole had a personal interest. Dr. Kelikian, with his surgical skills, converted Dole from a World War II near basket case into a bouncy, handsome, witty, greatly respected member of the United States Senate.

LEADS PLATOON

Dole, in April, 1945, as a young army lieutenant, decided to lead personally his platoon across Italy's Po river valley to wipe out a German machine gun nest. Crawling from a shell hole to hurl a hand grenade at the nest, he was struck by machine gun bullets and fragments from a mortar shell which blew him back into the shell hole. He discovered his legs were paralyzed and he thought his arms were shot off because he could neither feel nor see them.

Dole spent 39 months in various army hospitals. He finally overcame his paralysis, but could not regain the use of his right arm nor overcome his depression.

While at Percy Jones General hospital in Battle Creek, Mich., he heard of Dr. Kelikian's work in Chicago, and decided to visit him. He went to Chicago, and, in a series of operations, the doctor transplanted bone and muscle from Dole's leg to his shoulder and arm. Dole cannot grasp with his hand, but now it's his only handicap.

DINNER HONORS DOLE

Dr. Kelikian went to Luray, Kans., last month to a dinner honoring Dole.

"He was my best patient," said Dr. Kelikian. "I knew he would be a congressman. I knew he would be a senator. And I know he'll go farther, and I wait for the day."

Dole told his fellow Kansans that Dr. Kelikian told him "to grow up and do something with my life." Dole at the time was still hoping to return to college and be a basketball player and a doctor of medicine. "He made me understand I wouldn't be playing basketball again and that this wasn't the worst thing that could happen.

"Dr. Kelikian operated on me at least eight times, and he wouldn't let me pay a cent. He lost a brother in the war."

Dole went back to college, switched from medicine to law, and embarked on a successful career in politics.

RULES FOR BRINGING ABOUT A REVOLUTION

HON. JOHN M. SLACK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, last week I was present at the biennial meeting of the Royal Order of Scotland, and was highly honored to be enrolled among the membership of the Royal Order of Scotland. On that occasion the group was addressed by Marvin E. Fowler, provincial grand master of the order, and certain portions of that fine address seemed to direct themselves to the central point of origin for many of the recent events which have created distasteful headlines.

I take great pleasure in directing your attention to these excerpts from the address by Mr. Fowler, because I feel sure you will recognize the parallel between

an event occurring in 1919 and certain conditions which today constitute a growing hazard to our national strength, unity and sense of purpose:

Victor Hugo said: "Destiny is made up of crossroads." It is the crossroads in life that make the going hard and interesting. Obstacles—red lights at the crossroads—confront us throughout life's journey. It is the obstacles in life that cause us to stop, look and think. We need a few red lights to teach us caution, to develop our patience and temper our actions. We can profit from the obstacles we encounter. They frequently point to a moral or teach a lasting lesson. They become a part of our experience and bring us to a realization of things as they are.

All sensible men are concerned about the obstacles that confront those who believe in our way of life. We are constantly reminded that our time honored customs and rules of conduct are seriously threatened. The red light flashes and it's time for us to look and think, and it's time for us to choose our course and press forward with vigor. Will humanity be able to profit from the ills confronting it today? It hardly seems possible. But every time I see a clean cut young man seriously interested in the teachings of DeMolay—I take heart—and I appreciate this young man all the more because of the contrast with some of the unkempt, unclean and hairy individuals seen on the streets and in the parks. Let us hope and pray that some good may come from these obstacles of today and let us use our influence to see that we and those around us choose the right road into the future.

Earlier this month I spoke at the Masonic Home, and I want to repeat a small portion of that talk because I believe it contains something that should be brought to your attention. I shall hope that the following statement will stimulate a response on your part—ever bearing in mind that we each have a heritage worthy of being preserved. I quote from my previous talk as follows:

On a dark night in May, 1919, members of the allied military intelligence arrested a group of revolutionaries in the town of Dusseldorf, Germany. In the course of the raid, the allied officers emptied the contents of a safe and found therein a document containing a specific outline of "Rules for Bringing About a Revolution." It shows the strategy of a materialistic revolution, and how personal attitudes and the habits of lives affect the affairs of nations. This document, seized in 1919, a half century ago, lists the following "rules":

A. Corrupt the young. Get them away from religion. Get them interested in sex. Make them superficial, destroy their ruggedness.

B. Get control of all means of publicity and thereby:

1. Get people's minds off their government by focusing their attention on athletics, sexy books and plays and other trivialities.
2. Divide the people into hostile groups by constantly harping on controversial matters of no importance.
3. Destroy the people's faith in their natural leaders by holding these latter up to ridicule and contempt.
4. Always preach true democracy, but seize power as fast and as ruthlessly as possible.
5. By encouraging government extravagance, destroy its credit, produce fear of inflation with rising prices and general discontent.
6. Foment unnecessary strikes in vital industries, encourage civil disorders and foster a lenient and soft attitude on the part of government toward such disorders.
7. By specious arguments cause the breakdown of the old moral virtues; honesty, sobriety, faith in the pledged word, ruggedness.
- C. Cause the registration of all firearms on some pretext, with a view to confiscating them and leaving the population helpless.

Could these rules for bringing about a revolution ever succeed in our beloved country? How critical is our present-day plight? I urge each of you to accept your individual responsibility and your individual opportunity. Constant vigilance and earnest exemplification of the principles of Masonry should be a Masons "cloud by day" and his "pillar of fire by night."

MANKIND IS A REALITY TODAY

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, Eugene Clifford, director of public affairs for the Cooperative League of the U.S.A. and formerly special assistant to the manager of the Wisconsin Electric Cooperative for the State of Wisconsin, was the principal speaker at the Central Wisconsin Co-op Rally at Wausau, Wis., on October 9.

Mr. Clifford's speech on the value of cooperatives as a way of teaching democracy and making it function is a fitting tribute to the cooperative movement during October Co-op Month. Cooperatives have made a significant contribution to the American way of life and it is a real pleasure for me to call Mr. Clifford's excellent speech to the attention of my colleagues. The speech follows:

Mankind is a reality today.

It has not been before; certainly not with the sense of compactness and unity that the word implies. It really could not be because there was no perspective, no vantage point from which men could look upon themselves and their world and see it as the "one world" we have talked about and never fully understood.

Over the years and across the world, more often than not, people have been identified according to their differences and their divisions. They have been Americans, Russians, Chinese, Irish and many other things, depending on the origins of their ancestors; they have been Protestants, Catholics, Jews and other classifications based not at all on the togetherness of "mankind" but on the apartness of religious differences; they have been Republicans and Democrats; they have been farmers, laborers, businessmen; industrialists and a host of other things that label them according to how they earn their living.

The distinctions are still there today, but the emphasis is not at all the same, and probably never will be quite so prominent again.

The joint magic of space travel and television recently gave all of us the perspective we never had before—a long look at ourselves and our earth from a quarter of a million miles away. And we saw a remarkably beautiful gem of the firmament, bright and promising in the dark setting of space, with none of man's divisions showing at all. We could see no borders or boundaries anywhere, no iron curtain, no Berlin wall, no rocket launching pads. We could see only One World. And this was the long look, the broad view, that put us face to face with the absolute necessity to move all of mankind as one toward the best that One World can provide for its inhabitants. Having looked on this stirring scene, it is simply inconceivable that man could—or would want to—escape responsibility to advance the community of interests we all share. Not the individual interest, or the family interest, or the business interest, or any other single interest—but the community interest.

The long look across a quarter of a million

miles showed us this view, and a great deal more.

Having seen it, and having recognized our One World as a lonely oasis for one people in the seemingly limitless celestial pattern, we must have recognized at the same time the need for a closer look at the things that need doing to assure that the people are truly one—one in opportunity, one in responsibility, one in the shared satisfactions and advantages of One World.

It is this searching, closer look that shows us the things that need doing to match reality to the vision—the things that need changing . . . that need improving . . . that need the persistent concern and effort of men.

This is the closer look that will show the despair of the ghettos . . . the hunger of children . . . the hopelessness of the uneducated and untrained . . . the pain of the untreated ill.

The "giant leap for mankind" was not the physical leap to the surface of the moon. In its best sense, it was the impressive leap in man's understanding of himself and his world, and the start of a new determination that none must be left out of the oneness of mankind.

Offering an invocation on the occasion of Chicago's welcome to the astronauts, Cardinal Cody described the moon landing as the beginning of the Age of the Family of Man. He put it well—and, it seems to me, this points up the real significance of the "giant leap for mankind."

The Family of Man is not a new concept, but it has been a sadly limited application of an age-old concept. Certainly, there is nothing unfamiliar in this idea to this audience; you are here because you know about this kind of thinking, you are a part of its practical application, you are representative of veritable microcosms of the universal Family of Man we hope for.

You are practitioners of the cooperative way. And it is in this adaption of the mutual interest, self-help instrument that we see the outlines of the economic ideal—the magic blend of equality and equity, where none ranks above or below, in which men have found that personal sense or worth and dignity that comes of having something to say about some of the things that affect their lives.

William Hazlitt wrote that "Man is the only animal that laughs and weeps, for he is the only animal that is struck by the difference between what things are and what they ought to be."

You and those of the cooperative movement who have gone before are part of a select group who observed this difference between things as they are and as they ought to be, and perhaps laughed or wept, but then set out with vigor and persistence to do something about it.

When farmer producers found their economic fortunes were totally out of their own hands and completely beyond any semblance of their own control, they could and did do something about it. They formed their own processing, marketing and purchasing cooperatives.

The same self-help technique has been put to work to provide access to credit, to deliver electric energy across rural America, to establish the telephone network that for the first time tied in much of the rural countryside with the modern communications that are one of the major features of the 20th century.

The consumers of this country, rural and urban alike, adopted this same cooperative idea to improve the economics of their own lives, and it is a remarkable tribute to the effectiveness of this user-owned device that it is demonstrably valuable to both the initial producer and the ultimate consumer of the fundamental necessities of life. And there is an eloquent lesson to be noted in this pic-

ture of both producer and consumer choosing the cooperative solution to the problem of third-party, absentee control over decisions that should be rightfully their own.

The producer and the consumer are beginning to see themselves on common ground as they feel the weight of the snow-balling industrial complex that can dictate what the former will be paid for production and what the latter will pay for the end product. They see the life-and-death power over both that walks hand-in-hand with a situation that finds 85 percent of the breakfast cereal business firmly in the hands of only four firms. They are learning that it is a typical situation from coast to coast to have 50 percent of the food retailing business in any city funneled to the cash registers of the four largest retailers. They know now that more than half the output of the canning industry is the combined product of only 20 firms, and that another scant 20 firms control more than two-thirds of the frozen food industry output.

This is the picture that is now beginning to clear in the minds of urban consumers, who are applying their own organized efforts to see into the reasons for food costs. They are learning such remarkable things as the interesting fact that a box of well-known breakfast food for which they pay 49¢ actually contains eight-tenths of one cent worth of oats. And they can see the trouble with food prices, with outrageous frauds in quantity and quality, with deception on the label as well as on the price tag, are not the imaginative creations of the men who planted and cultivated and harvested, but the absentee third party.

The use of the cooperative as a wholesale and retail source of foods and other household supplies has contributed as much as any other single thing, and more than most, to this new consumer understanding. At the same time, it eases the pressure exerted by that growing industrial thumb on the windpipes of producer and consumer alike.

The cooperative creates this powerfully beneficial and mutually helpful effect for both sides of what once were thought to be incompatible interests. It can do this because it is not remote and apart from the human element that dictates decency and honesty and fairness if people are really to translate their Sunday morning professions into week-long practice. It moves into this role easily, because the cooperative—any kind of cooperative—is composed of people, controlled by people, and intended to serve for people.

There simply is nothing else anywhere on the business scene remotely like this—nothing at all comparable in purpose and motivation. This is why the cooperative can be, as it clearly is coming to be, the healing salve to cure what once was viewed as a necessary producer-consumer friction.

There was much of a "missionary" nature about the early cooperators in this country, and there is a new kind of missionary spirit demonstrated in the cooperative movement right now that reveals some fundamentally important things about the real character of the cooperative and its supporters.

The President of the University of Wisconsin, Dr. Harrington, hit upon this spirit in his recent comments on Co-op Month. He said this: "The cooperative way is more than a way of doing business. It is part of the American way of life, a way of teaching democracy, a way of bringing together people who are interested in more than profit. Cooperatives help teach the triumph of democracy over various alternative approaches to solving the problems of our civilization."

The essence here, as I see it, is this description of the cooperative as "a way of teaching democracy" and as "the triumph of democracy over various alternatives."

The government of the United States has repeatedly indicated its faith in the effec-

tiveness of the cooperative as a basic lesson in the ABCs of democracy. It is the easily understood example of a way of doing things that puts the doing directly in the hands of the people involved, that vests them with responsibility and authority and a mutual sense of obligation. It is the simple process of providing that each man stands as tall as any other man in the matter of decision-making in matters of common concern. One member, one vote is a fundamental principle of democracy in the United States; it is a fundamental principle of cooperatives all over the world.

It seems to me that the inherent quality of a people, their goodness or badness, their indifference or concern, must reflect more sharply and more clearly in a democratic system than in any other. Where people are free to express themselves, to sound their criticisms, to issue their challenges, to demonstrate their faith, they do so. They do so in our political democracy, in which a partisan pre-election campaign often includes the crudest elements of a back-alley brawl and the precise and reasoned persuasion of the platform debater or the objective editorialist.

Elections and membership meetings of the economic democracy, the cooperative, often are like that too. We all can dredge up memories now of decisions in both these arenas that may very well have been wrong. But it is a strong testimonial to the ultimate wisdom of the people that by and large, over the years, their decisions have been sound and have contributed to the dramatic evolution of both these democracies in this country.

The people themselves, at any given time, are the country and are the cooperative. In this role, their volunteered contributions to improve their world, their own lives and the situation of many others, are simply beyond question.

I think it is important that we acknowledge these contributions, and recognize their nature and their broadly-shared values, particularly in times like these when the air resounds with loud charges that these same people have wrong values or no values, have little concern or no concern, and have added little or nothing to the quality of the time they occupy in the history of men.

This simply is not so, and I think it is a part of any reasonable commitment to truth and decency to insist loudly and publicly and repeatedly that it is not so.

This has been a time on the scale of civilization that has seen the life expectancy of man increased by 50 percent, cut the workday by a third and at the same time doubled the per capita output. These are the years that have put higher education, once the privilege of the very few, within the grasp of millions. This is the period that has wiped out plagues, produced the answer to polio, found cures for some kinds of cancer and ways to slow the course of others, developed the intricate way to sew the severed limb back to the body, to open the ailing heart and repair it, to completely replace the heart or kidney that could not be remedied, thus guaranteeing the miracle of life for added months or years.

This is the time that saw the people of this country become the best informed and most completely informed of any people at any stage of history; that provided parks and trails and recreational areas all over the land, and broad, safe roads leading to them. It is the time that provided better food, better housing and better clothing for more people than ever before anywhere. It is the time that produced a far-reaching social revolution in this country, without revolt or bloodshed, that enlisted the people's government more fully than ever before in the people's cause—in the matters of decent medical care, dignified retirement years, reasonable job security and working conditions, and increasing means of protection against those who

viewed the consumer as fair game for subterfuge, deception and outright fraud.

Not everything has been accomplished. Not everyone has everything. Far too many still have far too little. But the deep concern that inspired many of these things continues, and increases, the trend is in the direction of the remedies. The fact that not everything has been done simply cannot be said to mean that nothing has been done. The people of this time of rapid advance on an impressively broad front have solid credentials as volunteer participants in the necessary struggle to better the quality of life for everyone.

No society in the history of the world has submitted to a weight of levied taxes comparable to that borne by the people of this time of development. And it is significant that no society before this willingly devoted so great a share of its time and labor and dollars to persisting efforts to improve life and health and educational opportunity for millions of others, both here and around the world.

Brutal criticism of these efforts, and of the results of these efforts, lacks authority and credibility when it comes from those who have not yet been tested themselves in this same crucible, who have not yet abandoned the sound and fury for the wearying personal sacrifice that means things are being done, not discussed.

If these critics want to know "where it's happening" today they should be told first of all where it is not happening. It is not happening in the streets . . . in the marches . . . in the soap box oratory . . . in the sit-downs and the sleep-ins and the drop-outs.

It is happening where people are willing to invest themselves to help cure the ills of our time. And it is happening with no greater effect anywhere than in the ranks of the cooperators who think and move in a collective way to help themselves, a way that requires the benefits of all they do to be shared among all those involved, and to be shared equally.

Those who have preferred to withdraw from schools, from politics, from jobs and from society, itself, are sitting aloof on the banks as life and all the doing it requires flows past. We hear them chant that "what the world needs now is love, sweet love," and we agree. But we also must insist that the world does not need poems of love and songs of love and sweet thoughts of love nearly so badly as it needs something to be done about love.

When millions of the world's people never have known a full meal, we need the energy and know-how of those who can produce and can teach others how to produce. When millions are groping in the darkness of illiteracy, we need open purses to provide pens and pencils and paper and books, and we need dedicated people to teach. When millions are sapped and pained by sickness and disease, we need educated and devoted hands to nurse and to heal. We need doers.

These are the festering sores of the world that have not been healed. And the shame of our time is that so many youthful hands are clutching rocks in poorly conceived outrage, when the agonizing need is for so many of these same hands to hold scalpels and pencils . . . and occasionally the pitiful, eloquently empty hands of the helpless.

The cooperative cannot be the social conscience of this country. But it certainly is a splendid and appropriate instrument to collect and focus the social conscience of many, many individual cooperators. And there is ample evidence that the cooperative has done exactly that with excellent effect.

The cooperative, like the institutions of a democratic government, is not an entity apart from the people. It is the membership . . . it is the people. And because it is, it can reflect accurate people concern about people problems. Multiplying the voices of the

individual members, it is a powerful means to turn up the volume so that this concern can be heard and respected.

Perhaps it is in this capacity that the cooperative device will find its most demanding secondary role in the years just ahead.

It is increasingly evident that man is going to need stern and decisive action soon, not so much to continue the improvement of his world as to save it. The technology of our time has put men on wheels and in the air and far out in space; it has produced a dazzling array of manufactured products calculated to make living easier, working more productive and recreation more enjoyable. And all of this together has produced mountains of residues and wastes of all sorts that now threaten to make man himself extinct. Your Wisconsin Senator Gaylor Nelson told his colleagues the other day that man is now considered by many to be on the endangered species list. He warned that "some ecologists and biologists have already concluded that it will only be a matter of time before mankind breeds and pollutes itself to extinction."

We all have heard that one of this country's Great Lakes, 240-mile long Lake Erie, is believed by many experts to be already condemned by the monumental discharge of pollutants that have fouled it for years. The lake literally is choking to death on municipal and industrial wastes. Lake Erie was gouged out by glaciers 12,000 years ago—but it has been artificially aged 15,000 years beyond that in the last 50 years alone.

Lake Erie is not alone. The Potomac River reaches Washington, D.C., as a clear stream. It oozes out the other side contaminated with 240-million gallons of waste every day. The Cuyahoga River in Ohio is said to be a fire hazard because of its thick coating of residues and oil. Swimmers who dive into Long Island Sound are splashing into 196-million gallons of waste that comes from 46 municipal plants, 56 industrial plants and seven federal installations every day.

Merely to breathe for half a day in New York City is similar to smoking a full pack of cigarettes. Dirty air is estimated to cost the economy more than \$11-billion every year, but at this point the federal government spends only \$78-million a year on air pollution abatement.

Rural America is not isolated from the problem. Even the largely rural State of Colorado, with its majestic mountains, clear waters and impressive open spaces, found it necessary several years ago to enact an air pollution control law. Make no mistake about it, when the atmosphere of One World and its soils and water supplies have been poisoned, there will be no place to hide.

These are people worries and people concerns. And it will be more important tomorrow than ever before for people to have ways to organize their efforts, to amplify their voices, to focus their influence. Their member-controlled cooperatives give them that way right now.

But that absentee third party is still waiting in the wings to pull the curtain on people who try to get into the act in their own behalf. This is the force that persists in its effort to keep the consumer and the producer suspicious of each other and at each other's throats. It is the same force that doesn't want industry regulated into water and air pollution remedies merely because people want to breathe and swim and to fish.

The cooperative is a powerful megaphone in the hands of the people. It is a powerful lever in their behalf. It makes mutual effort practical, and if that can succeed in collective buying of fertilizer it might also be done in emphasizing the people's demand for clean air and pure water.

The cooperative is the bogey man on the economic scene in this country, so the cooperative must be eliminated, or at least weakened and made ineffective.

The latest push in this direction came recently when a collection of utilities and big business, huddled anonymously behind the title of National Tax Equality Association, slipped a cyanide pellet for cooperatives into the bulky proposals of the Tax Reform Act of 1969.

The very fact that these anti-cooperative forces could get their thinking into a tax reform proposal at all is a clear indication of their influence on important people in important places. As you know, the House has passed this bill, which would dictate to cooperatives how and when they must pay out patronage refunds and revolve their member investment. The measure would put a due date on such investment, changing it from equity capital to debt capital and undermining the cooperative borrowing ability.

Congress does not tell other corporations to pay their dividends in cash. Nor does Congress usurp the corporate management function by spelling out the methods and deadlines for distributing margins.

But somebody somewhere is able to command the attention of enough important members, at least on the House Ways and Means Committee which put this Tax Reform measure together, to stimulate the kind of action they want.

It is sobering to observe that the reform bill, which in reality plugs only about \$1.6-billion worth of tax loopholes out of a grand total of \$50-billion worth in our federal tax structure, reaches far from the path of tax reform to snap this set of handcuffs on cooperatives.

It is sobering because it warns that the interests of many people often are badly bruised when they collide with the interests of many dollars.

But these are the very things that emphasize the grave needs that impelled people to join together in cooperatives in the first place. They emphasize that the old needs, and a lot of new ones, still exist, and that it is vital for people today to reinforce these existing associations and to look hard for more ways and better ways to join forces for mutual benefit.

You are joined together right now in a broader than usual way. You represent a variety of ways in which people have put the cooperation device to good use. You are here because you recognize that you have a powerful common bond, the cooperative. You are here as living testimony that "Co-ops: Progress Through People" is much more than the theme of the 1969 Co-op Month. You know that it really is the capsule story of the ways you have worked together, and of the extra quality you have added to your lives through your common efforts.

You did not need the long perspective afforded by a televised view from the moon to recognize that your cooperative, your microcosm of the Family of Man, put you and your neighbors in One World before others began to speculate that One World was possible.

You knew about mankind and its oneness and its common ground.

I have said that today mankind is a reality.

You of the cooperative family knew it all along.

OTHER WAR IN UNITED STATES RILES GI'S

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot of talk about war weariness in the United States. We hear talk of defeat, and surrender, and bugout.

And much if not most of it comes from people who have never been through a war, from draft dodgers who fear to fight for their country and from others who advocate draft dodging.

Some advocate these things with good intentions, with little thought of what the effect is on our men in Vietnam.

Don Tate, of the Scripps-Howard Newspapers, tell us of the reaction of our soldiers overseas to quitters in America. I commend the following story from the Washington Daily News of October 14 to my colleagues:

OTHER WAR IN U.S. RILES GI'S

(By Don Tate)

SAIGON.—As tomorrow's war "moratorium" will demonstrate, there are two Vietnam wars—the one Americans fight in Vietnam, and the one Americans fight in the U.S. Observers here say the decisive battleground is in the U.S.

They point out that short of a highly successful Communist offensive, which is extremely unlikely, or a dramatic allied strategy change, such as renewed bombing of North Vietnam, the killing war in South Vietnam is apt to rock along in its fight-lull-fight rhythm much as it has been, at least until many more U.S. troops are withdrawn.

Meanwhile, the war to win American public opinion and, particularly, the mind of Richard M. Nixon, is waxing hotter. What happens in the U.S. will determine what happens here. As the President warns Americans not to buckle and run, protesters prepare to hit the streets, many of them demanding immediate, unilateral withdrawal of all American troops. That translates here as "bugout."

GI DISDAIN "BUGOUT"

It is difficult to find an American soldier here who wants to leave Vietnam that way, or as one GI put it, "with our tails dragging." It is difficult to find one—even among those most disgusted with the war—who wishes simply to abandon the South Vietnamese to a Communist bloodbath.

It is difficult to find one who thinks the value of the American word would be worth a dime anywhere in the world if they did, or that a humiliating U.S. defeat by a blustering Communist midget would do anybody but the Communists any good.

These consequences are apparent to most American here, and they are not acceptable. It is largely a matter of national backbone. Most express hope that President Nixon sticks to seeking a reasonable solution to the war.

There are, of course, many critics of war critics here. They charge that a number of war critics in the U.S. are using the same tactics Hanoi has shown—the more you give them the more they demand, and they both demand total, immediate and unconditional everything.

In the two wars—one group of Americans is convinced of the rightness and necessity of bringing this bitter war to a conclusion by presenting a united front to Hanoi, the other protesting group is more or less convinced the only way out of Vietnam is to get out fast regardless of consequences.

MYSTERY IN VIETNAM

There is often the feeling here that the war is only a secondary feature to the show of exposed nerves going on in the U.S. What the war has done to the U.S. is the biggest mystery of all here.

"It seems like any American who ever wanted to protest anything has found his cause in the Vietnam war", one veteran analyst contends, "and yet 95 per cent of them

have suffered little direct personal hardship because of the war.

"You hear so much of the war-weary American, and how exhausted he is by the war. Yet this exhaustion of the mightiest power on earth is a relative thing. It hasn't been bombed, or invaded, or lived under the Communists a single day. It's manpower loss has been a drop in the bucket compared to that of either North or South Vietnam, and its suffering has been a thousand times less. Many Americans would hardly know the war was going on if it wasn't for newspapers and TV. Suppose Americans had to face what the South Vietnamese people have yet to face? America's exhaustion is a self-induced state of mind, composed mostly of confusion."

One rankled American, with invested years and effort in Vietnam, condemned some of the rantingest protesters as the "most confused of all."

WEARY OF "POPPING OFF"

"Soldiers do the dying," he said, "and these others do the popping off. I'm tired of hearing these so-sure people who haven't shed a nose-bleed in this war scream pig this and obscene that and run around protesting for the hell of it.

"I'm tired of hearing what politicians who sound like Hanoi radio demand, what well-meaning but awfully uninformed students demand, what ivory-tower doves who wouldn't dirty their hands over here demand. I'm weary of hearing how much Sen. (J. William) Fulbright, D., Ark., wants out. We all want out. We all protest the war. We all want peace. But not by saying: 'Here Hanoi, take 17 million people. We'll pretend we were never involved. We quit.'"

Many here feel that some of the protesters would do well to focus their moral wrath less on President Nixon and more on the Communists.

It is the Communists, they stress, who are killing Americans. It is the Communists who butchered, as a matter of policy, the civilians of Hue and so many other places, and it is the Communists who will murder methodically thousands more Vietnamese if the U.S. totally, immediately and unconditionally abandons them, as many protesters advocate.

To Americans who have put in their time here, it is not good enough to dismiss blandly such realities with an: "Oh, well, it is up to the Vietnamese to work out their own problems."

Many here, eyewitnesses to the war, have become anti-war in the truest sense, but they have also become resolutely anti-bugout.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this summer I sent a questionnaire to every household in my district, the 28th Congressional District of New York.

