

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, November 12, 1969:

IN THE AIR FORCE

Maj. Gen. Royal B. Allison, xxx-xx-xxxx FR, Regular Air Force to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility des-

ignated by the President in the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of section 8066, title 10 of the United States Code.

IN THE ARMY

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army,

under provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Joseph G. May xxx-xx-xxxx, Adjutant General's Corps.

Brig. Gen. LaClair A. Melhouse, xxx-xx-x... Adjutant General's Corps.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EDUCATION TAX EXEMPTIONS

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the pending proposal to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education, I am strongly convinced that this bill, which I am cosponsoring in the House, or something based on its principles, is necessary to meet urgent needs of parents struggling these days to provide their children with higher education.

The previous experience of Congress concerning legislation of this kind, for one reason or another has not been very successful. House and Senate committees have, apparently, not been convinced of the need or practicability of this legislation.

The Senate wisely inserted an amendment to H.R. 6950 during the 90th Congress, and, as is often the case with these matters, it was deleted in the conference at a time when it was well on its way to becoming law. This was lamentable.

I would not belabor the point of the vastly increased cost of modern, college education with regard to secondary and higher levels. It is truly prodigious. This cost has been rising in leaps and bounds, getting far beyond the means of a great many people in our society, who are intent upon educating their promising boys and girls.

The situation in regard to this soaring expense is somewhat akin to that obtaining in medical and hospital costs, in that the rich and the poor, for different reasons, have it easier. In the case of the rich, there is no serious problem, and the poor, though grievously burdened, are in a position to obtain scholarship benefits and other aid for their young folks, even though their struggles and sacrifices are great.

It is the rank and file in middle-income groups, so to speak, who have the majority of eligible scholars, who are harried and handicapped by the heavy burdens of prohibitive, rising costs of higher education.

With about 50 percent of high school graduates planning to attend colleges these days, and this percentage, fortunately rising every day, almost 8 million college students are pursuing advanced, college education, and the huge sum that is required to defray its costs cannot possibly in all or even a high percentage of cases, be met by the family of young students, and we must have massive, pub-

lic support in this area, if we would meet drastic needs.

I realize there are some people who do not want such a program, and there are those who think we are doing enough. But the plain fact is that many very bright, promising boys and girls and their families are having a desperate struggle to get a college education, and I think the Congress must be willing to take the bull by the horns, and put enough money into this program in order to educate the millions of young people who are qualified, deserving, and seeking higher learning at all levels, to fit themselves for business and the professions.

Obviously, tax relief for their parents is one way by which these burdens can be lightened for millions of American families. Other steps are necessary, including large funds for loans and grants for programs providing scholarships, aid and jobs for the students.

I hope that the Ways and Means Committee, and its counterpart on the other side of the Capitol, will take a sharp, sympathetic look at this problem, and come up with some real, generous, adequate help for our young people, and their folks, so they can be assured of getting a good college education without bankrupting their families and causing their parents concern and frustration because they are not able to help them as they would like to do, or cannot help them adequately at all.

I compliment my colleagues in the House and other people who have given so much attention to this problem, and hope that before long some reason, and understanding, and generosity of spirit will take hold here in the Congress to put these education programs on a solid, funding basis, so they can meet the needs of our young people aspiring to higher, academic training. No other nation should be ahead of us in education, or in anything else that is needed.

I realize that fixing taxing credits is a complex, intricate problem that must be accomplished by experts in this field attached to our committees, the Internal Revenue Service, academic and lay tax experts, whose views should be considered and carefully weighed, and written into law.

The important thing is to make the credits substantial enough to relieve parents who are contributing as much as they can to the higher education of their children.

I realize, of course, that this must be done without imposing unabsorbable loss of tax revenues that would put our basic tax bills out of line, though I do not believe this would necessarily follow, if proper expertise is exercised by our committees, their gifted advisers and other available experts.

In a rapidly changing world, where our young generation is being buffeted by unprecedented influences pulling them in all directions away from safe moorings, Congress must stick to basic fundamental principles and techniques that have been responsible for the growth and success of this great free system of ours in guarding our liberties and making possible unprecedented prosperity and well-being.

We would be foolish, indeed, to scrap the things that have made us great, just because we have some people in the country who think the ideas of Karl Marx are superior to those which built our unrivalled free economy and libertarian institutions, which have served us so well, and which can be changed and adjusted to any need that may develop in our society without pulling basic principles up by the roots and without letting them pass us by.

Let us go forward across a broad front with policies, programs, and measures designed to provide primary, elementary, secondary, higher, and professional education for the children and the youth of this country.

Let us change our laws and our institutions in every way that may be sound and necessary to meet and solve our problems. Let us enact such laws as we may need to serve our social programs at appropriate levels, and provide fully and adequately for the health, education, and well-being of the American people of every age.

Let us keep our great country free and prosperous, with opportunities for all who aspire to them, a place where liberty, individual rights, and equality under the law in an ordered society shall be the lot of our humblest fellowmen and women.

INDONESIAN JOINT VENTURE
OPERATION HAILED

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, recently Mr. Julius Tahija, chairman of the Pacific Indonesia Businessmen Association Investment Promotion Council, delivered a most thoughtful address to the American Management Conference. While his concern was primarily with the impact of American management on a growing Indonesia, his ideas have wide importance for the continuing development of enlightened social policy on the part of American business throughout the world. I commend this address to Senators and

ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD:

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

INDONESIAN JOINT VENTURE OPERATIONS
HAILED

(By Julius Tahiya)

During the Pacific Industrial Conference in Sydney in April 1967, sponsored by the S.R.I., I stated:

"... The Indonesia of today is a challenge to the established Private Business World that we, participants to this Conference, represent.

Will we take up the challenge?

We who live with the current problems in Indonesia each day see clearly this challenge. However, sometimes it seems to us that a large part of the business and political leaders of this world who preach the virtues of democracy and free enterprise, hesitate. They hesitate to display the very moral courage, self-confidence and enterprising spirit of the private entrepreneur. Are they interested in investing their judgment, their thoughts, time and money in the developing nations? Such investment, as you are well aware, is vital and indispensable to keep this world truly free.

At that time, I would not have dared to predict the tremendous response of international Private Enterprise to this challenge. The success so far in attracting Overseas and Governmental investment and aid to Indonesia should also be attributed to what has been expressed by His Excellency, Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX at the S.R.I. Jakarta meeting on August 2, 1967, and implemented by the Indonesian Government:

"No matter how great the desire of the outside world to help Indonesia and however important overseas credit and foreign investment, the overcoming of our economic weakness and especially our economic development must be based on the determination to surmount these problems with our own forces, beginning by putting our own economic house in order ourselves."

This we have now begun to accomplish. First we have had the foreign Investment Law in January 1967. Now inflation is cut very sharply.

The result has indeed been most gratifying, to see what has taken place in the field of foreign investment in Indonesia.

In order to ensure social and political stability while promoting Foreign Investment in Indonesia, the Government in Indonesia has wisely also promulgated and is implementing a Domestic Investment Law. It is important that the growth of Overseas investment goes hand in hand with the development and growth of domestic private capital and expertise. After all, private enterprise, whether domestic or foreign, operates on the same basic principles.

It is vital that small and large indigenous businesses have the opportunity to flourish as well as foreign and joint ventures. This is a prerequisite for a strong political stability with the citizen of Indonesia feeling and experiencing in his own life the advantages of the free economic system, in better opportunities to provide more for his family. This is the objective of private enterprise truly built on a firm foundation.

When the events in October 1965 took place, private enterprise in Indonesia was almost non-existent. It was only a matter of time before private enterprise would have been totally annihilated. Having gone through so much frustration, intimidation and anxiety, private enterprise in Indonesia now does appreciate the fact that the present Indonesian Government, headed by President Sukarno, is offering every possible facility and opportunity for private enterprise to actively participate in the development of Indonesia's economic growth.

This opportunity offered to us, brings

simultaneously certain responsibilities to the private sector, irrespective whether Foreign or Domestic. The newly born Indonesian business world and management hopes to share in and benefit from the experience gained by the American Management. It is for this reason why we welcome the seminar of A.M.A., the meetings organized by S.R.I. and the activities of N.I.C.B.

At present the largest investment committed in Indonesia comes from the U.S.A. This means that American Management will play an important role in Indonesia. In fact, American Management has exercised a great influence in the promotion of private enterprise all over the world. That American Management has been successful in expanding American business interest where private enterprise is welcomed, is beyond any doubt.

In a way it has been a blessing in disguise that the domestic private enterprise in Indonesia had to start almost over again since 1966 with new methods, new perspective, new goals.

American Management in Indonesia can contribute very much by sharing her experience with the newly born private enterprise in Indonesia.

There is a completely new relationship emerging between the business world and the world in which we live. The businessman is no longer only responsible for the economics of his enterprise. He can no longer think just of the profit picture this year and next.

Let us now take the case of considering a joint venture in Indonesia today. The businessman must consider that the policies he makes today will take into account the growing vitality and economic and political awareness of the Indonesian people and of Indonesia's place in the world in the years ahead. As Indonesia grows economically, developing her resources, as her people learn the skills and knowledge of the business world, so the Indonesian people will become very acutely aware of what is fair to them, what is a "good deal" for them in joint ventures.

Thus it is vital that the joint ventures which are made today are contracts which five or ten years from now will still look fair to the Indonesian people when the economic situation will be far brighter. Today, as there is such an immediate necessity for fertilizer plants, consumer products and other basic manufacturing industries to cut down on the large imports of these necessary products, Indonesia, might be pressed to accept contracts which, though in the deep need today may look fairly good, will not be so in the light of probably a better economic future of Indonesia in 5 or 10 years. Then the people of Indonesia may say, how could you make this contract, it is not fair to us now and that might cause political problems.

As private businessmen we all naturally need to make a profit. That is basic to the free enterprise system. But today there are also other considerations. As the world is changing so rapidly, profit to be sustained, may have to be less quickly made. Business must become more enlightened to ensure that there will be steady profits within a favorable political climate in the years ahead.

Even in the United States this appears to be true.

The businessman's environment holds him responsible for the general welfare of the environment in which he operates. Unless the people of any community can physically enjoy, directly or indirectly, the benefits created by the presence of business ventures operating in that community, the days of private enterprise are limited.

The business world is being called upon to participate in many activities of national concern that previously have been the exclusive domain of government—social, educational, and other non-profit developments. No longer is it enough to be imaginative and inventive in our technological research, but we have to be competitively creative in meeting the challenge of our new environmental

responsibilities, if we wish to realize the maximum potential of our business.

Some managers do either ignore or overlook this new relationship between the business world and the world we live in. They are heading for trouble and will fall by the wayside, because the "Good Old Days" of profit, with no considerations for political and human factors, are gone.

However, I know there are a substantial number of managers who do comprehend current developments and react most positively.

Perhaps now we should take a look at the role of American Management not only in the developing areas such as Indonesia but also their overall policies within the U.S. For whatever actions American business takes in the United States will very much affect the developing countries. The methods and creativity of American Management have been responsible for the success of American business established in other countries.

This success has left a great impact in many of the host countries and has been responsible for the fact that the host countries and their people do expect much from the American Management, such as American expertise, efficiency, foresightedness, inventiveness, etc. To the host countries American Management reflects the basic thinking and aspirations of the American nation and people.

Current political, social and economic developments in the world, but particularly in the U.S., have raised such questions as:

"How are conditions within the U.S., today and tomorrow? How much do events here have an impact on us outside the United States who do believe in the cause of private enterprise and democracy?"

Management starts at the birth of an individual. The kind of family and social environment in which a young person is brought up will have a major effect on how perceptive a human being and businessman he will be in the future.

What role is being played by the American Management in surmounting the problems in the U.S.A. such as the inflationary trend, minority problems, the seemingly uncontrolled expression of emotions, but most of all, the overcoming of disunity?

Unity is one of the strongest characteristics we do most admire in the American people. In no other management but the American Management can everyone concerned express his views so freely, but once a decision has been made, everyone including those who have held a different opinion, will loyally and without reservation implement the decision. The team work and team spirit without suppressing certain democratic principles, are the most commendable features of American Management.

It is in this human and social field within which we feel that American Management not only can, but must operate to keep free enterprise free in today's world.

Many of us outside the U.S. count on the success of American Management in solving within the U.S. these domestic, social and economic problems.

The governments and peoples of the developing countries look to the monetary success of the United States. However, they also watch to determine the happiness and individual fulfillment that that money has given to your people.

Naturally, we Indonesians and other developing peoples must ourselves adapt the free enterprise example of the United States to our own mores and culture. It is a necessity of which we in Indonesia are very conscious, that we meld our Indonesian family living, spirituality, and culture into the best of the modern developments. Only in this way can we try to give our people, as best possible, within all our human frailties, in government and in business, the best of both worlds. That is our responsibility.

However, as we are only beginning to build our foundation of a better economic and

business structure in Indonesia, some of the present cultural and social developments in the U.S., despite the high standard of economic living may give new ammunition to those who are staunch opponents of free enterprise.

So you see what happens in the United States does affect us in the immediate future, as to how enlightened you are and how much you look to the long run stability of society.

Thus your enlightened social business policy in the United States and in other developing countries at this time will keep free enterprise alive in the years ahead and it is a necessity for the long term survival of not only American business, but also private enterprise in this world.

We believe that the free enterprise system with a full social consciousness, modified by each country to meld with its indigenous culture is the best system to give the most food and work and leisure time to the people. Always there are inequities, as we are all human. As the late Jack Kennedy said, "Life is not fair." But let us together try to make life as fair as possible. Since we do have a common goal and objective, we need the help of each other. We need your expertise and monetary assistance now and you need our vitality and stability for the future.

I hope you understand why we are intensely interested in the conditions in the United States today and in the future of the American Nation. We cannot remain indifferent in this respect since any weakening in American unity and stability also affects us who do believe, as you do, in private enterprise and democracy.

Thank you.

SALUTE TO CAMBODIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on November 8, 20 years ago, Cambodia was granted control over her own internal affairs. Four years later, Cambodia was granted total independence. Since that time, under the skillful leadership of Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Cambodia has maintained her independence and neutrality in a part of the world where their continued existence requires adept diplomacy and force of will. Like their Khmer ancestors, the Cambodians of today must be recognized for their proud and influential voice in Southeast Asian affairs.

Small though it is, Cambodia has exemplified the unusual ability to get along with its Asian neighbors, despite various ideologies and quarrels. A longtime champion of a neutral Southeast Asia, Prince Sihanouk has attempted to live in peace with all of his neighbors, realizing that war can only damage the area's hopes for development and stability. So precious has Cambodia's neutrality been that she has proved herself willing to forgo substantial amounts of foreign aid to avoid compromising her international position. Cambodia's recently reactivated membership in the Asian Development Bank and her new membership in the International Monetary Fund augur well for her economic future.

Despite the financial hindrance caused by reluctance to be tied by the strings of foreign aid, Cambodia has made con-

siderable strides toward modernization in her two decades of independence. The gross national product has grown by about 10 percent in the last 5 years, and the transportation network has expanded with the construction of roads, railroads, and a modern airport.

Prince Sihanouk's imaginative proposals for the future, such as the Sihanoukville Free Port Zone, are not only sure to increase foreign investment in Cambodia, but also to increase her considerable attractiveness as a tourist center. Cambodia's historical temples and lovely capital have already proved irresistible to tourists from around the world.

Nor has Cambodia neglected her own citizens. The wealth in Cambodia is more evenly distributed than in most other Asian countries, and as a result of the Prince's frequent visits throughout his country, each town has its schools, parks, and development schemes. The emphasis on education since independence has produced a dramatic drop in illiteracy; today, only 2 percent of the population cannot read or write.

With the care that he has shown in both domestic policy and foreign relations, Prince Sihanouk is certain to lead his country toward increasing prosperity for the future. With the balanced approach toward different parts of his own country that he has shown toward other nations of the world, the Prince will be able to unify political factions and subdue internal threats to Cambodia's stability.

We in the United States look forward to future decades of Cambodian independence in anticipation that the relations between our two countries will prove cordial and enduring. Let us hope that the recent resumption of diplomatic relations between our nations augurs a new era of cooperation and understanding between the United States and Cambodia.

EDUCATION FOR THE NATION'S HANDICAPPED

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, in our Nation, education has become the major route to full participation in society.

It is appropriate during this National Education Week that we consider the needs of between five and seven million American children whose handicapping conditions are severe enough to limit their ability to profit from regular education programs.

However, only one third of our handicapped youths are receiving an education that will provide them with the basic skills they need to become active, productive citizens.

My remarks are not intended to be a blanket condemnation of the public schools of our Nation, since the problems they face are staggering. Rather I believe we must all share the guilt for the present situation as indeed we must all

bear the responsibility for improvement in the future.

The simple, stark truth is this: We have not committed ourselves to the concept of providing equality of educational opportunity for all children—an education based on the unique needs of the child, rather than a single stereotype.

The problem as it pertains to the handicapped is serious, particularly because it is generally true that education for the handicapped can only be as good as our Nation's commitment to and success in providing adequate education for the so-called masses of normal children.

Our failure to guarantee adequate instructional services to handicapped children not only inflicts undue hardship upon the child and his family, but afflicts the Nation as a whole. As adults, for example, our handicapped children today would have an earning capacity of more than \$15 billion.

The problem is well stated in the Kerner Commission Report on Civil Disorders:

A 1963 survey of Chicago Public Schools showed that the condition creating the highest amount of dissatisfaction among teachers was the lack of adequate provision for the treatment of maladjusted, retarded and disturbed pupils. About 79% of elementary school teachers and 67% of high school teachers named this item as a key factor. The need for professional support in dealing with the extraordinary problems is seldom, if ever, met.

We can all point with pride to the achievements of people like Helen Keller and others who, with handicaps, made significant contributions to our country. With an adequate educational foundation, many more of our Nation's handicapped today could also achieve more active and useful lives and the independence, security, and dignity to which they are entitled.