Over 10,000 questionnaires were returned to me representing 16,907 individual responses, the results of which my colleagues may find of interest.

The following are the tabulated answers to the questionnaire, with 16,907 total respondents, of which 8,882 were men and 8,025 were women:

Question 1. If the Paris Peace Talks fail to produce agreement leading to at least some disengagement in Vietnam within the next few months, would you favor:

- (a) Withdrawal of all U.S. Military forces from Vietnam even though this might mean a Communist takeover?
- (b) Withdrawal of U.S. troops as rapidly as they can be replaced with South Vietnamese forces?
- (c) An all-out offensive against North Vietnam, utilizing full available military power, short of nuclear weapons, to win a clear cut victory?
- (d) Undecided?

	His	Percent	Her	Percent
(a).....	1,279	14.4	1,292	16.1
(b).....	3,189	35.9	3,338	41.6
(c).....	1,954	22.0	1,220	15.2
(d).....	89	1.0	241	3.0
No response.....	2,371	26.7	1,934	24.1
Total.....	8,882		8,025	

Note: The high percentage of "No Response" on this question was caused by people marking more than one preference. As the computer was programmed to handle only one selection, it would register "No response" when more than one was indicated. In the following questions I have deleted the number of people responding, and only inserted the percentage, as the number of men and women remain constant throughout the survey.

Question 2. Should the power of the President to commit American troops to combat without the specific approval of Congress be curbed?

	[In percent]	
	His	Her
Yes.....	53.1	52.1
No.....	34.3	27.2
Undecided.....	4.1	8.7
No response.....	8.5	12.0

Question 3. Military draft—do you favor:

- (a) Keeping the present system?
- (b) President Nixon's draft by lottery with 19 as the prime age group?
- (c) As a long-range objective, a volunteer armed force supplemented by a Reserve program?

	[In percent]	
	His	Her
(a).....	12.8	8.5
(b).....	28.0	23.7
(c).....	29.7	35.7
Undecided.....	5.4	7.9
No response.....	24.1	24.1

Note: Here, too, the high "No response" was caused by respondents checking 2 answers. In checking over the questionnaires I find almost without exception that the doublechecking came when people indicated approval of the President's plan plus the desire for an all volunteer army as a long-range objective.

Question 4. President Nixon has recommended deployment of a modified ABM system. Are you:

	[In percent]	
	His	Her
In favor.....	48.2	40.8
Opposed.....	29.8	29.6
No opinion.....	14.4	19.1
No response.....	7.5	10.5

Question 5. Which one of the following most closely reflects your attitude toward the Nation's space program?

- (a) Continue with funding at about the present level—\$4 billion in fiscal 1969.
- (b) Accelerate, increasing funds if necessary.
- (c) Cut back, reallocate funds to major domestic programs.

	[In percent]	
	His	Her
(a).....	38.4	32.3
(b).....	8.7	6.1
(c).....	48.2	56.4
No response.....	4.8	5.3

Question 6. Social security benefit increases are being considered by Congress, do you favor:

- (a) A 7-percent increase without a payroll tax increase?

- (b) A 10-percent increase with a modest payroll tax increase?
- (c) No increase now, but a larger increase next year financed by increasing the maximum amount of salary subject to social security tax?
- (d) Do you favor a bill I have introduced tying social security benefits to the cost of living?
- (e) None of the above?

	[In percent]	
	His	Her
(a).....	11.5	11.0
(b).....	3.9	3.9
(c).....	3.8	4.1
(d).....	40.8	44.6
(e).....	12.0	10.1
No response.....	28.0	26.4

Note: Again the "No Response" is large, and in looking over the questionnaires I find that people tended to check A, B, or C plus D. This would indicate that the idea of tying social security benefits to the cost of living is far more popular in our area than the survey shows. I am pleased to note that President Nixon has only recently endorsed the idea of a 10-percent raise and then pegging benefits to the cost of living. In addition to my own bills introduced last February, I have also cosponsored President Nixon's proposed legislation.

Question 7. Should the Federal Government try to create jobs by granting tax incentives to private industry.

	[In percent]	
	His	Her
Yes.....	43.1	34.3
No.....	38.7	39.6
Undecided.....	11.5	16.6
No response.....	6.7	9.5

Question 8. The President has recommended a tax overhaul—do you favor:

	[In percent]	
	His	Her
(a) A reduction of the present 27 1/2% oil depletion allowance?		
Yes.....	77.5	63.9
No.....	10.0	9.8
Undecided.....	12.5	26.3
(b) A minimum tax on the wealthy whose income is now exempt?		
Yes.....	94.3	87.6
No.....	5.3	9.6
Undecided.....	0.4	2.8
(c) Taxing income from investments of private foundations, religious organizations and social clubs.		
Yes.....	69.8	72.2
No.....	20.5	13.9
Undecided.....	9.7	13.9
(d) A continuation of the 10-percent surtax to Jan. 1, 1970, when it will be reduced to 5 percent, coupled with the immediate elimination of the 7% investment tax credit, as suggested by President Nixon?		
Yes.....	51.2	38.8
No.....	34.6	41.8
Undecided.....	14.2	19.4
(e) Elimination of the 10-percent surtax now?		
Yes.....	30.0	41.4
No.....	51.7	41.9
Undecided.....	19.3	16.7

Note: Due to the tremendous desire for tax relief, with respondents answering nearly every alternative, Computer Research developed a separate program for the above computation. Due to this problem, the above figures are the only ones subject to question as many listed as "undecided" could have been "no," the decision on each questionnaire being made on separate inspection. I have been assured by Computer Research that the error factor in the "yes" answers are extremely low.

Question 9. Would you favor legislation fixing the minimum wage at \$2.00 per hour?

	[In percent]	
	His	Her
Yes.....	44.8	46.2
No.....	39.0	32.0
Undecided.....	11.8	15.2
No response.....	4.4	6.5

Question 10. Would you favor:
 (a) Extending the existing National Labor Relations Act to Agriculture?
 (b) Creating an Agriculture Labor Relations Board to deal especially with farm labor problems?

	[In percent]	
	His	Her
(a).....	13.9	11.4
(b).....	24.6	26.6
Undecided.....	30.8	35.1
No response.....	30.7	27.0

Question 11. A proposed Constitutional amendment to change how we choose our President and Vice President is before Congress. Do you prefer:

- (a) Direct popular vote?
- (b) No change from present electoral college reform?
- (c) A system based on allocating each states electoral votes in proportion to the states popular vote?
- (d) A district system where each candidate would receive one electoral college vote for each congressional district he carried, and two for each state he carried?
- (e) No opinion?

	[In percent]	
	His	Her
(a).....	58.2	59.0
(b).....	7.2	6.7
(c).....	9.2	8.5
(d).....	4.9	4.5
(e).....	2.0	3.2
No response.....	18.5	18.1

Question 12. Do you favor a Constitutional amendment to allow voluntary prayer in public schools?

	[In percent]	
	His	Her
Yes.....	75.0	77.1
No.....	15.2	15.8
No opinion.....	6.1	4.9
No response.....	2.8	2.2

Question 13. Do you favor a constitutional amendment which would permit one branch of the state legislature to be elected on a basis other than population?

	[In percent]	
	His	Her
Yes.....	26.9	19.1
No.....	43.6	43.8
No opinion.....	22.1	27.6
No response.....	7.4	9.5

Question 14. Should cigarette advertising on radio and TV be:
 (a) Allowed without restriction?
 (b) Allowed with health hazard warning?
 (c) Banned completely?
 (d) No opinion?

	[In percent]	
	His	Her
(a).....	14.9	9.1
(b).....	38.7	40.8
(c).....	32.3	33.3
(d).....	3.9	4.1
No response.....	10.2	12.8

Question 15. Would you favor making it a Federal crime to:
 (a) Mail or distribute via interstate commerce pornography to minors under 18?
 (b) Mail or distribute through interstate commerce pornography to anyone?
 (c) No opinion?

	[In percent]	
	His	Her
(a).....	25.4	17.2
(b).....	29.8	35.9
(c).....	3.9	5.5
No response.....	40.8	41.4

Question 16. Would you favor Federal licensing or registration of rifles and shotguns?

	[In percent]	
	His	Her
Yes.....	35.6	40.0
No.....	57.4	46.9
No opinion.....	2.5	6.1
No response.....	4.6	7.1

Question 17. Would you favor repeal of restrictions on sale of ammunition for rifles and shotguns?

	[In percent]	
	His	Her
Yes.....	35.7	27.8
No.....	54.1	54.0
No opinion.....	4.4	8.7
No response.....	5.7	9.5

Question 18. Should a government owned postal corporation be created to operate the postal system on a self-supporting basis?

	[In percent]	
	His	Her
Yes.....	68.9	64.1
No.....	16.9	14.0
No opinion.....	8.5	11.0
No response.....	5.7	11.0

Question 19. Would you favor a bill I have introduced calling for national, uniform minimum welfare standards?

	[In percent]	
	His	Her
Yes.....	71.1	70.6
No.....	48.9	14.6
No opinion.....	7.4	5.7
No response.....	6.6	9.1

Question 20. How do you grade the Nixon Administration so far?

	[In percent]	
	His	Her
a. Excellent.....	8.4	6.7
b. Good.....	48.9	50.1
c. Fair.....	27.0	26.6
d. Poor.....	7.7	8.1
No response.....	8.0	8.5

HOW MANY GI'S DID WAR PROTESTERS KILL?

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, a young soldier from my district asked some penetrating questions on October 15, the day of the peace moratorium. His letter speaks for itself and I recommend it to my colleagues. I especially wish that those who supported the moratorium would read this young man's query:

[From the Knoxville News-Sentinel, Oct. 22, 1969]

KNOX SOLDIER IN VIETNAM ASKS: "HOW MANY GI'S DID WAR PROTESTERS KILL?"

(NOTE.—Pfc. Michael J. Lowe, 20, son of Mr. and Mrs. W. F. Lowe, 5008 Knoxwood Drive, wrote the following letter to The News-Sentinel on the day of the Vietnam Moratorium. Pfc. Lowe is a graduate of Beardon High School and has been stationed at Long Binh near Saigon since March.)

TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE: Today you protested against military actions in South Vietnam. You have made me feel very bitter towards you. When I came to Vietnam I thought I represented you, and I was very proud.

You have made it very evident to me that you do not care if Communism gains control of the world. How can it gain control of the world by winning in this small country? Well it won't stop here. It will inch its way toward our great country until eventually it will gain control of it. Through your protest you have given it the encouragement it needs.

Ask yourself this question:

How many Americans did you kill in South Vietnam today?

Is it ridiculous? Through your protest you might have encouraged just one enemy soldier to stay and fight who otherwise might have given up. Now tell me you didn't kill your own sons.

Do you know what it is like to see a buddy lifeless and without legs after his truck has run over an enemy mine? Or hear the screams of a buddy who has been wounded by an enemy bullet? And then pick up a newspaper and see that the people of our own country are supporting the man who has just killed your friend?

People of America, you'd better wake up because someday we won't be fighting in some distant land, we will be fighting on our own soil. Believe me, many more people will die there than ever will here.

Who will you support then?

One of your sons,

Pfc. MICHAEL J. LOWE.

THE LEASED HOUSING PROGRAM IS ALIVE AND WELL, BUT WHATEVER HAPPENED TO RENT SUPPLEMENTS?

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, this body has been engaged in debate on the 1969 Housing Act. We have heard much discussion about new and better ways to improve the quality of life in our growing urban centers. In the midst of this debate, we sometimes lose track of the successful programs which this House has enacted, programs which have had a significant impact on city problems.

One example is the section 23 leased public housing program, which I am proud to have authored in 1965. In the 4 years of its existence, it has grown to the point that now about 70,000 dwellings are part of the program, providing decent housing in privately owned units across the country, while keeping the dwellings on the city tax rolls.

Mr. Simpson Lawson, senior author of City magazine and the City Chronicle, publications of Urban America, Inc., has written an excellent article in the September Chronicle discussing the leased housing program, and comparing it with the rent supplement program which was enacted at the same time.

I commend this article to my colleagues, as an example of a program which is working, and working well—perhaps even better than anticipated. Mr. Lawson's article follows:

THE LEASED HOUSING PROGRAM IS ALIVE AND WELL BUT WHATEVER HAPPENED TO RENT SUPPLEMENTS?

(By Simpson Lawson)

In 1965, responding to growing disenchantment with public housing, Congress authorized two major departures from the orthodox federal approach to housing the poor. By narrow margins in both the House and Senate, it passed the sharply debated rent supplement program. The other innovation, the leased housing or rent certificate program, was authorized by an amendment added to that year's omnibus housing act with scarcely any public notice.

Sent to Capitol Hill in the wake of expansive Johnsonian rhetoric, the rent supplement program became the centerpiece of Administration housing proposals. The leasing amendment was dropped unobtrusively into the bill by New Jersey Rep. William B. Widnall, chief Republican architect of housing legislation in the House.

Now, about four years later, almost six times as many units are being used under the leased housing program as under the rent supplement program. That was the principal finding of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations after making a comparative study of the two programs. Here are ACIR's compilations:

Leased housing: "On June 30, 1969, an estimated 70,000 dwellings were receiving annual contributions under the leasing program, and the total cost of contributions for the fiscal year was about \$50 million. The leased units represented about 9 per cent of the total units administered by Housing Assistance Administration (publicly owned housing constituted nearly 90 per cent)."

Rent supplements: "On the same date, 12,503 rent supplement units were under occupancy, and the total outlays for the year amounted to \$5,587,020."

Having noted this striking difference in the generative capacity of the two programs, ACIR probed the legislative history of both, assessing the impact of Congressional and administrative restrictions. The study reveals that leasing has become a sharply honed tool in the hands of experienced local public-housing administrators. The rent supplement program, depending for implementation on a highly fragmented and still-mobilizing constituency, is depicted as a dull and partially sheathed tool, though a vital part of the federal kit (the Nixon Administration asked for the full \$100 million for rent supplements, as requested by the last Administration).

The rent supplement program, envisioned by President Johnson as a means of encouraging "housing in which families of different incomes and different age groups can live together," is designed to provide lower-income families with accommodations in newly built or substantially rehabilitated housing owned by nonprofit, limited dividend, or cooperative organizations. A federal subsidy pays the difference between 25 per cent of the family's income and the market rental of the property. Eligibility is limited to families and individuals whose earnings are within the income range of those served by public housing and who are elderly, handicapped, displaced by government action or natural disaster, or living in substandard housing.

The leased-housing program authorizes HUD to make annual contributions to local housing authorities to enable them to lease existing, privately owned dwelling units for low-income families at rentals they can afford. The local authority selects the tenants in most cases and pays the landlord the difference between the normal rent and what the tenant pays, a sum based on charges for public housing accommodations. In both leased and rent-supplement housing, the tenant's subsidy is reduced as his income rises, but he may continue to occupy the

unit, even though he becomes ineligible for a subsidy.

Congress, the report noted, had left its imprint strongly on both programs. The Johnson Administration originally offered rent supplements for use by moderate-income families. It was widely hailed by some public interest groups, but the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, voice of the public housing bureaucracy, found the plan "administratively cumbersome and socially indefensible." Congress found it at least politically indefensible. However, it retained the other provisions that limited the program to the elderly, the handicapped, the displaced, and the poorly housed.

After enactment Congress continued to hobble the program. It was stingy with appropriations (in 1967 the House voted to deprive it of any new funds), and persuaded FHA, then still largely geared to suburban development, to impose inhibiting regulations in the guidelines. These placed specific dollar limits on construction costs and rentals and forbade tenants to receive supplements in excess of 70 per cent of the fair market rental, though this failed in high-rent areas to close the gap between their contribution and the total rent. These restrictions, along with bans on such features as air conditioning, extra baths, and project swimming pools, reduced the likelihood that unsubsidized tenants would live in them. They also discouraged private builders, on whom much of the success of the program depended, to sponsor rent-supplement projects. The Kaiser Committee, ACIR noted, found that limits on rents and construction costs made the program generally unworkable for new construction in major central cities outside the South and Southwest.

A rider to one appropriation bill restricted use of rent supplements to cities with the kind of blueprints for urban development which HUD terms "workable programs" and to those communities whose governments approved the projects. This diminished greatly the program's capacity for dispersing low-income housing throughout metropolitan areas. Rising interest rates, the Douglas Commission said, widened the gap between the cost of housing and 25 per cent of the income of low-income families, progressively limiting the number of poor families who could be housed.

Leased housing suffered its own birth pangs. "If the rent supplement program ran into opposition in a hostile Congress," said the ACIR report, "the leased housing program had its problems with a reluctant Administration." HUD's lack of enthusiasm started with then Secretary Robert Weaver who called it a "one-shot program." Weaver insisted that a growing population must have an increasing supply of housing as well as subsidies that permit poor families to occupy quarters that would otherwise be occupied by moderate-income families. Congressional testimony from other HUD officials revealed a middle-echelon coolness toward the new program.

Those feelings were reflected in initial guidelines which prescribed that the local vacancy rate on any given type unit must be above 3 per cent before such units could be leased. ACIR quotes a HUD source as attributing recent accelerated use of leasing to the later removal of that restriction.

"The local housing authorities were instinctively opposed to the rent supplement program because it took out of their hands, and placed in the hands of FHA, a portion of responsibility for housing low-income groups," says the ACIR report. The leased housing program, on the other hand, expanded their role, although some began to use it effectively only after prodding by NAHRO officials.

The growing tendency of local authorities to lease rehabilitated and newly built units

has been increasing the housing supply substantially, thus weakening HUD's early objections. Congressman Widnall frequently takes the occasion of Congressional hearings on housing bills to remind federal officials and other witnesses of the plan's availability.

It is now estimated, says ACIR, that about half the total number of leased dwelling units are new or rehabilitated. This, the study notes, expands the supply of standard housing and tends to diminish the effect of one of the early points of criticism that was directed at the program.

Both programs, says ACIR, have at least three advantages over traditional publicly owned, low-income housing projects: "They are privately owned and pay local taxes; they tend to be scattered throughout the community, and they enable tenants to graduate from public to private housing without moving."

Both programs emerged from the federal pipeline about the time the call for private involvement in urban programs had come to full-throated volume, it seems, therefore, somewhat ironic that the federal establishment laid down a tougher set of ground rules for the private sector than for the public sector.

J. A. TERRY

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, the Chamber of Commerce of Roanoke, Ala., has honored a Negro businessman who has done an excellent job of building a small sewing operation into a thriving manufacturing company. He is J. A. Terry, a native of Randolph County who stayed to prove that a self-made Negro man can make it in the South. I include in the RECORD the following story from the Birmingham News which describes Mr. Terry's success:

ROANOKE WILL HONOR NEGRO BUSINESSMAN
ROANOKE.—J. A. Terry, a Negro who earned the respect of the whites in this eastern Alabama community by building a million-dollar garment-manufacturing business from a shoestring says he wanted to show that black people can be an asset.

"We wanted to show that black people can promote themselves; that they can be an asset to the town, to the county, to the economy," the 55-year-old Terry said. "We wanted to help build something for ourselves."

Recognition of Terry's efforts comes Oct. 29, when the Chamber of Commerce will honor him at a luncheon. It may be the first time in the rural South that an all-white Chamber of Commerce has paid such a tribute to a Negro.

Terry is proud of the honor. "We've worked hard to get where we are today," he said in an interview Tuesday. "We'll have to work even harder to show people that all the nice things they're saying about us are justified."

When Terry says "we," he means his employees, himself and his family, which includes his wife and three sons who have worked closely with him since the beginning. "Without the unity of this family, we could not possibly have come this far," he said.

Terry, a native of Roanoke, received his education in high school and trade schools. He then learned and supervised practically every type of sewing operation while working for the federal government at Wright-Patterson Air Base experimental station for seven years in the 1940s.

He decided to enter the garment business and saved every penny he could. Little help

was available when he started Terry Manufacturing Co. in 1963, but he picked up the support of banks in Roanoke and nearby Wadley and the Small Business Administration along the way.

He started with five power sewing machines, housed in a small frame building and began manufacturing garments, training new employees as he expanded. Most of these employees were either unemployed, on welfare, or employed as domestics earning \$10 to \$15 per week.

Today he employs more than 60 persons, is housed in a new 16,000-square-foot plant and wholesales more than \$1 million worth of clothing a year.

He said he thought about leaving his home to seek greener pastures but rejected the thought. "The idea was that we should do something with what we had, do something to improve conditions rather than running away from those conditions," he said.

Many Negroes were leaving this Randolph County town of 6,000 in 1963 in search of jobs.

Terry hopes to increase employment to about 100 persons.

Most of his sales are to wholesalers, but he is trying to develop retail outlets. He said this prospect "looks pretty good."

One of his products is Afro-style garments for men and women. Individuals and small shops are being recruited to sell the Afro garments on and near the nation's black college campuses.

"This is just in the beginning stage," he said. He added the white community has shown no adverse reaction to the garments' manufacture.

In fact, the white community thinks he's doing an outstanding job.

"He's doing something for his race, instead of inciting them to riot," said J. C. Washington, manager of the local Chamber of Commerce.

Terry, named "Black Businessman of the Year" by the National Association of Market Developers which is jointly sponsoring the luncheon to be held in the National Guard Armory, is looking forward to Oct. 29.

It's rewarding to know that at last you've overcome many things," he said. "It's gratifying to find out that someone else is concerned with what we're trying to do."

CREDIT CARD ABUSE

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are living in a day of credit cards—and they certainly have a proper role in our economy.

Unfortunately, as in so many things, there are those who abuse a system.

I refer in particular to those companies who send out unsolicited credit cards. This is a practice that must be halted.

Our Subcommittee on Postal Operations has begun hearings under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Nix) and already we have received some very revealing testimony.

There is no intention to interfere with legitimate credit card distribution where there is a specific request for a card. However, the indiscriminate flooding of the mails with unsolicited credit cards must be banned by law. Apparently that is the only way to deal with the problem.

There are several proposals before our subcommittee and I feel certain a recommendation will receive prompt consideration by our full committee.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks an editorial from the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News of October 9:

CREDIT CARD ABUSE

In a variety of forums, Washington is debating whether the federal government should prohibit banks and businesses from mailing out credit cards which have not been asked for by their intended recipients.

We say "intended" recipients because a chance always exists that such unsolicited cards—complete with identifying numbers, names and addresses—may go astray and fall into the hands of some irresponsible person eager for a no-charge buying spree. Even if the person whose name is stamped on the card isn't required to pay for such purchases, he may have to go to inconvenient lengths, and perhaps even to court, to prove his innocence.

The thriving credit-card industry opposes any ban on mailing out these unsolicited cards, partly on the grounds that to invoke such a ban now would give businesses which have already sent such cards out an advantage over competitors which had not.

This flimsy defense was swiftly demolished the other day, however, by a one-time victim of a strayed, unsought credit card, Rep. Jonathan Bingham (D., N.Y.). It is wholly illogical, he reasoned, "to allow an objectionable practice to continue simply because it has been allowed in the past or because others have taken advantage of it." Since the practice has been going on for some time, moreover, "any firm that desired to take advantage of it has had ample opportunity to do so."

One way or another, the mailing of these unsought credit cards constitutes an abuse of the consumer and should be stopped. Businesses can achieve the same result, with the potential customer assuming no risks or inconvenience, by sending him a letter simply asking if he wants a credit card.

All this would seem elementary, yet neither the Federal Trade Commission, which regulates business, nor the Federal Reserve Board, which regulates banks, has barred such mailings. If they fail to do so very soon, Congress itself should act.

FEDERAL SALARY COMPARABILITY ACT OF 1969

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the House of Representatives passed the Federal Salary Comparability Act of 1969. I voted for passage of this legislation to demonstrate my wholehearted support for elimination of inequities that exist in the Federal pay system. However, I also voted to recommend this bill to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee because of certain irresponsible provisions incorporated in the legislation and because the committee failed to provide revenue to implement new procedures. It was, and is, my opinion that if these inadequacies are not corrected this legislation may well never become law.

During my first term in Congress, I served on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. During that time I developed a fairly intimate knowledge of Federal pay legislation and how it works.

My seniors on that committee—who still serve—certainly have sophisticated understanding of this important legislative arena. Thus, I was greatly surprised when the majority on the committee failed to provide sufficient revenue to implement procedures reducing from 21 to 8 years the period it takes a postal employee to reach the top step in his grade scale. Reflecting on this, over the last few days, I have come to the sad conclusion that this act of fiscal irresponsibility was a deliberate ploy by the Democratic majority on the committee to embarrass a Republican administration. At best, this failure to provide new revenues to meet new costs in a time of a tight budget is a cheap political trick to invite a presidential veto. At worst, it is a cruel hoax on hundreds of thousands of dedicated Federal employees who deserve comparability and a fair system for adjusting their salaries during a time of rising costs.

Two years ago I was a primary sponsor of comprehensive salary legislation which was carefully developed by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. That landmark bill was designed to bring postal workers to salary levels comparable to those of civilian employees. Both Republican and Democratic committee members worked closely together to increase postal revenues sufficiently to cover the cost of the salary and operating increases. We knew that this was not only responsible, but President Johnson insisted on such a provision if the entire package was not to be vetoed.

Mr. Speaker, this year the Post Office and Civil Service Committee made no effort to initiate a postal rate bill to pay for any part of the salary bill. I would submit that every member of that committee realized that such an action is a clear invitation to a Presidential veto. Furthermore, this legislation takes away from the President part of his constitutional right to administer over the Government by removing all of his jurisdiction over the setting of salaries for Federal employees. The bill—in reality—also takes away congressional responsibility in this important area.

I cannot think of legislation more carefully designed to build the false hopes of our postal employees while deliberately encouraging the wrath of the President.

Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Senate takes its responsibilities to create meaningful legislation to upgrade our postal employees and provide equitable compensation for civil service employees more seriously than did the House of Representatives.

SECRETARY ROMNEY TURNS HIS BACK ON HOMEOWNERS

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked, as every American must have been shocked, at Secretary Romney's statement blasting home ownership. It is a basic American tenet that all Americans should have a chance to own a home

of their own. Time and time again it has been proven that the pride of home ownership, the accompanying sense of responsibility, and a solid feeling of sharing in community values are buttressed by the American family who owns a stake in his own community.

No worse attack could be made on the principles of home ownership than Secretary Romney's blunt statement that the American home buyer should not be allowed to reflect in his income tax statements the interest he pays to a lending institution for owning his home.

I am honored to be a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which has the primary responsibility for housing programs. What we on the committee are trying to do is to bring all of our fellow citizens up to the standard of living which they have a right to expect in this wealthy country, not to drag people down by casually tossing away any laws enacted to help fulfill ideals. This, Mr. Speaker, is destructive criticism on the part of the Housing Secretary. The Congress has always tried to provide good housing for Americans, and I cannot understand how Secretary Romney can justify his attack on those who bear an already heavy tax burden.

I firmly believe in amply funding all the housing programs that we have enacted to help the elderly, the low-income families and the moderate-income families. This is the answer to America's housing problems. Yet the Housing Secretary is silent about the necessity of full commitment to these worthwhile programs. He has done nothing to convince the administration or assist the Congress to implement projects designed to revitalize the Nation.