COST COMPARISON

Realistically, we must wrestle with the omnipresent financial question. What will it cost if we need to support the handicapped as wards of society, rather than providing them with the opportunity to become productive contributors? The costs of lifetime residential care for the handicapped are overwhelming. It can cost as much as \$200,000 to support a handicapped person in a residential setting. On the other hand, \$20,000 provides a full elementary and secondary education to a handicapped child.

STILL NEEDS DESPITE PROGRESS

Mr. President, it cannot be denied that America has achieved much toward expanding educational opportunity for handicapped youth in the last decade. Ten years ago, only 15 percent received educational services; today, 33 percent of our handicapped youth are receiving educational assistance. Ten years ago, there were only 15,000 teachers of the handicapped; today 83,000 men and women are deeply and daily involved in education of the handicapped.

The challenge today is to direct our energies toward guaranteeing every child the education he needs. The hour is past when we can tell parents the door is barred to their children because facili-

ties, teachers, and other resources are not available.

We must find and pursue new ways to do the job.

FIRST SENATE SPEECH

In my first major Senate speech, on April 14, I suggested the creation of a Presidential Task Force on the Handicapped to review the efforts of the public and private sectors in providing services for the handicapped and to recommend how the job can be better done.

I am pleased that President Nixon has appointed a Task Force on the Physically Handicapped which is working now to pinpoint major problem areas and to suggest remedial legislative and voluntary action. We can all look forward to their recommendations on education for the handicapped.

I am also hopeful that the President will appoint a similar task force on the mentally handicapped to include the same kind of in-depth review and recommendations for the educational needs of those suffering from mental illness and mental retardation.

EDUCATION: CONTINUING PROCESS

In my judgment, there are three major areas which demand consideration and commitment if we are to improve educational services for the handicapped.

First, education does not arbitrarily begin at age 6 and end at age 18, but rather is a continuing life process. Our institutions of formal education have been generally created and confined to a more fixed span of life.

We have also generally accepted the family and community as providers of stimulation and development necessary during the early and later years of life. Yet during the past quarter century, we have all witnessed increased interest in development of preschool and adult education programs, community colleges, and various forms of manpower training for more capable members of our society.

YET LITTLE FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Yet little has been initiated and accomplished in these areas for the handicapped.

A child who is born handicapped suffers great deprivation, and without the resources of highly skilled professionals he will have little opportunity to gain from his family and community the skills needed to function within the educational system.

The same is true for the person who becomes handicapped in later years and is denied access to the normal channels or reeducation and forced to select from limited training and employment opportunities.

If continuous educational opportunities are important for the average American, they are imperative for our handicapped citizens.

SENATE ACTION

The Senate has shown leadership in recognizing this problem.

Last year this body initiated the Handicapped Children's Early Education Assistance Act for the purposes of establishing experimental and demonstration centers throughout the Nation for the education of preschool handicapped children.

The valid concept behind this program is development of programs and materials designed to meet the unique needs of preschool handicapped children, to prepare personnel to work with such children, to provide parents with counseling and guidance and to inform and stimulate the community to the problems of handicapped children and their possible solutions.

In addition, the Senate last year concluded that less than 1 percent of vocational education resources were available to the handicapped and thus required expansion.

While Congress has provided some leadership, it is time that we all address ourselves to the full range of educational programs that are needed.

SOME NEEDED PROGRAMS

We must develop ways to guarantee that every parent who learns that his child suffers from a handicapping condition, has services available to help his child develop to the fullest extent possible.

We must develop the capabilities to guarantee that every adult can participate fully in all educational opportunities regardless of the particular disability.

We must assure the dissemination of key information on technological advances and vocational opportunities, and the means to coordinate these services.

CHANGING PUBLIC ATTITUDES

Second, to fully assimilate the handicapped into our society, education is going to have to play a major role in changing public attitudes toward the handicapped. Noted sociologist Erving Goffman has pointed out that a person is only handicapped in the eyes of his fellowmen, and it is their attitudes that will determine the extent of the disability.

Too often we tend to look at and try to solve a problem in isolation. For example, we provide technological training to the handicapped individual, sometimes forgetting that an employer may be unwilling to hire him because of the stigma of his handicap and regardless of his skills. A child on crutches may be barred from a swimming pool without the chance to demonstrate that he can swim.

With greater public sensitivity to the abilities and disabilities of the handicapped, we can reach the objective of enabling every individual to participate fully in society.

SEE WHAT WE HAVE DONE

Third, I think we need to examine carefully the direction, substance, followup, and success of the efforts which we have undertaken to date. This includes all levels of government and the private, voluntary sector.

To date, for example, Congress has authorized considerable program development. There now exists authority for State grants-in-aid, preschool education, recruitment and information programs, regional resource centers, media centers for the deaf-blind, personnel training, research, and vocational education.

We have not, however, committed substantial financial resources to these programs.

CONCLUSION

We know that two out of three handicapped children are not receiving special education assistance.

We know that more than 300,000 additional teachers are needed.

We know the States are now spending about \$1 billion to provide education for the handicapped, with estimates that they need an additional \$2 billion.

The impact of our 6 million handicapped children on their families, schools, and communities is deep and wide.

That any educable child—handicapped or unhandicapped—does not receive an education irreparably cuts against the grain of the very heritage and hope of the Nation.

THE SILENT MAJORITY

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, there has been much written and said recently about the silent majority. I want to share with you a description of that dedicated group of loyal Americans written by Mr. John K. Lamb, civic leader and businessman in Terre Haute, Ind. His letter, signed a "Concerned American," appeared on the front page of the Terre Haute Star on Monday, November 10, 1969.

The letter follows:

THE SILENT MAJORITY

The silent majority works 8 to 10 hours each day and has little time to organize or participate in protests against anything or anybody—nor has it the money since it must pay a substantial portion of its hard-earned money to support the very institutions which the protestors would desecrate and destroy.

The silent majority believes in the right to dissent—believes in that right so strongly that it has tolerated the spectacle of an ex-university president plastered with pie as he attempted to address a student audience. It has suffered in shame as a former secretary of state was subjected to humiliation by a howling mob. The majority has stood still as campus after campus has been made an arena—as administrative offices have been overrun and seized by mobs or disruptors and despoilers who would negate 200 years of progressive efforts and who offer not one single constructive idea nor a method to implement it even if they had one. As they make a mockery of our Bill of Rights they clothe themselves in its protection.

They would have us write off 40,000 young Americans who have died in an unpopular war. They would say to a quarter of a million wounded that their sacrifice was a stupid gesture in subservience to established tyranny when they themselves constitute the real tyranny. They say to the parents of those heroic dead and maimed that the sacrifice to their nation was in support of an establishment which fosters war and is imperialist in nature. We have watched in disbelief as dissenters display the enemy flag and we listen in dismay as they support victory for the same enemy—all these and more the silent majority has suffered in silence in its dedication to that right to dissent.

The true record will show that no nation in recorded time has been so quick to forgive; no nation so generous in its efforts to rehabilitate those who have attacked it.

The silent majority resents the implication of the moratorium and other such antics—the implication that the silent majority is not for peace. The fact is that the majority does want peace but a peace with honor. The majority implements that desire by supporting our men and our government. It demonstrates its belief in and affection for our way of life by keeping order in its own ranks and going about its daily business. Concerned, yes. Worried, yes. Deploping the necessity of involvement in Asia, yes; but certain that our leadership will find an honorable solution with which we can live and preserve our integrity and self-respect.

The silent majority believes these to be the most trying days since our civil war and is convinced that strong leadership is a paramount ingredient in any formula for peace with honor.

It believes that honorable peace can be attained only through strength, tempered with compassion and good will.

The silent majority supports the president of the United States in his dedication to the accomplishment of peace with honor—a peace which will assure the safety of our friends in Vietnam and the early return of our gallant American fighting men.

CONCERNED AMERICAN.

A FATHER WRITES TO DEMONSTRATORS

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, this is a season of demonstrations, and many times in the process of demonstrations, the demonstrators read off the names of American military personnel who lost their lives in Vietnam.

The loss of American lives under any circumstances is, indeed, a tragic thing, and reference to such losses undoubtedly has great emotional impact. Whether or not the use by demonstrators of the names of honored American dead is in good taste is, of course, a moot question. The father of one of our servicemen lost in Vietnam has written a letter expressing his view with respect to this matter. This letter appeared in the November 8, 1969, issue of Human Events, and because it represents the feelings of someone who has lost a loved one in this conflict, I submit it to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

A FATHER WRITES TO DEMONSTRATORS: "WHEN THEY READ THE NAME OF MY SON"

(The letter below was written by the father of Pfc. Gregory M. Thompson, an 18-year-old Las Vegas (Nev.) high school graduate who was killed May 17, 1967, in Viet Nam. This letter is reprinted from the Las Vegas Review Journal, Oct. 16, 1969.)

When the peace demonstrators read my son's name, let them know how he felt about the Viet Nam war, and how the parents who shaped him feel about it.

It is we, the parents, who said goodbye to him when he went away to fight—not the peace agitators.

It is we, the parents, who wrote long, anxious letters to him during his three months almost continuous combat—not the agitators.

It is the ones who saw his body returned in a flag-draped coffin who first should be heard—not the protesters.

These transparent propagandists were not there to see my son buried, nor do they ac-

company me on my trips to lay flowers on his grave.

My son was killed while fighting for his country.

America cannot be permitted to perpetually persuade its citizens to instill in their sons a sense of patriotism, loyalty and a determination to defend the oppressed, and then, after the sons have died, suddenly change her mind and yield to those who killed them.

Most of the peace demonstrations and name-reading ceremonies across this nation are an obvious propaganda device designed to influence the President of the United States into surrendering South Viet Nam to an enemy which admittedly and openly seeks to conquer it by any and all means.

When they read my son's name to advocate peace at any price—the price being defeat—let them remember that he whose name they read did not surrender.

When these pretentious mourners read my son's name, let them realize that their grief would be better served if applied to the Viet Cong whose flag they wave even as they burn the one which graced my son's casket. Let them apply their bogus sorrow to those aggressors felled by my son as he won his posthumous Silver Star for heroism in ground combat.

And when they read the name of my son, let them know that he advocated an increase in the bombing of the ammunition depots in North Viet Nam—not a cessation so that his enemy would receive unlimited war supplies with which to kill them.

When they read the name of Gregory Malcolm Thompson, let them realize that they are proving before the world the truth of the oft-repeated Communist claim that many Americans have become soft, decadent and yielding to any determined force which opposes them.

And when these weak, gullible ones read his name in their avowed pursuit of peace, let them remember that a peace purchased at the price of surrender is but a brief Munich-type peace lasting only until the aggressor's appetite demands more victims.

Finally, when these hypocrites read the list of the dead who defended South Viet Nam, let them know that they have reached the ultimate low in the world-record of human infamy, in that they willfully and cunningly utter a dead man's name to achieve the defeat of the cause for which he died.

MALCOLM THOMPSON.

VIRGINIA BRIZENDINE RETIRES, FRIEND OF STAMP COLLECTORS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a friend of stamp collectors everywhere, Mrs. Virginia Brizendine, is leaving for a new home this week.

After 33 years in the postal service—the last 23 in the Division of Philately—Mrs. Brizendine will retire from Government service today. She has been in a key role since 1957 and Director of the Division since 1965, when it was completely reorganized.

Mrs. Brizendine actually put in her retirement papers last February, shortly after new administration took over. But, at the request of the Postmaster General, she agreed to remain temporarily on a consultant basis.

The postal service serves every citizen of our Nation, and the Division of Phil-

ately serves a greater share of our populace every day. There is no accurate way of estimating the figure because many do not belong to stamp clubs, but the total is reported approaching 10 million in the United States alone, with half again as many elsewhere in the world.

Two Postmasters General gave Mrs. Brizendine the highest awards which the Department could bestow upon an employee. These were well-deserved recognition of her endless devotion to duty in a role that required much tact and reasonableness in dealing with the public.

Mrs. Brizendine leaves the Department with a distinguished record of achievement, and those of us who have had an opportunity to be associated more closely with her in her work will miss her cheerful and helpful assistance as she went about supervising the Department's mushrooming philatelic activity.

Mr. Speaker, Belmont Faries, stamp editor of the Washington, D.C., Star, and a member of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Philately, has devoted his entire November 9 column to Mrs. Brizendine, as follows:

VIRGINIA BRIZENDINE RETIRES (By Belmont Faries)

Wednesday will be Mrs. Virginia Brizendine's last day as director of the Division of Philately, the position which is, for stamp collectors at least, the most important in the Post Office Department.

After 33 years in the postal service, all of them in jobs connected with stamps, she is leaving to make her home in Florida. Tomorrow night many of her friends will gather at Blackie's House of Beef, 22nd and M Streets, for a farewell dinner arranged by Robert C. Graebner, who can be reached by phone at 247-1434.

The former Virginia Gamble attended Guilford College and the Women's College of the University of North Carolina in her home town of Greensboro, N.C. In 1936 she began her postal career as a Grade 2 stenographer in the old Division of Stamps. On her first day on the job she had a little trouble spelling an unfamiliar word "philately." She has had a great many problems involving philately and philatelists since, but has managed to solve most of them to the satisfaction of both stamp collectors and her postal superiors.

In 1946 she became secretary to the late Robert E. Fellers, then superintendent of the Division of Stamps, who for the next 11 years, until his retirement in 1957, guided the department's philately activities from a variety of positions ranging up to deputy third assistant postmaster general. The work, which she has been doing ever since, was excellent on-the-job training for the position to which Postmaster General John A. Gronouski appointed her in 1965, director of the newly reorganized Division of Philately.

In it she has been responsible for subject matter and design of new stamps, serving as secretary of the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee and maintaining liaison with stamp artists and the Bureau of Facilities which is responsible for stamp procurement.

In addition she has supervised arrangements for first day ceremonies, processing of first day covers, preparation of philatelic news release and speeches, the Philatelic Exhibition Room, display panels, cooperation with stamp shows and correspondence with the public on philatelic matters.

One of the Government Printing Office's best sellers, year after year, is "Postage Stamps of the United States." It carries no by-line, but Mrs. Brizendine has prepared all of the information added since 1946, the great bulk of the book.

In 1966 Postmaster General Lawrence F.

O'Brien gave her the department's highest career service recognition, the Distinguished Service Award, for "dedicated and distinguished work that has significantly improved the quality of the philatelic programs of the United States."

Late in 1968 Postmaster General Marvin Watson proposed her for the award again, and finding it could be given an employee only once, substituted the department's second highest honor, the Meritorious Service Award.

Mrs. Brizendine actually put in her retirement papers last February, but was persuaded by Postmaster General Winton M. Blount and his special assistant, James Henderson, to stay on as a consultant until the new administration was firmly established.

Now, with her home in Arlington sold and a new apartment waiting for her in Fort Lauderdale, she is saying her good-byes to her co-workers in the department and her hundreds of friends throughout the country.

No successor has been named.

NEW CONCEPT IN HEALTH CARE

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL), testified on Tuesday, November 4, before the Committee on Ways and Means on a totally new concept in health care.

The gentleman, a physician and surgeon himself, is highly qualified to speak on the subject of quality health care.

His testimony before the committee has evoked so much interest and comment that I am inserting it in the RECORD for the enlightenment of those interested in learning more about this vital subject.

The testimony follows:

STATEMENT BY DURWARD G. HALL, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, NOVEMBER 4, 1969

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, the purchasing power and stability of the social security retirement system has been sorely tested, by inflation and by actual and pending threats of raids on its trust fund (from both the disability and medicare programs), which were erroneously costed to the Congress by eager salesmen.

Your committee has just heard that part "A" of medicare needs a fifty percent increase in funding—and part "B" needs about \$1.25 increase from both the aged, and the Federal Treasury.

My interest in preserving the integrity of the retirement "foundation stone" our social security program, and to assure solid actuarial arrangements for future health programs, compelled me to seek an opportunity to appear as a witness before this committee.

I would hope, that as Congress struggles with "medicaid" for our poor, that a realistic "test of need", be our goal, in deference to our overburdened wage-earner-taxpayers, who expect Congress not to tax them to support others, who are capable of providing health care for themselves.

Like all of you, I have been reading about the recent Governors Conferences and their demands for larger Federal participation in medicaid. Additionally, my attention has been attracted to the Reuther, Rockefeller, and American Medical Association proposals.

The Reuther proposal, to place the entire population under medicare, is by far the worst of all possible solutions! Blanketing all under one Federal program as it does, when the large majority of our population

are well able to, and desire to purchase their own health care programs it is unthinkable, in these times of inflation, tax needs and revision, and dollar declines.

We are today, providing Federal dollars to support more than fifty percent of the cost of medicaid, currently covering 10.2 million individuals. We spend about 4.5 billion Federal and State dollars (2.6 billion Federal), or approximately \$400 per individual.

The Rockefeller Plan would have the Federal Government assume the total cost of "medicaid," then make it compulsory for the rest of the population to cover themselves with private insurance plans—employers, if any, paying half the cost. Yesterday the American Medical Association suggested both a Federal assumption of "medicaid" and a tax-credit plan giving incentive credits to persons who purchase their own insurance, with the size of the credit being related to the extent of their income.

In light of this background of possible solutions, and based on my own background, experience in practice, and evaluation in Congress, I would propose a new two-part program—not within the social security system but doing away with medicaid and creating a whole new category.

One program that I feel Congress will accept at this time, would be directed at the "medicaid" type recipient. And another, that you might wish to consider more thoroughly at a later date (should Congress decide to institute some type of universal coverage).

PART I—MEDICAID

Currently, there are 10.2 million individuals covered by medicaid, all of whom sorely need medical care protection. The young in the A.D.C. program generally don't have high medical expenses. However, the aged are spending about 40 percent of medicare's total dollars and about 30 percent of the total is going into nursing home expense. Yet, the average cost per person served is, as I said earlier, \$400 annually.

This fiscal year, the Federal Government will have need to spend \$2.6 billion and next year the cost would rise to \$3 billion, but the States can't go on meeting their share. In fact, about a dozen States haven't even started. I do not propose that the Federal Government take over the whole financial load, but rather we offer each State this proposition: The Federal Government will supply the cost of a health insurance certificate to every eligible recipient. Said certificate will entitle them to a health plan of certain specified basic health protection (defined by Congress) and which would be purchased from existing private carriers including the "blues" and would amount to perhaps 85 percent of the average \$400 annual health care expense, provided, however, that the State will assume the balance of health expenses for each individual who exhausts his basic benefits. In other words, the States would assume this rare but financially devastating, catastrophic expense.

The merits of this suggestion (to mention just a few), are:

1. The States will be required to spend less than they are currently spending, and could plan, budget, and appropriate for it.

2. The Federal Government will expend approximately a billion dollars more annually, (3.6 vs. 2.6) but, the Federal Government's share would not be subjected to unexpected escalation, and could be budgeted with fair certainty.

3. When the States are called upon to spend their catastrophic dollars, they will be acting in their traditional and historic role in assuming such long term care as mental illness, and T.B.

Now the question becomes, who would be entitled to a free health insurance voucher? This is a critical decision that could be decided on the same basis as that used in the Hill-Burton program, where the Federal share is determined by the per capita wealth of a State, as compared to the national per

capita wealth. Perhaps the average eligibility figure will be in the neighborhood of say \$3,000 or \$3,200, where New York with a high cost of living pegged at say \$4,500 for a family of four, and in the case of some of the poorer States, where living is cheaper, the figure could be \$2,600.

PART II—THOSE WHO CAN AFFORD TO PURCHASE THEIR OWN HEALTH PLAN

For those Americans with income above the eligibility line set in part I of my suggestion, and in any universal health plan designed by Congress for the more affluent, I would oppose any Federal subsidy—with one single exception: protection against economic catastrophic type illness. I want to repeat that again—for those Americans with income above the eligibility line set in part I—I would oppose any Federal subsidy—with the lone exception being protection against catastrophic-type illness. This is the only area where the Federal Government should properly involve itself with those who are able to care for their own needs. And it should be noted that catastrophic coverage will need careful definition by the Congress.

Let me give you an example, not by disease category, but by expenditure. Whenever an individual or a family is forced by health reasons to exhaust their life savings, or to mortgage their home, then help is needed, even if it has to be from their Government!

Thus Congress might attempt to establish a pool from funds supplied for this specific purpose by the financially able public itself. It could be drawn upon after an individual or family expended a percentage of his or their annual income, and after having exhausted the benefits of their health insurance coverage, when such percentage let's say, exceeded 20 percent of the level of last year's adjusted income. Or you may wish to make it the level of his income the month or two just prior to his illness, figured on an annual basis.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the statement I have just read might well come as a shock to those, who thought of me as a foe to any federal participation in health care. Of course, that is not the case, as my support of the "elder-care" proposal in the 89th Congress will attest.

My suggestions have come about as a result of my professional background, as well as my realization and recognition of changing times, customs, and acceptances!

I have considered some type of catastrophic health coverage for a long time, yet I have, in my own mind, hesitated to involve the Federal Government further in the field of individual responsibility than absolutely necessary. However, it is obvious that the time is upon us when changes in the nation's health programs are on the horizon, if in fact not already here. It is therefore, my intention to try and make the best deal possible, not only for the government, but for the States, the family and the individual.

Mr. Chairman, I am speaking of quality health care for all our people, not just those in absolute need. I, for one, would like to assure you that members of the medical profession are also concerned about providing good health care for all Americans. I believe that there is a need for this kind of legislation, and I think the time has come for its enactment.

U.S. AGRICULTURAL EXPORT INDUSTRY IS BIG EMPLOYER

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, few persons realize how many jobs are dependent

upon agricultural exports. The Department of Agriculture, under the leadership of Secretary Hardin and Assistant Secretary Clarence Palmby, has worked diligently to promote increases in U.S. commodity export—not only to strengthen domestic prices and provide outlets for increased production, but also to insure that the substantial labor force dependent upon these exports is protected.

While we are often reminded of those jobs threatened by increased imports, we sometimes forget that many U.S. workers depend upon export markets and a healthy flow of goods overseas from our farms and processing factories.

Because of the importance of U.S. agricultural exports as a supplier of U.S. jobs, I submit for the RECORD the following article from the November 3, 1969, issue of Foreign Agriculture, published by the Foreign Agricultural Service of USDA:

U.S. AGRICULTURAL EXPORT INDUSTRY IS BIG EMPLOYER

(By Charles Bowman, Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor)

A recent study by the U.S. Department of Labor reveals that U.S. agricultural and food exports, on the basis of 1966 data, supported jobs for an estimated 729,000 U.S. workers. These jobs represent some 30 percent of the 2,464,000 jobs related to all merchandise exports.

About three-fifths of the 729,000 workers were on the farm while the other two-fifths were in many other industries which benefit directly and indirectly from U.S. agricultural exports. For example, a large number of farm jobs are supported directly by exports of U.S. wheat, about half of each year's crop normally moving to overseas markets. But there are also jobs involved in moving the wheat from farms to U.S. ports and in turning out the fertilizers and other materials required to produce it.

MOST JOBS ARE ON-FARM

The largest number of jobs related to agricultural exports—433,000—are on the farm in the production of commodities such as grains, oilseeds, cotton, tobacco, and livestock. In 1966 these jobs represented almost 11 percent of all agricultural employment in the United States as it is measured by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. While a large part of this production is exported directly, some of it is sold to the food industry where it undergoes further processing before being exported. In the food processing industry an additional 49,000 jobs are supported by the export of such farm-related products as fresh and prepared meats, feed-grains, and frozen foods. The remaining jobs—supported indirectly by farm and food exports—are concentrated in the trade, transportation, and chemical industries.

The relationship between the value of agricultural exports and the number of jobs supported depends mainly upon labor productivity, or output per person. As the volume of exports expands, export employment tends to increase. However, the increase in employment is limited by gains in productivity. For example, between 1960 and 1966 the value of agricultural exports, adjusted for price change, increased by 27 percent; at the same time the amount of employment directly or indirectly related to these exports declined by 6 percent.

The effect of productivity increases on export employment can be expressed in another way. In 1960 about 160,000 workers were required directly and indirectly for each billion dollars of agricultural exports. Six years later only 118,000 were needed. Such gains in labor productivity are of course

a major element in reducing costs which, in turn, lead to expansion in demand and employment. In the years ahead, increased use of chemicals and machinery on the farm and improved handling methods can be expected to continue the trend toward a more efficient use of labor in the production of agricultural products.

These estimates do not include agricultural employment related to manufacturing other than processed food, although for example, textiles and similar items are made from agricultural products. Also excluded is employment involved in providing capital equipment such as farm machinery and structures.

In addition, calculations are based on the recorded U.S. port value of exports. Employment related to agricultural exports will be understated to the extent that, due to subsidies, these values are lower than comparable domestic values.

U.S. employment attributable to farm exports

Industry:	Jobs supported by exports, 1966
Agricultural products	433,000
Forestry and fishery products.....	1,000
Agricultural, forestry, and fishery services	21,000
Manufacturing:	
Food and kindred products.....	49,000
Chemicals	11,000
Other manufacturing	38,000
Services:	
Trade and transportation.....	99,000
Other services	55,000
Other industries	22,000
Total.....	729,000

A CHERISHED LESSON IN HUMILITY

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on the November 7, 1969 edition of the Boston Herald-Traveler, there was printed the letters to the editor section a letter written by Mr. Edward M. Ginsburg of Boston, Mass. with respect to our beloved Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this says it all. There could be no better illustration of humility from a man of greatness than is recounted in this letter. This act of wisdom stemming from an act of charity is the mark of the man and shows how the Speaker "does his thing."

Mr. Speaker, I insert the letter written by Mr. Ginsburg in the RECORD at this point:

A CHERISHED LESSON IN HUMILITY

TO THE HERALD TRAVELER EDITOR:

As a recent graduate from Harvard Law School, I was taken by my father to meet John McCormack 11 years ago. They had been friends since the 1930's, when my late uncle, Bernard, as a Republican, had run for Congress against the speaker and had received over 30,000 votes, a number unheard of for a Republican in that Democratic district.

While waiting to see the speaker, I noticed the front page of the New York Times on the table in the waiting room, showing a picture in which John McCormack was standing with President Eisenhower and the other leaders of Congress. As I looked up from the paper, a constituent, obviously down and

out, came out of the speaker's office and left. The speaker noticed my eyes go from the picture in the New York Times to the man leaving the room. He asked me what I was thinking. Although my thoughts about the man before me, being with the President one day and the next day with a poor bedraggled soul, obviously showed on my face, I said nothing. The speaker then asked me if I had ever been to the top of the Empire State Building. When I said yes, he took a ball point pen from his pocket and pointed to the top of it and said:

"From the top of the Empire State Building we all look like a dot. It is all a matter of perspective. Never forget that, young man."

The encounter was a lesson in humility I shall always cherish.

To implicitly criticize John McCormack because he puts a high premium on loyalty and friendship is unfair. We all put a high premium on those two values. Furthermore, a man who has remained a leader in Congress for as long as John McCormack, a leader among his peers of able and ambitious politicians, must be doing something right. He and his loyal aides should not be tarnished after 40 years of service to this Commonwealth and to the nation.

EDWARD M. GINSBURG.

BOSTON.

VETERANS' EDUCATION

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in order to compete in today's job market, a veteran needs an education, a skill, a trade. The first questions an employer asks of a job seeking veteran is, "What is your level of education? Have you any experience?" If the ex-serviceman cannot respond favorably to these questions, he is not going to get the job he seeks. The result is unemployment. The result may be crime. The result is increased welfare rolls.

We are obligated to encourage our returning servicemen to resume their schooling, if that schooling was interrupted. We are obligated to encourage the returning veteran to seek the best education and training he can attain.

Between 1950 and 1967, U.S. census data and estimates show that the median years of education completed by a person 25 years or older had risen from 9.3 to 12 years. Further, census figures show that for 1966, among persons considered to be in the labor force, the unemployment rate among high school dropouts was 18 percent and was 14.2 percent among those with no more than a high school degree.

In no area has our obligation been more evident than in the field of veterans' education. Many of our sons have gone in the armed services and served our Nation well. Some have remained in the service; most have returned to civilian life. What are they going to do in civilian life if they have no trade? Twenty-three percent of our enlisted separatists from military service in fiscal 1969 were high school dropouts. At present, only 6.1 percent of the eligible high school dropouts have taken advantage of

the post-Korean conflict educational program.

We can rectify this apparent failure by concurring in the Senate amendment to H.R. 11959, which increases GI bill allowance rate by approximately 46 percent in all programs.

Another provision of the Senate amendment provides for a newly oriented and greatly expanded veterans' service program designed to search out recently discharged veterans, especially the educationally disadvantaged, to advise them of the benefits to which they are entitled and assist them in obtaining these benefits.

Currently the Veterans' Administration operates 71 U.S. veterans assistance centers. In 1969, of the 232,125 initial interviews at the centers, only 37,176—16 percent—were educationally disadvantaged. Of the 216,200 sequestrates who were high school dropouts, only 17 percent were contacted. This situation can be corrected by expanding the veterans' outreach program.

The need for this legislation is clear. The time to act is now. Investments in veterans education and training will bring into the Treasury much more than the cost of the program. Increased earnings and increased skills will result in a stronger, more viable nation.

GENERATION GAP

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, I think I have a partial answer as to why our Nation is experiencing a so-called generation gap. An article from my hometown newspaper, the Norton Daily Telegram, tells about an "experiment in democracy" by seventh and eighth graders in the Norton public schools.

The students, as part of a school assignment, designed a question-answer experiment to check adult reaction to our basic freedoms. In going door-to-door, one would have expected the youngsters to find among their elders a reservoir of good will plus a firm personal commitment to our country's principles. The results, however, were rather disturbing. Many adults did not recognize the first amendment to the Constitution and many did not agree with the basic freedoms it sets forth.

Young people today constantly hear the admonition they must do their homework and experience the hard knocks of life before their voices can be heard—and listened to. We tell them our problems can be solved only in an atmosphere of calm and reason. It is also clear that adults, as well as students, must do their homework before they can become truly effective citizens. It is most disappointing to find some citizens do not understand or want to understand the precepts upon which their very own freedom is based. It is just as disappointing to find citizens who full well understand

their responsibility in making our democracy work but who will not take the time to help pass on this responsibility to our youth.

Freedom is easily abused and I am sure many citizens are tired of seeing opportunists and self-acclaimed revolutionaries hide behind basic freedoms while violating the rights of others. Controversy and emotionalism seem to have blocked rational discussion of our problems. This is no reason however, to refuse to take the time to communicate with our young people. As President Nixon has said, it is necessary to stop all of the shouting before we can hear each other—that is good advice, especially for those of us who are adults.

I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the following article from the Norton Daily Telegram:

PETITION SHOWS FIRST AMENDMENT NOT FAMILIAR TO MANY IN NORTON

Pupils in the Seventh and Eighth Grade Reading Improvement Class in the Norton Schools recently circulated a petition throughout Norton seeking signers for a document they had prepared. The document actually was the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States and they reported that they were going to present the petition to Congress and ask that it be passed.

The circulation of the petition followed discussions in the class which is taught by Ray Fitzpatrick. Mr. Fitzpatrick reported that the class had been reading articles concerned with America and its problems. The articles, he said, could well be divided into two categories, "What Is Wrong With America," and "What Is Right With America."

Mr. Fitzpatrick's account of the class discussions, the circulation of the petitions and the report of the class following the project, follows:

I discovered that many of my students were well informed, and quite concerned about current, domestic problems in the United States, and that they are familiar with their rights as individuals and citizens. I became quite aware that these students cannot be classified like many of their counterparts seen on television or read about in the newspapers. My students are quite aware that "freedom isn't free," and that "there is a cost in being free."

Some of my students made comments such as, "Freedom is having the ability to choose right from wrong, good from bad, etc." "Here in the United States, freedom means freedom of religion, of the press, of speech, and of movements." "Freedom is a wonderful thing, but sometimes it can be terrible. It could destroy a nation if anyone could do anything they wanted to do."

After hearing these comments, I wondered how many adults are aware that there are many young people today who try not to abuse, nor take for granted, the freedom they have. We decided it would be interesting to find out how many adults knew what freedom they have and how they agree with them.

I had the class conduct an experiment to find out this information. The class, under the name of Students To Petition (STP), circulated the following information in the petition:

When in the course of human events, it becomes apparent that the fundamental democratic concepts of life, liberty, and freedom are threatened, we feel it necessary as young American citizens to petition our elders to pass a law that will enable all rights of men to be recognized.

Therefore, we of the Students To Petition (STP), with the help of various adults, deem it necessary to submit the following docu-

ment to be considered and acted upon by the Congress of The United States.

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion; or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech; or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble; and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

The First Amendment to the Constitution is contained within this petition. The students were to explain that they intended to submit this to Congress as a petition.

The First Amendment, of course, guarantees to all U.S. citizens freedom of religion, speech, press, peaceable assembly, and the right "to petition the government for redress of grievances."

RESULTS INTERESTING

The results were very interesting. Of the 300 people polled, 250 did not recognize the First Amendment. Of these 250, 200 agreed with the statement, 30 disagreed, and 20 would not commit themselves. Of the 50 who recognized the statement, 20 disagreed with all of it, or parts of it; 20 agreed to it, and 10 would not commit themselves.

What was most astonishing to the students was the treatment they received from many adults. The students were instructed to be courteous and polite no matter how they were treated. They also were to conduct themselves in a serious manner.

Some of the comments of the adults to the student pollsters were:

ADULTS COMMENT

"You young kids don't know what's good for you. You're spoiled."

"I don't read any more; the paper is full of nothing but war and riots. I don't care to sign."

"I agree, but I'm afraid of getting into trouble because of working for the city."

"I don't believe in freedom of religion."

"Show me your right to petition. Has this been cleared by the Board of Education for you to do this?"

"What's this mean? What if the Communists move in, Congress won't be here to help us."

"I'm not interested!!!" (slamming the door.)

"Go to hell!!!" (slamming the door.)

"I don't think you are smart enough to know what this means."

"Throw it in the trash can."

"If this means to kick Madelyn Murray out of the country, I'm for it. I'll sign."

"I don't know what it means, but I'll sign it."

"I don't like the way it is worded." (It is worded exactly as the Constitution reads.)

"Sounds as if you are trying to do away with the First Amendment." (This article was the First Amendment.)

"I'm not going to sign anything I have to pay money for." (No contribution was asked.)

"I have a cold and can't stand up without getting dizzy, so I can't sign."

"I don't believe in religion in the schools."

"You dirty old bums."

"I don't agree with peaceable assembly."

"Heaven's no. You must think I'm a dumb dumb."

Besides receiving some rather abusive remarks and having doors slammed in their faces, two of my students had the sheriff call on them. After asking a few questions, the sheriff let them continue.

This was a very enlightening experience for all of the students participating. I asked each of them to write their comments about the experience and some of them were:

STUDENTS COMMENT

"Many people did not sign it because they did not want to get involved in anything. That seems to be the cry nowadays."

"I think the people of The United States should be interested in their country enough

to know what they are signing and should know the Constitution. If they don't, should they call this their country?"

"I think people should be a little more courteous and should watch their language; after all, they are supposed to set an example for us."

"It was funny to find out how ignorant the adults are of their rights."

"Most of the people should get hearing aids and glasses."

"I feel every American should know their own Constitution. Most riots are started by people who want more freedom and don't even know the freedoms they do have."

"The adults say, 'These kids! They go around rioting and killing and trying to change things.' And the adults don't even know about our own government."

I can see why many of these experiences did happen to the students. People see violence and rioting and protesting on TV, and read about it in the newspapers every day. They are growing very tired of all the commotion going on. I feel that we are all concerned with the welfare of our country, but I also think the students' feelings are justified. How can the adults be an example and guide for our youth of today when they are so in the dark themselves?