It is sad that Secretary Romney chose as his forum the dedication of the Federal National Mortgage Association building. The Congress in giving Fannie Mae independence meant to promote home ownership, not undercut it. It is most unsuitable for the Secretary to use the dedication of their new building to question the value of home ownership. The majority of Americans, through hard work and self-denial, have worked to achieve that measure of independence. Yet our Housing Secretary does not support a provision in law designed to help home ownership. I personally know how people have worked to realize home ownership, and I cannot turn my back on them. It is obvious that Secretary Romney can.

THE GOOD WE ARE DOING IN VIETNAM

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a few days after the so-called Vietnam moratorium I received a letter from the mother of a serviceman, Mrs. Martha L. Dobey, of Arlington, Va., in which she expressed a sentiment I know is shared by thousands of Americans.

As I believe Mrs. Dobey's comments deserve the thoughtful attention of all our

colleagues, I insert her letter, in part, at this point in the RECORD:

I am sure you remember our son, Allen Brantley . . . Well, he went to Vietnam as an Army Engineer, and like thousands of other young men, volunteered for extra duty, because they had jobs to do of building (not destroying), and they wanted to get them completed instead of leaving the tasks to green replacements who might not even care.

These men repair roads and bridges; help the Vietnamese rebuild bombed out villages, training them in different skills; and do many loving things for the kids. I am sure you know all this, but other people don't, and in view of what is going on here in the United States it looks like these dedicated young men—squares, of course—are really going to get the cold shoulder when they return home.

It surely would be a fine thing if you and other influential people, loyal to the President, would start a little campaign of informing the public about the good we are doing in Viet Nam.

I resent terribly the untrue, inflammatory remarks made Wednesday about the United States being the aggressor. Nothing is ever said about the bloody hands of North Vietnam—only about the poor spies we have "murdered"; nothing about our building work—only about our accidental bombs.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to do as Mrs. Dobey suggests, in starting a little campaign of informing the public about the good we are doing in Vietnam. I urge my colleagues to join me in this campaign. The American people are entitled to know and be proud of the fine young men who are trying to help the Vietnamese people defend and rebuild their land so that they might live in peace after their American friends are gone.

PENTAGON CRITICISM

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, when things erode and deteriorate far enough in any department of our Government, there is bound to be a housecleaning. It seems to me that the Department of Defense should be confronted with a comprehensive investigation as a result of the multitude of scandals which have been brought to public attention in recent weeks and months.

Fred J. Martin, editor of the Park County News in my district in Montana last week wrote an incisive editorial in which he called for a Pentagon reassessment and housecleaning. I share his shock and concern and include his excellent editorial in the RECORD. I recommend it to my colleagues:

A BLOT OF SHAME ON THE PENTAGON

(By Fred J. Martin)

Former President Lyndon B. Johnson halted escalation of the Vietnam war—a decision violently opposed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and their followers in the Pentagon. In fact, LBJ's admission was made at the expense of his hopes for a second term.

Now President Richard M. Nixon knows the country is tired of Vietnam, the needless suffering and death of our young men, the corruption in Vietnam of the South Vietnamese government and in other areas and particularly the effrontery of the South Viet

nam government to try and dictate U.S. Peace terms.

But, some recent events make the judgments of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the U.S. Command in Vietnam subject to question when considered on a common sense appraisal. Why did President Nixon have to overrule the Pentagon to protect the Green Berets from disgrace over the fate of a "double agent" when Pentagon orders and policies have resulted in the loss of thousands of lives of civilians in Vietnam?

Just Tuesday night on television an Army colonel in Vietnam said his orders were unchanged—to search and destroy the enemy. Surely, we should safeguard our men in Vietnam, but competent observers readily tell of senseless destruction of lives and property with needless risks.

But, the most revolting episode in the current U.S. Senate Committee exposure of the conduct of General Turner, who seemingly approved of racketeering, corruption and personal profiteering by a select group of non-commissioned officers in the operation of Servicemen's clubs at Army posts and bases throughout the world. Then, to top it off, this General Turner admits that he took confiscated guns from Chicago and other Metropolitan police departments for the Army and sold them for personal gain. Under fire, he admitted he filed an amended income tax return to list his profits from the sale of the guns.

It is a regrettable indictment of the Pentagon that the military brains of the nation did not spotlight these abuses, rather than this Senate investigating committee. When we consider that the Pentagon has had seemingly unlimited power to dispense hundreds of billions of dollars without benefit of public scrutiny isn't it time to turn on the spotlight? We must respect and honor our Servicemen, but the Pentagon chiefs must be worthy of that respect also. The Green Beret mess, the use of service connections for personal gain and illegal racketeering and profiteering, and the blatant disregard of General Turner for his country by giving priority to personal gain over his duty to his country—these, coupled with the corruption seemingly overlooked in Vietnam, put a Blot of Shame on the Pentagon.

A Pentagon reassessment and housecleaning is in order. The era of "You must not question the Military" is at an end. Let's hope the spotlight turns on brightly and roots out corruption. Billions can be saved, but more than that—at stake are the possible loss of thousands of lives of our priceless young men, not to mention helpless non-combatants and the enemy. The escalation in Vietnam, the result of Pentagon domination of our Foreign policy, achieved nothing tangible.

REASONABLE PROPERTY INSURANCE RATES

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, particularly those who represent heavily urbanized areas, are well aware of the increasing difficulty of obtaining adequate property insurance at reasonable rates.

Recently Congressman FRANK ANNUNZIO of Illinois introduced legislation to aid urban property owners and I would like to bring to the attention of the House the following resolution adopted by the city council of Cleveland, Ohio, in support of Congressman ANNUNZIO's bill, H.R. 13666:

RESOLUTION

The following Resolution was adopted by the Council of the City of Cleveland October 13, 1969:

Res. No. 1849-69.

By Messrs. Armstrong, Bell, Bilinski, Blaha, Brooks, Brown, Mrs. Cain, Messrs. Carr, Cimperman, Duggan, Flynn, Forbes, Garofoli, Gilliam, Harmody, Jackson, Katalinas, Kellogg, Lavdis, Matt, Mrs. McCaffrey, Messrs. McFaul, Perk, Jr., Pottinger, Prince, Russell, Sliwa, Smith, Stanton, Stringer, Thompson, Turk, Zone.

An emergency resolution memorializing the U.S. House of Representatives to enact legislation enabling property owners in urban areas to purchase insurance at reasonable rates.

Whereas, one of the more pressing problems in the urban area and more especially in certain deteriorating areas of the City is the inability of the home owner or small businessman to secure property insurance at a reasonable rate; and

Whereas, as soon as the insurance companies refuse to write coverage in particular areas, the condition of the neighborhood deteriorates more rapidly since the small businessman or homeowner is not equipped financially to cope with problems of vandalism; and

Whereas, each homeowner or small businessman must be given every opportunity to retain and protect his home or business so that these may remain as a stabilizing influence and a deterrent to slum and blight which would run rampant through any section of a community where the homeowner or small businessman has given up hope and lost incentive; and

Whereas, there are deficiencies in the present government assistance plans which can be corrected by authorizing the Federal Government to write direct insurance in cases where the premiums of the private companies are unreasonable or where no insurance is available at any price; and

Whereas, this Council feels that this type of legislation is necessary to stem the tide of slum and blight before a neighborhood becomes hopelessly deteriorated; and

Whereas, this resolution constitutes an emergency measure providing for the usual daily operation of a municipal department; now, therefore

Be it resolved by the Council of the City of Cleveland:

Section 1. That the U.S. House of Representatives be and it hereby is memorialized to enact legislation which would authorize the Federal Government to write direct insurance for homeowners and small businessmen in urban areas where insurance is unavailable or where the premiums are unreasonable.

Section 2. That it supports House Bill 13666 introduced by Representative Frank Annunzio which would correct deficiencies in the Fair Access to Insurance Requirements Plans.

Section 3. That the Clerk of Council be and she hereby is requested to transmit a copy of this resolution to Representative Frank Annunzio, 7th District Illinois and to Representative Louis Stokes, Michael A. Feighan, Charles Vanik and William Minshall.

Section 4. That the resolution is hereby declared to be an emergency measure and, provided it receives the affirmative vote of two-thirds of all the members elected to Council, it shall take effect and be in force immediately upon its adoption and approval by the Mayor; otherwise it shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law.

Adopted October 13, 1969.

Effective October 16, 1969.

I, Mercedes Cotner, Clerk of Council of the City of Cleveland, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Reso-

lution No. 1849-69, adopted by the Council of the City of Cleveland, October 13, 1969.

Witness my hand and seal at Cleveland, Ohio, this 27th day of October, 1969.

MERCEDES COTNER,

Clerk of Council.

PROFESSIONAL PAY FOR MILITARY LAWYERS

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of our colleagues to a bill recently reported out of the House Armed Services Committee to provide professional pay for military lawyers. I support this bill, and commend the salutary efforts by the Armed Services Committee for providing this means to encourage military lawyers to stay in the service.

Although I have not introduced this bill, I have followed with some interest the developments finally resulting in passage by the House committee. Speaking with the experience of a former Marine Corps legal officer, I can understand how this bill will help to provide competent legal support for our military personnel. Late last year I spoke with Rear Adm. Joseph McDevitt, Judge Advocate General of the Navy, and he explained to me the importance of legislation like this to retain experienced lawyers in the military. The House committee hearings further documented this need.

Simply put, the problem is that military lawyers are not staying in the service because of greater financial opportunity in civilian life. If their pay can be increased to make being a military lawyer financially competitive with being a civilian attorney, then many will decide to remain in uniform. The modest "professional pay" authorized by this bill will go far toward this goal.

Mr. Speaker, I will have more to say about this proposal when it is considered by the House. I bring up this matter now so that other Members will strongly consider the merits of this legislation before floor consideration.

CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM SCHERLE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, Congressman WILLIAM SCHERLE of Iowa, was an honored guest at the Washington area Hungarian Freedom Fighters' banquet last Friday, October 24.

I am pleased to insert his remarks emphasizing the support that we give and the respect that we have for the Hungarian Freedom Fighters and respectfully direct the attention of the Members

to the significant remarks of our colleague:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM J. SCHERLE OF IOWA TO THE HUNGARIAN FREEDOM FIGHTERS' BANQUET, OCTOBER 24, 1969

It is with deep appreciation I thank you, my fellow Hungarians, for allowing me to share in this memorable evening.

That infamous day in 1956 when Hungarian hopes for freedom were ruthlessly suppressed by the Soviet warlords is still fresh in our memories. Those who cherish freedom will never be satisfied until the tyrants depart from Hungary.

You, who gather here to honor those men and women whose contributions to the cause of freedom exemplify the finest heritage of both our countries, are a living memorial to the valiant men and women of Hungary who have made the ultimate sacrifice in her behalf.

As one who has close relatives behind the Iron Curtain in both Hungary and East Germany, my thoughts are with them tonight. To my cousins who escaped the brutal blood baths I say, "Thank God."

My mother, an Hungarian immigrant, and my father, a German immigrant who fought for his adopted land in World War I, proudly sent four sons to serve with the American armed forces during World War II. They strove to instill in us the knowledge that the precious gifts of freedom and liberty and the unlimited opportunities this generous country bestowed upon us, the sons of immigrants, are available to all who seek the shelter of her shores. We share a personal desire to see the restoration of these freedoms to our captive homeland.

SHOPPING BLIND IN THE FEDERAL STORE

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I hereby commend to my colleagues' careful attention another important expression of editorial support for the proposal—which I and many of my colleagues are sponsoring—to merge the calendar and fiscal years. More and more we are shopping blind in the Federal store. The situation must be corrected.

I think you will find that the Armed Forces Journal editorial by James D. Hessman brings an interesting defense standpoint to bear on the whole subject. Here is the text of the editorial:

MERGE THE FISCAL AND CALENDAR YEARS

(By James D. Hessman)

Now we're finally down to the nitty-gritty. After months of spectacular parliamentary thrashing about, House and Senate Conferences are getting set to wind up the great debate of FY 1970 on the pending Defense procurement authorization bill.

There's already general agreement (in the authorization bill at least—there is likely to be a renewed fight when the appropriations bill comes up for debate) on such major systems as ABM, AMSA, CVAN-69, etc. Agreement still has not been reached, however, on such items as the billion dollar ship add-on inserted into the House bill by Armed Services Committee Chairman L. Mendel Rivers (D-SC), the Heavy Lift Helicopter, the AWACS, and other such incidentals.

There's much more at stake in the \$21.3-billion measure (give or take a billion, as the

boys in the back room at the Budget Bureau are wont to say) than the weapons systems themselves.

One big thing at stake, for example, is the common sense of the Congress, which must recognize, sooner or later (preferably sooner) that it cannot indefinitely continue the present financially irresponsible system of delaying action on appropriations bills until well into the fiscal year in which the funds appropriated are to be used. (With debate on the Defense authorization bill not likely to wind up prior to the end of this month, for example, it likely will be half past November before the FY 70 Defense appropriations bill is passed by both houses and goes to the White House for the President's signature—and this is only if there are no major tieups on the funds measure such as bedevilled the authorization request.)

The system is ridiculous. Agency administrators are almost half way through the fiscal year before they know how much money they'll have to spend during the year. Programs are delayed—long leadtime items on a new carrier, for example, can't be ordered with any assurance that money to pay for same will be available when the bills fall due.

The system is also wasteful. If an on-going program is cancelled late in the fiscal year, there's no way to recover the money already spent. If funding for a program is reduced, rather than cut altogether, the entire reduction must be absorbed within a six or seven months period, rather than spread over the entire fiscal year. "It's a lot like being forced to go on a two-week crash diet to lose 15 pounds," one Pentagon budget analyst told *The Journal* "but not being able to start the diet until Saturday of the first week."

(Another analogy that appeals to our domesticated ears is that of the husband half-way through the week's shopping before his wife presents him the shopping list and the grocery money—husbands everywhere will know what we mean.)

It is palpably a poor way to run a railroad, much less the greatest country in the world. No sensible Congressman (the phrase is not necessarily redundant) would run his own household in this manner.

We would not advocate that future legislative debates on the Defense procurement authorization and appropriations bills be cut short to satisfy the arbitrary 1 July deadline marking the start of the fiscal year. We think, in fact, the sessions are likely to get longer instead of shorter. And, despite the buffeting the military has received this past year from some of less-than-objective critics, we think this will be a good thing—the more the Congress and the public in general know about and are involved in defense affairs, the better, we say.

But if the legislators can't change themselves, they can change the system. What Congress must do—quickly, in our opinion—is to scrap the fiscal year concept and put appropriations on a calendar year basis, with the proposed budget plan being submitted by the executive branch to Congress a full year in advance, instead of six months, as is now the case.

Under such a system (which has been suggested earlier by others—we merely second the motion), the President would submit his fiscal/calendar year 1971 budget to the Congress in January 1970, for example, and Congress would debate, amend, and finally approve the budget by October or November 1970. Agency heads thus still would have one or two months of orderly planning time left before the new budget year starts.

It is never easy to get action on any proposal—no matter how sensible or how meritorious—which requires our legislators to overcome their own inertia. But this is an idea whose time has come.

We submit that Congress and the Executive Branch must act, and act quickly, to restore order to the presently chaotic appropriations process.

WRITE A LETTER TO HANOI

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, October 17, the Washington Daily News carried an editorial "Write a Letter to Hanoi." I would hope that each Member of this House would make such a plea to their constituency in behalf of the better than 1,000 American servicemen who are known and believed to be POW's of the North Vietnamese.

Certainly the actions taken so far have proved fruitful and with the help of all Americans, in the form of a letter to Hanoi, perhaps we will ultimately be successful in learning the truth about our prisoners.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 17, 1969]

WRITE A LETTER TO HANOI

Now that hundreds of thousands of Americans have manifested their concern over our continued participation in Vietnam, one wonders if there might be enough energy left for another universal expression of concern having to do with another aspect of man's inhumanity to man arising from this war.

Latest figures from the Defense Department state that 413 American officers and enlisted men are known to be prisoners of war in North Vietnam. Another 918 are listed as missing and are believed captured. Most of them are pilots who were shot down over North Vietnam.

Since the beginning of the war, the American Red Cross has sought, thru the world Red Cross organization and thru diplomatic and other channels, to assist these prisoners.

The government of North Vietnam, tho a signatory to the 1949 Geneva Conventions covering the treatment of prisoners of war, has consistently refused to permit delegates of the International Committee of the Red Cross to visit prisoner camps in North Vietnam. It has even refused to provide the committee with the names of American prisoners or to permit the regular exchange of mail between them and their families.

In case anyone is wondering, the government of South Vietnam, which has charge of all prisoners taken by both its forces and by U.S. forces, has been fully co-operative with International Committee officials.

At the quadrennial International Conference of the Red Cross in Istanbul, Turkey, last month, a resolution was adopted unanimously by the representatives of 77 governments and 91 national Red Cross societies urging North Vietnam to observe the conventions it has signed. The American Red Cross has followed up this action by cabling Red Cross societies in all parts of the world asking that they appeal to the Red Cross Society of North Vietnam and that they urge their governments to make similar appeals to the North Vietnamese government.

The Red Cross further suggests that since Hanoi keeps a close weather eye on American public opinion, if enough Americans were to invest 25 cents in an air mail letter to Hanoi, this direct appeal might also go far toward persuading the North Vietnamese to bring

their treatment of prisoners of war up to the level of decency which even the Nazis observed in World War II.

The address is:

The Office of the President, Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Hanoi, North Vietnam.

All this may be offensive to admirers of the late Ho Chi Minh. Yet Sen. J. William Fulbright, whose credentials as an opponent of American involvement in Vietnam have been impeccable ever since the involvement he once espoused began running into trouble, has voiced support of the Istanbul resolution on the floor of Congress as a simple matter of humanitarianism having nothing to do with the nature of the conflict.

Even if the United States were to sign a peace with North Vietnam tomorrow, or were to withdraw from Vietnam immediately and unilaterally, the machinery of repatriation would take time. Pending that day, it would mean a great deal to the families of American prisoners of war if they could at least learn that their loved ones are alive.

LETTER FROM A CONCERNED AMERICAN IN VIETNAM

HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, like most of my colleagues in the Congress, I was greatly concerned about the effects of the October 15 moratorium. For those who felt that the recent Moratorium Day demonstrators deliberately or unwittingly played into the hands of our enemies, I want to share a letter I have just received from Vietnam. It was written to me by a young man from my hometown, Ogdensburg, N.Y. It is the thoughtful, concerned and intelligent expression of a fine young American. I commend it for your reading. The letter follows:

OCTOBER 16, 1969.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McEWEN: As a member of the United States Army, serving in the Republic of Vietnam, I am appalled at what is happening in the United States. What is happening back there? Can't these people realize that we're trying to prevent Communism from overtaking a country. These people received a letter from Hanoi and were asked by Vice President Agnew to disassociate themselves with the aims of the North Vietnamese, but they refused. If they could only realize what effect this whole thing has on the morale of the men here. The feelings of the majority of the men are to have these same demonstrators come over here for a few days, and they would surely change their minds and opinions on the whole subject. If they could see a mother weeping because the Viet Cong have just murdered her husband, or if they could have seen the thousands of mourners at Hue when the remains of more than 400 victims of a Communist massacre were buried, they would have a completely different outlook of the war.

Sure, sir, we all want to come home. Nobody likes to fight a war, but I feel, along with many others, that if we can save a people from Communism, we have accomplished a great task. Why don't these people try to stop the violence and killing that is going on right in their own home towns?

Thank you for listening to my point of view, sir. By the way, I'm from Ogdensburg myself, and I sure miss that colorful North Country at this time of the year.

Sincerely,

Sp4c. DON DODD.

OPERATION SPEAK OUT

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a great many Americans are deeply concerned about the attention accorded to the Vietnam moratorium demonstrations of October 15.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, which represents 1.5 million U.S. veterans, is also concerned. The VFW has asked more than 60 national organizations to join it in support of "Operation Speak Out," November 9-15.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that civic, fraternal, patriotic, labor, and religious groups will join in the observance of "Operation Speak Out" which spans Veterans Day on November 11.

We must let the world know we the people of the United States do support our Government. We must let the world know we have a voice, that we are proud of our country and proud of our tradition of defending freedom throughout the world.

I commend to my colleagues the following material on "Operation Speak Out" which is being distributed by the Veterans of Foreign Wars to organizations and individuals throughout the United States:

OPERATION SPEAK OUT

Now that the self-styled 1969 moratorium manipulators have—done their thing—let's move on to some positive, two-listed basic patriotic Americanism in action.

That means let us bury deep in memory those who stage their Communist supported street demonstrations against the Vietnam war.

Then let's re-declare, loud and clear, our determination to carry on to a conclusive, clean-cut victory against the sworn enemies of freedom. And let's do it Nov. 9-15 in "Operation Speak Out."

The October demonstrations by those who would have us quit, surrender, to the Reds, are in the past. And so, for November and December and on through the coming year—let us switch the pitch to the positive.

The would-be quitters have had their day. Now let's push them to the sidelines and show them how true Americans really think and act.

We will make it very clear to them and to the entire world that real Americans always fight to win.

We will fly our Stars and Stripes flag high and proudly. Then we will reaffirm our united pledge to keep on fighting for freedom and our determination to protect all of our nation's priceless traditions, unity and ideals.

Just to help stir things up a bit let us recall the forthright declaration which was founded 194 years ago by the bold Scotch-American orator, statesman and patriot Patrick Henry. It was he who dared defy—in 1775—some of his fellow citizens who advocated surrendering to foreign enemies, rather than fighting for American freedom principles.

Yes, it was Patrick Henry who shouted—I do not know what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death.

That did it back in the American Revolutionary era. The loyal citizens of our land rallied around Patrick Henry. They provided fighting men—and armed them—to wage war

to a victory against the would-be killers of American rights and independence.

Give us liberty or give us death. That could very well be our battle cry today—in the year 1969.

Why not? The challenge is similar and our choice is that simple. It means we must fight to keep our freedoms intact or we shall suffer their loss—and that would truly mean the death of our nation.

That's what our ancestors faced back in the days when American democracy was being born. Their determined and victorious defense of freedom is the foremost reason we're here today—living as free peoples.

But not every American appreciates those facts. Some of our citizens have forgotten history. And now they're seeking to surrender everything to the current foreign enemies.

So the dissenters have taken their signals from today's enemy headquarters. And they've translated those signals into treacherous action against the security of our nation and against all American freedom ideals. They've cheered themselves on with their defeatist demand that we quit fighting Communism. They have advocated peace, peace—at any price.

Those dissenters called their demonstration a moratorium, but their actions were more suggestive of a mort-uarium—because they were really killing freedom and delivering freedom's body to our enemies so that they can do what they've always boasted they'll do. The Reds, you know, have said—we will bury you.

Well, presidents, secretaries of state, members of Congress, war veteran leaders and the fighting men have all declared themselves against such a ghastly fate.

The late President John F. Kennedy said that—the cost of freedom is always high but Americans have always paid it. And he added that—one path we shall never choose is the path of surrender or submission.

President Richard Nixon has declared that our current enemies—the Communists we're fighting in Vietnam, in Korea and opposing elsewhere around the world—have said that they warmly welcome and wholeheartedly support our homefront dissenters. A message straight from Red Hanoi declared just that.

Secretary of State William Rogers, looking at the recent so-called moratorium against our continued fighting in Vietnam—said that the Communist Viet Cong enemies believe that our president does not have the support of his own people. But the secretary added that the noise which the Reds have been hearing comes only from a relatively small number of loud dissenters—not from the majority of truly thinking Americans.

Some students have cried loudly for us to quit fighting in Vietnam—and to bring all of our men back home—regardless of whatever might be the final result of such a retreat. That's why some students staged their demonstrations across the country.

But other students, like T. Harding Jones of Princeton University, declared that such public displays of defeatism will lengthen the Vietnam war—rather than shorten it. And Jones added that the quit-fighting advocates are, in fact, saying to the Hanoi Red enemies—hang on, baby, you might win it all.

Our men who are fighting in Vietnam have looked at the homefront and asked—what's going on at home? Tell those silly dissenters to cool it. Then the frontline veterans say—we know why we're here. We are fighting to lick the Communists in Vietnam so we won't have to fight them later on our own shores.

Raymond Gallagher of Redfield, South Dakota, Commander-in-Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, speaks for one-million 500-thousand V.F.W. members who declare that the only way to win a war is to pour everything upon the enemy until he yells quits—and surrenders.

Gallagher declares that the moratorium demonstrations against our fighting in Vietnam are Communist supported. He said they are a national disgrace which cheers the enemy, prolongs the war and increases the loss of American lives.

Gallagher adds that the time has come for the silent majority of American citizens to stand up and be counted in support of our fighting men overseas.

Never in the history of our nation, the V.F.W. leader declares, has there been greater need for national unity and support of our constituted leaders.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars calls upon our congressional leaders and upon all other loyal Americans to strengthen our government's pledge to help others gain freedom, and to help our fighting men in Vietnam win a just and honorable victory—and no compromise with the enemy.

So much has been said about Vietnam that some of our citizens have the notion that that is the only Red threat. But that is far from the truth. The Communist threat stretches around the world. It presses in upon free people everywhere.

All we need do is to look at the millions of unfortunate people in Czechoslovakia, Red China, Hungary, North Korea, East Berlin, the Soviet Union and Cuba, to name just a few places. They have been robbed of their freedoms—and the same fate is being aimed directly at us.

But we Americans are not all so stupid as to follow the few who seek to betray true Americanism through any distorted politics, or racism and radicalism, nor through just plain childish tantrums defying law and order in our land. That's what we've been seeing on our homefront recently and we're fed up with it. Yes, we are mightily sick of it.

More than 32-million American men have fought in nine major conflicts since the days when Patrick Henry spoke his mind. And well over 1-million of those men have given their lives in combat, also another million, 500-thousand were wounded in battles to defend and to perpetuate the freedoms we enjoy today.

Are we going to say that those men have fought in vain? Are we ready to surrender to the Reds all for which those men went to war and gave their lives? Certainly not.

If the homefront trouble makers of today think that they can upset our balance then they'd better calculate a little further. Because they are far outnumbered—by more than 27-million war veterans who are living in the United States today.

These men do not know the meaning of the word—surrender—either on the fields of battle, nor through any negotiations in a phony, fruitless, Paris peace conference, or anywhere else.

Our combat war veterans—and millions of real Americans like them—declare that there is only one answer to our true way of life. That is the steadfast loyal defense of everything we have in our country—and no crawling at the feet of any enemy, either.

Now, there are two special days in the month of November which emphasize our thinking and determination to stand firmly on all of this.

There is Veterans Day, celebrated on the eleventh of November. The other is Thanksgiving Day, November the 27th. Those days give the greatest impact to our appreciation of the men who have fought for our nation—and our deepest thanks to the Supreme Being for the freedoms we still enjoy.

Let's take a closer look at those two November days—because they do truly touch the very essence of American tradition and contemporary thought.

Veterans Day began as Armistice Day. That marked the November 11th date in the year 1918 when the First World War ended with the signing of some documents through

which Kaiser Wilhelm and his Central Powers surrendered to the Allied Forces. We had defeated the Germans after four years of bloody fighting.

Woodrow Wilson, who was then president of the United States, declared that the first world conflict was the war to end all wars. That was his sincere hope for the future. It would have been mighty wonderful if the Wilson dream had come true but, as we all know, that war did not bring world peace. It merely set the stage for the power-crazed Adolph Hitler and his brutal Nazi Party. They launched the Second World War in 1939. Then we joined the fighting in 1941 and won victory in 1945.