Many adults were very cautious about signing anything and this is the reason for many acting as they did. There were quite a few who signed the petition without any interest in what it said.

TAFT ASKS AGAIN FOR WAIVER OF BIG TEN RULE TO SEND OHIO STATE TO ROSE BOWL

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, last week I suggested that since this year marks the 100th anniversary of collegiate football, it might be an appropriate time for the Big Ten to waive its prohibition against a team's consecutive participation in the Rose Bowl, to permit Ohio State's Buckeyes to play in the January 1 game, should they repeat as Big Ten champions.

While chances do not appear bright for such an occurrence, I still believe it would be a tremendous way to properly celebrate this historic year in college football.

The following article, from the New York Times of November 10, gives a run-down on sentiment across the country:

OHIO STATE FUELS ROSE BOWL FUROR BY ROMPING MINUS STARTING QUARTERBACK
BIG TEN RULE BARS RETURN TO COAST—BUCKEYES CALLED "GREATEST" AFTER WEEKEND OF ROUTS BY 8 OF TOP 10 TEAMS

(By Neil Amdur)

Early in college football's centennial season, Fred Taylor, coach at Texas Christian, praised Ohio State as "the greatest college team ever."

Last Saturday, John Coatta of Wisconsin wondered whether the Buckeye players put their shoes and socks on one at a time like everyone else, or if they changed clothes in telephone booths.

"I forgot to go over and check to see if they had a big S [for Superman] on their chests," Coatta said, after Ohio State amassed 62 points and 595 yards total offense with the No. 1 quarterback, Rex Kern,

resting an ailing shoulder. "This is one of the greatest college teams I have ever seen and I don't think I will ever see one better."

Maybe not, but fans of Texas, Tennessee, Arkansas and Penn State still are waving popular hand-made banners and proclaiming their unbeaten sectional favorites, as what else? No. 1.

Ohio State's ineligibility to repeat as a Rose Bowl representative, under Big Ten Conference rules, has caused its share of commotion this year and has been logged in The Congressional Quarterly as an injustice. Last weekend's results solved nothing in the greatest cross-country debate since the Notre Dame-Michigan State dispute over a tie game three years ago.

Eight of the top 10 teams (Penn State and U.C.L.A. were idle) won by margins of at least three touchdowns. Not even a virus epidemic that struck 27 players could slow Texas from its 16th straight victory, 56-14, over Baylor.

The absence of a postseason playoff in football is taxing more than the patience of alumni, fans and television sponsors. It has bowl officials, the strongest opponents to such a proposal, in a dither trying to second guess the feelings of their prospects, a week before formal invitations can be issued.

Will Penn State desire Miami sun or the challenge of meeting the Texas-Arkansas survivor in the Cotton Bowl? What postseason deal will be worked out for the loser of the Southwest Conference title game on Dec. 6? And where do such once-beaten powers as Missouri and Louisiana State fit into the major bowl picture after convincing victories over Oklahoma (44-10) and Alabama (20-15), respectively, last weekend?

The air should clear in several directions this Saturday when Ohio State and Tennessee face their toughest tests against Purdue and Mississippi. Woody Hayes, coach of the top-ranking Buckeyes, already has announced that all workouts will be closed to the public and press—even to the local press in Columbus.

The lack of competition last weekend was so pronounced that John McKay, coach of unbeaten but tied Southern California, suggested that his club was "flat, down or whatever" in whipping Washington State, 28-7. "I can't account for it," McKay said.

Johnny Pont, the Indiana coach, blamed "the emotional drain" in the black athlete crisis at the school for Indiana's 28-17 loss to Iowa, a defeat that may have squelched the Hoosiers' hopes of a Rose Bowl berth.

But emotions were high for at least two teams last weekend, Wesleyan and Allegheny. Allegheny knocked off unbeaten Thiel College with a 21-14 victory. Wesleyan won its seventh straight game, 18-17, over Williams with a touchdown in the last 67 seconds for its first Little Three title since 1966.

RURAL AFFAIRS COUNCIL

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the President's decision to establish a new Cabinet-level Rural Affairs Council to deal with the present and future problems of rural America.

It is appropriate that the problems of the countryside receive the same high-level attention as has been focused on the problems of the cities through the Urban Affairs Council.

A great many urban problems originate as rural problems. Rising production ex-

penses, higher taxes and farm prices equal to or lower than he was receiving 20 years ago are forcing out of business nearly 600,000 farmers—and particularly farm youths—every year.

Turning to the overcrowded cities for new opportunities, they often find themselves lacking the skills necessary to gain good jobs and support their families adequately. As a result, they become part of what we refer to as the "urban crush."

When he was at Purdue University, the distinguished agricultural economist Don Paarlberg, now an assistant to Secretary Hardin, estimated the export of brains and brawn from the countryside to the cities runs about \$12 billion a year. That is twice the total agricultural budget and several times the actual subsidy to farmers.

Rural America cannot afford that type of a subsidy to the urban areas and the economy in general.

Nearly 14 million new jobs have been created in the last 15 years—nearly all of them in the cities. Close to 70 percent of America's population lives on 1 percent of the land. Obviously, we need some economic incentives to reverse the migration, to get people out of the overcrowded, smogbound cities and into the open air of the countryside where half the population would like to live and work if opportunity existed.

So I am heartened to see President Nixon taking initiatives to redress the imbalance.

A good beginning agenda for the Rural Affairs Council can be found in the full-page advertisement the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association has been running in the Saturday Review and other national magazines.

That advertisement makes these points:

Over half the Nation's substandard homes—more than 4 million—are in rural America. Many who live in these homes are old. Many are poor.

Nearly 30,000 rural communities are without adequate water systems—about 45,000 without sewer systems. Thousands lack medical centers, libraries, good schools, recreation programs.

Few of the nearly 14 million new jobs created in the last 15 years were in rural America. And rural unemployment figures in many areas run nearly 18 percent, compared to a national average of about 4 percent.

The effects of high interest rates are most sharply felt in the countryside where there is a chronic shortage of capital for housing and community and industrial growth.

If the Rural Affairs Council can pinpoint means of providing decent housing, adequate water and sewage systems and other community facilities, industrial development, job training, and low-cost credit, its contribution to revitalizing rural America will have been immense.

On top of this, of course, we in the Congress must provide sound farm programs so the farmer may be rewarded more adequately for his investment, time, and labor. I know that goal is uppermost in the minds of Secretary Hardin and the House Agriculture Com-

mittee members in their current deliberations.

Creation of this council does not relieve Congress of its responsibilities in this area. But it will provide an ongoing, high-level appraisal of how to help rural America in cooperation with the Congress and with private effort.

A TRIBUTE TO ALL VETERANS

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with approximately 100 of my colleagues in cosponsoring House Resolution 663 in recognition of the efforts and sacrifices of the American servicemen in Vietnam which unfortunately are often overshadowed by the emotional debate on our future course in Vietnam.

The resolution was filed just prior to Veterans Day and for my part I intended it as a tribute to all veterans. With this in mind I call attention to a realistic and impressive statement made on Veterans Day by Comdr. John Olear of the American Legion, Corporal Coyle Post No. 1 in Waterbury, Conn.

Commander Olear is a friend and constituent of mine. He is school inspector for the city of Waterbury, president of St. Mary's Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church, chairman of the Waterbury Veterans Day Committee, and chairman for the Waterbury Committee of United Nations. Mr. Olear's Veterans Day statement follows:

A TRIBUTE TO ALL VETERANS

(By Comdr. John Olear)

It is appropriate on this Veterans Day of 1969, since we are observing it during a period of national unrest and uncertainty, to look realistically at some facts that have been forgotten.

First and foremost, let it be remembered that no one wants peace more passionately than those who have fought for it.

There is no greater dedication to the cause of a world at peace than that of a man or woman who has lived through the hell of war. Can anyone know the importance of peace more than the man who served with the A.E.F. at Selcheprey, or the soldier or marine who fought in the sugar cane fields of Okinawa, or the sailor on convoy duty through the submarine-infested North Atlantic, or the airman in lonely battle in the sky, or the nurse or WAC under enemy bombardment?

These people cherish peace because they know what war is.

But they cherish honor also.

And they cherish simple love of country.

The veterans want peace; of course they do; but they want peace with honor.

When American troops have marched off to war they have marched in freedom's cause. They have sought no new territory, no new peoples to enslave. They have fought for freedom and for the right of each people to choose its own government in its own way.

These men who fought—the veterans whom we honor today—were and are the real champions of peace. Only those who have lived intimately with the horrors of war can truly know how vitally urgent it is that we build a world in which all men and all nations can live together as neighbors in peace and harmony.

These men know also that surrender to

aggression does not mean real peace. They know that a temporary cessation of hostilities resulting from a yielding to the aggressor will be used by the aggressor only to build up his strength for new and greater assaults on free nations and free men.

It would be a mockery if we let the social unrest of today serve to downgrade in the slightest the valor and the sacrifices of those who have fought in freedom's cause from Valley Forge to Vietnam.

Today should instead be an occasion for paying even greater tribute to them—those veterans who fought under the flag of the country they loved. Veterans Day should be a time for remembering—and today, in remembering, let us seek a deeper appreciation of our veterans.

On this day of remembering, let us make the record show that we in Waterbury have deepened our admiration for those who have served their country in uniform—that we are etching deeper into the metal of history our gratitude to those who went to war in freedom's cause. Let us remember those who fell in battle, giving their all on the altar of freedom, and let us hail with affectionate pride those who returned safely from the field of battle.

Let us remember, on this day for remembering, that it is only because of the courage and the sacrifices of those who fought for America and freedom that Americans are able to meet today in an assembly such as this. But for what the Veterans did, this city and this land would today be under the jackboot of a foreign dictator.

Our veterans fought for the freedom of all Americans—even those who today consider it fashionable to dishonor their contributions and belittle their memories.

Let it never be forgotten that the men and women we honor on this veterans day fought and bled to bring peace to the world.

The cause for which they fought lives on because of them.

Peace and freedom—freedom and peace—these are the real lessons and the real legacy left to us by the veterans, living and dead, in whose honor we gather today.

ILLINOISANS SPEAK OUT

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I have completed tabulating the results of a questionnaire I recently sent to 90,000 residents of the Second Congressional District of Illinois which I represent. I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the responses received from over 10,000 residents of my district. I believe that my colleagues and others will find them of interest.

The Second Congressional District of Illinois is diverse and heterogeneous: its residents come from all walks of life, from all occupations and professions and from all economic brackets. The district includes urban areas, suburbs, steel mills, universities, urban renewal areas and slums. Although predominately urban in character, it contains a substantial number of farms as well. Thus, I believe that the results of this poll have more than local significance; they show what a representative cross section of America thinks about pressing national problems.

On the subject of Vietnam, responses showed that in August and September of this year, over 65 percent of those who responded favored a reduction of U.S.

military efforts in South Vietnam, with over half of these favoring immediate withdrawal of our troops. On related issues of military spending, 70 percent favored reducing U.S. military forces and over 65 percent favored cutting the defense budget. Seventy-five percent favored some change in the present system of drafting men for military service.

More than half of those responding favored increased Federal efforts in areas like aid to education, aid to cities, anti-poverty programs, and health.

Responses to the question on electoral college reform—over 76 percent favoring abolition of the electoral college in favor of direct popular election—confirmed the results of a poll of Illinois State legislators which Congressman RAILSBACK and I had conducted earlier this year.

Perhaps most significant, over 90 percent of those responding considered air pollution a most critical problem. I believe this justifies increased efforts at the national level to remedy what an overwhelming majority of Americans consider a serious threat to their health and welfare.

The complete results of the poll are summarized below:

[Answers in percent]

1. Vietnam: I favor—	
Reducing the level of fighting while peace negotiations are in progress.....	32
Continuing military operations at the present level regardless of developments in the Paris peace talks.....	9
Immediately withdrawing all our troops from Vietnam.....	37
Discontinuing negotiations and stepping up military operations to attain a military victory.....	14
Did not reply.....	8
2. Draft law: I favor—	
The present system which permits student deferments.....	18
A lottery system with no student deferments.....	34
An all-volunteer army.....	41
Did not reply.....	7
3. Surtax. I favor the surtax as a weapon against inflation—	
Yes.....	23
No.....	60
Undecided.....	13
Did not reply.....	4
4. Surtax and tax reform: I believe these should be linked together—	
Yes.....	46
No.....	36
Undecided.....	13
Did not reply.....	5
5. Military forces: I favor the reduction of U.S. military forces by 10 percent by the end of fiscal year 1970—	
Yes.....	70
No.....	15
Undecided.....	10
Did not reply.....	5
6. Future Government spending: I think the Federal budget for the following programs should be as follows:	

	Decreased	Same	Increased	Did not reply
Defense budget...	66	23	7	4
Aid to education...	8	19	70	3
Poverty program...	25	17	53	5
Welfare...	33	20	40	7
Aid to cities...	13	24	58	5
Space program...	47	38	10	5
Foreign aid...	65	21	7	5
Health...	5	21	69	7

7. ABM: I support—
 A limited ABM system..... 24
 Only research on an ABM system..... 24
 No ABM system..... 32
 An expanded ABM system..... 14
 Did not reply..... 6

8. Voting age: I favor lowering the voting age to 18—

Yes..... 57
 No..... 36
 Undecided..... 6
 Did not reply..... 1

9. Air pollution: I consider air pollution to be a critical problem—

Yes..... 92
 No..... 5
 Undecided..... 2
 Did not reply..... 1

10. Post Office: I favor the proposal to convert the Post Office Department into a Government-owned corporation operating on a self-sustaining basis—

Yes..... 64
 No..... 18
 Undecided..... 16
 Did not reply..... 2

11. College campuses: I believe the Federal Government should become involved in enforcing order on college campuses—

Yes..... 32
 No..... 60
 Undecided..... 6
 Did not reply..... 2

12. Federal welfare programs: I favor—

Standardizing welfare payments in all States..... 50
 Replacing existing programs by a guaranteed annual income or negative income tax..... 39
 Retaining present programs as they are..... 4
 Did not reply..... 7

13. Electoral College: I favor—

Retaining the Electoral College as it is..... 10
 Abolishing the Electoral College and electing the President and Vice President by direct popular vote..... 77
 Abolishing the Electoral College but having the vote in each State on the basis of Congressional Districts..... 9
 Did not reply..... 4

14. Hunger: It is my opinion that—

Hunger is a very serious problem in Illinois..... 33
 Hunger is a somewhat serious problem in Illinois..... 34
 Hunger is not a serious problem in Illinois..... 29
 Did not reply..... 4

ADDRESS BY DR. WILLIAM McELROY

HON. CHARLES A. MOSHER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, on October 14, Dr. William D. McElroy delivered his first public address since becoming the Director of the National Science Foundation. It is most appropriate that the audience on this occasion were his colleagues of the National Academy of Sciences, in session on the campus of Dartmouth College for their annual fall meeting.

In his address, Dr. McElroy highlighted three hard problems he believes cannot be ignored by the science com-

munity—leadership, communication, and social responsibility.

Recognizing that basic research in the various disciplines continues to be essential to the progress in science, the NSF Director expresses a leadership concept for the science enterprise which is concerned about "the whole of our society, its environment, and the growth of the individuals who make it up." Accordingly he cites the need for interdisciplinary research and stresses that high priority also be given environmental and ecological studies.

While acknowledging the Foundation's capability to accept leadership for these programs, he suggests two necessary steps to insure "the proper base on which academic science can carry out its changing role," an increase in Federal funding of academic science, and raising the NSF proportion of Federal support for academic science so that it can achieve its objectives to advance science and science education.

Dr. McElroy urges that the story of science be told to the public at large, and cautions that the "scientific community isolates itself only at its own peril."

Mr. Speaker, Dr. McElroy's speech to the National Academy of Sciences is not only provocative but holds import for all of us in the Congress. It is indeed a reflection of the constructive and forward looking style of leadership we can expect from him, and I urge careful reading of the full text of his remarks which follows:

REMARKS OF DR. WILLIAM D. McELROY,
 AUTUMN MEETING, HANOVER, N.H.,
 OCTOBER 14, 1969

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

I can think of no audience whose attention honors me more. My pleasure at being here this evening is heightened still more by the fact that this is my first talk, in my present position as Director of the National Science Foundation, to a group of people outside the Government. As such, picking a topic poses a particularly hard choice for me.

I could tell you about my new job and what it consists of. But that has been done better by the late Robert Frost at the time he was appointed Consultant in Poetry at the Library of Congress. He described his job as making "the politicians and statesmen more aware of their responsibility to the arts." Substitute the word "science" for "art" and you have a fair fix on my job too.

I could talk about money, but judging from recent events, if money is the answer to our problems, we must be asking the wrong questions. Since tonight is a beginning for me, it seems fit to start by asking what are, or might be, the right questions.

There are two basic ways of looking at our situation and each generates entirely different sets of questions. The first views the science enterprise as an institutionalized system seeking to maintain equilibrium and a balanced growth. Ecologically speaking, this is good. In this world of rapid, often threatening change, continued viability may well be based on how well stability is preserved. However, I remind you of a fact that living systems cannot remain alive if a true equilibrium is reached. Energy must be continuously fed into the system.

When stability is in danger, or is upset, the questions posed tend to orbit around the idea of restoration. Typically, the query is "how can we bring the system back to normal?" or "what is needed to smooth out

the turbulence?" If the disturbance is outside the system, we ride off to bring it under control. Perhaps the most extreme version of that response is to be found in the cartoon, which some of you may have seen, in which the Evans Subcommittee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives is depicted as a large dragon, and a small lone figure, Knight McElroy, is galloping forward to do battle. Naturally, I was pleased to be shown as a brave and resolute fighter in the battle for science. But this feeling was tempered, however, by the thought that maybe the cartoonist was doing more harm than good by suggesting the wrong answer to what may also well be the wrong question.

The second way of assessing our situation emphasizes change, not equilibrium, and process rather than structure. When we look at the changes that are underway and what we are in the process of becoming, quite a different set of questions arises. Aside from trying to understand what is going on among all the variables involved, a new factor of direction comes into play. We are confronted with the classical question of where we are heading and why? This is, in my view, the primary question. Let me elaborate.

In the past we had little control of our destiny. Now, for the first time in man's history, we are at the point where we can do virtually anything we wish if we are willing to pay the price. But with this power to choose comes a bewildering variety of hard questions. These questions seem all the harder because of the widening gap between knowledge and wisdom, and the questioning of authority and precedent.

Although the questions met in the process of change are more difficult than the questions that arise from restoring or maintaining system equilibrium, I am convinced that the continuity of the past is best preserved by confronting the questions of what we are becoming.

I believe there are three hard problems we must solve—leadership, communication and social responsibility.

The problem of leadership

Science leadership today must be grounded in an effective concern for the whole of our society, its environment, and the growth of the individuals who make it up. This leadership must be broad in view and long in perspective, while at the same time involved in current problems to which science can make unique contributions.

The problems that obstruct and endanger our hopes for a decent society are too well known to need listing here. That the solution of social problems will be tied to a significant degree to science and technology is also widely accepted. To be sure that science can preserve its integrity in such a coupling needs careful leadership; that science must increasingly come to accept such a coupling is also a responsibility of leadership. If such a coupling makes for hard choices in our hierarchy of priorities, then this is also a burden to be shouldered by leadership. But however heavy this burden may be, we cannot justify a primitive level of scientific knowledge in areas of vital social concern.

It is clear that the nation must undertake interdisciplinary approaches to many, if not most, of our current problems. But let me hasten to add that good, in depth, basic research in the various disciplines is and will continue to be the essential element of progress in the sciences.

In addition to various types of interdisciplinary studies, I believe that environmental and ecological studies are clearly of high priority.

None of us view such studies as a panacea for social ills, and however gifted ecologists may be, their abilities as generalists rest on the skills of many specialties. For this reason,

while we vigorously pursue every pathway of advancement, let us be careful not to oversell the merits of ecological analysis. Rather, let us deliver more than we promise.

To carry out these and other types of activities we need to stimulate young people to develop the highest scientific and technical skills they can. This does not mean, however, that everybody need be a Ph. D. It may take many Ph. D. physicists or engineers to develop a nuclear reactor, but after it is built a team of reactor operators must run the plant on a routine basis. Each individual in such a situation is trained up to the level at which he is engaged. Of course, Ph. D.'s must also be available in order to teach and to ask the right research questions and even find some answers. But we also need engineers and technicians able to apply scientific and technical knowledge in a great many social circumstances not requiring the fullest extent of advanced training.

Clearly the new or augmented undertakings represented by my reference to interdisciplinary research, environmental sciences, and educational reforms, require a period of dynamic growth so that worthy programs of a more traditional type are not harmed. It is also clear that a substantial share of the additional funding needed must come from the Federal Government. The NSF has the experience and the capability to accept leadership for these programs—provided adequate funds are available.

Almost all agencies support some basic research. However, our experience over the last few years tells us that despite the benefits, the pluralistic pattern of Federal support as it is now operating has some severe disadvantages. Mission agencies now providing major support to academic science have had fluctuating appropriation patterns reflecting changing priorities as well as the completion of specific programs. Priorities, of course, change and jobs get done. But, as a result, academic science has been hit harder than necessary. I believe that the time has come for NSF to take the leadership by ensuring the proper base on which academic science can carry out its changing role. To do this, two specific steps must be taken. The first is an increase in Federal funding of academic science. The second step is to allocate this increase so that the NSF proportion of Federal support for academic science can be raised to the point where the needed leverage or influence on the system can be exerted. A doubling of the NSF's fiscal year 1969 level of about 15% of the Federal support for academic R & D would be the right order of magnitude.

The problem of communication

If progress were solely a matter of leadership I could end my remarks now—but it isn't. I am troubled by the fact that we scientists don't seem to have been able to tell the story of science adequately to enough people—certainly not to those who must make political judgments.

It is unfortunate, perhaps unavoidable, that the scientist's servitude to his discipline creates ways of thinking and modes of expression which may be alien to some in our society. The scientist lives not only with his public utterances and publications but also with his interior notion of what he thinks he has done and what he will do. The world sees only a fragment of this. Is it any wonder that the signals of the scientists are scarcely legible through all the surrounding noise?

And yet, can we afford to shrug our shoulders, and go on speaking only to our scientific peers? The answer is obvious of course, but it needs restatement—the scientific community isolates itself only at its own peril.

We, who are in a sense the trustees of science, have an obligation to translate science at a variety of levels and from many

perspectives. This does not just mean an informal talk on the wonders of science before the local PTA or an impassioned letter of protest, either singly or in groups, to your Congressmen when the budget is cut. It does not always mean pleading for more science money. It certainly means explaining what good science is and what it can do—to our elected representatives and others.

We need a commitment to this problem of communication which is continuous and significant. There are numerous possibilities, but time will only let me speak of a few. Alvin Weinberg suggests, and I agree, that we need scientific critics or pundits to "examine the scientific-political scene with the same comprehensive understanding as Mr. Walter Lippmann or Mr. James Reston show in discussing national and world politics." Joshua Lederberg has shown us the feasibility of this idea through his columns.

Another good idea was made by Robert Morison who suggested that we devise some analogy for presenting science to adults that would do for the general public what agricultural extension has done for the farmer. Possibly an organization comparable to the League of Women Voters. Such an organization would present information on issues involving science which is non-partisan, factual and reliable—with the reader to draw his own conclusions.

The communication possibilities are endless, ranging from scientific exhibits of the moon rocks to celebrations of the 500th birthday of Copernicus. With a total eclipse of the sun due to pass over some of the most populated areas of the United States next spring, have we made our plans for the public as carefully as those we have made for science?

But whatever we do, the scientific community should apply to this problem the conceptual tools it uses in its scientific studies. Do we test our assumptions or engage in wishful thinking? Do we consider the relevant facts that are operative in the political and social systems in which the science enterprise is embedded? Do we confuse expertise for opinion and substitute slogans for solutions? The answers to these questions may seem obvious, but if answered objectively we might find some explanation for our current condition.

Problems of social responsibility

Earlier in these remarks I mentioned the need for an effective concern for the whole of our society, its environment, and individual growth—in short, social responsibility. Without such concern science leadership and communication efforts can never develop the kind of broad support required for science's long-term health.

Many commentators have written that our society is sick; that it has gone off the track. I don't accept the truth of this view, but I am bothered by the fact that science is so often identified as a cause for the abnormalities in our society. For every friend who rises to salute science for what it has done for better health and the general welfare, others rise to denounce the flaws of society which they attribute to science or technology—without making any distinction between the two. Although we protest, on the one hand, that the destructive side effects of technology should not be charged to the account of science, on the other hand we often try to justify science by the material benefits which flow from it.

Obviously, we cannot, nor should we, have it both ways. If we had any doubts about this question, a recently completed report by the Illinois Institute of Technology should put them to rest. This report demonstrated that there is a continuum between science and technology by tracing the key research discoveries and developmental events which led to 5 specific technological innovations with major economic and sociologic impacts.

This continuum did not always exist, nor

do the benefits which flow from it always move from science to technology. Much of the great advance we have made in recent years is based on the useful symbiotic relationship between science and technology. The side effects of technology, of course, often lead to undesirable social effects. Thus, the responsibility we scientists ought to feel for technological effects is grounded not only in logic but in self-interest.

It is for this reason that I find the report of the National Academy of Sciences on "Technology: Processes of Assessment and Choice" to be of exceptional interest, quality, and importance. Most of us here would find little to quarrel with the idea that we must take into account the direct and indirect effects of technological change in regard to both environmental and social quality. We would also want to be sure that our decision-making mechanisms for technological assessment are effective.

Science and technology were once thought of as a liberating force; today they are viewed by many as destructive of freedom. Why? Perhaps some of this attitude stems from the sophisticated concept that if you reduce the quality of a man's environment without his consent, you reduce his freedom. Seemingly the partnership of science and technology with business corporations and Government has leached some of the sense of freedom of the individual. When, as Dean Price points out "the main lines of our policy, over the long run, are likely to be determined by scientific developments we cannot foresee rather than political doctrines," the individual cannot be blamed if he feels that still another dimension of freedom—control over his environment—is lost.

I have mentioned some very fundamental trends in the relation of science to society which seem to have produced, and understandably so, animosity toward science. The Academy's report is right when it urges "meaningful public participation in choices having major public consequences." It is also right when it warns of "unreasoned political reaction against all technical innovation."

There are no easy answers to questions of the responsibility of science to society. But because there are no easy answers doesn't mean that there are no answers. The increasing recognition by the scientific community of the importance of these problems gives me reason to be hopeful.

Conclusion

I began my remarks by asking what the 'right' questions are. The 'right' questions, that go to the tree—not to the branch, seem to be mostly those which ask where we are going, why, and with whom. Although every question doesn't deserve, or for that matter, have an answer, I believe that the questions presented to you tonight—concerning leadership, communication, and social responsibility—cannot be ignored. As answers develop they will likely be tentative, partial, and unsatisfying. As scientists we have learned to live with such unsatisfying results and found instead that they are a stimulus to advance. Why not in this instance?

HORTON CITES YOUTH CAMP SAFETY AS AREA OF NEGLECT

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, youth camps deal with our most precious commodity—our children. It amazes me that most States either have no regulations or very spotty ones concerning

summer camp safety, sanitation, and personnel.

Jack Dempsey, news director for Malrite Stations and WNYR in Rochester, brought to my attention that almost all types of public service jobs have to be licensed except working for a youth camp. He also pointed out that very little is known about camps and their need for greater health and safety standards.

I know that most camps take great care for the safety of young campers, but there is a real need for more attention in this area.

The last survey of camp safety was taken in 1929—that is 40 years ago. Right now, we do not even know the exact number of summer camps across the country, and information about deaths or injuries is hard to come by.

To help correct this situation, I have introduced a youth camp safety bill, which was originally sponsored by Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF of Connecticut. This bill directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish Federal safety standards for youth camps. It will provide matching funds up to \$50,000 a year to each State which implements camp safety programs and standards.

The standards spelled out in my bill pertain to counselors and staff qualifications, staff-camper ratios, sanitation, public health, medical services, food handling, waste disposal, equipment, and vehicle condition.

Mr. Speaker, every year parents and children happily anticipate camp time. The children look forward to the companionship, the outdoors, the boating, swimming, hikes, campfires, and field trips. Parents feel confident that the people who will take their place for the summer, or for a month or a week are competent and reliable. And yet every year we hear of another tragedy, a bus accident, a drowning, a youth badly burned, insufficient supervision of campers in emergencies. Unfortunately, we do not have the statistics available to determine what can be done to improve this situation.

Youth camp safety has been neglected too long. It is time to protect the safety of our children. I urge my colleagues to consider this carefully and to support this measure.

A GOOD FRIEND OF ERNEST HEMINGWAY

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, during the 18 years in which I taught at Old Dominion University, it was my privilege to claim as a colleague and friend Prof. William W. Seward, the author of "My Friend Ernest Hemingway." Mr. Seward teaches English at Old Dominion, and was for 20 years a friend and correspondent of Hemingway. In that time, Mr. Seward came to know the warm, human side of the great 20th century author.

It gives me great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to include for publication in the RECORD several of the reviews which have been written praising Professor Seward's book. I have read the book myself and found it to be a well-written "affectionate reminiscence."

The reviews follow:

[From the Richmond News Leader, Sept. 10, 1969]

HEMINGWAY "ADMIRABLY HUMAN"

(By Harry M. Meacham)

On July 2, 1961, 19 days short of his 62nd birthday, Ernest Hemingway blew the top of his head off with a double-barreled shotgun. Since that fateful morning there has been a steady stream of books about the man and his work. As in the case of Ezra Pound, the dust kicked up by his personality tends to obscure the serious and highly gifted writer. In the light of rumors, gossip and misinformation, it is refreshing to read a book such as Professor Seward's "affectionate reminiscence."

Mr. Seward, who teaches English at Old Dominion University, knew Hemingway for more than 20 years, and while they did not often meet they did correspond regularly, and the letters (paraphrased, for Hemingway declined to permit his letters to be published) are the foundation on which these memoirs are built. The author was uniquely qualified to write this book. He has long been recognized as an authority on the 20th Century novel, and he has taught a course on Hemingway's novels for many years.

If the reader wants to understand the subject of this study, he will find Carlos Baker's biography helpful, but nothing will take the place of memoirs such as Professor Seward has written. No man has precisely the same relationship with two people, not even with members of his immediate family. It follows that the great writer's discussions with the author will become an important part of the Hemingway canon. And they will, as the author points out, "help explain what the gathering myth obscures—that Hemingway was endearingly and admirably human."

[From the Los Angeles Times Calendar, Oct. 5, 1969]

HOW AUTHOR KEPT HIS COOL WITH HEMINGWAY

(By Wirt Williams)

Ernest Hemingway and the English professors were never close, and there are signs he was wistful about it.

Understandably, he felt his own credentials as a literary man were impeccable, if a bit exotic. He had been a youthful coeditor of Transatlantic, the distinguished Paris magazine. He was the protégé of those dazzling theoreticians of the written word—Ezra Pound and Gertrude Stein. So he was unmistakably hurt and aggrieved by the coolness that so many scholars maintained toward him.

One of the very few academic friends he had was William W. Seward, chairman of the department of English of Old Dominion University at Norfolk, Va. So Seward's chaste memoir of that relationship has a unique and lasting value. "Bill, you are my shortstop whom I admire," Hemingway told Seward. "Anyone can play second or third base, but a good shortstop is hard to come by."

Shortstop Seward's book is written with delicacy, grace and devotion, but the devotion is so tautly controlled that it never slips into sentimentality. His portrait of the great Nobel Prize winner is that of a warm, generous and above all chivalrous human being.

Throughout their acquaintance, Hemingway was lavish with acts of consideration and thoughtfulness to all of those with whom he came in contact. Noting how impressed Seward was with his extraordinary affability to a waiter on one occasion, Hem-

ingway explained, "If you want people to be polite to you, you have to be twice as polite to them."

Not that he ever lost his capacity for bawdiness. Refusing to go to a certain funeral, he said, "A son of a bitch alive is a son of a bitch dead."

These direct glimpses of the author are fascinating; one wishes—guiltily—that Seward was a shade less scrupulous about refusing to quote Hemingway's correspondence directly. But there are enough conversational tidbits.

Years after he had won the Nobel Prize Hemingway took inordinate pride in the fact that his books were finally taught in college classrooms. He proudly told a Pullman conductor, "Mr. Seward teaches my books in his classes at the university."

In a warm summation, Seward writes, "Since Ernest's use of the spoken language was extremely uninhibited, I have tried to adhere to the obligations of a trusted friend in presenting his conversations. He loved to talk and talked at length about the things he believed in. Also he had a way of drawing out your opinions that made you feel as if you had really said something. . . ."

"The man I knew was an adventurer and a compulsive reader, a sportsman and a husband and father, an athlete and a businessman. But most of all he was an artist with unlimited interests and talents. Always, the marvelous side of Ernest's intellect is what came through to me most and I hope it is what will come through to the reader. When he was not writing, he felt he was wasting his life."

COMMENT FROM CARLOS BAKER TO A. S. BARNES AND CO., RE "MY FRIEND ERNEST HEMINGWAY"

Dr. William Seward of Old Dominion University in Norfolk is one of the few professors of English that Ernest Hemingway knew and genuinely liked. In this generous and warm-hearted memoir of their twenty-year friendship, Seward paints an engaging portrait of a side of Hemingway that is perhaps too little known; it shows, incidentally, that Hemingway could be as generous and warm-hearted as Seward is himself.

AMERICANS MAKE CLEAR TO HANOI THEIR CONFIDENCE AND SUPPORT OF OUR PRESIDENT

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, each day brings new indications that the silent majority are not without their voices. The three daily newspapers serving Michigan's Sixth Congressional District in recent editorials have expressed their conviction about how important it is for the country and for the prospects for peace in Vietnam that Americans make clear to Hanoi their confidence and support of our President. I commend them to the attention of my colleagues and to all who are visiting the Nation's Capital this week. The editorials appearing in the Owosso Argus Press, November 6; the Jackson Citizen Patriot, November 5; and the State Journal of Lansing, November 5 follow:

NIXON PUTS HIS PRESTIGE ON LINE

It would be a tragedy if a course of action which offers the only hope of ending the Vietnam war within the reasonable future without entailing an outright surrender to

Hanoi and abandonment of South Vietnam, a strategy which would have been greeted with overwhelming enthusiasm in 1968, were to prove to be in 1969 not too little but too late.

It may be that the time is out of joint, by at least a year.

Had presidential candidate Richard Nixon 12 months ago revealed a plan to "Vietnamize" the Vietnam war, and had he promised that one of his first acts if elected president would be to withdraw 50,000 American troops immediately and as many thereafter as military conditions permitted, he would likely have been swept into office with a far greater margin than the razor-thin plurality he achieved.

There may be any number of reasons why he did not make such an announcement at that time, including the very good reason that he had not yet arrived at such a solution to the war. A presidential candidate, while something more than an ordinary private citizen, is still is not a president, with access to all the information which floods the Chief Executive's desk.

There was, also, the hope that a fresh team of negotiators could get the stalled peace talks in Paris moving. Or, from a more cynical viewpoint, candidate Nixon may simply not have wanted to lay himself open to the charge of playing politics with the lives of 500,000 American fighting men.

But the ironic possibility now is that, having achieved the presidency and having decided upon this plan in the face of continued North Vietnamese obstinacy, Richard Nixon may be swept, not out of office, but out of effective leadership over the nation, even as Lyndon Johnson in his final months became a shadow of the strong, consensus-wielding president he once was.