More than 21-million Americans fought in those two world wars and close to 1-million, 500-thousand of them were killed or wounded.

Then came the Communists. And we've been combatting the Reds ever since—over in Korea, with nearly 6-million men—and in Vietnam, with more than a half-million other Americans. Our men who have been killed or wounded in Korea and Vietnam total more than 436-thousand—and we're still on those Asiatic firing lines.

So, fifteen years ago, in 1954, the United States Congress and the late President Dwight Eisenhower approved legislation which provided that, henceforth, the eleventh day of November should be celebrated as Veterans Day—instead of Armistice Day.

Our citizens are urged to make Veterans Day a very special recognition of—and tribute to—all the more than 32 million men who have defended this nation of ours since the American Revolution.

Veterans Day also gives the living ex-servicemen a special occasion upon which to re-declare their solid loyalties and to re-emphasize, for the guidance of every American, both young and old, the importance of fulfilling his and her citizenship duties.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars takes the lead in declaring that the Veterans Day fight to win message is of most vital importance in this critical year of 1969. That is the fighting man's rebuttal against the so-called moralism advocates.

Then there's Thanksgiving Day, on the fourth Thursday of November. We know that day well because it has been an American tradition nearly 350 years—ever since the Pilgrims introduced it in 1621. The hardy Pilgrims had come to our shores seeking freedom from oppression. And, after surviving a rough, hard winter they expressed their appreciations of our new land, with a feast and with the rendition of special prayers of thanks for Divine Guidance and protection.

That is why we still celebrate Thanksgiving Day. Because we, too, appreciate the good things in our mighty nation, therefore we thank God for all our blessings.

The overall answers can be summed up in five brief terms—and those are—

The United States of America forever.

The Stars and Stripes flag above all.

Fulfillment of our duty to always defend this nation, and

Heartfelt thanks for all our truly priceless freedom rights.

We in our hearts are always loyal to those principles and we shall always defend them—even unto death.

That is what Patrick Henry called for back in 1775. And that is what millions of other American patriots have upheld throughout all the history of our nation.

Yes, and that is what the Veterans of Foreign Wars means when it declares—as it has always declared—we shall support our government and the laws of our land—today, tomorrow and to the very end of time.

So now, in line with our determination to switch from the negative to the positive let us reaffirm that we shall stand solidly against

all enemies and against their homefront dupes. We shall press our fight against all of those until they cease to threaten the security of our land.

Then paraphrasing Patrick Henry, we'll add that—we care not what course others may take—but as for us—who have fought for America—shall carry on—in peace as in war—for the ever solid defense of our nation—today and tomorrow.

We invite and urge every loyal citizen to join us in supporting our frontline men. Then let's thank God that they are carrying on like true Americans—fighting to win—against the enemies of freedom. Yes, they are setting the patriotic pattern of action for all of us to follow.

PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD a column by Mrs. John Helms II from the August 11 Morristown, Tenn., Daily Gazette-Mail. This discussion of prayer in the public schools is deserving of the attention of this legislative body. The article follows:

CONNIE'S CORNER—ODDS AND ENDS

Now that the re-opening of city schools is in the offing, the mind is drawn with sorrow and revulsion to the ban the U.S. Supreme Court placed on prayer and the reading of the sectarian Christian religion's Bible in public schools.

Clair Cox, woman author, claims that the Court in its 1962-1963 decisions "forbade teaching religion but did not forbid teaching ABOUT religion".

Well, no teachers are wanting to add another course to the already over-crowded curriculum. Little elementary school children have no room in their minds to take on such arguments, anyway. All that is asked by dedicated teachers and parents is that every morning's school program will be launched with a selection from the Bible, followed by a prayer to Almighty God, asking his protection and love throughout the day.

Miss Cox says that in a test given to eleventh grade pupils in Newton, Mass., by one Thayer Warshaw, the following knowledge about the Bible was displayed:

"One of the students identified Sodom and Gomorrah as lovers, one pupil said Jesus was baptized by Moses, and to some, Eve was created from an apple, ye cannot serve God and Merman, and the stories by which Jesus taught were called parodies."

And now comes along that repulsive Madalyn Murray O'Hair, the world's most famous atheist, to file a lawsuit against the Space Agency to prevent American Astronauts on duty from practicing religion on earth, in space or "around and about the moon."

It was Mrs. O'Hair's lawsuit which resulted in the Supreme Court's ban on prayer in public schools. Her lawsuit filed last week in Austin, Texas asks that it be moved to a special three-judge court because U.S. Dist. Judge Jack Roberts "has a Christian sectarian bias."

She seeks an injunction "specifically enjoining the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and its administrator and personnel from further directing or permitting religious activities, or ceremonies and especially reading of the sectarian Christian religion's Bible and from prayer recitation

in space and in relation to all future space flight activity."

The atheist criticized moonbound astronauts of Apollo 8 and 11 for engaging "in religious ceremonies and in an attempt to establish the Christian religion of the United States Government before the world while on a scientific-military expedition to around and about the moon..."

She objected specifically to Col. Frank Borman reading the Bible last Christmas Eve while orbiting the moon on the Apollo 8 mission and said that Astronauts Edwin Aldrin and Neil Armstrong left a small disc containing microfilmed prayers on the moon when they walked there last month.

I wonder to whom this brave lassie would turn for help if she were among those orbiting and suddenly realized that the cage in which she rode was going down, down, down with no chance of escape for her?

Many public school pupils unfortunately have no church affiliation. Their only opportunity for becoming versed in the power of God is in the daily school regime.

The opening of the day's program with Bible reading and prayer puts one and all in the right frame of mind and gives a readiness for launching into the sometimes difficult tasks ahead.

The parables in the Bible were my favorite selections for Bible reading and often the one selected bore a fortunate relation to some misdemeanor that had occurred the previous day.

For seven years I opened daily classes of the seventh grade in Roby Fitzgerald School, Greeneville, at that time the town's only elementary and high school which were combined into one ten-grade institution.

I do not believe I could have lasted with 65 pupils, many of whom had the appearance of adults, had I not started the day off with the help of the Maker of All Things.

COURT'S DESEGREGATION DECISION

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I applaud yesterday's unanimous decision of the Supreme Court ordering immediate desegregation of this Nation's schools.

This decision will go down in history as the day on which we recognized and admitted that anything less than immediate desegregation was in fact a denial of rights already far too long deferred.

No longer can we tolerate a double standard;

No longer can we pretend that expectant optimism is the same as equality;

And no longer can we pretend that just intentions are the same as justice.

We are men of one world and one nation; we are equals among our fellow men and today we are saying that no man shall be denied the right to equal education of quality for 1 day longer.

It has been over 15 years since the Court's mandate in Brown against the Board of Education, and that is preceded by almost two centuries of injustices and inequality. This is a rather sad commentary, but I hope that we will now implement this Supreme Court decision,

with dispatch and commitment, and without any further delaying tactics by officials at any level of government.

PLEA FOR QUICK ACTION ON AMENDMENTS TO BAIL REFORM ACT

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this past week I received a plea on behalf of the Uptown Washington Lions Club from its president and secretary, for quick action on amendments to the Bail Reform Act of 1966.

As I believe the letter from these gentlemen speaks more eloquently than I could in behalf of urgently needed reform, I insert it in full at this point in the RECORD:

UPTOWN WASHINGTON LIONS CLUB,
October 22, 1969.

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL,
District of Columbia Committee,
U.S. House of Representatives.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BROYHILL: The Lions Club of Uptown Washington desires to bring to the attention of your Committee and register with each of its members its genuine concern over the Bail Reform Act of 1966, more particularly with that portion of the Act which requires the court to take into account the accused's "record of appearance at court proceedings," rather than the accused's record of behavior while at large pending a court appearance. We feel the Act should be amended in several ways, especially to allow a judicial officer to give equal weight to a consideration of a defendant's danger to the community if released on personal bond.

In this era of over-crowded court dockets, of too few judges, of an almost total disrespect for law enforcement, of social conditions which need reform, we nevertheless think it is time the well-being and the safety of the overwhelming majority of the community be your first and foremost consideration, and those of the individual, or the smaller group, be subordinated.

We are horrified and deeply disturbed over the number of business establishments within the City which must conduct day-to-day operations behind locked doors, for fear of the sudden appearance of a rapist or holdup man. We are alarmed and gravely concerned over the future of the City as we witness long and well-established commercial and professional businesses moving to the surrounding counties of Maryland and Virginia.

We urge you to take action as soon as possible to correct the conditions which make the majority of our citizens afraid to use the streets of Washington, afraid to enjoy the delightful parklands, afraid to patronize downtown businesses.

To do this, in part, we recommend legislation which would amend the Act as follows:

1. In the consideration of personal bond, a judicial officer *should be required* to take into account a defendant's past record while on bond, personal or otherwise.

2. Revoke the bond, personal or otherwise, of a defendant who is charged with a crime committed while on bond, where there is a likelihood such defendant committed the later offense.

3. Make commission of another crime while on such release unattractive by increasing the penalty for the subsequent offense.

4. Commit without bond those whose records testify to the fact they are of such potential danger to the community they are likely to commit additional crimes, if released.

We realize much must be done and years will be required to do it, but we feel your Committee is in a position to recommend to the entire House now such legislation as will give some tangible and present relief to our law-abiding citizens. We urge you to think of the immediate future because by tomorrow we will all be a part of it.

Very respectfully yours,

JOSEPH A. CHEESEMAN,
President.

M. E. HERNDON,
Secretary.

INDIANA SOLDIER REPLIES TO CRITICS OF THE MILITARY

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, far too many otherwise intelligent Americans have, without doubt the best of intentions, cast a great shadow of discredit on the finest young Americans of all, our servicemen.

The fashion this year seems to be indiscriminate attacks on the military. While most of us in this Chamber know that the attacks are aimed at policymakers and officers of high rank, I wonder how many realize their effect on our soldiers who give so much to defend their country. Most of the current attacks on the Pentagon are ill-advised enough in their own right, but the effect on our younger fighting men is a disgrace.

Recently, I saw a letter from such a serviceman, John William Locke, a private first class whose home is near Winamac, Ind., in my district. His letter to the editor of the Pulaski County Journal of October 23, 1969, deserves the attention of every Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Pfc. Locke's letter at this point in the RECORD:

DEAR EDITORS:

I'm an artilleryman stationed over in Korea, in the Second Infantry Div.

I'm not writing for just myself, but on behalf of all the servicemen all over the world who serve, and some who sacrifice and give their lives so dearly for their country.

What makes men fight, and if need be, to die for their country? It's many things. Freedom, patriotism, pride in the United States, the great nation we live in. And the main reason? God gave us this great country, and nation, so why can't we all stand up together, for the right to defend, keep its honor, and freedom?

I used to take my country for granted like most people sometimes do, but after getting overseas, I saw what a fool I had been, and how lucky I was to live in the United States.

Please, keep backing us service men up. We need all the moral support, and backing up we can get. By doing this we will feel very proud and in the same token, we will feel it is worthwhile, what we are doing over

here. After all, we are doing it for the people of the United States.

To those ready to be inducted, don't get angry, or feel sad. Be proud, and feel it an honor to serve our country and, if necessary, to die to keep our nation free.

Each night before I go to sleep, I thank God I live in the United States, and pray it will always, "Ring out Freedom".

Thank you very much.

Pfc. JOHN WILLIAM LOCKE.

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW—A DEDICATED AMERICAN

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Vice President of the United States Hon. SPIRO AGNEW is a dedicated American. He is much maligned, often misunderstood, frequently unfairly misquoted out of context, but tonight at Harrisburg, Pa., he speaks frankly and directly to the urgent problems that threaten to tear the United States apart.

Because of the fact that I fear some hostile voices will fail to report the full text of what he has to say, which should be heard by all Americans, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Vice President AGNEW's speech in full at this time.

His remarks are deserving of thoughtful consideration by all citizens.

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT SPIRO AGNEW AT THE PENNSYLVANIA REPUBLICAN DINNER, HARRISBURG, PA., OCTOBER 30, 1969

A little over a week ago, I took a rather unusual step for a Vice President . . . I said something. Particularly, I said something that was predictably unpopular with the people who would like to run the country without the inconvenience of seeking public office. I said I did not like some of the things I saw happening in this country. I criticized those who encouraged government by street carnival and suggested it was time to stop the carousel.

It appears that by slaughtering a sacred cow I triggered a holy war. I have no regrets. I do not intend to repudiate my beliefs, recant my words, or run and hide.

What I said before, I will say again. It is time for the preponderant majority, the responsible citizens of this country, to assert their rights. It is time to stop dignifying the immature actions of arrogant, reckless, inexperienced elements within our society. The reason is compelling. It is simply that their tantrums are insidiously destroying the fabric of American democracy.

By accepting unbridled protest as a way of life, we have tacitly suggested that the great issues of our times are best decided by posturing and shouting matches in the streets. America today is drifting toward Plato's classic definition of a degenerating democracy . . . a democracy that permits the voice of the mob to dominate the affairs of government.

Last week I was lambasted for my lack of "mental and moral sensitivity." I say that any leader who does not perceive where persistent street struggles are going to lead this nation lacks mental acuity. And any leader who does not caution this nation on the danger of this direction lacks moral strength.

I believe in Constitutional dissent. I believe in the people registering their views with their elected representatives, and I commend those people who care enough

about their country to involve themselves in its great issues. I believe in legal protest within the Constitutional limits of free speech, including peaceful assembly and the right of petition. But I do not believe that demonstrations, lawful or unlawful, merit my approval or even my silence where the purpose is fundamentally unsound. In the case of the Vietnam Moratorium, the objective announced by the leaders—immediate unilateral withdrawal of all our forces from Vietnam—was not only unsound but idiotic. The tragedy was that thousands who participated wanted only to show a fervent desire for peace, but were used by the political hustlers who ran the event.

It is worth remembering that our country's founding fathers wisely shaped a Constitutional republic, not a pure democracy. The representative government they contemplated and skillfully constructed never intended that elected officials should decide crucial questions by counting the number of bodies cavorting in the streets. They recognized that freedom cannot endure dependent upon referendum every time part of the electorate desires it.

So great is the latitude of our liberty that only a subtle line divides us from abuse. I am convinced that our preoccupation with emotional demonstration, frequently crossing the line to civil disruption and even violence could inexorably lead us across that line forever.

Ironically, it is neither the greedy nor the malicious, but the self-righteous who are guilty of history's worst atrocities. Society understands greed and malice and erects barriers of law to defend itself from these vices. But evil cloaked in emotional causes is well disguised and often undiscovered until it is too late.

We have just such a group of self-proclaimed saviours of the American soul at work today. Relentless in their criticism of intolerance in America, they themselves are intolerant of those who differ with their views. In the name of academic freedom, they destroy academic freedom. Denouncing violence, they seize and vandalize buildings of great universities. Fiercely expressing their respect for truth, they disavow the logic and discipline necessary to pursue truth.

They would have us believe that they alone know what is good for America; what is true and right and beautiful. They would have us believe that their reflective action is superior to our reflective action; that their revealed righteousness is more effective than our reason and experience.

Think about it. Small bands of students are allowed to shut down great universities. Small groups of dissidents are allowed to shout down political candidates. Small cadres of professional protestors are allowed to jeopardize the peace efforts of the President of the United States.

It is time to question the credentials of their leaders. And, if in questioning we disturb a few people, I say it is time for them to be disturbed. If, in challenging, we polarize the American people, I say it is time for a positive polarization.

It is time for a healthy in-depth examination of policies and a constructive realignment in this country. It is time to rip away the rhetoric and to divide on authentic lines. It is time to discard the fiction that in a country of 200 million people, everyone is qualified to quarterback the government.

For too long we have accepted superficial categorization—young versus old; white versus black; rich versus poor. Now it is time for an alignment based on principles and values shared by all citizens regardless of age, race, creed, or income. This, after all, is what America is all about.

America's pluralistic society was forged on the premise that what unites us in ideals is greater than what divides us as individuals.

Our political and economic institutions were developed to enable men and ideas to compete in the marketplace on the assumption that the best would prevail. Everybody was deemed equal, and by the rules of the game they could become superior. The rules were clear and fair: in politics, win an election; in economics, build a better mousetrap. And as time progressed, we added more referees to assure equal opportunities and provided special advantages for those whom we felt had entered life's arena at a disadvantage.

The majority of Americans respect these rules . . . and with good reason. Historically, they have served as a bulwark to prevent totalitarianism, tyranny, and privilege . . . the old world spectres which drove generations of immigrants to American sanctuary. Pragmatically, the rules of America work. This nation and its citizens—collectively and individually—have made more social, political and economic progress than any civilization in world history.

The principles of the American system did not spring up overnight. They represent centuries of bitter struggle. Our laws and institutions are not even purely American—only our Federal system bears our unique imprimatur.

We owe our values to the Judeo-Christian ethic which stresses individualism, human dignity, and a higher purpose than hedonism. We owe our laws to the political evolution of government by consent of the governed. Our nation's philosophical heritage is as diverse as its cultural background. We are a melting pot nation that has for over two centuries distilled something new and, I believe, sacred.

Now, we have among us a glib, activist element who would tell us our values are lies, and I call them impudent. Because anyone who impugns a legacy of liberty and dignity that reaches back to Moses, is impudent.

I call them snobs for most of them disdain to mingle with the masses who work for a living. They mock the common man's pride in his work, his family and his country. It has also been said that I called them intellectuals. I did not. I said that they characterized themselves as intellectuals. No true intellectual, no truly knowledgeable person, would so despise democratic institutions.

America cannot afford to write off a whole generation for the decadent thinking of a few. America cannot afford to divide over their demagoguery . . . or to be deceived by their duplicity . . . or to let their license destroy liberty. We can, however, afford to separate them from our society—with no more regret than we should feel over discarding rotten apples from a barrel.

The leaders of this country have a moral as well as a political obligation to point out the dangers of unquestioned allegiance to any cause. We must be better than a charlatan leader of the French Revolution, remembered only for his words: "There go the people; I am their leader; I must follow them."

And the American people have an obligation, too . . . an obligation to exercise their citizenship with a precision that precludes excesses.

I recognize that many of the people who participated in the past Moratorium Day were unaware that its sponsors sought immediate unilateral withdrawal. Perhaps many more had not considered the terrible consequences of immediate unilateral withdrawal.

I hope that all citizens who really want peace will take the time to read and reflect on the problem. I hope that they will take into consideration the impact of abrupt termination; that they will remember the more than 3,000 innocent men, women, and children slaughtered after the Viet Cong captured Hue last year and the more than 15,000 doctors, nurses, teachers and village leaders murdered by the Viet Cong during the war's early years. The only sin of these peo-

ple was their desire to build their budding nation of South Vietnam.

Chanting "Peace Now" is no solution, if "Peace Now" is to permit a wholesale blood-bath. And saying that the President should understand the people's view is no solution. It is time for the people to understand the views of the President they elected to lead them.

First, foreign policy cannot be made in the streets.

Second, turning out a good crowd is not synonymous with turning out a good foreign policy.

Third, the test of a President cannot be reduced to a question of public relations. As the Eighteenth Century jurist, Edmund Burke, wrote, "Your representative owes you not his industry only but his judgment; and he betrays instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

Fourth, the impatience—the understandable frustration over this war—should be focused on the government that is stalling peace while continuing to threaten and invade South Vietnam—and that government's capital is not in Washington. It is in Hanoi.

This was not Richard Nixon's war . . . but it will be Richard Nixon's peace if we only let him make it.

Finally—and most important—regardless of the issue, it is time to stop demonstrating in the streets and start doing something constructive about our institutions. America must recognize the dangers of constant carnival. Americans must reckon with irresponsible leadership and reckless words. The mature and sensitive people of this country must realize that their freedom of protest is being exploited by avowed anarchists and communists who detest everything about this country and want to destroy it.

This is a fact. These are the few . . . these are not necessarily leaders. But they prey upon the good intentions of gullible men everywhere. They pervert honest concern to something sick and rancid. They are vultures who sit in trees and watch lions battle, knowing that win, lose or draw, they will be fed.

Abetting the merchants of hate are the parasites of passion. These are the men who value a cause purely for its political mileage. These are the politicians who temporize with the truth by playing both sides to their own advantage. They ooze sympathy for "the cause" but balance each sentence with equally reasoned reservations. Their interest is personal, not moral. They are ideological eunuchs whose most comfortable position is straddling the philosophical fence, soliciting votes from both sides.

Aiding the few who seek to destroy and the many who seek to exploit is a terrifying spirit, the new face of self-righteousness. Former H.E.W. Secretary John Gardner described it: "Sad to say, it's fun to hate . . . that is today's fashion. Rage and hate in a good cause! Be vicious for virtue, self-indulgent for higher purposes, dishonest in the service of a higher honesty."

This is what is happening in this nation . . . we are an effete society if we let it happen here.

I do not overstate the case. If I am aware of the danger, the convicted rapist Elridge Cleaver is aware of the potential. From his Moscow hotel room he predicted, "Many complacent regimes thought that they would be in power eternally—and awoke one morning to find themselves up against the wall. I expect that to happen in the United States in our lifetimes."

People cannot live in a state of perpetual electric shock. Tired of a convulsive society, they settle for an authoritarian society. As Thomas Hobbes discerned three centuries ago, men will seek the security of a Leviathan state as a comfortable alternative to a life that is "nasty, brutish and short."

Right now we must decide whether we will take the trouble to stave off a totalitarian

state. Will we stop the wildness now before it is too late, before the witch-hunting and repression that are all too inevitable begin?

Will Congress settle down to the issues of the nation and reform the institutions of America as our President asks? Can the press ignore the pipers who lead the parades? Will parents have the courage to say no to their children? Will people have the intelligence to boycott pornography and violence? Will citizens refuse to be led by a series of Judas goats down tortuous paths of delusion and self-destruction?

Will we defend fifty centuries of accumulated wisdom? For that is our heritage. Will we make the effort to preserve America's bold, successful experiment in truly representative government? Or do we care so little that we will cast it all aside?

Because on the eve of our nation's 200th birthday, we have reached the crossroads. Because at this moment totalitarianism's threat does not necessarily have a foreign accent. Because we have a home-grown menace, made and manufactured in the U.S.A. Because if we are lazy or foolish, this nation could forfeit its integrity, never to be free again.

I do not want this to happen to America. And I do not think that you do either. We have something magnificent here . . . something worth fighting for . . . and now is the time for all good men to fight for the soul of their country. Let us stop apologizing for our past. Let us conserve and create for the future.

THE VICE PRESIDENT'S VOCABULARY

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring an excellent editorial to the attention of my colleagues. This article, reprinted below, appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press on Friday, October 24.

I think the editorial expresses my views on the New Orleans utterances of the Vice President adequately. However, I would like to point out that those who supported the moratorium in Minnesota included U.S. Senators and Congressmen, prominent clergy, distinguished educators such as a regents professor of the University of Minnesota, and an ex-Governor of Minnesota who happens to belong to the Vice President's political party. These people along with many thousands of others who participated could scarcely be described as "effete and impudent snobs." I therefore use this opportunity to take strong exception to his remarks.

The article follows:

AGNEW GETS A REST

This dispatch came over the wire Thursday:

"Palm Springs, Calif.—Vice President Spiro T. Agnew begins a short vacation in this desert resort today with no plans for speaking engagements or public appearances.

"Agnew was to spend his time resting, according to the Palm Springs Convention and Visitors Bureau . . ."

The Vice-President deserves a rest, of course, after some of the statements he has issued lately, particularly in New Orleans where he concocted this sentence: "A spirit

of national masochism prevails encouraged by an effete corps of impudent snobs who characterize themselves as intellectuals."

Aside from its rhetorical and analytical faults, it astonished a sizable portion of his own party, most members of the opposite party and seven-eighths of the U.S. citizenry, which is still trying to decipher what is meant by an effete corps of impudent snobs."

BIG TRUCK BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, my editorials for today are from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and the Jefferson City Capital News, in the State of Missouri. The editorials follow:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sept. 20, 1969]

BIGGER HIGHWAY FREIGHTERS?

It is a severe disappointment to learn that the Nixon Administration has given its blessing to the bill permitting longer, wider, and heavier freighters on the interstate highways. This measure is virtually the same as the one which was sneaked through the Senate in the last session and then died in the House amid a storm of opposition.

At that time Mr. Nixon, as a candidate for President, urged that action on the bill be postponed. He declared that if he were elected he would direct the Secretary of Transportation "to take a hard new look to make certain that the interest of the traveling public and also the life of our highways are fully protected."

President Nixon's plan for a "hard new look" evidently has not been carried out, because the federal highway administrator, F. C. Turner, admitted to a House Public Works subcommittee that his department did not have "sufficiently reliable evidence" to determine whether bigger, heavier vehicles would increase hazards on the highways. He said, however, that if Congress decides that highway safety won't be affected, the Administration will go along. He suggested that the effective date of the new size and weight standards be delayed until July 1, 1972.

Representative Fred Schwengel (Rep.), Iowa, rightly pointed out that if the Transportation Department did not have the necessary safety information it should have recommended postponement until the facts are available.

All the data on safety may not be at hand, but there is plenty of evidence that the axle loads of vehicles have an important effect upon the life of pavement. Road tests made by the American Association of State Highway Officials showed that the proposed weight increases would require the spending of billions of dollars on reconstruction of older pavements. A survey by the American Automobile Association showed that 67 per cent of the bridges on major highways were not designed to support the truck loads they are now called upon to bear.

Advocates of the bill before Congress make a great deal of the fact that it applies only to interstate highways and that no state would be obliged to approve the higher limits. But the big highway busters don't confine themselves to the interstate roads; they also use two-lane connecting routes and city streets. If Congress raises limits for the interstate, the powerful truckers' lobbies will be turned loose on every legislature.

The truckers have many friends in Congress and in the legislatures. One explanation for these friendships is liberality. Rec-

ords filed by the Truck Operators Nonpartisan Committee last year showed that large campaign contributions were made to sponsors of the bigger truck bill. Among the beneficiaries was Representative John Kluczynski (Dem.), Illinois, chairman of the House Public Works subcommittee on public roads. The truckers bought \$2000 worth of tickets to a \$25-a-plate dinner for the Congressman.

The late Senator Dirksen also was remembered. The truckers bought \$2000 worth of tickets for the Salute to Dirksen held here in 1968.

Such kindnesses are remembered in Congress. If the bigger truck bill is to be defeated, Congress will have to hear from the motorists who have experienced the terror of competing with 35-ton monsters.

[From the Jefferson City (Mo.) Capital News, Aug. 14, 1969]

HIGHWAY "MONSTER TRUCK" BILL DESERVES QUICK DEATH

Anyone who has traveled Interstate 70 or any other major thoroughfare especially at night knows the big lumbering trucks both monopolize the highways and create a serious nuisance at times.

But the trucking industry isn't satisfied with the status quo. They want the federal laws changed affecting size and tonnage of trucks.

Having failed by a hair last year, the industry has launched a new drive in Congress, which would permit longer, wider and heavier trucks on our highway system. Under the bill the proposed new highway monsters could weigh as much as 108,500 pounds and be up to 105 feet long.

Most motorists, we believe, dislike driving near or trying to pass the present behemoths of the roads. Passing the proposed new "monster freight trucks" on heavily traveled highways would scare the wits out of most of us.

This new push by the trucking industry is a dangerous piece of legislation. Although most truckers are excellent, safe drivers, we feel the mere presence of these highway behemoths would contribute to an already increasing accident rate.

The "monster freight" trucks also would place additional stress on our highways, boosting the cost of upkeep and adding to traffic pressure.

Moreover, the claim that the legislation is permissive and would be limited to the interstate system is pure hogwash. The trucking industry lobby is powerful in virtually every state.

It would only be a matter of time until requests for the legislation to be extended were advanced. In addition, the proposed legislation would have an immediate major impact on other roads and streets since we assume these super trucks would have to use other highways and even city streets to reach their eventual destination.

The nation's highway system, we believe, belongs primarily to passenger car drivers, not the trucking industry or any other special interest. The U.S. Congress owes it to the safety and well-being of the 80 million passenger car drivers to give a blunt resounding No to this bill.

NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the week of October 19 through 25 has been designated National Business Women's Week to recognize the contribution

women make to the commerce and industry of our Nation.

It has been my pleasure to speak with business and professional women's clubs throughout my congressional district as well as other organizations of women in the business world. On each of these occasions I have noted the expanding role being played by women in important areas of responsibility that were closed to them not many years ago.

For many years women were subjected to job discrimination, which not only had the effect of denying them the opportunity to develop their individual interests in business, but which also denied business enterprise the opportunity to benefit from the leadership which women have demonstrated so clearly since these artificial barriers began to come down.

I join with others today in saluting the achievements of all business and professional women throughout the country.

THE MOST BEAUTIFUL SEWERS IN THE WORLD

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, there is mounting concern throughout the Nation over the deteriorating condition of our environment. As our population grows, the problems resulting from this expansion are bound to intensify. At present, each American has less than 10.6 acres in which to grow food, bury wastes, live, and breathe.

In Connecticut, statistics reveal that the population has doubled only three times in 158 years. The incredible fact is that the first doubling took 72 years to accomplish; the next doubling of the population of my native State, however, is only 11 years away, completed in little more than one generation.

The question we must face up to is: Will we destroy our environment as we make room for our population before we have developed, funded, and implemented programs to preserve the world in which we live?

If this year's congressional action is any indication, I fear the future is not an entirely optimistic one. Look at what we did with water pollution control. This year Congress failed to fully fund the Clean Water Restoration Act. The authorization for fiscal 1970 was \$1 billion. The administration requested a meager \$214 million for water pollution control. Even fiscal conservatives admitted that this was inadequate, and as a result the Appropriations Subcommittee recommended funding at a level of \$450 million. An attempt on the floor of the House to fully fund the act, however, failed, and the House finally settled on a compromise appropriation of \$600 million.

As a supporter of the full funding proposal, I was, of course, disappointed in the House action.

Mr. Speaker, the August issue of the Telephone Bulletin, published by the

Southern New England Telephone Co., contains an article on the water pollution problems confronting Connecticut. Citing the difficulties of program development, funding, and implementation, the article paints a bleak picture for our environment.

I commend the article entitled "The Most Beautiful Sewers in the World" to my colleagues for their careful consideration. I am certain that many of the problems discussed in this article will be familiar.

It is time we stopped talking about the destruction of our environment. If we do not back our words with action, it will be too late to do anything. The cost of pollution abatement will be less if we act now than if we wait until our Nation's waters have become massive sewers.

The article by Karen Lansky on Connecticut's new clean water program and the problems that lie ahead follows:

THE MOST BEAUTIFUL SEWERS IN THE WORLD

(By Karen Lansky)

A brave new law promises an end to water pollution in Connecticut by 1974. But . . . enacting the program is a big, tough, costly job. . .

On Highway 8 in Naugatuck there is a road sign that many look at, but few see. It warns that persons found littering will be fined \$200. Hard by, across the dank, sickly-green Naugatuck River, a factory dumps nine million gallons of raw, latex-ridden sewage into the river every day—without paying a cent.

This is no surprise. Water pollution is not a new problem in our state. When the Connecticut General Assembly convened in 1899, the sewer commission stated: "Our cities are growing all the time, the quantity of sewage discharged into the streams is thereby increased, and the practice which 20 years ago may have been objectionable has become unbearable."

There are two major sources of pollution—municipal and industrial. According to a group of citizens appointed by the Governor in 1965 to investigate the problem of pollution:

"Potentially, the most dangerous source of pollution in Connecticut is municipal waste—sewage, in other words. Untreated, or inadequately treated human waste can spread disease. It curtails and makes the recreational use of water distasteful. It has already destroyed a portion of Connecticut's once thriving shell fish industry. Sewage has already lowered property values along our coastline. Sewage is transforming many of our streams and our waterways into a gray, putrid slime.

"Industrial waste is another source of pollution in Connecticut's water. Whenever the treatment of industrial waste cannot be included in new or enlarged municipal treatment plants, industry must be assisted in the construction of their own treatment plants."

In our state such pollution has rendered the Connecticut River unfit for swimming—anywhere—within the boundaries of the state. Trash, filth, and human waste line the shores of the Yellow Mill River in Bridgeport. On the Mill River in New Haven, foul-smelling white sludge from the manufacture of paper flows from a sewer line directly into the river. A service station attendant living near the Mill River claims he has seen dead animals greased with slime floating there.

There are 199 factories in this state discharging sanitary waste to surface water without even primary treatment, or removal of solids. Primary treatment is not enough. To halt industrial pollution, 234 new treatment facilities are needed.

There are 169 towns in Connecticut. Of these, only 73 operate sewage treatment plants. Nine towns have sewers that dump

raw sewage directly into streams. The rest have septic tanks which may or may not be effective in disposing of waste.

Connecticut has had pollution controls of one sort or another since 1925. Nevertheless, pollution continues—year after year—to turn our rivers into gaping, open sewers. One reason is that before 1967, Connecticut was the only New England state to contribute no money at all to the construction of municipal sewage plants. In addition, the Water Resources Commission, prior to the adoption of Clean Water Act, was pitifully understaffed. And though the law let the Commission order polluters to build treatment facilities, it could not take violators into court until after the date when the entire facility was to have been completed—which usually meant a wait of several years.

With ever-increasing amounts of filth being dumped into our waters, citizens began to press for stronger controls. They formed groups like the Farmington River Watershed Association, to which SNET belongs. The FRWA urges local governments and businesses to invest in treatment plants.

In 1965 Governor Dempsey appointed a Clean Water Task Force of 100 private citizens to recommend what was needed to clean up the waters.

In 1967, the legislature turned the Task Force's recommendations into the Clean Water Act. To help municipalities, the Act provided for a \$150 million bond issue that would let the state finance up to 30% of the cost of municipal sewage plants. In 1969 the legislature issued another \$100 million in bonds.

One half of 1%, or \$750,000 of the \$150 million bond issue, was made available to the State Water Resources Commission for administrative expenses and badly needed staff salaries.

To help industry, the Act granted state and local tax abatements on industrial sewage plants.

By adopting federally-approved water standards the Act made towns in the state eligible for federal subsidy—30% of construction costs of sewage treatment plants and lateral sewers, 50% for other facilities.

The Act allowed speedier enforcement than the old law. The Water Resources Commission was authorized to issue orders to polluters containing a timetable of steps that must be undertaken to control pollution. Neglect of any one of these steps could result in a court suit by the state. The aim was to eliminate the long wait required under the old law.

In its May 12, 1969, Status Report on the Connecticut Clean Water Program, the Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources states, "Public Act #57, the Clean Water Act, went into effect on May 1, 1967. Within the first year the required schedules had become a fact. At the present time, these schedules are incorporated into 793 orders which have been issued. These orders contain more than 2,300 steps of compliance. Already 776 of the steps have been accomplished. It is anticipated that the recommendations of the Governor's Clean Water Task Force, which called for the elimination of all sources of pollution before 1974, will be accomplished. It is actually the intent to accomplish practically all by the end of 1972."

Regardless of new and more effective legislation, there still are problems. First, there's a question of how clean is clean. Second, enforcement of orders is slow. Finally there may not be enough money to complete the necessary projects.

As for cleanliness, "clean water" does not necessarily mean drinking water or water of bathing quality.

"What we want," says Merwin Hupfer, division engineer of water pollution control at the State Water Resources Commission, "is to bring the standards of all streams up to what's appropriate for the stream's in-

tended use. For instance, many of the streams are not intended for drinking, but for fish life. Some fish could not live in a stream of drinkable quality."

Hupfer says a discharge going into a stream must be made as clean as is technologically feasible. "Most of the time this is cleaner than the stream itself," he says. "Due to cost, insuring that all discharge into our streams is of drinkable quality is not feasible at this time. We are attempting to treat discharge in such a way that our waters are at least acceptable for various recreational uses." Hupfer explained that not all waters may even be made suitable for bathing.

State Senator George Gunther, a persistent critic of the Water Resources Commission, says enforcement of even these standards is falling behind.

Last year he wrote the Commission concerning an order to the town of Beacon Falls.

"I found that in May, when Beacon Falls was supposed to start construction under the new law, they actually had been referred to the Attorney General's office on a previous order under the old law that they hadn't conformed to a year prior.

"When I asked Attorney General about the case," Gunther said, "he claimed that it was just in his file, and that his office hadn't taken any action because no action had been requested by the Commission.

"Then the Water Resources Commission contacted the Attorney General's office and recalled the file and granted Beacon Falls a year's extension."

Says Hupfer: "Beacon Falls was falling behind. But they were not taken to court because they promised conformity. Public Act No. 57 provides for fining but doesn't insist upon it. What the heck is a fine? It takes so long to get into court. We want to accomplish, not lose time.

"If we stood by our schedules 100% of the way, we'd have almost all our orders in court and we wouldn't go anywhere. Sometimes a job must be delayed because of slow equipment deliveries."

The Water Resources Commission says Beacon Falls is "now up to date."

Although there's a tax abatement, industry must erect treatment plants at its own expense. Today approximately 685 industrial and private orders are outstanding—the figure changes weekly.

As for municipalities, the needed treatment plants would have taken an estimated \$200 million in 1967; but \$363 million today. And the needed investment grows monthly due to increasing construction costs.

The federal government has failed to appropriate enough funds for the construction aid it promised. As a result, the state allows the Commission to pre-finance that portion of the federal grant which is unavailable. Hopefully, the federal government will come through with its promised repayment before the state of Connecticut depletes its own funds.

But if the federal government provides the money, will it be enough?

Eric Mood, a pollution expert at the Yale department of Public Health and Epidemiology, laments that Connecticut is falling behind other states.

Mood, a member of the National Technological Advisory Committee on Water Quality Criteria for the Secretary of the Interior, cites specific areas:

Money. "\$250 million is not enough."

Salaries. "The state is not willing to pay salaries to bring in top men in the field. The amounts we offer are pitifully low."

Water Standards. "You need two sets of standards, one for streams, one for discharge. The definitions of our current standards are ambiguous, weak. Industry should have specifically worded criteria that govern the quality of its discharge. All discharge can be upgraded to drinkable quality. It is technologically feasible."

"As I see it, water pollution abatement activities in the state of Connecticut will continue to be low-priority, non-effective and of limited scope unless and until there is dedicated leadership on the part of the governor, the legislators and the officials of the state agencies concerned with water pollution abatement. Industry must begin to acknowledge its role in water pollution abatement activities, and the electorate must provide the needed funds to municipalities for the construction and operation of treatment plants."

DESEGREGATION AT LAST

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, as I said in earlier remarks today, it was gratifying to read of yesterday's Supreme Court decision rejecting slow-motion integration and ordering the immediate cessation of dual school systems.

By ruling that "all deliberate speed" for desegregation is no longer constitutionally permissible, the Burger court proves it will follow the commendable precedent of the Warren court and guarantee equal opportunities to all our Nation's citizens.

Since the historic Brown against the Board of Education ruling in 1954 acknowledged that separate but equal schools are inherently unequal, the phrase that urged integration "with all deliberate speed" has been the object of some of the most unconscionable legal maneuverings this country has ever witnessed.

In an article in the September issue of the Progressive, Edwin Knoll shows how successful the anti-integrationists have been in stalling the 1954 Supreme Court order.

But yesterday, after 15 years, 5 months, and 12 days, the Supreme Court indicated its patience had come to an end. An entire generation has attended schools that have openly defied an order of the highest tribunal in our land. Hopefully, yesterday's Supreme Court decision will correct this blatant twisting of our Nation's "law and order."

Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of a decade and a half of full integration postponement is thoroughly documented by Mr. Knoll. I recommend the article to all my colleagues, and I submit it for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

STILL SEPARATE, STILL UNEQUAL

(By Erwin Knoll¹)

The school year that begins this month will be the sixteenth since the Supreme Court of the United States decreed that "segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other 'tangible' factors may be

¹ Erwin Knoll is the Washington editor of The Progressive. He has worked as a reporter and editor for The Washington Post and the Newhouse National News Service, and he was formerly Washington correspondent for the Southern Education Reporting Service and The Nation's Schools. His articles have appeared in Commentary, Esquire, and the Columbia Journalism Review.

equal, [deprives] the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities" and therefore of the equal protection of the law.

The new school year will be the fifteenth since the same Court ordered state and local officials to devise plans "to effectuate a transition to a racially nondiscriminatory school system." Lower Federal courts were directed to require school boards to make "a prompt and reasonable start" toward desegregating the schools and to proceed toward full compliance with the Supreme Court's edict "with all deliberate speed."

A child born on May 17, 1954, the date of the Supreme Court's historic *Brown v. Board of Education* ruling, should be entering the tenth grade this fall. If that child is black and happens to live in one of the Southern states, the odds are better than two-to-one that he will be enrolled in a segregated school. The odds are at least even that he will be graduated from high school in 1972—if he is graduated at all—without ever having sat in a classroom with children who were not black.

For most of those whose rights it was intended to secure, the Supreme Court's historic desegregation decisions remains a promise unfulfilled. This is the fact that was all but lost sight of in this summer's strenuous debates over the Nixon Administration's revised guidelines for school desegregation. After a decade and a half of "all deliberate speed," the argument was made that the Government could not move "precipitously" to enforce the law of the land—and the argument prevailed. A nation that shaved a year from its deadline for sending an American to the moon decided that it needed more time to send Americans to biracial public schools.

Last year, about twenty per cent of the black children in the Southern states attended desegregated public schools. It will be some time before this year's figures become available from the cumbersome (and less than reliable) statistics-gathering machinery of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, but civil rights enforcement officials in HEW now concede that it is quite unlikely the total will reach the forty per cent they projected only a few months ago. Some of those who take the most drastic view of the new guidelines speculate that the rate of desegregation may actually decrease.

The Nixon Administration's policy statement of July 3, which declared its opposition to "arbitrary dates and systems" for desegregation and promised to take into account "bona fide educational and administrative problems," was merely the latest installment in a long history of officially sanctioned delay and evasion. Even the South's most strident segregationists must have been repeatedly surprised over the last fifteen years by the success of their dilatory tactics.

In its first reaction to the 1954 decision, the *Richmond News Leader* (which was to become the leading mouthpiece for Virginia's policy of "massive resistance" to desegregation) declared: "If the Court were to fix, say, a ten-year period, and permit the states to integrate ten per cent of their schools a year . . . a solution might be found." The *News-Leader's* sister-paper, the *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, suggested "the abolition of segregation by stages or steps with, say, ten per cent eliminated the first year after the decrees became effective, forty per cent two years later, perhaps, and the remaining fifty per cent some years after that. In this way all uncertainty as to the timing and method of the tremendous shift would have been eliminated. . . ." To Northern liberals, such comments represented unconscionable temporizing in 1954. With today's hindsight they seem to represent a breakneck pace of compliance. In the 1968-69 school year, desegregation had not yet reached ten per cent of the black pupils in Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi.

In the first decade after *Brown v. Board of Education*, compliance in the South could be measured only with a micrometer. In an unprecedented display of parliamentary energy, state legislatures in the region passed scores of ingenious laws designed to thwart the Supreme Court's edict. Sleepy school boards whose official activity had been largely confined to the occasional authorization of funds for the purchase of baton twirlers' uniforms suddenly manifested a talent for Machiavellian intrigue. Lawyers prospered and politicians became famous. The few blacks who managed, through persistent litigation, to enroll their children in formerly all-white schools were, more often than not, subjected to harassment, economic pressure, and occasionally violence. In the 1963-64 school year, 1.17 per cent of the black children in the eleven states of the Deep South were attending desegregated schools.

Then came the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which stipulated in its Title VI that Federal financial aid would be withheld from all discriminatory state and local activities. It was a provision that Representative Adam Clayton Powell Jr., the Harlem Democrat, had long tried to attach to Federal aid measures only to be repeatedly rebuffed by fellow liberals who preferred aid to segregated schools to no aid at all. "The Powell Amendment is now the law of the land," Powell was able to boast after the Act of 1964 was passed.

Title VI (and Title IV of the same Act, which authorized Federal financial and technical aid for desegregating school districts) for the first time put the Federal Government into the business of enforcing desegregation administratively rather than through the courts. It was—and remains—a small business. Once guidelines for the application of Title VI were drawn, an understaffed and overburdened office—first in the U.S. Office of Education, more recently in the parent HEW Department—was assigned the task of bringing about compliance. It was an unenviable task, for the guidelines were fraught with the potential for evasion; the Southern school districts, seasoned by a decade of litigation, were adept at exploiting that potential; the Johnson White House was relentless in its demands for "progress" statistics—and just as relentless in insisting that due deference be paid to the Southern Congressmen who constantly called for delay.

Nonetheless, the pace of desegregation quickened appreciably. The percentage of black pupils attending desegregated schools rose to seven, then thirteen, then twenty. Segregationist outrage rose even more rapidly—particularly after both HEW and the Federal courts began to take a dim view of the South's most effective device for pseudo-compliance, the so-called "freedom of choice" pupil assignment plans which desegregated the schools in theory while leaving them segregated in practice. In May 1968, the Supreme Court held that "the burden on a school board today is to come forward with a plan that promises realistically to work now," and added that "if there are reasonably available other ways, such for illustration as zoning, promising speedier and more effective conversion to a unitary, nonracial school system, 'freedom of choice' must be held unacceptable." HEW's Title VI enforcement officers said they would be governed by the Court's view. Furthermore, they revised the guidelines to call for complete desegregation by the fall of 1969, except for those districts that had a majority of black pupils or a shortage of facilities; they would be given one more year.

These goals have not only been undermined by the Nixon Administration's policy statement of July 3; they were further jeopardized when the House, in appropriating funds for the Department of HEW on July 31, approved a provision barring the use of these funds to "force" the busing of pupils, the closing of schools, or the assignment

of students to particular schools against the wishes of their parents.

This provision, sponsored by Representative Jamie L. Whitten, Mississippi Democrat, had the effect of restoring the legal sanctity of "freedom of choice"—or, as Representative Jeffery Cohelan, California Democrat, put it—"affirming the South's right to keep its racially segregated schools."

A year ago, a similar Whitten amendment was defeated—in part, at least, because Presidential candidate Richard M. Nixon passed the word that he did not favor it. This year, however, President Nixon remained silent, and Congressman Cohelan's attempt to strike Whitten's language from the bill was defeated by 158 votes to 141. How the Senate will act remains to be seen, and will depend in large measure on the Administration's attitude.

Of some 4,500 school districts in the seven-teen Southern and border states, HEW reported this summer, about 3,000 had complied voluntarily with the Title VI guidelines, although the degree of compliance varied widely from the sheerest tokenism to genuine desegregation. About 330 had promised to desegregate by 1969 or 1970, 369 were under court order to desegregate, and 123—mostly small, rural districts—had forfeited Federal financial aid by failing or refusing to comply. The rest were under review or at one stage or another of the cut-off process, and they represented the districts where resistance to desegregation was most firmly entrenched.

Against the background of rising segregationist resistance to enforcement of Title VI, Richard M. Nixon mounted the "Southern strategy" of his 1968 Presidential campaign. "There has been too much of a tendency for both our courts and our Federal agencies to use the whole program of school integration for purposes which have very little to do with education and which do not serve a very useful purpose," he told a television audience in Charlotte, North Carolina, and as he toured the South he dropped hints everywhere that a Nixon Administration could be expected to take a more "reasonable" view. South Carolina Senator Strom Thurmond and other stalwarts of the Southern strategy felt no need to resort to hints; they stated flatly that a Nixon victory would bring an easing of civil rights enforcement.

For five months after entering office, the new Administration grappled with the problem of the guidelines. While Southern segregationists pressed for relaxation, such Republican moderates as Senator Jacob K. Javits of New York, Senator Marlow W. Cook of Kentucky, and Governor Winthrop Rockefeller of Arkansas urged the President to adhere to the standing desegregation timetable. Within the Administration, these conflicting views were complicated by a third—that of the Madison Avenue men in the White House whose prime concern was to find a solution that would do the most to enhance—or the least to diminish—the President's image.

In an early action that was widely read as a sign of a coming cave-in, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Robert H. Finch, announced late in January that five Southern school districts—two of them in Thurmond's South Carolina—that were facing a loss of Federal funds would be given sixty days to recover the funds retroactively if they submitted acceptable desegregation plans. Finch firmly denied the suggestion that the guidelines were being eroded and subsequently made it known that he favored no extension of desegregation deadlines.

The same position was taken by the Department's new desegregation enforcement chief, Leon E. Panetta, who impressed civil rights leaders as an earnest opponent of racial discrimination. But the general counsel at HEW, Goldwater Republican Robert C. Mardian, wrote a private memo to Finch (which was mysteriously leaked to the press) sug-

gesting that the guidelines be secretly relaxed. To deprive a school system of Federal funds for practicing racial discrimination is "the meat-axe approach," Mardian believes.

While the Administration vacillated and pending compliance actions gathered dust on Finch's desk, school districts with pending desegregation plans began to balk at compliance. Some said they had been advised by members of Congress to make no rash moves, since the pressure from Washington would soon be lifted. Some cited the advice of "people high up in the White House." Lending substance to their expectations were announcements from HEW that Southerners had been appointed to two of the five seats on the panel reviewing fund cut-offs, and that the desegregation deadline for twelve South Carolina districts had been extended until the fall of 1970, although the HEW Department's enforcement staff had strongly recommended 1969.

In a confidential memorandum to Finch, the former director of HEW's Office for Civil Rights, Ruby G. Martin, wrote that if the guidelines were relaxed, hundreds of school officials who have already moved into compliance "would be forced to reconsider their decision. . . . Many school districts would be forced by local pressures to resegment their schools by reinstating a freedom of choice plan." A shift in Federal policy, Mrs. Martin added, "would drag the race issue back into school board meetings, PTA meetings, the classroom and local elections."

The murky statement of Administration policy jointly announced July 3 by Finch and Attorney General John Mitchell was a triumph for the White House phrase-makers. "I assume that there are people who can read it any way that they want to read it and undoubtedly will," said Jerris Leonard, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of civil rights enforcement. An HEW official who chose, understandably, to remain anonymous called it "a masterpiece of double-talk."

The statement put the Administration on record as "unequivocally committed to the goal of finally ending racial discrimination in schools." It also declared that "there may be sound reasons for some limited delay." This latter passage, Finch and Panetta insisted, meant nothing. Attorney General Mitchell, who seemed to think it meant something, had the force of logic on his side; if it meant nothing, why was it in the statement? Panetta announced that he would send a letter to Southern school authorities explaining that the statement was intended to convey no relaxation of desegregation deadlines. The letter was never sent; an HEW spokesman announced that, on second thought, there was no need for it.

Two other points of substance were in the Administration's statement: an acknowledgment that racial discrimination is prevalent in Northern school systems, and an indication that increasing use would be made of the courts—rather than the Title VI cutoff provision—to bring about desegregation. Taken separately and together, these points are easily misunderstood.

So far as attacking discrimination in Northern schools is concerned, the principle has been espoused for several years by HEW. It has proven extraordinarily difficult to put into practice, for Congress has specifically forbidden Federal action to remedy racial imbalance in the schools where evidence of discriminatory intent is absent, and the courts have in most instances rejected legal assaults on segregation, Northern style. The one most important exception, the remarkable *Hobson v. Hansen* case in which a Federal judge found that the public schools of Washington, D.C., had systematically discriminated against the low-income black children who constitute the overwhelming majority of their enrollment, offers little basis for encouragement. Two years after winning his suit, plaintiff Julius W. Hobson, a mem-

ber of Washington's newly elected Board of Education, is marshaling new evidence for another test case because the first one resulted in no relief.

If the Justice Department's small staff of civil rights lawyers is to devote much of its time to Northern de facto segregation cases that are likely to fall, efforts at ending de jure segregation in the South will be further neglected. And at best, the efforts on the South will bear fruit only slowly, if at all. It should be borne in mind that the reason Title VI was incorporated in the 1964 Act was that the courts had proven ineffective in fostering desegregation at a meaningful pace. School systems under a court order to desegregate are automatically exempt from the loss of Federal funds under Title VI, regardless of the progress—if any—which they are making toward eliminating racial barriers. In Alabama, all 118 school districts are under court order to desegregate; last year, only 7.4 per cent of the state's black pupils were in desegregated schools.

In April, 1967, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals ordered each state within its jurisdiction—Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas—to take the steps to bring about a "unitary system in which there are no Negro schools and no white schools—just schools." This is dramatic language but it overlooks the prime lesson of *Brown v. Board of Education*—the gap that can exist between judicial rhetoric and administrative compliance.

Nonetheless, the Administration moved swiftly on the legal front in the days immediately after July 3. In a frenzy that reminded the editors of *The Washington Post* of "the finale of *Hellzapoppin*," the Justice Department showered lawsuits and warnings on school systems North and South, the most notable being aimed at the Chicago Board of Education. It was a dazzling performance—and a deceptive one, for officials at Justice acknowledged that the suits had long been ready and had been held in reserve to demonstrate the Administration's "good faith" on desegregation. The publicity men at work again.

The Department announced, among other actions, that it intended to bring a statewide desegregation suit against the public schools of Georgia, eliciting howls of indignation from its slow-witted governor, Lester Maddox. Apparently no one bothered to explain to him that an unwieldy and unenforceable statewide desegregation order against Georgia schools would have the immediate effect of restoring Federal funds to thirty-six districts that have already been cut off for noncompliance with Title VI. The suit was filed on August 1.

"Cutting the school guidelines is the clearest possible notice to Southern segregationists that they can ignore the rights of black children," Professor Gary Orfield of the University of Virginia, the author of *The Reconstruction of Southern Education*, wrote after the Administration released its policy statement. "The Federal backdown rewards resisters. Schoolmen who have staked their careers on developing sound desegregation plans will be denounced as 'race mixers' doing more than even Federal bureaucrats really want. Strom Thurmond has another victory and Southern progressives a very serious defeat."

In Louisiana, Federal Judge Ben C. Dawkins, Jr.—one of the judges on whom the Administration is presumably relying to carry out its "unequivocal" commitment—promptly ordered HEW to renegotiate "outrageous" desegregation schedules it had drawn up for thirty-seven districts to replace freedom of choice plans. The new Administration policy gives "us considerably more elbow room," Judge Dawkins said. He called it "a sort of new breath of fresh air to re-

place the virtually intolerable situation for all of us prior to the new policy." In Mississippi, State Republican Chairman Clarge Reed commented: "This is a historic step in returning to the schools their prime objective of education of the nation's youth."