The time is not only out of joint but growing short. Its temper can be read in the fact that those who have supported the President in his handling of the Vietnam problem throughout the first 10 months of his administration praised his television address to the nation as a vigorous reaffirmation and defense of his policies. But those who have opposed him or who have supported him only tentatively expressed reactions arranging from disappointment to outright rejection.

So weary have Americans become of this war, so far has emotion replaced calculation regarding Vietnam, so many have the disillusionments been in the past, that a policy which is a 180-degree turnabout from the policy of the previous administration can be dismissed as offering "nothing new."

As the President said, North Vietnam cannot defeat or humiliate the United States. Only Americans can. It all depends upon that "silent majority" he referred to.

If the President can beg, borrow or steal another 10 months of support, grudging though it may be, from the American majority, and if Vietnamization does indeed begin rolling, he spoke truly when he said that it will not matter then what the critics say now.

In the meantime, however, America seems as sadly divided as it was before the President's speech. A period of even greater domestic turmoil may be ahead for the nation.

NIXON DOING HIS BEST TO END VIETNAM WAR

President Nixon's carefully-phrased report to the nation on the course he intends to take with respect to the Vietnam war disappointed those who expected the dramatic.

The common comment on the speech was that he said nothing new but said it rather well. Indeed, there was little else the President could say and remain, as he put it, faithful to his oath of office.

President Nixon invoked the philosophy behind the favorite expression of one of his predecessors, President Harry S. Truman was fond of saying: "The buck stops here," meaning at the President's desk.

The President's critics do not have to make the hard decisions which affect American and South Vietnamese lives. They do not have to chart and follow a course which may affect the history of a large segment of the world for years, or even for centuries to come.

The President is denied the luxury of making popular statements or demand such as "stop the killing and bring the troops home—now." He can't influence those who lack a sense of history or understanding and world affairs by laying down a timetable for troop withdrawals.

Coming from a war critic in the streets, on the campus or even in the halls of Congress, a call for a precipitous American retreat from an unpopular war, soothes a people who have become weary of the struggle. The same line coming from the President constitutes a major policy decision.

Agitation for an immediate withdrawal of United States forces is welcome in Hanoi as an indication that popular support is swinging away from the President and that the practice of waiting for still the next concession . . . and the next . . . is working, coming from the President a promise of a rapid retreat becomes a signal to the Communists that their victory has been won.

To put it another way, the President went as far as he possibly could by laying out the two courses to peace which are open today.

He indicates that he has not given up hope completely on the Paris negotiations, although they have moved exactly nowhere. He obviously expects that the alternative will be followed: The de-Americanization, and the increasing Vietnamization, of the conflict. Even so, he dares not set a timetable for withdrawal of troops and neither can he assume that de-escalation of the American role in the conflict will work. A new violent offensive by the Communists could upset even this hope of winding down the war.

Those who lead the protests against the war were, of course, disappointed by the President's words. They had hoped that he would announce a cut-and-run policy and fully meet what they see as a great popular demand for an end to the killing.

The President spelled out his feelings on that very point. He was frank in saying that an immediate end to the war would be the popular thing—for the moment.

He was on sound ground when he stated his reasons for rejecting an early end to "Johnson's war" before it became "Nixon's war."

President Nixon reminded his listeners of points of history which so many of his critics conveniently have forgotten. He mentioned the atrocities at Hue and the genocide practiced against the South Vietnamese leaders when Ho Chi Minh made his first bold and brutal moves to take over all of Vietnam.

Mr. Nixon's position is that no American President possibly can put himself in the position of exposing thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands, of South Vietnamese to violent persecution or death.

The war, the extent of it, and the scale of American participation, are accomplished facts. Debating over the wisdom of American involvement or the conduct of the war under either President Johnson or President Nixon is pointless at the moment.

The over-riding question in the minds of Americans, as demonstrated in public opinion polls, and even in the Vietnam moratorium demonstrations, is how to end our participation in the war without a disaster, either for America or the South Vietnamese people.

As a man who sits in the seat of awesome power and responsibility to match, President Nixon's plan for winding down the war goes as far as is possible under the circumstances.

He has responded, so far as a President can respond, to the demands for bringing American forces home.

Thus he deserves the support of the American people and is entitled to as much freedom of action as is possible.

He has made as many commitments for peace as he can and still honor, as he puts it, his oath of office.

The impatient ones who criticize him for not going all the way on ending the war tomorrow, who insist on hampering his peace efforts by giving Hanoi hopes of an early and total surrender by America, should not be able to influence the "silent majority" which retains the ability to see things as they are and which surely must realize that President Nixon is doing the best he can with a situation bordering on the impossible.

PRESIDENT OUTLINES PROGRAM FOR PEACE

President Nixon Monday spelled out a program for bringing an end to the American involvement in the Vietnam war through gradual military withdrawal and it is a course we believe the vast majority of Americans will support.

He did not take what some consider to be the popular road, immediate withdrawal of all U.S. forces and leaving the South Vietnamese people to defend themselves anyway they can. That, in fact, is a formula for surrender.

The President made it clear to all that, as chief executive of this nation, he has explored virtually every avenue of compromise and negotiation with the North Vietnamese government in an effort to bring an end to the fighting. The Hanoi leaders have simply rejected anything short of a U.S. surrender with no concessions whatever on their part.

It would appear that the President, for the time being at least, has crossed off all hopes of any meaningful peace negotiations in Paris and instead has turned to the American people, seeking their support while he carries out the disengagement policy of giving the government and people of South Vietnam time to take over the defense.

This will take time.

But as the President indicated, it is the only way to prevent a Communist victory through American default. It is a realistic policy which keeps in mind the potential for murderous purges by Communist forces if the military balance suddenly gets out of kilter, as well as the vital factor of protecting American forces while they are in the process of withdrawal.

There is also the grave danger that an immediate pullout of American forces would demolish the faith and confidence of other nations in our willingness to stand behind our commitments.

Persistent critics of the Nixon administration have continued to demand that the President take the initiative to end the war. The President is doing just that in spite of the refusal of Communist forces to negotiate.

There is little question that the President's Monday speech was directed at the American people—particularly the so-called silent majority. He is seeking our help against a militant minority of anti-war leaders who are, in effect, demanding an immediate end to U.S. military activities in South Vietnam no matter what the cost.

An example of the latter was evident in a statement put out by the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam several days before the President's Nov. 3 talk.

A leader of that group stated that nothing President Nixon might say would be acceptable to them unless all U.S. forces, ground troops, air and navy personnel, as well as equipment, are withdrawn; and unless all U.S. military or economic aid is withdrawn from the Saigon government.

Furthermore, the committee demanded that the U.S. make war reparations to the Vietnamese people.

There was nothing in their demands con-

cerning discontinuance of Russian and Red Chinese military aid to Hanoi; nothing about withdrawal of North Vietnamese forces from South Vietnam.

It is evident that these types of professional anti-war organizers are interested in one thing—attempting to dictate the foreign policy of our government from the streets.

There is a definite dividing line between those sincere people across the nation who want to see an end to this war and those who see in this turmoil a chance to grab for power. President Nixon pointed that out clearly.

A great deal is heard about the organizations such as the one mentioned above. But we would like to quote from another organization, "Citizens Committee for Peace With Freedom in Vietnam." It was founded in 1967 by the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower, former President Harry S. Truman and former Sen. Paul H. Douglas of Illinois.

The committee said last week:

"Hanoi is fighting on three battlefronts—in Vietnam, in Paris, and in American public opinion. The enemy's only remaining chance for total victory lies here in the United States—in the pressures of American public opinion."

We hope the American people will also recognize this fact and support the President in his sincere and determined efforts to bring about an honorable peace.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON SEES LAOS AS FIRST TESTING GROUND FOR NIXON DOCTRINE

HON. ROBERT T. STAFFORD

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, in his speech on November 3, the President reported to the Nation his thinking on what policy future U.S. foreign involvements should be based on.

He spelled out in welcome terms the meaning of the new Nixon doctrine of U.S. foreign policy which will be aimed at helping our free world allies to help and to defend themselves.

Two days ago, in a speech before the Rochester Association of the United Nations, our colleague, the gentleman from New York, expressed strong support for this new direction in foreign policy. He went on to cite the present situation in Laos as one where the tenets of this new doctrine should receive their first real test.

Congressman HORTON made several points in his Rochester speech which I feel should be brought to the attention of the Congress and the public. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD the full text of his remarks:

FIRST TESTING GROUND—LAOS

(By Hon. FRANK HORTON)

This meeting of the R.A.U.N. Board comes at a time of both great optimism and great pessimism about the future of U.S. foreign policy as it relates to peace in the world.

On the one hand, the great national debate over Vietnam has grown into a symbolic popularity contest between peace marchers and telegrams on the President's desk. But the heat of this debate has caused many Americans to overlook the essential change in the Vietnam debate in the days since

President Nixon took office. We are no longer debating whether or not to bomb the North. The debate is now focused between those who seek quick but gradual withdrawal from Vietnam, leaving behind a strengthened South Vietnamese Army and Government, and those who seek withdrawal immediately without regard for the consequences in Southeast Asia. It is no longer a debate "whether to get out," it has now turned into a discussion of "how to get out, and how quickly."

Despite the lack of dramatic withdrawal announcements in President Nixon's speech a week ago, I am convinced that he feels our involvement in Vietnam and the policy assumptions on which that involvement was built are wrong. Whether or not you think the President is moving fast enough toward withdrawal, the American people who feel we can no longer police the world alone must welcome at last, a President who is taking a hard look at the way we have carried out the policies of containment of communism which were forged under President Truman over 20 years ago.

With all of the despair, pessimism and frustration our nation feels with each passing day of war and bloodshed in Asia, I feel there is great reason for optimism about the future of American foreign policy. Last Monday, the President underscored the importance of the policies he announced last summer in Guam and Manila which he called the "Nixon Doctrine." Unlike the Monroe Doctrine, the Truman Doctrine and the Eisenhower Doctrine, the Nixon Doctrine is not founded on a threat or promise of landing U.S. Marines on the shores of allies in threatened regions of the world. Instead, it seems genuinely to be a self-help doctrine, offering material, economic and equipment aid to free world governments threatened by invasion or by communist guerrilla wars. But the Doctrine specifically states that the threatened nation and her regional allies will have to stand in their own defense, without reliance on U.S. troops.

I think that if the President's speech could have been given last week without the emotional backdrop of the Vietnam war, his enunciation of new guidelines for the way in which America will honor her treaty commitments would have been loudly and publicly acclaimed.

There is particular significance in the Nixon Doctrine for the concept which underlies United Nations peacekeeping.

As you know, for three straight Congresses, I have sponsored resolutions that would put the United States on record as favoring use of the U.N. as a multi-lateral peacekeeping establishment. My particular resolution which this Board has endorsed, calls for the setting up of a peacekeeping force made up of earmarked units from U.N. member nations. My resolution takes the further step of asking the United States delegation to the U.N. to offer, as a measure of our sincerity, an American support unit of 1,000 men earmarked for U.N. peacekeeping duty.

I am sorry to have to report at this time, that despite the number of Congressmen and Senators who have co-sponsored similar resolutions, neither the House Foreign Affairs nor Senate Foreign Relations Committees have scheduled hearings thus far.

I am firmly convinced that with the rising pitch of nationalism within every region of the world, we have just seen the beginnings of regional "brush-fire" wars. We cannot continue to gamble with the safety of the world by juggling a balance of power in each region with tugs of war between the great powers. The ideal solution would be to move immediately to a truly international peacekeeping structure, centered around the U.N. Obviously, competing international interests, and a festering cold war will prevent this from happening overnight—just as it has stymied U.N. peacekeeping progress up to

now. But I think any steps that are taken toward making responses to brush-fire wars multilateral, are steps in the right direction.

That is why I am so encouraged by the Nixon Doctrine, and why it will be crucial in the months and years ahead to see how it is carried out. By removing the pledge of quickly and massively deployed U.S. troops as the first line of defense of the free-world's outer boundaries, we can take a major step toward de-fusing potential military confrontations between the great powers.

By putting our allies around the world—in Europe, in Asia and in Latin America—on notice that the responsibility for providing well-trained manpower to preserve freedom will be theirs, and not ours, we accomplish several positive results. First, we remove the complacent dependency on American military might that has lulled the Western world into laxity and de-emphasis on self-defense. Second, we encourage the development of regional treaty organizations which are truly regional. Instead of sharing only a mutual dependency on U.S. intervention, the new generation of treaty organizations will, of necessity, involve active and proportional military participation by all member nations seeking to benefit from the regional defense umbrella. In SEATO there must come about a strong, well trained alliance, manned by the free nations of Southeast Asia and partially supplied and trained by the U.S. NATO, too, will have to revert to a more truly mutual alliance if the Nixon Doctrine is carried out to its full implications.

Another benefit of implementing the Nixon Doctrine would be a gradual lessening of the proportion of the Free World's defense burden that will have to be borne by American tax dollars. If our military establishment does not actually shrink in the years to come, I think at least that its rapid rate of growth in this decade can be stopped or slowed to a trickle as the world becomes convinced that the President is serious in pursuing this new policy direction.

This brings me to the final, and disturbing point of my message. How serious is our government about implementing this new and hopeful policy guideline? Because the 91st Congress, more than any of its predecessors, is closely scrutinizing every aspect of U.S. foreign and military policy, and because this Administration is making an honest effort to level with the public on foreign policy moves (as evidenced by the President's speech last week), we know a great deal more today about our foreign interests and maneuverings than we have in the past. One outgrowth of this is the growing public awareness and concern over recent events in Laos. I believe much of this concern is justified. On October 15, moratorium day, I ended a speech on Vietnam policy with the following warning:

The clouds which hang today over Laos look ominously like those which shadowed Vietnam five years ago. Reports that American advisors are there in substantial numbers are disturbing if they mean that the Vietnam experience is being recycled a few hundred miles northwest of Saigon. If we have not already learned the lesson that the nature of our military commitments must change in a world-wide context, let us learn it now before a new Vietnam is born in the wake of this tragic war.

When I was in Vietnam in January of 1968, the members of my Military Operations Subcommittee were fully briefed on U.S. military operations in Laos. At that time, there was very heavy infiltration along the Ho Chi Minh trail in Laos by the North Vietnamese, and we were trying to slow it down with bombing raids along this jungle corridor as part of our war effort in South Vietnam.

Recent reports indicate that the number of U.S. advisors in Laos, today is believed to be over 1,000. The main mission of these men is to advise the Royal Laotian Army of Prince Souvanna Phouma. At the same time,

It is believed that there are 50,000 North Vietnamese in the portions of Laos controlled by the Communist Pathet Lao.

Our present role has recently been said to include activities by the Central Intelligence Agency in funding and training an army of Meo tribesmen in Northern Laos. This army is said to be the best trained and equipped anti-communist force in Laos. While the State Department has not officially disclosed the functions of our personnel in Laos, it is clear that we have undertaken in a major way to help stave off the advance of the Pathet Lao, which today threatens the neutralist government of Prince Souvanna Phouma. Under the Geneva accords of 1962, foreign intervention in neutralist Laos was prohibited. This understanding has been violated by everybody, from the Soviet Union and Chinese who have helped to equip and train the Pathet Lao and North Vietnamese in Laos, to our own country which found it necessary to take steps to limit the use of Laos as a sanctuary for communist troops and supplies destined for South Vietnam.

The question we are faced with in Laos is not whether we should desert the neutralist government to face alone the risks of a Pathet Lao takeover. We agree that communist takeover of Laos would be as undesirable as total Viet Cong victory in South Vietnam. But the serious question here is how can we strengthen the neutralist government without getting involved in another Vietnam, in a nation which is a less attractive Asian battleground than South Vietnam itself—if that is possible.

Laos can become either the Guadalcanal or the Waterloo of the Nixon Doctrine. If our unilateral intervention, clandestine or not, continues to grow—then the dependency of the Laotians on America will grow along with it. We cannot permit this to happen. Other Southeast Asian nations—particularly Thailand—have a vital interest in preserving the neutral status of Laos. I would think that India, the major neutralist power, would have an interest in discouraging the takeover of fellow Asian neutralists.

Two steps must be taken immediately before the situation in Laos becomes a *fait accompli* for irreversible U.S. intervention.

We must call for an immediate session of the 1962 Geneva signatories who originally guaranteed the neutral status of Laos. The alarming increase in North Vietnamese troops in Laos makes such a meeting that much more urgent. The communists are now in a position to allow world opinion against American intervention in Southeast Asia to feed on the publicity Laos is now getting here at home. Calling for a new meeting of the Geneva signatories could serve to point up the real danger that the neutral regime may face in a short time.

Second, we must take immediate steps to de-Americanize the Western military aid and personnel in Laos while the numbers are small. The free Asian governments must decide among themselves whether Laos is vital to their own well-being, and if so, they must, with our material help, take steps to replace the Americans now helping to build Laotian defenses.

By making Vietnamization of the Vietnam war his primary objective, President Nixon is forming the cornerstone of his new foreign policy in Laos, he has the chance to build on this foundation at an early stage. Whether or not the struggle in Laos explodes into a neutralist war against the Pathet Lao and North Vietnam, we must not be caught in the same position in which we found ourselves in Vietnam in 1964.

I urge your support for these steps to replace direct American intervention in Laos. As directors of the Rochester Association for the United Nations, you are in a position to help lead public opinion on foreign policy in the Rochester area. I firmly believe that the Nixon Doctrine is a very meaningful and

welcome step away from the dangers of "red button" confrontation and toward the eventual goal of truly international peace-keeping through the United Nations. I hope you will lend your support to this vital element of the President's policy.

Public acceptance and recognition of the Nixon Doctrine new policy goals will help to demonstrate to our allies around the globe that the American people and their government are sincere in setting this new course. If this support is forthcoming soon enough, it could help immensely to establish this doctrine as the basis for free world foreign policy for years to come.

CLOSING THE WORLDWIDE LEARNING GAP: AN IMAGINATIVE PROPOSAL FROM AMERICAN INDUSTRY

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, during the closing days of October, a very significant conference took place in San Francisco. Arranged as part of the 50th anniversary celebration of the Institute of International Education, the conference had a single, challenging objective—a workable program of educational assistance to developing nations involving private enterprise in cooperation with the United States and foreign governments.

Cochaired by Mr. Ernest C. Arbuckle, chairman of the board of Wells Fargo Bank, and Mr. O. Meredith Wilson, director of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, the conference featured a number of prominent speakers from industry, the academic sector, foundations, foreign countries, and the U.S. Government. Their presentations suggested new and exciting dimensions for social development-oriented programs of American and multinational firms operating in the developing countries.

One of the most interesting presentations at the conference was delivered by Mr. C. W. Robinson, president of Marcona Corp., which firm has a long and inspiring record of supporting education in Latin America.

Fully conscious of the important role which education plays in the processes of development, and of the great and urgent need to close the worldwide learning gap, Mr. Robinson urged American and multinational firms to contribute of their own resources to the accomplishment of that objective.

He said:

I urge every multi-national corporation to adopt a "fair sharing" approach in its foreign operations as is becoming increasingly common in domestic affairs. We accept with only minor grumbling, the cost of insurance protection against fire, earthquake, and other natural calamities. I now propose a "business survival" insurance policy; this to be based on an annual contribution to an educational foundation in each developing nation equal to 1 per cent of the investment in that country . . .

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Mr. Robinson's thoughtful remarks will prove of

considerable interest to my colleagues and I am, therefore, placing them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

CLOSING THE WORLDWIDE LEARNING GAP LESSONS FROM BUSINESS INVESTMENTS IN EDUCATION IN DEVELOPING NATIONS (Address by Charles W. Robinson)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I feel honored to be able to participate in this conference dedicated to the exchange of ideas on "Closing the Worldwide Learning Gap". It has brought together here in San Francisco distinguished representatives of education, government and private enterprise from throughout the world. This evidences the importance which we all attach to this key problem in the elimination of inequities between so-called developed and developing nations.

I have been asked to share with you my views on business responsibility and opportunity in the field of international education. I must confess that I was in a state of shock when I received a copy of the program and found that I was to be the lead off speaker with a subject entitled "Lessons from Business Investments in Education in Developing Nations". This poses a real challenge as it implies that I am to provide you with a solution to a problem which we haven't yet defined. However, I would like to discuss with you some convictions which I have gained from direct exposure to the problem of encouraging education in a developing nation. I do this, however, not to suggest any one solution, but rather in an effort to bring the problem into clearer focus.

There are many ripples on the sea, most of which soon disappear back into the surface; however, every now and then one appears at the right time and it continues to build into a giant swell eventually to crash on a distant shore. The need to encourage and support worldwide education as an essential step in closing the "economic gap" represents just such a ripple—an idea whose time has come. We are at a crossroads where the way in which we deal with the human resources in the developing nations will determine whether we are to be successful in controlling the explosive forces in our world today.

Some of you may recall an advertising campaign conducted by one of our zipper manufacturers some thirty years ago. Each ad contained a photograph of an item of personal clothing improperly secured by the use of buttons. In these ads there was always the question, are you suffering from gapes? There was the obvious suggestion that the affliction could be cured by replacing buttons with a zipper.

Today, our world is suffering from a serious case of gapes; however, we have a "zipper" in the form of international education which is essential for the ultimate cure.

We are fortunate to have represented in this two-day conference, leaders from the three fields of education, government and business. I say fortunate because I feel that the solution of our problems in international development calls for coordination of effort between these three groups. It's what I might refer to as the new "alliance for progress", if that expression had not come into ill repute.

Others might refer to it as an "unholy alliance" to the extent that representatives of business are involved. For this reason it is appropriate that I confess my personal bias in order that you may place my views in proper perspective. I am President of Marcona Corporation, a multinational company with operations in mining and shipping throughout the world. This has led to deep involvement in both developing and developed nations. I confess to profit motives but with what I view as long range orientation.

Furthermore, businessmen generally are evidencing growing recognition of a basic responsibility to the society in which we operate. I believe that we must first *earn the right to make the profit* which our stockholders demand through effective concern for our environment—both physical and social.

It would be fair to say that our objective is to create a climate in which we can maintain and expand profit in the future. However, in our international investments we face a still more serious problem in that the climate must offer hope for survival itself.

Most of the developing nations are passing through a dynamic stage which poses a serious threat to both foreign business and government relationships. Gabriel Valdes, Chilean Minister of Foreign Affairs, and current spokesman for much of Latin America, comes right to the point when he explains that in spite of the foreign investors' desire for fixed rules of the game—that just isn't in the cards. The developing nations are in a state of flux and the rules will change and foreign investors must adjust to these changes if they are to survive. Obviously, we can't look to our contracts or existing legislation in these countries for our security. We must seek other forms of insurance for continuity of operations.

The multinational corporation is becoming a powerful economic force throughout the world. With the increasing acceptance of a direct responsibility to the community this must have a tremendous impact on overall development. I am convinced that within the next ten years multinational corporations, including those represented here today will rival our own State Department as a factor in U.S. international relations.

However, to achieve the positive results which are absolutely essential for the future of our world, we must have a quality of business leadership which is all too rare today. By leadership I mean those qualities of *sensitivity* to the problems brought about by accelerating change; the *imagination* to develop solutions, and the *courage* to carry them out.

Our technological revolution has made available much more relevant data on a more timely basis which should support more effective leadership; however, in some respects it seems to have had an opposite effect. It has introduced into both the worlds of politics and business a disease which I refer to as 51%ism. Our politicians can now readily determine the attitudes of the average voter on a wide range of issues. This encourages the development of policies to conform to the majority view. This same disease affects the business world where our executives can more easily determine the consensus of stockholders, consumers, and employees. Faced with these facts it is tempting to take the easier majority route and increasingly difficult to support a minority position.

Here in California we have what we sometimes refer to as the 49er spirit. This evolved out of the soul testing experience of our pioneers during the Gold Rush days of the last century. A belief in goals and the courage and determination to achieve them sustained these pioneers during their efforts to cross the mountains or round the Horn into California. What we need today is a renewal of that 49er spirit; leaders who are willing to fight for a 49% minority position because they believe it right and in the best long range interests of all.

Our graduate schools of business have contributed to a much more effective administration of increasingly complex business enterprise. However, sometimes I wonder if we haven't become overly entranced with the idea of manipulating sophisticated management tools. In seeking to convert the *art* of business management into a *science* we are in danger of losing the *art* of leadership. Perhaps we should redirect our efforts to

encourage greater sensitivity to the needs of our world of accelerating change. We must develop a leadership philosophy to guide us in the hard personal decisions required in complicated situations involving great risk.

We are at a crossroads, a time for reappraisal and redefinition of our goals in both political and business worlds. We have a special need today for courageous leadership to ease the rising tensions between developing and developed nations. Our previous efforts in this area have failed, with the problems more acute today than ever before.

Since World War II accelerating technological growth has had a revolutionary impact on communication and transportation. The freer exchange of ideas, of people, and of goods within and across national boundaries has stimulated an irreversible movement toward the interdependence of all nations. We are rapidly becoming a one world family with all the stresses which exist within any family group, particularly where unequal opportunities exist.

At the beginning of the so-called "Soaring 60's" we had few doubts as to our ability to solve this problem through merely doing more of what was done in the 50's. However, our concept of foreign aid suffered from what I think of as the Taiwan syndrome. We pointed with pride to our experience in that country where the infusion of financial assistance primed the pump and the economic motor then ran without further U.S. financial fuel. Based on this experience it was argued that U.S. Government financial aid alone would solve the developing nation problem.

Unfortunately we failed to recognize two key factors which made Taiwan a unique situation. Number one, there were in Taiwan, educated and dedicated people with managerial experience who had been forced out of China by the Red Revolution. There was a highly developed human resource waiting to take advantage of the opportunities created by financial assistance.

Secondly, we poured into that country financial aid per capita which greatly exceeded the amount we could ever hope to supply to other developing nations of the world.

It is increasingly clear that financial assistance alone will not provide the answer. In areas with limited development of the human resources financial aid flows largely through government channels and quite often ultimately into the hands of vested interests. This encourages preservation of the status quo and discourages an atmosphere of change which is absolutely essential for development.

Our current problem arises from the increasing awareness of the differences in economic levels without the educational opportunities required to satisfy individual and national needs. From this has come the frustration which is the basic cause of the growing strain in our relationships—both political and commercial.

To reduce these frustrations, we must first find ways to encourage development of human resources through education. I believe in the universal equation: "Education equals Development". There will be no hope of closing the economic gap with the developing nations until we find a way to deal effectively with this problem.

If we accept this premise, we still face the difficult question of how to encourage education in the developing nations. What little U.S. Government financial assistance has been granted for education to date, has been largely on a government-to-government basis. Unfortunately the governments in these developing nations have been handicapped by lack of funds; lack of continuity and often by basic conflicts with political objectives. Local vested interests in many of these countries have been reluctant to support any activity which might upset the status quo.

Traditionally the economic powers behind the "throne" have feared education for the masses. They have equated *education* with *awareness*, and *awareness* with *discontent*. However, the technological revolution in communication and transportation has created *awareness* without *education*, which is doubly dangerous.

However, in Latin America where I have had more exposure to this problem, I sense a significant change in this traditional attitude. Local businessmen are awakening to the need for education to broaden economic opportunity for all. The need for private support of education in these countries is essential and, in my opinion, this is where the U.S. multinational corporation can and must play an important role.

I'd like to turn briefly to an experience which we have had in Peru, which I hope will help to give this problem clearer definition. We have an iron ore mining operation in that country and have faced all of the problems of a foreign investor in an extractive industry. We have been seriously concerned about attitude problems as they might affect our future in that country.

We have always believed that a foreign investor has responsibility far beyond contractual and legislative obligations. We also felt that a broader level of education in Peru represented good insurance for our future. Therefore, during the 1950's we supported the construction of schools and other physical facilities for education. Unfortunately, after the fanfare and inauguration speeches the buildings soon deteriorated into crumbling stone monuments. This was the result of the lack of trained personnel to administer and operate these facilities.

From these abortive efforts came the conviction that we should start at the top and work down. In this way we could encourage university level activities, the results of which would filter on down to secondary and ultimately to the primary school level. To carry out this program we decided that a private educational foundation should be established in Peru. We also concluded that this program should be organized and administered by Peruvians who had evidenced serious concern with their own development problems.

With this in mind I visited Washington in 1960 to discuss the project with representatives of the State Department and foreign assistance organizations. Although their enthusiasm was somewhat restrained, there was a feeling that this might develop into a mechanism for U.S. financial aid to education outside of normal government-to-government channels. On returning to Peru, I discussed this project with some of the more progressive and enlightened business leaders. They were sufficiently inspired with the idea to form the Instituto Peruano de Fomento Educativo, now better known as IPFE. This was the first truly private foundation in Latin America dedicated to support expanded educational opportunity.

This foundation has continued to grow with activities today throughout Peru based on support from many other foreign corporations. There is also increasing financial support from local Peruvian businesses and individuals which offers real hope for a basic change in the traditional opposition to expansion of educational opportunity.

As IPFE grew in importance there was a natural desire on the part of the Peruvian Government to bring this activity under the wings of the Ministry of Education. However, this effort was successfully resisted and today the government is actively encouraging its private nonpolitical status by treating any financial contribution to IPFE as a double deduction for income tax purposes.

We have also been encouraged in this effort by the increasing financial support from the U.S. Government. Early in 1968 AID volunteered a \$3 million low interest loan to support further expansion of the

IPFE program. Unfortunately, the threatened application of the Hickenlooper Amendment in Peru during the past year has delayed consummation of this agreement. However, we have reason to believe that Washington is increasingly sympathetic with this approach and will soon reactivate this loan.

The planning required for effective human resource development is a highly complex matter. Each nation faces different problems in terms of specific education needs and each must seek its own solution. I hope that our better qualified participants in this conference can contribute some ideas for an effective attack on this facet of the educational challenge.

The question often arises—do we have the time? Don't we need a more direct solution? My answer is that there is no other solution; furthermore, creating educational opportunity brings hope and with hope comes a lessening of frustration and very possibly the additional time required to solve the basic problem of economic growth.

Because the need is so great and so immediate, I urge every multinational corporation to adopt a "fair sharing" approach in its foreign operations as is becoming increasingly common in domestic affairs. We accept with only minor grumbling, the cost of insurance protection against fire, earthquake, and other natural calamities. I now propose a "business survival" insurance policy; this to be based on an annual contribution to an educational foundation in each developing nation equal to 1% of the investment in that country. Let's consider for a moment the chain of events which would follow this decision:

First, this assurance of financial support will stimulate the development of private foundations, which are today largely nonexistent in these countries.

This in turn would encourage financial contributions from local sources which will help to bring about a change in traditional negative attitudes towards education.

Once functioning, the foundation would attract U.S. Government financial assistance providing a highly leveraged situation. Hopefully by this time we will have created the proposed U.S. nonprofit government corporation—the Inter-American Social Development Institute. This channel for financial assistance offers many important advantages over direct government aid to overseas education.

And finally for the school age generation there will be an increasing awareness of the "opening doors" of opportunity for those students who are qualified by ability and financial need. This will bring a positive change in attitudes—a lessening of frustration—and ultimately the capacity to contribute to accelerating economic growth.

For these reasons I am convinced that a multinational corporation will receive an important and prompt dividend from this investment. Furthermore, this should be viewed not as a burden but rather as a great opportunity.

I know that to some of you this suggestion will seem to be a bit far out and perhaps anti-establishment. For this reason I would like to quote from David Rockefeller's address at the International Industrial Conference here in San Francisco last month. As most of you know, this was a conference that brought together more than 700 of the leading business executives from throughout the world to discuss the developing nation problem. Mr. Rockefeller asked the question, and I quote—Can we perhaps fashion for the Seventies a new development contract that is free of the illusions of the Sixties and appeals not just to the generosity of rich nations but to their self-interest as well? Further in his address he added this thought—"In the Seventies, development should be seen primarily as a process of training and educating more and more peo-

ple to play a constructive and self-fulfilling role in our society" . . . End of quote.

I believe that the achievement of these goals demands the active participation of private nongovernment interests along the lines I have just proposed. Certainly the U.S. multinational corporation can and must play a leading role in this effort.

The success of this conference will not be judged by the views expressed here, but rather by their impact on future government and business policies aimed at narrowing the "Worldwide Learning Gap". It is my sincere hope that the exchange of ideas which will take place here over the next two days will produce that ripple on the surface of the sea whose time has come; a ripple which gathers size and strength as it races towards the shore. Our very existence may depend upon it.

A COGENT COMMENT ON THE PRESIDENT'S VIETNAM SPEECH

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening, November 3, the President's image had hardly faded from the television screen before some of the network commentators and congressional critics were using the same media to belittle, carp, and disagree.

Like a breath of fresh air from the heartland of the Nation came the voice of the editorial staff of WTMJ-TV, radio, and FM, Milwaukee. Presented by John McCullough and Don Parcher, this editorial cogently and succinctly placed our grievous Vietnam problem in true perspective. Would that I had the eloquence to say what WTMJ said so well.

The editorial follows:

WTMJ MILWAUKEE, WIS., EDITORIAL

The importance of President Nixon's Monday night's broadcast to the nation lies not in what he didn't say but in what he did say. While the President didn't disclose figures on future troop withdrawals from Vietnam as anticipated, he did give a timely refresher course on how we got into the war in the first place. He also fully explained the consequences of an abandonment policy.

Mr. Nixon revealed his frustrations at trying to negotiate peace personally, at the United Nations and in Paris. Yet, while he was unable to get results through established avenues of negotiation, Hanoi showed its preference to speak to private individuals in this country. This method, it apparently believes, will wear down our determination to hold our commitments, fire up anti-Nixon sentiment at home and abroad and finally cause the United States to accept North Vietnam's demands. Hanoi even brazenly stepped up its offensive action on the eve of Nixon's broadcast to force a counter-action.

The war has now been put into a true perspective by the President. He has stopped the escalation and cut casualties. He is not sending more troops to Vietnam but instead bringing them home. Our side has attempted to cool off the fighting while Hanoi steps it up.

On the basis of Hanoi's past performances, an abrupt U.S. pullout from Vietnam would bring about a bloodbath with thousands of South Vietnamese slaughtered. Furthermore, America's word and leadership throughout the world would be sharply devalued and the development of peace and democracy in

Southeast Asia an other underdeveloped parts of the world would be reversed or slowed down.

President Nixon has growing public support for his Vietnam policy. He has asked for the great silent American majority to speak out. He could have no better selling point for peace than their support. We urge that you speak out on this issue.

SMOG: THE KILLER CAN BE HALTED

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, for many years the dangers arising from significant air pollution—what we tend to term smog—seemed to be taken rather lightly. Visibility was hampered, eyes watered, coughs lingered, clothes drying out on the line came out gray; all these things were irritations, but they soon went away. Now, the situation is changing.

Now we know that smog is a killer.

According to reports published during the current American Public Health Association meeting in Philadelphia, smog frequently causes 10 to 20 deaths daily in New York City. Stuart Auerbach of the Washington Post detailed the situation in this morning's paper, and I insert his article at this point:

REPORTS TIE AIR POLLUTION TO DEATHS,
ASTHMA, ECZEMA

(By Stuart Auerbach)

PHILADELPHIA.—Badly polluted air frequently causes 10 to 20 deaths a day in New York City. In Buffalo, the number of children hospitalized with asthma and skin inflammation increases significantly when the air is particularly dirty.

These reports today at the American Public Health Association's meeting bolstered the view of many scientists that pollution is one of the nation's greatest health hazards.

The report also underscored complaints made at the meeting about the lack of progress in the fight against pollution.

"Every year pollution has grown worse," said Charles C. Johnson Jr., head of the federal agency that deals with environmental health. "Every year there is more evidence of self-damage from environmental contaminants. Every year our cities have become less liveable, our highways more death-dealing. Every year, the barrage of chemicals, physiological, biological and psychological stresses to human health has increased."