Senator Thurmond was more cautious in appraising his victory. He called it "an improvement over past policy," but reserved further judgment "until I see how this new policy is administered." The White House is on notice: It is being watched.

Strom Thurmond is not the only one watching. Black Americans—those who have not given up on integration yet—are watching. A recent *Newsweek* poll found that black parents want integrated schooling for their children by a margin of eight-to-one—not, we can assume, because they see some magic virtue in having their children attend school with whites, but because they have learned from long and painful experience that when white America can get away with providing separate schools, it does not bother to make them equal.

How many more years? An American who heard the administration explain its desegregation policy on July 3 and saw two of his countrymen walk on the moon on July 20 might be forgiven for suggesting a new version of a proud old slogan: The impossible we do immediately; the difficult takes forever.

FROM PUBLIC SERVICE TO PRIVATE SERVICE

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, last week it was my privilege to publicly congratulate former Secretary of the Treasury, Joseph W. Barr, upon his appointment as president of American Security & Trust Co., of Washington, D.C. This morning the *Washington Post* printed in their editorial column some very kind words about Mr. Barr. I wish to add this editorial to the *RECORD*—and with the *Post* I "wish him well":

FROM PUBLIC TO PRIVATE SERVICE

They rarely go back to Pocatello or even to Indianapolis. Joseph W. Barr, one term Indiana Democratic Congressman, who failed for re-election in 1960, was one of those who stayed here to make a record of success in both private business and public life. His public record was one of progress from being assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, to being chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp., to serving as under-secretary of the Treasury, and then, in the last few days of the Johnson administration to the Treasury secretaryship itself. Mr. Barr was confirmed by the Senate just 10 days before the Nixon administration took office. His private Washington career then began as vice chairman of the board at the American Security and Trust Co. Now, at 51, he has been named president of the bank, the city's second largest. It is considered likely that a year hence, he will step up to the top job, chairman of the board and chief executive officer when the present chairman, Robert C. Baker, retires. Service in Congress and the cabinet is heady stuff, but no more important, from where we sit, than service as a leading financial figure in this community; it is no mean responsibility that now falls upon Mr. Barr and we wish him well.

SOLITARY IS WORST—COMMUNIST TREATMENT OF POW'S

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the news media have neglected to report much about the aspect of the Vietnam war involving our POW's and the MIA's and their families.

The reasons for this neglect are not obscure. Reports and facts were difficult to obtain. This aspect of Communist atrocities involved only a few U.S. citizens and their families who could easily be forgotten. They were loyal, patriotic; they did not riot, demonstrate, or make insulting or obscene criticisms of our Government; they suffered extraordinarily in silence.

Any accurate report of the POW and MIA aspect of this miserable war would have indicted the North Vietnamese Communists and the Vietcong as the most diabolical and vicious war machine in the history of warfare. Few reporters or editors desired to depict our enemy in this heinous perspective.

Every time the North Vietnamese have liberated any prisoner of war, they have intentionally prolonged and exacerbated the mental and emotional torture of every family of every man who is a prisoner of war—POW—or reported as missing in action—MIA. The Communists in this country and abroad in Paris and North Vietnam milk every bit of publicity from the world press, but also every ounce of emotion and strain from the families of all POW's and MIA's. The hopes of every family are raised. The elation of expectation soars to heights unappreciated by those of us who have never had a loved one in a Communist prison. Then all of these hopes and anticipated joys of reunion are crassly dashed. Then deeper despair, anxiety, and terror overcomes the family—and they must go on bravely. But oh how demonic an enemy who uses the wives and children of prisoners to fight their wars of terrorism.

Only recently have the news media assumed any reportorial responsibility for "telling it like it is" regarding our POW's and MIA's.

Because the news media have seen fit to emphasize the atrocities they attribute to the South Vietnamese, I am inserting a reportorial column from the *Washington Star* by Star staff writer William Delaney which captures, better than most reports, the despicable life and torture of our POW's.

I commend the *Star* and Mr. Delaney for reporting this aspect of the war. It tells a good deal about the kind of enemy we are fighting in Vietnam. It tells a good deal about the government which is trying to take control of South Vietnam. It tells a good deal about the treatment the South Vietnamese can expect when our forces leave and the Communists are permitted to assume control. It tells a good deal about communism and the

treatment of human beings under a Communist regime.

The facts presented in Mr. Delaney's article ought to be known by every Member; these facts should be available to every citizen of our country. Unless this aspect of the war is known, the war, its causes, its conduct, and its settlement cannot be understood.

The article follows:

HANOI HIDES FACTS, BUT POW REMEMBERS

(By William Delaney)

Long days alone in a tiny, stifling room; a bowl of pumpkin soup twice a day; an open arm wound that stuck to his blanket each night; a fellow officer with cigarette burns on his arms and his fingernails yanked out . . .

Locked in the tortured memory of 28-year-old Navy Lt. Robert Frishman is probably as thorough a report as anyone in America now has on the condition of the 1,320 U.S. servicemen captured or missing in Vietnam action.

Frishman, one of the nine Americans freed from the North Vietnamese prisons in the past five years, recalls an anecdote from childhood to describe "the worst" part of his 20 months in captivity.

NOT MUCH IS KNOWN

"When I was a little kid and I did something wrong, my dad would ask, 'Do you want to have a beating, or else you can't go out with the boys in the afternoon.'"

"I would always take the beating. The isolation and the solitary confinement is the worst on you."

But neither Frishman nor the U.S. government knows the worst that has befallen those who have not been freed.

In fact, the government does not even know from Hanoi whether these men are today alive or dead.

All it knows, as it cautiously appraises reports of an imminent break in Hanoi's POW silence, is that varying sorts of evidence suggest that at least 414 individuals are probably now in enemy prisons.

The evidence on these "confirmed" prisoners—letters from more than 100 of them, images and voices in North Vietnamese propaganda, U.S. intelligence information, reports from foreign journalists, and first-hand accounts of returnees like Frishman—indicate that the bulk of them are in camps within North Vietnam.

More than 50, however, are believed to be scattered among enemy units in South Vietnam. According to reports from some 40 Americans released or escaped from captivity in the South, these men are not held in camps but individually, at the most in two or three.

Only last Sunday, the Viet Cong announced that three more of these men would be released but did not say when or where.

As for the 906 Americans missing and unaccounted for, the Pentagon feels that perhaps half of these may be in North Vietnamese prisons.

ABOUT 150 IN LAOS

The rest include some 300 missing in South Vietnam and about 150 missing in Laos.

Of all the 1,320 listed as either POWs or missing, nearly two-thirds are Air Force pilots or crewmen. For the most part, they were downed during the 2½-year-long bombing of North Vietnam—which ended a year ago this week.

Many others are Navy pilots, like Frishman.

They include Lt. (j.g.) Everett Alvarez Jr., who was downed Aug. 5, 1964, in the first U.S. air strikes against North Vietnam, during the Gulf of Tonkin crisis.

Alvarez has been captive longest of any of the confirmed POWs, according to the Pentagon.

More than 200 others have been in Communist hands over 3½ years.

Some of the captured or missing men are Army personnel—all of them in South Vietnam or Laos—and the Defense Department believes "a few" Marines are being held in North Vietnam.

As for the conditions in the enemy POW camps, probably the freshest and most thorough information available to the U.S. is that obtained from Frishman and the two other Americans released by Hanoi last August.

Like the six earlier returnees, the latest trio personally saw only a limited number of other Americans (Frishman remembers a total of "around 150" in two camps where he was held).

But what Frishman saw and heard, and smelled and felt, all served to confirm Washington's conviction that not only has North Vietnam failed to honor one basic tenet of the Geneva POW Conference agreement—listing the prisoners. It has also, as Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird said, "violated even the most fundamental standards of human decency."

For example:

Right after Frishman was shot down by a surface-to-air missile on Oct. 24, 1967, he was driven blindfolded through a gun emplacement and stoned.

He was refused treatment for the elbow wound he initially suffered unless he would agree to give information.

When he passed out, he was taken to a hospital and roped to a stool until he passed out again. ("In two days your feet swell up, and then it creeps up your legs until they're numb . . .")

When his elbow finally was amputated, fragments of the missile remained in his arm. It took six months for the incision to heal because it formed a scab against his blanket each night in the 45-degree winter.

Most of Frishman's time was spent in solitary confinement in 10-by-11 or 14-by-26-foot rooms, where he shivered in the winter and suffered from a heat rash during the sultry summer. Twice a day the prisoners were served pumpkin soup with pig fat in it and some bread.

Most Americans are allowed to read only North Vietnamese propaganda and to listen to Radio Hanoi.

"They took pictures of me reading Newsweek magazine," said Seaman Douglas Hegdahl of Clark, S.D., who was released along with Frishman. But he said that as soon as the picture was snapped, "they took the magazine away."

GOT SOME MAIL

Hegdahl also confirmed that in a Japanese newspaper photo of him reading "Christmas mail" at the POW camp, the letter he was looking at was dated the previous April 2. He said he got 15 other letters from home, but that packages were rifled if he got them at all.

"Many POWs do not write or receive mail," he said.

The 1949 Geneva Convention permits the exchange of two letters and four cards per month between the POW and his family.

During the five years since Alvarez was captured, a total of only about 800 letters have been received by the families of more than 100 of the POWs. "The mail there really should have been something like 20,000 to 22,000," says a Pentagon source.

Frishman and Hegdahl also said they had no contact with the Red Cross, which is authorized to inspect POW camps under the Geneva Convention.

Most prisoners, they said, are kept in "isolated" situations, some in solitary confinement, some in two- or three-man rooms.

After initial "rough treatment" to obtain military information, the captors later ap-

ply pressure to obtain statements that the POWs are receiving "humane" treatment.

Frishman said he was rehearsed before an interview with an Italian journalist. "You try to do what you can to resist that thing, but, like I say, they have ways of forcing you . . ."

A WEIGHT PROBLEM

The North Vietnamese, though "capable of giving good medical care," do only what is necessary to keep the POWs alive. Both Frishman and Hegdahl lost about 50 pounds in captivity.

In contrast to the reports from American POWs, the Pentagon says South Vietnam and the Red Cross have supplied Hanoi with lists of the 28,000 to 30,000 Viet Cong and North Vietnamese prisoners currently being held in six POW facilities in South Vietnam.

The camps are regularly inspected by the Red Cross, and the prisoners regularly receive mail. Hanoi has been informed that 60 of the prisoners are sick or wounded. But Hanoi has failed to arrange for their return to the North—in some cases, for as long as two years.

Over the past five years, more than 400 of the POWs held in the South have been released, partly in hope that such action would inspire a counter-release by Hanoi. That figure does not include the 88 whose release Saigon proposed yesterday.

LAIRD'S DECISION

Only in recent months, however, has the U.S. begun applying the pressure of world opinion to the plight of its enemy-held servicemen.

According to a Pentagon spokesman, Laird reviewed the entire POW problem after taking office last January and became increasingly convinced that America's discreet past posture on the matter didn't seem to be obtaining results.

Furthermore, the halt of bombing of North Vietnam and the public forum provided a chance to put pressure on Hanoi. A final factor was a feeling that the families of the men needed reassurance from their government that "they have not been forgotten."

Working closely with the State Department, Laird repeatedly made public appeals to Hanoi to abide by the Geneva convention—to list the prisoners, release the sick and wounded, treat them properly and provide regular mail and impartial inspections of POW camps.

During the summer, Richard G. Capen Jr., deputy assistant defense secretary for public affairs, was dispatched to speak with more than 1,700 members of POW families in 21 U.S. cities to assure them of the government's interest. He also told them the government would no longer discourage any efforts on their part to secure the release of the men.

WOMEN ON THE MOVE

Although feelings among the families are mixed, and some wives fear retaliation against their husbands if they speak out, many of them organized to put the POW plight in the national and international spotlight.

From California to Colorado to Long Island, they have handed out bumper stickers, written countless letters to Hanoi, pleaded with congressmen, corporation presidents and newspaper editors.

In the last six weeks, several of them visited Paris and won assurances from North Vietnamese delegates that they would soon be informed of their husbands' status.

In a third prong of the world opinion against Hanoi attack, delegates at the International Red Cross conference in Istanbul last month approved, without dissent, a resolution calling on all parties to the 1949 Geneva POW Convention to abide by its tenets.

The resolution, which did not specifically mention North Vietnam, was approved by attending representatives of the Soviet Un-

ion and Yugoslavia among other Communist powers. Neither North Vietnam nor its Red Cross society attended.

In addition, American Red Cross officials say they are "greatly pleased" by 11 positive responses to their separate plea to Red Cross societies in 30 countries—including Russia, Yugoslavia, and many neutrals—asking them to appeal to Hanoi in behalf of the Americans.

As for Hanoi's reported new promise last weekend to release all POW names to anti-war militants here, the State Department says it welcomes information "through whatever channel."

But privately, government sources dared not regard the new hope as a sure thing.

"I'M HOPING"

Neither does Candy Parish of Alexandria, who was told by North Vietnamese in Paris 3½ weeks ago that she would soon be told the status of her missing pilot husband, Navy Lt. Charles C. Parish. As of yesterday, she hadn't.

"I'm hoping that something will come of it," she said, referring to the reported new Hanoi move. "It may be that this is the form the answer (promised her) will take."

Remarked one official source close to the POW dilemma: "It's possible that the weight of world opinion played some role in bringing this about. . . ."

"But I'm afraid Hanoi is going to stretch it out for every dime's worth of propaganda they can get."

ARE NUCLEAR SHIPS THE ANSWER?

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished board chairman of American Export Isbrandtsen Lines, Inc., Adm. John M. Will, USN, retired, has written a very challenging article entitled, "Are Nuclear Ships the Answer?" The article appears in the July/August 1969 edition of *Oceanology International*.

In the article Admiral Will points out that only courageous and bold action to modernize our merchant marine will prevent the surrender of our maritime heritage and our position in world trade. Admiral Will believes the time is at hand to build a second generation of nuclear powered merchant ships with very high cruising speeds—perhaps around 30 knots. This proposed generation of ships would probably be competitive with conventionally powered ships or very nearly so. More importantly, the experience of their design, construction and operation would lead to a third generation which would almost certainly far outstrip conventional ships from the economic aspect. It is only through such a farsighted program as Admiral Will proposes that the United States can avoid a fifth-rate maritime stance.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Admiral Will's article in the RECORD at this point:

ARE NUCLEAR SHIPS THE ANSWER?

(By Adm. John M. Will, USN, retired)

Within the American merchant marine today there is a suitable feeling of quiet despair. For years, this "fourth arm of defense"

has been relegated to the position of fifth wheel. A basically hard-working industry has been fending off the odious sobriquet of feeder at the public trough.

It is true that the American merchant marine finds itself at the nadir of its effectiveness, but it is less sinner than sinned against. Since World War 2, the merchant fleet has wallowed in the backwaters of neglect and endured the barnacles of demands for exceeding productivity.

The debilitated state of the merchant marine is a compound of government overregulation and undersupport, labor's increasing insistence upon more pay for less work, and, finally, the so-what attitude of all too many ship owners and ship operators.

Numerous as they are, the problems of the merchant marine are not the main thrust of this article. I am more concerned that at least one means is ready at hand now to overcome many of these problems, and, conceivably, to reverse the steady decline of what was once the greatest merchant fleet in maritime history.

We already have in the inventory—not on the drawing boards, but already with us—a method of changing the United States from a sixth-rate to a first-rate maritime power, a position we have not enjoyed for more than a decade. This startling panacea is the nuclear-powered merchant ship.

I do not hold that nuclear power is the only cure for our maritime ills. But it is here, it is available, and it can go a long way toward reversing our present downhill course.

The atom as a source of power dates back to Stagg Field in Chicago and to Alamogordo, N.M. It has the violent connotations of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. But it also has the benign aspects of Shippingport and dozens of land-based electric power stations located throughout the United States.

During President Eisenhower's administration, it was proposed that the United States demonstrate its great interest in the peaceful uses of the atom. From this premise, the nuclear ship *Savannah* was born.

Frankly experimental, and never intended to pay her own way, the *Savannah* was launched in July 1959, and her 80-megawatt pressurized water nuclear reactor first went critical in December 1961. She was then, and still is, perhaps the most beautiful ship afloat.

Like the horse designed by a committee that turned out to be a camel, the *Savannah* is not the most efficient commercial cargo vessel under the American flag. Nor can she be considered particularly utilitarian for the future in these days when the intermodal use of standardized containers is effecting revolutionary changes in the patterns of world trade.

The *Savannah's* great contribution to our maritime development can be appreciated only if she is considered as a program rather than an individual ship. She is the prototype of a fleet of ships to come. She has blazed that trail.

The basic design of the ship does not lend itself to efficient cargo stowage, the cargo handling gear is of limited capacity, and much potential cargo space is taken up by passenger rooms and accommodations.

Despite these manifest drawbacks, American Export Isbrandtsen Lines and the Maritime Administration decided in August 1965 to relieve the *Savannah* of her "showboat" role and cast her as a workaday commercial freighter.

Relatively little conversion was required to prepare her for her new duties. About 1,800 tons of solid ballast were removed from her tween decks and holds, and electrical circuits were installed to service refrigerated containers. Luxurious appointments for her 60 passengers were removed and the passenger spaces were sealed off. Enclosed promenade decks were given over to the stowage of au-

tomobiles in transit. A crew member remarked sadly that it was like making a sow's ear out of a silk purse.

A responsible steamship line and a competent agency of the U.S. government would not have undertaken this enterprise merely to perpetuate the life of a single vessel. Both American Export Isbrandtsen Lines and the Maritime Administration were acutely aware that the *Savannah*, as a program, had an overwhelming potential for the future of the American merchant marine.

In nearly 6 years of operation she had proved to be both safe and reliable. She has visited many foreign countries and indoctrinated overseas officials to accept nuclear-powered ships in their harbors. She has trained a large group of merchant marine officers in the complexities of nuclear science and in the operation of a nuclear reactor plant. She has proved that the hypersensitive safety regulations imposed by the Atomic Energy Commission during her earliest days were not required.

As an example, the annual inspection required by the Coast Guard of all American flag ships initially was thought to require that the *Savannah* be placed out of service at the nuclear ship facility in Galveston, Tex., for two full months. The experience derived from year-to-year operation of the ship proved this totally unnecessary. In 1968, the annual inspection was performed in the Port of New York in 12 days.

The *Savannah* has been retained in service, and rightly so, to hold together the skilled cadre of men and related operating systems until the United States is prepared to construct a second generation of nuclear ships specifically intended to be competitive in world trade.

OTHER NATIONS THREATEN LEADERSHIP ROLE

Since 1961, the U.S. has been in the forefront, and indeed alone, in the field of nuclear merchant ships. This unique advantage came to an end last December when West Germany's *Otto Hahn* completed her full-speed sea trials. The Germans built the *Otto Hahn* to be a relatively small, low-powered, low-speed combination ore carrier and training ship. They built her in the full awareness that, like the *Savannah*, she would never be economically competitive with a similar ship propelled by fossil fuel. Now it appears that they soon will build a 23-knot nuclear-powered tanker with the expectation that in its intended service, it will be economically superior to a fossil-fuel ship.

The Japanese laid the keel for their first nuclear ship in November 1968 and intend that the vessel will be operational in the early 1970s. They have said that the ship is being built for "training purposes." By this, they obviously mean the training not only of a ship operator and reactor operators, but also of a nuclear shipbuilder and nuclear ship maintenance personnel. This will clear the way for Japanese shipyards, the world's busiest, to construct nuclear ships in quantity later in the next decade.

The Soviet Union has not been idle in the nuclear race. The icebreaker *Lenin* became operational in the early 1960s, and the Russians recently have announced plans to build one or more additional icebreakers with nuclear plants. These plants, they say, will be the same as those they plan to put in the nuclear merchant ships they also intend to build.

With no firm plans for further nuclear ships, the American merchant marine is losing ground on a day-to-day basis to foreign competitors.

The attractiveness of nuclear power as a source of propulsion for merchant vessels lies not in its novelty but in the way it so aptly complements recent trends in U.S. flag shipping.

During the 1930s, a speed of 8 to 10 knots was conventional for American merchant ships. Merchant ships built during World War 2 generally were rated at 12 to 16 knots and these vessels still comprise more than three-quarters of our present-day fleet. Postwar ships were built to steam at about 18 knots; those becoming operational today average 20 to 24 knots.

Although overlong in coming, this gradual increase in speed has been directly responsive to the needs of shippers who seek to minimize the length of time their goods must be in transit in order to expedite payments from their customers. Consequently, even faster ships are being considered by ship operators. Vessels with a cruising speed in excess of 30 knots most assuredly will take business away from even the express ships of today.

A FISTFUL OF FUEL

A major problem with a high-speed ship is its consumption of fuel. Fuel requirements increase, as a rule of thumb, as the cube of the speed. These greater amounts of fuel must be carried aboard ship at the expense of available cargo space.

With nuclear fuel this problem ceases to exist. Although the ratio of fuel consumption to speed remains constant, a nuclear vessel cares very little if she steams at 10 or 23 knots, even in excess of 30. To all intents and purposes, the fuel weight and volume remain the same.

The amount of fuel that the *Savannah* uses to cross the Atlantic Ocean is equal in volume to the size of a clenched fist. By contrast, a conventionally powered ship of similar size would require almost 430 tons of fuel oil for the same voyage. The *Savannah* steamed more than 330,000 nautical miles in 6½ years before her first refueling last fall, yet she consumed only 119 lb of U-235 enriched uranium oxide fuel.

The case for high-speed, high-performance vessels must loom large in our maritime planning. The best way to achieve high speed without excessive intrusion upon carrying capacity is through nuclear power.

If this is the case, why, then, have we not proceeded full tilt on a nuclear ship construction program? Why are we still circling the problem at arm's length? The answer is economics. Why do thousands of Americans who would love to drive Cadillacs still drive Volkswagens?

A nuclear ship is more expensive than a conventional ship by a significant amount. No one will argue this fact. Yet, two 30-knot ships can replace three 20-knot ships on the same service so that a higher initial unit cost does not necessarily mean a higher overall construction cost.

Many studies have been made comparing the economics of a nuclear cargo ship with a comparable fossil-fuel ship. Generally speaking, it appears that second-generation nuclear ships would be borderline competitively. If you consider the figure optimistically, they will have a slight economic edge. If you are less optimistic, they will fall slightly short of being economic. There is no doubt, however, that given the experience in design, fabrication, and construction of the second generation, the third generation of nuclear vessels definitely will be competitive.

To achieve this advantage, we must build not just one nuclear ship, but three or more specifically designed for service on a given trade. For example, if three ships are required to provide service at a stated frequency, there is no advantage if one of these ships is capable of 30 knots but the other two are capable of only 20 knots.

The most recent study of this cost problem was completed in 1968 by General Dynamics

Corp. for the Maritime Administration. It was based upon a buy of three 30-knot container-ships designed to operate between the East Coast of the United States through the Panama Canal to the Far East along Trade Route 12.

The study concluded that the total capital cost to the shipowner without government assistance would be \$61.9-million, as compared to \$43-million for three comparable conventionally powered ships. If the government provided maximum support for the construction of the ships, the owner's cost would be \$25.2-million for the nuclear and \$25.4-million for the conventional ships.

Operating costs were estimated at \$14.3-million annually for the three nuclear ships and \$13-million for the conventional without subsidy, and \$11.2-million and \$11.5-million, respectively, with maximum subsidy.

Another study recently completed by NUS Corp. for the Maritime Administration predicts fuel costs of 2.2 mills per shaft horsepower hour for the first nuclear core. In the course of a 7-year period, these costs will drop to 1.7 mills/SHPH, a figure less than half the mills/SHPH of a fossil fuel ship. It is basically because of these fuel savings and the expected reduced costs for a third-generation nuclear ship system that the high-speed nuclear ship will be superior economically to its conventionally powered counterpart.

We have the atom of a chance to revitalize the American merchant marine. What we need is courage in high places—in government, industry, and organized labor—to seize this chance and to move forward now with an intensified construction program. Even if we were to start today, our vessels could not be operational before 1975.

To procrastinate further is to surrender our maritime heritage and our position in world trade to the *Ottos*, the *Marus*, and the *Ivans*.

BPW: BOOSTERS OF AMERICA

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc. of the U.S.A. observed National Business Women's Week October 19 through 25, and I would like to join in paying tribute to this outstanding organization.

We have a number of BPW clubs in my home State of Minnesota. I have found that the members in them are always among the most able, skilled, knowledgeable, and effective individuals in their entire community. The BPW's know how to get things done, and their sense of civic responsibility and service has led to community improvements in many hundreds of instances.

I understand that the BPW now has 180,000 members in more than 3,800 clubs throughout the United States and in the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. It is a tribute to the growing importance of skilled womanpower in virtually every field of American endeavor. It is also a tribute to the BPW organization itself, which has exerted fine leadership in boosting American ideals and objectives. I am pleased to congratulate the BPW membership on this occasion.

FORGOTTEN AMERICANS HAVE NOT FORGOTTEN AMERICA

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there has been much said and written about the average American. Sometimes he has been referred to as the forgotten American.

I have just received a copy of a speech given by a man who I think expresses the views of the average American. He is a man from a small town, a man with his own business and a man with an interest in his community.

In talking to his club, he set out what he thought was Americanism. This was carried in the *Stuart News*. I have read it and am moved by it.

I can only say that Kenneth S. Stimmell, a forgotten American, has not forgotten his country.

At this time, I would like to insert this talk into the *RECORD* for the interest and information of my colleagues and I hope that all will take the time to read it. In these times, it says much for mainstream America.

The item follows:

WHAT IS AMERICANISM?

(By Kenneth S. Stimmell)

Americanism is the Revolutionary War . . . The Boston Tea Party . . . John Paul Jones . . . Valley Forge . . . Mount Vernon . . . Bull Run . . . Gettysburg . . . Lookout Mountain . . . The Statue of Liberty . . . Bunker Hill . . . Independence Hall . . . The Washington Monument . . . The Lincoln Memorial . . . Thomas A. Edison . . . The United States Capitol and a host of other national shrines in this great country.

As American citizens and members of this great order we must at all times live Americanism. We must be proud to be Americans. We must value our citizenship because it was bought and paid for with the lifeblood, the toll, and sacrifice and courage of men and women who believed in freedom, in the dignity of man, in his inherent instinct to recognize Almighty God as the giver of every blessing, and in their ability to claim His promises by their honesty, their integrity, and their recognition of spiritual values.

We must look upon the flag of our country with deep respect because it symbolizes everything for which we must strive, for which people strive, for which people yearn and do not always acquire and we must always hold that banner in reverence second only to God.

We must cherish for this country those things which set her apart as a goal towards which other nations may aspire in good conscience. Her principles, her ethics, her morality and her national policies are important in this objective, and we must recognize the fact that these characteristics of the individual are to be molded into a nation dedicated to the virtues which gave it birth.

We must respect the rights of our fellow citizens to enjoy the fruits of the American way of life, but in return we must believe that every American should have a proper respect for the patriots who made possible our way of life. We must believe that one who calls himself an American should live according to the standards of honesty, dig-

nity and culture which has been our inheritance from the earliest days of our nation.

We must refuse to give aid and comfort to the enemies of our way of life by engaging in or encouraging the atheistic concepts of communism. We must never believe it is possible for an American to disseminate unwholesome propaganda, or indulge in smear campaigns or to employ any inimical dogma towards his fellow citizens and feel conscience free. We must not believe it is possible for an American to live under the iron heel and hand of a dictatorship or to adhere to the regimentation of a welfare state. We must believe that individual initiative is superior to state control of thought, action and franchise.

We must look upon the free enterprise system of business as the ultimate in opportunity for every citizen. We must never believe that either management or labor is perfect in their relationship each to the other. We must never believe in a double standard whereby one will destroy the other. We must believe that man has the right to choose his field of endeavor and to enjoy the privilege of exercising his talents to the full capacity without restraint, thereby making his contributions to society to the best of his ability.

We must believe that every child is entitled to an education to the limits of his mental process of assimilation and that this education should be provided in the manner practiced through the years by our democratic system for maintaining our educational institutions. Being Americans, we must not believe in thought control as practiced by communism nor in government control of schools and curriculum.

We must believe that every man has the right to exercise the religious faith of his choice, but we must believe and covet the Christian religion which is the basis of our faith from the beginning of our society as a free nation.

We must believe in freedom of assembly to which we have been accustomed but must believe that organizations dedicated to the destruction of our way of life should not enjoy a privilege within our borders comparable with those who are observed by dedicated patriotic Americans. We cannot reconcile ourselves to the philosophy that enemies in our country should have the protection of the laws which they defy and propose to destroy.

We must always believe in and defend the Constitution of the United States and that the interpretation of its provisions shall never be tarnished by the ideological thinking of individuals whose motives are politically activated, and whose reasoning is based upon socialistic dogmas espoused by foreign radicals. We must always challenge any efforts to alter its meaning and purpose.

We must believe in the concepts of the Declaration of Independence, applicable today as they were the day it was founded.

We must believe in material, moral and spiritual strength; these three are inseparable. We must look upon the unfortunate and the underprivileged of our nation with compassion and understanding and to the best of our means to help to alleviate their condition. We must not belittle any man whose achievements and capabilities do not compare with our own or a certain standard. We must extend a helping hand that he may improve his lot.

We must always realize that our own motives, our ambitions and our own ethics must be above reproach. Otherwise we defeat the purpose for which we were born to be a part of this great nation. We must therefore abhor those things which are detrimental to a clean, wholesome and moral society and refuse to condone crime and corruption wherever it may be found in this nation.

Because we are Americans, we must look out upon the vast and beautiful resources which God has given us with a deep sense of appreciation for our heritage. We know we have enemies who would deprive us of these treasures and spread ruin upon our cities, towns and villages. We know these enemies would destroy our churches and our institutions of culture which have helped us through the years to build character and spiritual fortitude. We know they could lay waste to the verdant lands, and make a shambles of our achievements and in so doing would destroy our American way of life. Our lives must be dedicated to the perpetuation of all the fine ideals and high purposes for which thousands of our citizens gave their lives, and all of us Americans are called upon here and now to make a similar dedication, lest through carelessness, apathy and indifference, we lose it all.

As Americans, we must give thanks to Almighty God for the blessings of the past and pray earnestly that we may be worthy to seek a continuation of His bounties for the future.

Americanism is freedom: Freedom to desire . . . Freedom to produce . . . Freedom to exchange . . . Freedom to enjoy. As Americans and as Elks, we must believe in our country, its people, and its government.

TV BARGAINS FOR CANDIDATES

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been public discussion about the advisability of forcing the television industry to substantially reduce its advertising rates for candidates seeking Federal office. While I am fully aware of the exorbitant cost of political campaigning, it is my opinion that singling out one media and asking it to subsidize part of the cost of political campaigns would be discriminatory. I was struck by a recent editorial on this subject in the Washington Post and commend it to your attention:

TV BARGAINS FOR CANDIDATES

With the costs of political campaigns soaring, the idea of bargain rates for television and radio time used by candidates has a strong appeal. Men and women who run for public office have come to regard television in particular as indispensable. Yet many feel that they cannot pay at regular rates for all the time they need; so there is increasing pressure on broadcasters to provide special rates for all legally qualified candidates. A Senate subcommittee is conducting hearings on a bill that would require substantially reduced rates for candidates running for Congress.

It is rather strange, however, to be talking about compelling broadcasters to reduce their rates on a service which many of them are willing to give without charge. For many years the broadcasters have sought repeal of Section 315 of the Federal Communications Act which forbids them to make time available to the regular candidates of the major parties without also giving time to fringe candidates who have no chance of being elected. Without this impediment in the law, an enormous amount of free time would be given to presidential and congressional candidates because of the wide-spread public interest in contests of this kind.

The television networks have offered, as an alternative to the bill, to give varying

reduction in rates to political candidates. But of course they would be somewhat inhibited in carrying out such policies, if the rates were cut to very low figures by the necessity of accommodating an unforeseen number of fringe candidates as well as the regular party nominees. It is difficult to see, moreover how political debates would be arranged under a system of reduced rates, whether voluntary or compulsory.

The best approach might well be repeal of Section 315 and reliance upon the Federal Communications Commission's fairness doctrine for the allocation of a reasonable amount of time on the air for fringe candidates. If serious abuses should develop, Congress could deal with those specific problems. We think the risks involved would be minor compared to the great disadvantage of the present severe restriction on the use of television in political campaigns.

COMMENTS ON THE YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS AND H.R. 14260

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity the select subcommittee has given me to file views on the proposed Youth Conservation Corps. I believe the proposed corps fills a much neglected vacuum and I am pleased to see the subcommittee give this legislation the expeditious treatment it deserves.

As many of the Members already know, I have also introduced legislation which seeks to accomplish many of the same goals outlined in the bills considered during your recent hearings. However, my measure, H.R. 14260, has some differences which I believe substantially strengthens the proposed corps when compared to the version favorably reported by the Senate Interior Committee.

Two major objections were raised to the Senate bill during the hearings on S. 1076. The first objection was the length of service by the proposed corpsmen. The administration experts unanimously objected to limiting the corpsmen's experience to just the space of a summer.

The second objection, although related to the first, concerned the costs versus the benefits. S. 1076 authorizes \$3.5 million annually to implement a "summer corps." Administration officials voiced their opposition advancing the argument that the cost exceeded the return, and in fact could prove more costly when supervisory time not considered was included in the total.

I had one additional objection of my own. One of the most extensive local youth conservation efforts currently being conducted happens to be under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor. The Neighborhood Youth Corps involves thousands of young people in young people in numerous conservation projects. Yet, nowhere in S. 1076 is any provision made to incorporate Labor Department activities into the corps, nor is there any requirement for the Labor Department to participate in either the planning or implementation of the YCC.

I believe this oversight to be a serious mistake.

The legislation I introduced on October 8, answers each of these three questions. At a later point in this statement I will review the approaches I have taken in regard to these questions. First I would like to set forth my arguments for a Youth Conservation Corps constructed in the manner outlined in H.R. 14260.

There are essentially three arguments that persuaded me to introduce my YCC bill. This is not to say that I am not in firm agreement with the representatives of the major conservation organizations. I do agree with their views. However, the thrust of most of the favorable testimony suggested that the most important reason for initiating YCC was the impact it would make on the young people who participate. No doubt this is important. There are three other compelling arguments for YCC and it is these arguments I wish to stress.

Until it was brought to the attention of the Senate Interior Committee, no provision had been made for disadvantaged youngsters. Although the Senate committee did finally include a new provision in their reported bill which recognized the need to give the disadvantaged a special opportunity to participate, little emphasis was placed on this aspect of the YCC.

This is most unfortunate. Anyone following the current labor picture realizes we are soon going to be waist deep in a serious social problem. With unemployment increasing, and expected to increase for a number of months to come, we must ask ourselves what will be done with the literally thousands of unemployed youngsters the accelerated jobless rate will produce.

During the last week I placed a set of statistics in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which dramatically demonstrated the effects rising unemployment have on the young. For every point of increase in the general rate there is apparently a 10-percent increase in the youth jobless rate. Compounding this problem the largest segment among the young unemployed are nonwhite, unskilled minority males. It can be seen from these very brief statistics that the group the increasing unemployment rate affects most is the group least able to afford such adverse circumstances. It is also the same group upon which the YCC should have its most profound impact.

I believe that the most socially useful, and efficiently productive direction the proposed YCC can take is to absorb a great number of these young people who are becoming the increasing victims of Government policy. Everything said about the wholesome, meaningful, and constructive contact a young person can have while working on a conservation project must be doubled and doubled again for thousands who will find themselves, because of Government policies, on the street—with no money—and little hope.

I cannot plead too strongly for a YCC that is first and most importantly an agency that gives hope to those without it. I can think of no more disastrous

course for this agency than to make it subject to the accusation that it is being used as nothing more than an opportunity for "middle American" children to have an entertaining summer vacation.

The second argument that compelled me to introduce the legislation is my belief that our national forests are over administered and undermanaged. A vast bureaucracy has come into existence each with its own special jurisdiction and interest.

Let me cite a few interesting facts which will serve to highlight this point. Three departments—Labor, Agriculture, and Interior—now are involved in conservation projects. The Department of Commerce is involved as well, but it is difficult to ascertain how many of its people are directly concerned with forest management.

The Agriculture Department of course administers the national forests which occupy some 187 million acres. The Bureau of Land Management is responsible for more than 450 million acres. Now, of course, these are not the only agencies involved in forest management. We have bureaucrats from Commerce, Treasury, and an assortment of lesser agencies not worth listing. Everyone seems to be involved in administering our forest resources.

And that is exactly my point—everyone seems to be administering while there seems to be a surfeit of people out in the field. For example, Agriculture's Forest Service bulletin reports an employment force of some 20,000 of which "About 7,000 are professional foresters." The rest of the force is in "administrative—and other professions." When the various agencies begin overlapping administrative personnel the organizational charts become mind boggling and one must ask whether the proportion of desk administrators to field managers might show a disproportionate ratio.

Of course the YCC will not solve this organizational problem, but my proposal will do at least two things not presently evident. First, it will get the three principal agencies together to discuss at least putting young people into the field. Second, the YCC should substantially increase the number of bodies actually doing on the spot resource management. For if the present organizational nightmare of the forest management bureaucracy suggests a lesson it is we are not taking full advantage of this natural resource.

This leads me to the third argument. In order to take full advantage of this precious resource we must have the manpower available to do the job. The manpower is not currently available. The proposed YCC should go a long way toward filling the gap.

With the demand for housing increasing, foreign competition at the door, and timber prices spiraling putting needed housing out of the range of lower income families it is imperative that forest management be upgraded and made a more important component of our domestic policy.

As I suggested earlier, the measure I introduced on October 8, H.R. 14260, an-

swers many of the questions raised by the above arguments.

First, my bill incorporates the Labor Department into the program. The legislation establishes an interagency—Labor, Interior, Agriculture—groups familiar with their respective youth employment projects. This group has the responsibility of recommending the details on implementing the YCC. I did this because I felt the corps required the close cooperation and coordination of all three agencies if it was to start upon a firm foundation.

The second major feature of the bill leaves the length of YCC service open. Rather than confining it to any specific period I felt the length of service should be flexible in order to take into consideration such factors as the need for additional manpower for specific short or long range forest management projects, and, second, the rate of youth unemployment. To confine by statute YCC service to a specific length is a mistake. The program must have a high degree of flexibility in this area.

The third feature of my bill concerns the formula for funding. Rather than authorizing new funds, H.R. 14260 directs the interagency group to examine current youth employment programs within the component agencies and report how funds already allocated for lesser priority programs be redirected to YCC. I am convinced that there is a substantial amount of money now being spent on similar efforts which lack central direction and purpose—therefore substantially blunting the impact these funds were designed to produce.

H.R. 14260 while preserving the concept of the YCC, is substantially different in detail than the other bills being considered. I do believe, however, that my bill answers the objections raised against the other bills, while at the same time strengthening the overall program.

GOVERNORS SHOULD NOT BE GIVEN VETO POWERS OVER LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAMS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the OEO legal services program ranks as outstanding among efforts developed over the past few years to aid poorer citizens. Thousands of Americans now utilize vital legal aid they previously were unaware of or were unable to afford.

Unfortunately, following Senate adoption of the Murphy amendment to the OEO authorization bill, future effectiveness of the legal services program appears uncertain, and if the House fails to reject this amendment, not only is the prospect quite dim for this admirable program, but an important—and dangerous—precedent may be set which can seriously weaken the entire range of antipoverty projects.

As I interpret the amendment's objective, Congress can—and should—offer

assistance to poor people when they cannot afford a lawyer in some specific matter, but Congress does not mean that poor citizens should have similar help in determining—and possibly redefining—their broad legal and civil rights.

Such an attitude is both demeaning and patronizing. In effect, it says "we can aid you because you are poor, but we are not interested in changing institutions that keep you poor."

On the surface, the popular theory supporting this amendment holds that State and local officials should have greater determination over program direction, that these administrators will be more responsive to the needs of their own areas. Yet, given the blighted history and meager accomplishments of antipoverty efforts in many States in which there are now strong legal services programs, these views are extremely shortsighted. Control by the Governors means the end of many legal aid programs.

Under the amendment, the role of individual lawyers will become untenable. Even though the lawyer is an officer of the court, his first and foremost advocacy represents clients' rights and needs. By making the lawyer answer to the system—by putting his actions at the mercy of a potential veto at any time by the political establishment—the client will necessarily suffer, and so, eventually, will the system, itself.

Of course, the real reason behind this amendment results from many controversial—and, therefore, most of the time, positive—things done under the auspices of legal services programs. And any attempt to cut into existing power relationships, to create expanded political strength for previously disenfranchised persons naturally runs quickly into major obstacles from current powerholders. It is as simple as that.

If we allow a line-item veto power for the legal services program, who can say what will be next. I do not claim to be a seer, but I predict that this type maneuver may be tacked on many other controversial programs—perhaps not this year, but quite soon nevertheless—if this dangerous precedent is approved.

Already, it is evident that there is little support for the Murphy amendment within the administration. OEO Director Rumsfeld strongly opposes it; I also hear that Attorney General Mitchell may not favor the amendment. Criticism from members of the legal profession and by the press also has been mounting.

I am convinced that the Murphy amendment represents a significant backward step for the Congress, and I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment.

I have received a number of relevant letters, statements, and editorials pertaining to the Murphy amendment, and I now place them in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT BY DONALD RUMSFELD ON OEO LEGISLATION PASSED BY THE SENATE

I was generally pleased by the action taken by the Senate on Tuesday. The final vote of 72 for and only 3 against a two-year extension of the Office of Economic Opportunity was, by far, the largest margin ever received for the program in the Senate of the United States since the program began in

1964. The debate and the final vote indicates broad support in the Senate for the OEO and its mission, as well as the concern of the members of the Senate for effectively dealing with the problems of the poor.

However, the adoption of the amendment on Legal Services offered by Senator Murphy is most unfortunate and will seriously damage the Legal Services program. The Congress properly saw, when establishing the Legal Services Program, that to be successful local communities should have an opportunity to develop Legal Services programs to meet their local needs. A balance was carefully devised by the Congress and it has worked well. It should not be changed lightly. I will strongly oppose this amendment in the House. It is my hope that the House of Representatives will see the wisdom of maintaining the Legal Services Program and will not risk denying the benefits of Legal Services programs to the poor in major sections of the nation.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Oct. 19, 1969]

CURB ON LEGAL SERVICES IN OEO A BLOW TO NEEDY

(By James C. Millstone)

WASHINGTON, October 18.—The United States Senate applied a mighty shove this week to accelerate the downward slide of the war on poverty, antipoverty warriors asserted. Discovering an antipoverty program that worked, the Senate—with minimum debate and little apparent interest—quickly voted to curb its effectiveness.

The target was the Legal Services Program of the Office of Economic Opportunity. The Senate voted to set Legal Services apart from all other antipoverty programs by making its work subject to the veto of any state governor, denying the OEO director the authority to override such a veto.

Stunned OEO officials were dizzy with shock and surprise.

"We had no inkling," said Terry Lenzner, 29 years old, a former Harvard football captain who now directs the program. "In fact, I was told it couldn't happen."

OEO's new director, former Representative Donald Rumsfeld (Rep.), Illinois, who is trying to soften the agency's image as a center of controversy, called his first press conference since assuming the generalship of the war on poverty to denounce the Senate action and promise a fight to reverse it in the House.

Lobbyists for the American Bar Association, whose support of a strong legal services program is unwavering, were still trying to figure out what had gone wrong. The anti-Legal Services move just didn't figure.

To practitioners of the law who have grieved at the inability of the American system to assure the poor man equal justice with the rich, Legal Services was a godsend, the jewel in the OEO crown.

Through Legal Services, the Federal Government pays 1600 lawyers to represent poor people in 270 communities across the land, spending \$50,000,000 a year. In a society that has constantly urged the poor to abide by the law of the land rather than the law of the jungle, Legal Services offered the means to the desired end of working within the system.

Not only did the organized bar stand four-square behind Legal Services, young law school graduates satisfied their yearning for an alternative to Wall Street corporate boredom by flocking to the neighborhood law offices operating with OEO money.

Even President Richard M. Nixon, no cheerleader for the war on poverty, put the Legal Services Program in a special niche. He approved a budget increase over the funds sought for Legal Services by the previous Administration.

And Rumsfeld gave an unusual endorsement to Legal Services by elevating it from a part of the all-embracing community ac-

tion operation to the status of a separate division.

"The Legal Services Program," he said, "has come to symbolize much of the mission of this agency (OEO): justice for the poor, and orderly institutional change within the framework of the legal system."

Rumsfeld, Lenzner, ABA officials and congressional supporters were unanimous in the opinion that the Senate change, if approved in the House and enacted into law, would ruin the program.

"In effect," said John P. Tracey, assistant director of the bar association's Washington bureau, "this will end OEO's Legal Services Program. Attorneys in the field will suffer a crisis of confidence. I would not be surprised, should this change pass the House, to see it followed by mass resignations."

Lenzner could not have agreed more. The change, he said, is "a threat to the whole program." Its immediate impact, Lenzner said, would be on local attorneys who would have to decide "whether they can stay in a program where they must chance retaliation" of losing the funds that pay their salaries for representation of poor clients in suits that state governors may not like.

One of the great strengths of the Legal Services Program has been its development as both a means of sweeping law reform and as an advocate for the poor against unreasonable and unfair government actions.

The nation's brightest young law graduates have been attracted to the program because of its success in challenging the way state and federal agencies who deal daily with the poor have treated their clients.

Last year antipoverty lawyers won their first case in the Supreme Court on behalf of a young mother of five who was denied welfare benefits in California on a questionable technicality. A few months later, they earned a far-reaching victory when the nation's highest court held unconstitutional state regulations requiring welfare applicants to establish their right to benefits through a period of residency.

Other efforts by state officials to hold down welfare costs have been attacked by Legal Services. The Supreme Court already has knocked out "man-in-the-house" rules used to deny benefits to mothers of dependent children.

In the new term of court, the justices have agreed to rule on several issues brought by antipoverty lawyers, including whether states may legally reduce the level of benefits to individuals, and whether a state may set an absolute maximum limit on the amount of welfare a family may receive.

Legal Services lawyers have won rights for public housing tenants against evictions without notice, for wage-earners against garnishment actions taken without a hearing, for students against punishment by school officials without recourse to appeal.

Thanks to actions by antipoverty lawyers, poor people have won the right to be represented in mass transit rate-making in Baltimore, a new state law in Massachusetts spelling out tenant rights, the right to counsel in municipal courts in Oregon and Florida, a right to prevent California Gov. Ronald Reagan from reducing state health care benefits.

The result of all these successful actions against state officials has been two-fold: first, it has cost the states a lot of money, chiefly by thwarting efforts to reduce various services to the poor. Second, it has enraged some of the state officials, notably Reagan.

Two years ago, after suffering a series of court defeats at the hands of Legal Services lawyers, Reagan persuaded Senator George Murphy (Rep.), California, to try to push through Congress a proposal to prohibit antipoverty lawyers from filing lawsuits against Government agencies. The Senate rejected the move.

No more was heard on the subject until Murphy sprang his surprise amendment this

week. The occasion was the arrival on the Senate floor of a bill to extend the life of OEO for two years, along with funding authority for that period.

The day before the bill reached the floor, Murphy included in a committee report on the proposal a personal note that he was "considering introducing an amendment to the bill that directs the program toward legal assistance and away from law reform."

ABA lobbyists quickly moved to counter any such move by circulating a letter from the organization's president, Bernard G. Segal of Philadelphia.

The Murphy move was not viewed as a matter of much concern by OEO lobbyists. They recalled his defeat in 1967, knew that Legal Services was widely regarded as among the most effective OEO programs, were aware that Mr. Nixon and Rumsfeld wanted to approve the OEO bill without amendment.

The few moments of debate on the amendment were not very enlightening. At one point, questioned about the meaning of his proposal by Senator Gaylord Nelson (Dem.), Wisconsin, Murphy said:

"I am unclear on that . . . in the speed of writing the amendment I have not had a chance to even read the language which the staff has included."

The only protest came from Senator Walter F. Mondale (Dem.), Minnesota, who had to come rushing to the floor when the amendment was brought up earlier than had been anticipated. With Senators displaying more interest in the World Series game then on television in the cloakroom, they quickly disposed of the amendment by approving it, 45-40. Twenty-nine Republicans joined 16 Southern Democrats to provide the winning margin. Five Republicans and 35 Democrats voted against the amendment.

"We weren't prepared for the number of Republicans who voted against the Administration," one lobbyist said. "There was a lot of confusion on this. The amendment came up sooner than expected. Absences hurt us. And some Senators, I'm sure, didn't know what they were voting on."

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Oct. 21, 1969]
A MOVE TO VETO JUSTICE

Sen. George Murphy (R-Calif.) has pushed through the Senate an amendment that would give governors the right to veto any legal service activity offered within their states by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The amendment is attached to a money authorization bill that must go to the House, and, legislatively, there will be a chance to erase the folly.

Nonetheless, the move definitely endangers the legal services program, which has become one of OEO's true successes. OEO Director Donald Rumsfeld will need all the allies he can muster.

The legal services program has brought to the poor and harassed something they have not historically experienced: expert legal representation and protection of the law in both minor and major matters. Naturally, the program—staffed by 1,800 eager and persistent attorneys—has made enemies. It has done so because the lawyers often step on establishment toes.

One of the luminaries sent limping on occasion is Murphy's friend and former screen colleague, Gov. Ronald Reagan of California.

Reagan has been sorely troubled by migrant workers demanding reform down on the farm. He has been at least as sorely troubled by the OEO legal assistance given these workers.

For example, as Tom Littlewood of The Sun-Times Washington Bureau pointed out Monday, these attorneys "resisted the importation of Mexican braceros to pick the tomato crop, thwarted Reagan's cutback in medical care for the needy aged and blocked a school district from closing classes so the students could help with the grape harvest."

Reagan, of course, is not the only state official to feel the impact of the OEO efforts, and the lawyers themselves have rubbed a little salt in the sore spots. Rumsfeld appointee Terry F. Lenzner, head of the legal services program, said he plans to broaden the scope of legal assistance activities to community questions such as poor garbage pick-up, bad street lighting or other "misallocation of resources."

And in August a group of poverty lawyers banded together to "oppose and resist political . . . or other interference in the effective representation of our clients who are indigent."

The poor needs this tough-minded help, for justice should not belong only to those who can afford it. Let's hope a few voices are raised to that effect in Congress.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 22, 1969]

LAWYERS FOR THE POOR

An amendment added on the Senate floor to the anti-poverty program authorization bill threatens to kill one of the most creative and socially useful projects financed by the Office of Economic Opportunity. The amendment, introduced by Senator Murphy, would give the governors of the states a veto power over legal services projects. The effect of this would be to allow the governors to block, if they chose, many of the efforts by OEO lawyers to bring about far-reaching legal reforms.

It is quite understandable why some governors and other politicians want this amendment passed. The young lawyers OEO has employed are simply too energetic and progressive for their tastes. These lawyers have not stuck to the idea that the poor are given adequate legal counsel if their simplest problems with the law are handed well. Instead, they have attempted to give the poor the same kind of legal services that the rich can afford. As a result, OEO-financed projects have attacked such things as the attempt by Governor Reagan to cut \$16 million from California's Medicaid program and an attempt by the Department of Labor to import farm workers from Mexico. Senator Murphy was quite candid in saying on the Senate floor that this is the kind of activity from which he thinks OEO lawyers should desist.

Fortunately, the nation's legal community is rallying in defense of the OEO lawyers and in opposition to the Murphy amendment. The board of governors of the American Bar Association has called the amendment an "oppressive interference with the freedom of the lawyer and the citizen." The poverty lawyers, of course, are opposed to the amendment, as is the National Legal Aid and Defender Association whose president said last week, "To give the poor only certain 'desirable' services makes the 'poor fellow' to use Senator Murphy's words, a second-rate citizen in our halls of justice."

A year ago, Senator Murphy attempted to achieve the same end* with a different amendment which was rejected by Congress. We trust that the House of Representatives will not be beguiled into accepting his effort this year it ought to insist that the law governing this aspect of OEO's operations remain as it is—with governors free to veto those projects they dislike but with the Director of OEO free to override the vetoes. A governor should not be given power to veto or to intimidate through a threat of a future veto any project that is designed to bring equal rights to all Americans.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 29, 1969]
LEGAL AID—FOR LAWYERS

One of the most effective programs in the Office of Economic Opportunity is legal services, under which 1,800 attorneys in 800 neighborhood offices in forty-nine states represent impoverished clients. Federal funds administered through the O.E.O. enable hun-

dreds of thousands of indigent persons every year to obtain equal justice under law.

The program will perish in the areas where it is most needed if a proposed Senate amendment to this year's antipoverty bill goes through. By giving Governors veto powers over O.E.O. storefront law projects, it would place effective legal representation at the mercy of state and local political machines. It would, in many cases, prevent the disadvantaged from getting an even break before politically appointed judges. It would discourage some of the most dedicated young lawyers in the country from entering the new field of antipoverty law.

This amendment should be called the Reagan amendment because the California Governor is really the man behind it. The board of governors of the American Bar Association has described the amendment as "oppressive interference with the freedom of the lawyer and the citizen" which would "discourage actions that are politically unpopular." The conference in New York this week of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association clearly shows the deep concern of the bar all over the country for representing clients who cannot afford to pay. Their rights will be seriously infringed if the Reagan amendment is adopted.

NEWS RELEASE OF THE NATIONAL LEGAL AID AND DEFENDER ASSOCIATION, OCTOBER 17, 1969

Maynard J. Toll, president of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association (NLADA), issued the following statement today:

On Oct. 14 the Senate passed an amendment proposed by Senator George Murphy (R-Calif) to the effect that the governor of each state would have an absolute veto over the funding of any Legal Services Program assisted by the Office of Economic Opportunity. Although another amendment has also been passed that would give the President power to override the governor's veto, it is unlikely that this safeguard will remain in any final bill agreed upon by the Senate and the House of Representatives. Through threatened use of this veto, a governor could impose crippling restrictions and curbs upon the activities of legal aid offices assisting the poor of this country.

NLADA has strongly supported, to date, the Legal Services Program of OEO because its administrators have insisted that these programs for the poor provide the fullest range of services. This approach has demonstrated its practical idealism as evidenced by the response of the poverty community to these programs. To tell the poor now that legal services are to be cut back and that their lawyers cannot entertain cases of broad social significance would destroy all the gains already achieved by the program. More, the threat of restrictions would cause the poor to view the program as a paternalistic hand-out meant to deceive but not to help effectively.

Throughout its 59-year history, NLADA has fought steadfastly for the principle that a poor person unable to pay legal fees should receive the same quality of effective legal services as his more affluent brother. To give the poor only certain "needed" or "desirable" services makes the "poor fellow", to use Senator Murphy's words, a second-rate citizen in legal negotiations and our halls of justice. In addition, the morale of the 2,000 new lawyers now working in these programs would suffer tremendously if their independence of action on behalf of the poor were curtailed and restricted. These advocates are now subject only to the ethical standards of the profession. All professional associations—NLADA, The American Bar Association, American Trial Lawyers Association, and the National Bar Association—have supported this program because it has assured this full independence to the lawyer and a total responsiveness to the needs of the poverty community.

Although I can speak only personally, I know that I voice the united feeling of our entire civil membership—500 offices and 2500 individual lawyers for the poor—when I express strong opposition to the action of the Senate on Oct. 14 in approving Senator Murphy's amendment to S. 3016, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1969.

NLADA, with headquarters at the American Bar Center in Chicago, is the national coordinating and standard-setting body of local aid and defender organizations. Last year, these offices provided legal advice and representation for more than 1½ million poor people.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION BOARD OF GOVERNORS, OCTOBER 18, 1969

Whereas, the adoption by the United States Senate of an amendment to S. 3016 seeks to place in the hands of the Governors of the various States a power of veto over the activities of Legal Service Programs funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

And whereas, such power contravenes the American Bar Association's commitment to secure full and effective legal services to the poor by providing every person in our society with access to the independent professional services of a lawyer of integrity and competence;

And whereas, enlarging the scope and effectiveness of the power to veto legal services programs is highly undesirable because experience has shown that the power to veto may be used to circumscribe the freedom of legal service attorneys in representing their clients to address issues of government action or omission affecting the rights of their clients, and to discourage actions which are politically unpopular or adverse to the views of the majority;

And whereas, such limitations impair the ability of legal services programs to respond properly to the needs of the poor and constitute oppressive interference with the freedom of the lawyer and the citizen;

Now, therefore be it resolved, that the American Bar Association reaffirms its position that the Legal Services Program should operate with full assurance of independence of lawyers within the program not only to render services to individual clients but also in cases which might involve action against governmental agencies seeking significant institutional change.

And, further resolved, that representatives of the American Bar Association be authorized to express the concern of the Association as to the effect of the aforesaid amendment.

LEGAL AID FOUNDATION OF LONG BEACH,
October 22, 1969.
Re Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1969.

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: I am deeply concerned over the passage of Senator Murphy's amendments to S. 3016 relative to the veto power of governors over legal services programs. This amendment, if it becomes law, particularly without the safeguard of an override, will seriously affect the independence, effectiveness, and even the existence of many important legal aid and legal services programs.

Enclosed is a copy of a press release from Maynard Toll, President of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association, which contains the concerns and position of the legal aid movement and the organized bar.

I strongly urge your opposition to the Senate's action in approving Senator Murphy's amendment.

Very truly yours,

HOWARD M. VAN ELGORT,
Executive Director.

JUDGE OF MUNICIPAL COURT, LOS ANGELES JUDICIAL DISTRICT,
Los Angeles, Calif., October 21, 1969.
HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.,
House of Representatives, Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GEORGE: As a member of the National Advisory Committee of the Legal Services Program I wish to call your attention to an amendment passed by the Senate in conjunction with the extension of the Office of Economic Opportunity Act which could result in defeating the purposes of the Legal Services Program under the OEO. This amendment grants the governor of a state the right to veto legal services projects. It was authored by Senator George Murphy of California.

Additionally, the OEO director has been deprived of the power to override a governor's veto of legal services projects. The obvious result of this amendment is to deprive the poor people of legal representation in the states where it is most needed.

You are urged to study this provision when the measure is referred to the House of Representatives and to vote against the provision which will take away the effective legal protection that the poor have been receiving through the Legal Services Program. There is a meeting of our advisory committee in Washington on November 7th and perhaps it will be timely and desirable to have a representative of your office at this meeting in the OEO office to inform you more fully as to the possible consequences.

Sincerely,

PHILIP M. NEWMAN.

DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION ACT

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering the Drug Abuse Education Act, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor.

For some time, concerned citizens in my congressional district have been working on a program of drug abuse education. While relatively new, Macomb County's drug abuse education program is, to my mind, one of the most advanced in the Nation.

Recently, I received a letter from Mr. Daniel P. Gumbleton, chairman of the Macomb County Task Force on Marijuana and Drug Abuse. In his letter he discusses the Drug Abuse Education Act, and the need for Federal assistance in this area.

I recommend his letter to my colleagues and insert it in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED COMMUNITY SERVICES OF METROPOLITAN DETROIT,
Warren, Mich., October 27, 1969.

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE O'HARA: As Chairman of the Macomb County Task Force on Marijuana and Drug Abuse, I wish to express our unanimous support for the Drug Abuse Education Act, 1969.

The experience of our Task Force has made it abundantly clear that the twenty-one school districts in Macomb County need assistance and support for the development of sound and positive curriculum materials. Many of the efforts currently under way are handicapped by the lack of adequate research and scientific data on the basic problem of drug abuse. Because of this lack of adequate materials to meet the high demand,

there has emerged an abundance of second-rate pamphlets, movies and teaching tools that are inaccurate, misleading and have the potential of encouraging youths to experiment with drugs rather than point out the true dangers of experimentation. If we do not discourage the use of such materials, we are only going to diminish the credibility of the teacher in presenting the curriculum approaches to be developed as a result of the passage of this act.

The merits of the drug culture have been highly acceptable to far too many youths and any efforts employed by the adult society that are not reasonable and sound will only continue to support the arguments of those who advance the abuse of chemical substances. Therefore, we urge you to consider the need for extensive research on the issue of drug abuse itself so that educators may have adequate scientific data to draw upon for the development of specific curriculum and teaching tools.

Under Section 4 "Community Programs", we would like to recommend that specific opportunities be made available to allow for the development of imaginative programs by youth and young adult groups to reach the vast number of young people associated with the drug culture that are not enrolled in any school program. Those of us who have been actively engaged in the planning and execution of training seminars recognize the fact that it is only through young people themselves that we will reach those who are convinced that the drug culture is good for them. This position emerged through our awareness that advocates of the drug culture are convinced that the use of drugs will open new dimensions of the mind and opportunities to understand their fellow man. This is a very difficult position for many of us to comprehend because of our own commitment to our fellow man. However, if we are going to deal with the problem we must try to understand the frame of reference of those involved.

The Macomb County Task Force has been acting as a catalyst to many groups in our country to begin developing training programs for the professional community. The enclosed materials represent one unique program.

In addition to educational efforts on drug abuse, we would like to solicit your support and help in securing the establishment of treatment resource centers. We have found, through our educational efforts, that many individuals are coming forth and identifying a drug dependency problem. At this time, we do not have any identifiable resources to treat them. On September 12, 1969, Judge John Swanson appeared before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to request that the Marine Hospital in Detroit be designated as a treatment and research center for the metropolitan area. Any encouragement you can give to the members of this Committee to consider this request favorably, will be much appreciated.

The Macomb Task Force appreciates your interests in this problem which affects so many of our citizens and is willing to assist in any way possible to secure the passage of the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969.

Sincerely,

DANIEL P. GUMBLETON,
Chairman, Macomb County Task Force
on Marijuana and Drug Abuse.

TALK TO GOD AND BE STRENGTHENED

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. WYMAN, Mr. Speaker, my good friend and distinguished Member of

Congress, EARL LANDGREBE of the great State of Indiana, has taken the time to bring to the attention of all Congressmen a "Very Timely Prayer."

There is strength through prayer. No man is or can be omniscient nor omnipotent. Any who believe the contrary are fools. Likewise the maxim that haste makes waste applies in the 20th century as it has since time immemorial.

I include Congressman LANDGREBE'S "Timely Prayer" for the benefit of those whose values under stress seem to lose their conviction. The simple things of life are often the truly invaluable. One of these is prayer. The prayer follows:

A VERY TIMELY PRAYER

Slow me down, Lord! Ease the pounding of my heart by the quieting of my mind. Steady my hurried pace with a vision of the eternal reach of Time. Give me, amidst the confusion of my day, the calmness of the everlasting hills. Break the tension of my nerves and muscles with the soothing music of the singing streams that live in my memory. Help me to know the magical restorative power of sleep. Teach me the art of taking Minute Vacations . . . of slowing down to look at a flower, to chat with a friend, to pat a dog, to read a few lines from a good book.

Remind me each day of the Fable of the hare and the tortoise, that I may know that the race is not always to the swift; that there is more to life than increasing its speed. Let me look upward into the branches of the towering oak, and know that it grew because it grew slowly and well. Slow me down, Lord, and inspire me to send my roots deep into the soil of life's enduring values, that I may grow toward the stars of a greater destiny. Amen.

MARS: IS RUSSIA RACING?

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we consider the future of our national space program we must balance, not only of the opportunity for international cooperation, but also the realities of international competition. Not only do we compete for men's minds in the world of today and tomorrow but also we compete to assure that we may remain secure in the difficult days ahead. An article by Mr. B. J. Richey in the Huntsville Times of Sunday, September 28, points to the progress and determination of the Soviet space program and what it may mean for the future. We would do well to heed Mr. Richey's remarks as we consider our future activities in space.

The article follows:

MARS: IS RUSSIA RACING?

(By B. J. Richey)

WASHINGTON.—American space officials are convinced the Russians are aiming for manned Mars missions, perhaps as early as 1979, even though the Soviets haven't yet demonstrated equipment and technique necessary to land men on the moon.

There also is strong feeling that Soviet Union will attempt to softland an unmanned spacecraft on Mars in 1971, the next oppor-

tunity to launch a craft to the red planet, and two years ahead of the 1973 unmanned U.S. Viking Mars lander.

In light of past and unfulfilled predictions of what the Russians are up to in their space ventures, it's tempting to brush off these two forecasts as just so much talk, particularly since topic was discussed before a congressional committee studying space findings.

But there are a couple of solid indications there may be some substance to the ideas.

One: Dr. Thomas O. Paine, National Aeronautics and Space Administration administrator, who disclosed the agency's feelings about the Soviets and their possible Mars plans, is not James Webb, former NASA chief, who was a fast-talker, and used the "Russians are coming" cry often to squeeze funds from Congress.

Secondly: The Russians, indeed, have always shown strong interest in the planets. Since 1960 the Soviet Union has not missed a single opportunity to launch an unmanned probe to either Mars or Venus.

The Russian program popped up when space officials were discussing manned and unmanned Mars plans.

Dr. Werner von Braun, Marshall Space Flight Center director, first outlined the possible launch date to send men to Mars as Nov. 12, 1981. They would land on the planet in August, 1982, and return to Earth Aug. 14, 1983.

Both von Braun and Paine underscored the point that they weren't proposing this as an American target date, but simply using it to show a typical Mars journey. But what Paine said next certainly made it seem like a strong pitch to meet this date.

"We have selected 1981 as perhaps the boldest date, perhaps the earliest date at which the Soviets might make such an attempt, although I would not rule out 1979, either, as perhaps a fly-by date in their program," he said.

It is by no means clear that the Soviet Union may not decide "to mount a crash program and bring this in before the end of the decade of the 1970s."

Paine shored up his contention by presenting, at the request of the senators on the committee, stories from the official Russian press which indicated manned missions for cosmonauts are coming.

"The possibility of sending piloted spacecrafts to Venus and Mars is excluded in the immediate future. But the time will come, maybe before the end of the 20th Century, when an expedition of people on board a large space system will embark on a lengthy interplanetary voyage to our neighboring planets." Soviet space scientist L. Sedov wrote in Pravda in July of this year. "Automatic stations will pave the way for them."

Paine also quoted from a speech by Communist Party secretary Leonid Brezhnev in which he said the flights of Soyuz 4 and 5 may lead toward "solving the tasks of rescuing cosmonauts in emergencies during Earth orbital flight or during distant flights in interplanetary space."

Then Paine took the discussion out of the context of what might be interpreted as a Mars race to follow the moon race, which was easily won by the U.S.

Despite what the Russians may be up to, the U.S. should work toward making the 1973 unmanned Viking landing a success, and then perhaps talk about going for a manned landing, he said.

"In my mind, in no event should we make such decisions until we have had the 1973 lander on Mars, and have a much better idea of conditions there and the degree to which the U.S. has an interest in such an expedition."

CONSTITUENT'S SHOCK

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the other day I received a letter from Mr. Burton S. Hoffman of 1200 North Queen Street, Arlington, Va., one of my constituents, expressing his shock and surprise that certain public officials would make the use of marihuana legitimate on the basis that to continue to make its use unlawful is an invasion of the constitutional rights of citizens. Mr. Hoffman's letter attacks this proposal head on. Since his views sum up the overwhelming attitude of northern Virginians on this most disturbing subject, I am including his letter in the RECORD:

OCTOBER 15, 1969.

Representative JOEL T. BROYHILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROYHILL: I would like to tell you about my incredulous shock and surprise to read the report in a recent leading newspaper of the statements made by a responsible public official concerning laws against the use and possession of marihuana.

The newspaper reported that this public official said that he opposed any laws against the use and possession of marihuana and directly quoted the official as saying in a hearing of the House Select Committee on Crime, "I don't see how you can say it's a crime to either possess or use this drug." The official is also quoted as calling laws against the use of marihuana as "an invasion of the constitutional rights of citizens."

In my view this official has done a grave disservice to this country by making these reckless statements concerning a very serious problem, of which you must be well aware. I do not believe that any reputable medical or legal authority would support this public official's view. While the long-term effects of the use of marihuana may not be clearly known, there seems to exist grounds to believe that grave harm is likely. Medical authorities do not seriously challenge the fact that marihuana is a dangerous drug and its use by young people can cause serious psychological, if not physiological harm.

Perhaps a case can be made for reducing the present criminal penalties for use and possession of this substance. However, the position advocated by this official, in my view, alarming in the extreme.

I cannot fathom how an official in his position could justify the use of such a dangerous substance on the grounds of "constitutional rights." Where is such a right stated in the Constitution? It is my view that the whole question of drug abuse extends far beyond any one individual's sacred "right to abuse himself" because of the much wider implications of the threats and costs to the whole society when drug abuse is resorted to as a means of coping with individual problems. Also, when the drug abuser's time runs out and it becomes necessary for the healthy members of society to attempt to salvage him, it is we, the over-taxed taxpayers who must pay the bills for rehabilitation programs. Furthermore, it is recognized that those drug abusers who do go on to the so-called "hard" narcotics from marihuana are in fact responsible for much of our violent crime today in the course of their insatiable quest for illegal funds to "support their habits." So, there is a much broader problem

here than any alleged abridgement of "individual rights," and it appears to me that this official is seriously mistaken or, at the very least, dangerously misguided.

It is my earnest belief that the usage of marijuana, especially by the young, in their formative years, bodes much ill for the future of this country, and that responsible Congressmen must not permit this official's remarks to go unchallenged.

Therefore, as a concerned citizen and constituent of the Tenth District, I urge you to take a vigorous public stand in strenuous opposition to this public official's position and in favor of a reasonable, intelligent and responsible approach to this problem.

May I have your reply in which you state your views on this question in general, and in particular with respect to this public official's remarks?

Very truly yours,

BURTON S. HOFFMAN.

RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE—SUPREME COURT HOLDS ITSELF NOT BOUND BY CONSTITUTION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, upon receiving the per curiam decision of the Supreme Court yesterday—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 32098—in the Mississippi school cases, I pointed out to the Members that there was no possible basis in either the Constitution or the law for its holding.

Today, I reported to the people of my district, amplifying the remarks which I made on Wednesday.

I include the report at this point following my remarks:

REPORT BY MR. RARICK

Last Wednesday, the Supreme Court handed down another of its terrible decisions on our schools.

Although the actual cases before the Court were Mississippi cases, the Justices obviously mean for this decision to apply to all of the schools in the South—and by this means to abolish our freedom of choice.

As soon as news of the decision came over the wires, I sent to the Supreme Court for a copy. When I read it, I could hardly believe it.

It was what we call a "per curiam" decision, which means that none of the Judges wanted to have his name connected with it. I can readily understand why not.

As I told the other members of the House that evening, the decision cannot pretend to be based on any possible interpretation of the Constitution, nor can it pretend to be grounded in any possible interpretation of any law on the books. It's a classic example of the arbitrary and unfettered exercise of naked power.

Long years ago, Thomas Jefferson warned us that of all the tyrannies, judicial tyranny was the most to be feared. That's what this latest Supreme Court decision is, pure and simple, unadulterated judicial tyranny.

Up until 1954 it had never been seriously questioned that school officials had the power to assign children to one school or another, and that the race of the child could be considered as a factor in that assignment.

Suddenly, in 1954, the Warren Court decided that all of the other judges since

1866 had been unable to read plain English, and that the Constitution prohibited any school assignment based on the race of the child.

In other words, the Supreme Court decided that parents had freedom of choice in the school assignment of their children, and that the the Constitution prohibited any government interference which was based on the race of the child.

This meant that Negro children could attend white schools, or white children could attend Negro schools, and the school authorities had no power to make assignments based on race.

We here in Louisiana, like our neighbors in the rest of the South, did not agree with that decision. We did not believe that the Constitution interfered with our school system. We still do not.

But we have learned to live with this idea—that our schools cannot assign a child to one school or another, based on his race. We have operated on the basis of freedom of choice.

This is what is meant by the term "desegregation." That the State of Louisiana has no power to force the separation of the races in the public school system. If the people, of their own free choice, decide to send their children to schools which are attended by children of their own race, the Constitution has no more to say about that than it does about which church you elect to attend. It only says that you have the right to make the choice, and that the State has no power to do it for you. In plain words "desegregation" simply told the State officials to let the people alone.

Now "integration" is something else again. While the term "desegregation" means only that you cannot keep people separated if they want to be together, the term "integration" means that you must force together people who do not want to be together.

"Desegregation" means preventing the State from using its power to keep the races apart; "integration" means using the power of the State, or of the Federal government, to force the races to mix together.

When the Warren Court ordered "desegregation", it really ordered freedom of choice. But neither of the races chose the way that the socialists thought they should choose. Only a few negro children wanted to leave their schools to attend white schools, practically no white children wanted to attend negro schools, and all of the money and pressure from New York and Washington didn't change things very much. Few of our people of either race were ready to sell their children into slavery.

Now the Burger Court has ordered "integration"—something totally without even a shadow of justification in either the Constitution or any conceivable law. The Court has said in effect, we are going to see to it that the races are mixed the way we want them mixed, whether either of them want it or not. Today the judges' whims call for a doctrine of racial proportions—tomorrow it may be something else.

The Supreme Court is in the absurd position of holding that while the Constitution forbids the use of government power to assign children to schools by race, if the object is to keep the races separate; it not only permits but requires the use of the same government power to assign children to schools by race if the object is to mix the races.

You do not need to be a genius to understand that government either has the power to make assignments based on race, or it does not have that power. If it has the power, the purpose for which the power is used makes no difference. If it does not have the power, it simply does not have it.

Until the decision of the Warren Court, everyone agreed that Government had the power to consider race in making assignments. After 1954, the Warren Court said that Government had no such power—and its decision was enforced with Federal bayonets in our sister States of Arkansas, Mississippi and Alabama. Now the Burger Court says that Government has the power again—but only if it uses it the way the Court wants it used.

This is not law—this is tyranny, the very judicial tyranny against which Thomas Jefferson warned.

The Constitution of the United States places the legislative power in the Congress. It requires that the President execute the laws. Congress has stated plainly that desegregation does not mean integration, and has prohibited the use of Federal moneys for busing to further the "doctrine of racial proportions."

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has seen fit to ignore this law. He has made his own law, and by withholding funds, has attempted to do exactly that which he was forbidden to do. Now the Supreme Court has authorized the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals to use its judicial power to enforce as law the lawless acts of Mr. Finch.

This is judicial tyranny in its worst form. A Cabinet officer and some Federal judges—not one of whom were elected by or are responsible to the people—have combined to promulgate and attempt to enforce a bogus law, directly contrary to the laws enacted by the Congress.

I said that Congress had plainly stated that desegregation does not mean integration. Here is the Civil Rights Act of 1964:

Let me read what Sec. 401B of this Act, passed by your Congress, says:

"Desegregation" means the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, color, religion, or national origin, but "desegregation" shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome "racial imbalance."

Now let me read to you what the Supreme Court says, taken directly from its unsigned order last Wednesday:

"The Court of Appeals may in its discretion direct the schools here involved to accept all or any part of the August 11, 1969, recommendations of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare."

You will notice that the Supreme Court has authorized the Fifth Circuit to order the Mississippi schools to accept H.E.W. recommendations.

That means that the courts will enforce as law the H.E.W. guidelines which are directly contrary to the law enacted by Congress. You didn't hear me wrong—I repeat it. Congress passed a law forbidding racial assignments to overcome racial imbalance. H.E.W., disobeying that law has recommended racial assignments to overcome racial imbalance. The Supreme Court has now told the Fifth Circuit that it can ignore the law passed by Congress and can enforce as law H.E.W.'s illegal guidelines.

Here are some of the guidelines. There are 26 more sets but any one of these can tell us what to expect.

This set applies to our friends in Woodville—Wilkinson County, Mississippi. I will read some of the recommendations which the Supreme Court wants the judges to enforce as law:

"The Superintendent should actively seek greater involvement of parents of both races through school meetings, newsletters, an active and biracial P.T.A., class meetings, parent conferences, and through home visits by school personnel."

"It is important that, through personal observations, students see that nonprofessional service positions in their schools are not for members of one race and that harmonious working relationships can exist between members of both races. The Superintendent and Board of Education should therefore take all necessary steps to assure that all staffs are bi-racial."

"Participation in extracurricular activities by students of both races should be actively encouraged by administrators and teachers as a means for developing school spirit and a feeling of belonging."

"School organizations—student government, cheerleaders, musical organizations, athletic teams—must be operated on a non-discriminatory basis and should include students of both races."

"Guidance counselors should be oriented and urged to plan a leading role in successful implementation of the desegregation plan."

"The curriculum should be reviewed and, as necessary, revised to provide recognition of Negro history, culture and contributions to our society. Library books which deal with such subjects should be added to school book collections."

"The Superintendent should direct each principal to establish a student-faculty human relations committee representing both races to aid in the successful implementation of desegregation."

"All school staff and members of the student body should exert extra effort to assure the full participation of all students of both races in extra-curricular programs, including when appropriate the provision of a "late bus" for those staying after school to participate in such programs."

These H.E.W. guidelines not only violate the law but H.E.W. misused its appropriation to prepare them. Sec. 409 of the Appropriation Act under which the H.E.W. employees are paid reads as follows:

"No part of the funds contained in this Act may be used to force busing of students, abolishment of any school, or to force any student attending any elementary or secondary school to attend a particular school against the choice of his or her parents or parent in order to overcome racial imbalance."

And Sec. 410:

"Sec. 410. No part of the funds contained in this Act shall be used to force busing of students, the abolishment of any school or the attendance of students at a particular

school in order to overcome racial imbalance as a condition precedent to obtaining Federal Funds otherwise available to any State, school district, or school: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall assign as many persons to the investigation and compliance activities of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 related to elementary and secondary education in the other States as are assigned to the seventeen Southern and border States to assure that this law is administered and enforced on a national basis, and the Secretary is directed to enforce compliance with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by like methods and with equal emphasis in all States of the Union and to report to the Congress by March 1, 1969, on the actions he has taken and the results achieved in establishing this compliance program on a national basis: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds or commodities for school lunch programs or medical services may not be recommended for withholding by any official employed under appropriations contained herein in order to overcome racial imbalance: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, moneys received from national forests to be expended for the benefit of the public schools or public roads of the county or counties in which the national forest is situated, may not be recommended for withholding by any official employed under appropriations contained herein."

Not only has the Supreme Court condoned violation of the law by HEW but it has authorized the Fifth Circuit to enforce as law the illegal HEW guidelines.

Thursday, we voted on the Selective Service Act. We have seen the Armed Forces of the United States used against our neighbors in Arkansas, Mississippi, and Alabama to enforce lawless court orders. I did not support these amendments. I told the House:

"So long as the lawless HEW guidelines remain in effect, and are not publicly repudiated by the President, I cannot in good conscience as a representative of my people, cast their vote to give the President the power he seeks to draft young men into the Armed Services and even chance their exploitation by being required to enforce this illegal social injustice against my people."

Together we have overcome many hardships.

For the sake of our children, let us all unite together and work to overcome this latest oppressive wrong.

BLACK UNITED FRONT ASKS REPARATIONS

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 30, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine who is a member of Washington's B'nai Israel Synagogue, recently called my attention to how ridiculous the Black United Front's demands for so-called reparations are becoming.

A representative of the front apparently felt it necessary to demand from the members of the synagogue payments on the basis of their "Christian vision." Without further comment, I should like to include the text of a brief article concerning their encounter with the synagogue janitor who received their demands:

MISLABLED, MISFIRED AND MISTAKEN

WASHINGTON.—The Black United Front, a militant Negro organization which is demanding reparation in cash from the religious community, sent representatives to read a policy statement on the steps of Washington's B'nai Israel Synagogue on Yom Kippur Eve calling on "Jewish church to shake off the shackles of white racism and capitalist exploitation that have strangled its Christian vision."

A BUF field chairman, Tony Cox, read a statement calling for a \$10 million contribution to the Black Economic Development Corporation from synagogues. Mr. Cox and 16 other Black activists arrived at the synagogue at 8:05 p.m. when the worshippers had gone home to break their fast after Yom Kippur. The statement was read to the janitor of the synagogue.

In the statement, the BUF urged "the Jewish church on this, your Day of high Atonement, to not only stop sanctioning racism but to make amends for its active role in the capitalistic exploitation and economic gerrymandering of the Black community."

If the synagogues refuse, the BUF warned, it could lead to "another Middle East crisis in the District of Columbia or another Vietnam in Washington."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, October 31, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Come ye and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord; that He may teach us His ways and that we may walk in His paths.—Isaiah 2:3.

Eternal God, who art our refuge and strength, our present help in every hour of need, we would begin this day with Thee, we would continue it with Thee, and we would end it with Thee. May this be a day when we truly adventure with Thy spirit and in so doing increase in faith, advance in hope, and extend good will in our Nation and in our world.

We pray for our country that our people may learn to be one in spirit, one in purpose, and one in a desire to live together harmoniously. As a result may we endeavor to bring peace to our world, understanding between nations, and a

new sense of responsibility for the welfare of all mankind.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on October 29, 1969, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 11039. An act to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended; and

H.R. 12781. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 73. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the sale and exchange of isolated tracts of tribal land on the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation, S. Dak.;" and S. 267. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Samuel J. Cole, U.S. Army (retired).

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 474), entitled "An act to establish a Commission on Government Pro-