"Yet we seem to have thought that we had to wait until we count the corpses in the streets before we could mobilize our forces in defense of human health," he told the nation's public health leaders. Johnson is head of the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The New York study found a direct relation between the amount of sulfur dioxide and smog—major components in polluted air—and excess deaths in the city over a five-year period.

"For the first time we are satisfied that we have some definite relations between sulfur dioxide in the air and excess deaths—almost like the relation between smoking and cancer deaths," said Leonard Greenburg, a pioneer student of air pollution and health.

He did the study at the Albert Einstein

College of Medicine in New York with Dr. Marvin Glasser, a statistician.

Other studies of deaths and pollution have concentrated on periodic episodes of extremely dirty air. But Glasser and Greenburg showed that deaths started to rise sharply when there was as little sulfur dioxide filtered outside into the air as .2 parts per million.

The number of excess deaths varies from 10 to 20 a day when the level of sulfur dioxide is between .2 parts per million and .4 parts per million.

The air pollution level was that high on at least 10 per cent of the days during the five-year period of the study.

Sulfur dioxide is caused by the burning of gases and other fuels in industrial plants. The smog is a measure of solid particles in the air.

In Buffalo, Doctors Harry A. Sultz, Joseph G. Feldman, Edward R. Schlessinger and William E. Mosher measured the number of children under 16 hospitalized with asthma and eczema, a skin inflammation, against air pollution levels.

They found 32.4 hospitalized asthma cases for 100,000 children when there was little air pollution. The rate jumped to 50.7 cases per 100,000 at the highest pollution level.

The figures for eczema were even more striking. The low pollution rate of 2.9 hospitalized cases per 100,000 children jumped under conditions of high pollution to 10.2 per 100,000.

The study found "a striking association" between air pollution and the hospitalization of boys under five with asthma or eczema.

"These figures do not take into account the effect of air pollution on the vast majority of asthma and eczema patients who never require hospitalization," the study said. "If air pollution affects the incidents of the more severe cases among children, as is strongly suggested, there are important and widespread implications in terms of medical costs, physician and hospitalization utilization and personal suffering."

A study at the University of Rochester by Drs. David Rush and Walter W. W. Holland strengthened reports given by Sir George Godber of increased respiratory illness among smokers. Sir George is chief medical officer of the British Ministry of Health.

High school students who smoke more than 15 cigarettes a day have 10 times as many coughing attacks and production of sputum as nonsmokers. And, the study said, this was true of children as young as 13.

These reports from the APHA meetings tie in with a paper given last year at the Ninth American Medical Association Air Pollution Medical Research Conference in Denver. That paper, written by three doctors in the Bureau of Occupational Health and Environment Epidemiology of the California State Department of Public Health, concludes that "an association could exist between myocardial infarction case fatality rate and atmospheric carbon monoxide pollution." In lay terms, the doctors say that fatal heart-muscle seizures are related to smog levels. I shall insert the entire paper at the end of this statement.

Both these reports contribute to the mounting indictment against the private sector—and, more specifically, against the automobile manufacturers—which has continually, and predictably, shown more initiative in maintaining huge profits than in advancing the public interest.

All we have to do is add the billions of dollars spent over the past 15 years by car makers for annual model style

changes, and then compare that to the piddling amounts allocated to reduce smog and the priorities become evident for these bastions of free enterprise.

Indeed, the case against automobile manufacturers can be even more devastating. After all, in the recent antitrust suit settled after closed-door negotiations between the manufacturers and the Justice Department, the Antitrust Division had accumulated enough evidence to consider making a criminal action, charging a 15-year conspiracy by the car-makers to retard development of effective air pollution controls; instead, political pressures prevailed and the lesser civil complaint was lodged and then settled.

While Federal District Court Judge Jesse W. Curtis' decision to accept the consent judgment left the door partly open for future damage suits against the auto manufacturers, I am disappointed that the proposed consent decree was accepted. This move blocks the public's right to see and analyze for itself the information detailing the automobile manufacturers strategy to avoid providing stringent pollution controls.

And I know that I am not alone in this opinion. Over 200,000 southern Californians have written me during the past month expressing their deep concern over the dangers of smog and their demands for positive action.

I remain convinced that public and Government pressure and appropriate legislation must be wielded to cause the auto industry to assume a proper responsibility and act to cut out smog. Given our society's existing and potential technological capabilities, I cannot accept any arguments from carmakers that they cannot accomplish this objective at a reasonable cost.

The logical place to start is here in Congress. Certainly, I am aware that numerous air pollution statutes already exist, but they are not halting rising pollution levels, and the one area existing measures are weakest is where they deal with the largest of all polluters—motor vehicle emissions.

As an initial step, I recently introduced three bills which propose to make the auto industry proceed—without delay and regardless of costs—to produce effective antismog cars.

These bills augment my strong "Omnibus Environmental Quality Act" introduced earlier in the session which sets out a powerful Government program to maintain and enhance our environment.

The first new bill, H.R. 14577, amends the Clean Air Act and is based upon the Petris bill which passed the California State Senate a few months ago; it bans, after January 1, 1978, the sale or use of any vehicle powered by an internal combustion engine producing pollutants above very stringent levels.

The second bill, H.R. 14578, termed the "Smogless Vehicle Development Act of 1969" proposes a \$300 million 3-year Government grant program to develop and produce a working nonpolluting car. I believe this to be a much stronger approach to getting a low emission car than those programs which allow the Government to decide among various proposals which one might be purchased for Gov-

ernment use. No matter how large the incentive, the auto industry to date refuses to give serious consideration to building cars powered by other than gasoline engines.

The third measure, H.R. 14579, changes only one word of an existing law, but that one small alteration would create significant progress in this crucial struggle against smog.

The current National Emissions Standards Act loses much of its strength because car makers are given a convenient "catch"—pollution standards can be set to permit the fewest possible emissions, but only if the costs involved are low. My amendment requires manufacturers to comply with the most severe standards "to the extent technically feasible and without regard to economic costs."

I am aghast that we have let cost factors outweigh health considerations. No matter how expensive the most stringent standards can be, we must set them and we must adhere to them.

It cannot be a matter of economics in the traditional sense of profits and prices; it is a matter of economics in the sense of maintaining our increasingly scarce, abused, and depleted natural resources, and the future costs of remedying damages resulting from our failure to impose these strict standards today can be stupendous.

Prompt action by Congress is imperative if we are to halt the smog menace. Public response on this issue overwhelmingly supports the need for stronger controls. The burden now rests on us to translate public demands into effective legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I now insert the report on carbon monoxide and myocardial infarctions into the RECORD:

CARBON MONOXIDE AND MYOCARDIAL INFARCTION

(By Seymour I. Cohen, M.D., Margaret Deane, M.P.H., and John R. Goldsmith, M.D.)

INTRODUCTION

Carbon monoxide (CO) is a major urban air pollutant derived primarily from vehicular exhaust. In most cities, moderate levels of CO are restricted to the areas adjacent to heavily traveled streets and highways. In several metropolitan areas, however, high values may occur over large sectors of the community.¹ Ambient CO levels appear to have increased in the last decade though the increase has been erratic. Other exposures to CO result from combustion products of cigarettes, cooking and household heaters, as well as industrial operations.

Carbon monoxide combines with hemoglobin forming carboxyhemoglobin (COHb) and to a lesser extent with myoglobin forming carboxymyoglobin. In the presence of COHb, there is a shift to the left of the oxyhemoglobin dissociation curves.² This shift is a result of the increased affinity of hemoglobin for oxygen in the presence of CO. There is, therefore, a decreased oxygen partial pressure for a given blood oxygen concentration resulting in a further reduction in the availability of oxygen supplied to body tissues.

A small fraction of the absorbed CO is normally oxidized to carbon dioxide. Endogenous CO is produced in small quantities when hemoglobin and other cyclic tetrapyrroles are catabolized. Concentrations of CO resulting from endogenous formation are insignificant except in hemolytic disorders

Footnotes at end of article.

or during special situations when expired air is recycled without removal of CO. This can occur during closed-circuit anesthesia as well as in submarine and space capsule environments.

In 1959 the California State Department of Public Health set an air quality standard for ambient CO of 30 parts per million average over 8 hours. This is a level which will produce a COHb concentration of approximately 5%.³ It was predicted that if this level occurred frequently, it could interfere with the survival of patients who had vascular disease, particularly these with myocardial infarctions (M.I.). This prediction has not been tested but several kinds of evidence suggest that exposure to CO may be a relevant factor in vascular disease.

Although an important source of CO exposure results from cigarette smoking, studies of health effects of smoking have tended to place almost all their emphasis upon other components of cigarette smoke. A recent report by Hammond⁴ shows significantly higher coronary disease mortality among smokers. (Table I).

Although several occupational health studies^{5,6,7} report no increase in the incidence of disease in men exposed to CO concentrations approaching 100 ppm during an 8-hour day, other studies indicate that there may be an increase in hemoglobin and hematocrit in individuals with similar exposures.^{8,9}

Studies to determine the health effects of CO have usually utilized short CO exposures at high concentrations and therefore the observed clinical effects have been attributable to asphyxiation. Acute CO exposures have resulted in transient as well as permanent electrocardiographic changes in man.¹⁰ Animal studies utilizing very high concentrations of CO (1000 ppm) over long periods of time have consistently resulted in necrotic myocardial lesions.¹¹ Additional exposure studies with continuous or intermittent long term exposure to 50 ppm CO have also been suggestive of myocardial effects.^{12,13}

In environmental epidemiological studies, mortality data have been relatively insensitive indices for measuring air pollution health effects. This is often because of inappropriate cause of death designation as well as the frequent unavailability of autopsy data for verification of diagnoses. Biases in morbidity data such as hospital admissions for specific diseases can result from differential admission policies, availability of hospital beds, and changes in medical staffing. Some of these problems have been dealt with by Sterling^{14,15} in a study utilizing Blue Cross hospital admissions as an index of morbidity.

We have currently undertaken a re-examination of admissions to thirty-six Los Angeles area hospitals during 1958, to test the hypothesis that increased exposure to ambient CO is associated with a decrease in the probability of survival of patients who have been admitted because of myocardial infarction. The basic strategy involves comparisons of morbidity in which exposure to CO varies by place as well as time.

METHODS

Selected data were obtained from the records of patients admitted to thirty-six hospitals in the Los Angeles metropolitan area between January 1 and December 31, 1958 with specific cardiac and/or respiratory disease discharge diagnoses. The charts were abstracted by medical record librarians at each of these hospitals. Information obtained included age, sex, date of admission, date of discharge, date of onset of the illness, discharge diagnoses, disposition of patient (recovery or death), area of residence, area of employment, and number of days hospitalized.

Our present analysis is limited to the 3,080 admissions for M.I. (I.C.D. 420.1). Two case

fatality rates were calculated. The "admission case fatality rate" was based on number of M.I. admissions on a given day with the numerator being the number of these people who subsequently died during their hospitalization although not necessarily on the day admitted. The "man-days at risk case fatality rate" was based on the number of M.I. patients in the hospital on a given day with the numerator being the number of individuals who died on that day. However, if an individual stayed in the hospital more than seven days, he was considered at risk only for the first seven days. The decision to limit "M.I. patients at risk" to this period of time is based upon the observation of markedly diminished risk of dying from an M.I. after the first week of hospitalization (Figure 1). These two different case fatality rates allow contrasts to be made of the importance of ambient CO on the day of admission versus the ambient CO level on the day of death.

Carbon monoxide measurements were available from monitoring stations operated by the Los Angeles Air Pollution Control District. Data recorded for each station include hourly and daily averages as well as the maximum 5-minute peak concentration occurring during the day. The daily average value was selected to represent dose-exposure to CO because of evidence which indicate that approximately 3-4 hours are required for equilibrium to be reached with fixed CO exposures under conditions of normal respiration and activity.

We have not made any attempt to utilize specific stations as an index of exposure for a given hospital because patients may live in an area sufficiently distant so that the level utilized is nonrepresentative of the exposure. A Los Angeles "basin average" value was therefore calculated using five monitoring stations which were in operation during the entire year of the study. A station was not incorporated in the computation of the daily basin average unless measurements of CO were available for at least 8 consecutive hours of that day. This limitation insured that excessively low or high periods of any day would not artificially alter the basin average. Examination of the data indicates that no systematic omission of any of the five stations occurred.

To introduce a spatial component in our examination of M.I. case fatality rates, the hospitals were divided into those located in relatively "low" and "high" pollution areas based on isopleths of CO prepared by the Los Angeles Air Pollution Control District. The presumptively "low" area was outside the 8 ppm isopleth for 1955. Figure 2 indicates presumptively "high" and "low" CO pollution areas in Los Angeles during 1958. Since the majority of hospitals are located in the "high" area, 2,484 M.I. admissions were to hospitals in this area and 596 M.I. admissions were to hospitals in the "low" area.

RESULTS

Weekly hospital admissions, M.I. case fatality rates and deaths from M.I. as well as basin averages for carbon monoxide during 1958 are shown in Figure 3. No obvious seasonal trends are observed for case fatality rates, admissions or deaths; however, CO shows the expected increase usually observed during the winter months in Los Angeles.

Several analytical methods were considered to explore the hypothesized relationships between the environmental variable, CO, and case fatality rates. In the first method regression analysis was used. In order to normalize the data and obtain approximately equal variance an arc sin transformation was applied to the M.I. case fatality rates (which are proportions), and a logarithmic transformation of CO was used. Correlation coefficients between the two

M.I. case fatality rates (arc sin transformation) and log CO were calculated for the total Los Angeles area as well as the "high" and "low" areas separately by each day of the week to eliminate day of week effect and to reduce possible auto-correlation (Tables II and III). No significant association was found between CO and hospital admission for M.I. The greater frequency of significant correlations between CO and "admission case fatality rates" for the total Los Angeles area compared to those between CO and "man-days at risk case fatality rates," suggests that CO on day of admission is of greater importance in predicting M.I. case fatality rate than the CO on day of death. In the "high" area, significant correlations were found for several days of the week, but no correlations were significant in the "low" area (Table III). The major source of significant associations of case fatality rates with CO appears, therefore, to be contributed by hospitals in the "high" pollution area.

A second analytical method uses a non-parametric statistical technique. Weekly M.I. case fatality rates were calculated separately for the "high" and "low" pollution areas. For each week, the sign of the difference between the case fatality rates were determined. If spatially dependent factors, including the overall air pollution exposures of the "high" area, had no effect on the case fatality rates, about 50% of the weeks would be expected to show a positive difference. The method as described so far is principally a spatial one since the variation of air pollution over time is not involved.

Temporal factors were introduced by dividing the year into quartiles of weeks on the basis of CO basin averages, and performing the analysis separately upon each quartile. The same approach could have been used on a daily basis but the small frequency of admissions for myocardial infarctions daily in the "low" area makes this impractical.

An example of the sign test used in the temporo-spatial model is shown in Table IV. In the 52 weeks during 1958, there were 35 occasions in which "high" area hospitals had a greater "admission case fatality rate" than "low" area hospitals. This result is significant at the 5% level, suggesting that some factor operating in the "high" area is associated with increased "admission case fatality rates". When the weekly case fatality rates (both "admission" and "man days at risk") are further examined by quartiles, a significant difference between "high" and "low" area hospitals occurs only in the highest quartile. This is shown in Figure 4 for the "admission case fatality rate". A Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-rank test verified the significant increase in both case fatality rates in the "high" area. This was noted in the highest quartile for the "admissions case fatality rate" and in the highest two quartiles for the "man days at risk case fatality rate". This indicates that significant differences in case fatality rates between the two areas are only evident during periods of relatively increased CO pollution and suggests that CO may be the responsible factor.

DISCUSSION

Traditional approaches to the study of health effects associated with air pollution have often utilized regression analysis. Spurious or undetected associations may result from bias due to day of week or seasonal effects upon morbidity. In an attempt to deal with these problems, we have incorporated in our analysis a temporo-spatial comparison utilizing a nonparametric statistical technique. This method also avoids to some extent the problem of auto correlation in analysis of sequences of time intervals as well as the problem of whether or not a time lag should be used between the "cause" and the "effect" variable.

The division of Los Angeles County into relatively "high" and "low" pollution areas

is based upon CO measurements from monitoring stations during 1958 and is additionally strengthened by studies recording the differential pattern of eye irritation in areas of Los Angeles. Since differences in M.I. case fatality rates in the relatively "high" and "low" areas may be based upon other factors which characterize the populations, we have examined our data to see whether this is the case. The age, male-female ratio, and percentage of individuals having hospitalization insurance did not differ between the two areas. Factors other than these, especially socioeconomic level, may be of importance, but we are not able to determine this from our data. A census tract study carried out in 1960 by the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission shows that a greater proportion of individuals 65 and older live in the relatively "high" pollution area of Los Angeles County. Since this is not reflected in the age of individuals admitted to hospitals for M.I. in these two areas, we do not feel this factor is likely to have any influence upon the occurrence of higher M.I. case fatality rates in the relatively "high" pollution area.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

To test the hypothesis that during high periods of carbon monoxide pollution, persons with acute cardiovascular accidents would be adversely affected, we have studied admissions and case fatality rates for patients admitted with myocardial infarction to thirty-six Los Angeles hospitals during 1958.

No significant association was found between number of admissions for myocardial infarction and carbon monoxide levels. Significant correlations were obtained for myocardial infarction case fatality rates with carbon monoxide on day of admission. The significant associations occurred in the area

of the county with higher carbon monoxide levels and during selected days of the week. These results could have been due to factors other than carbon monoxide exposure such as hospital admittance and hospital care practices or effects associated with time of year. The results of nonparametric tests indicate that differences in "high" and "low" area M.I. case fatality rates are only evident during periods of relatively increased CO pollution.

At the present time, our interpretation of these findings is that an association could exist between myocardial infarction case fatality rate and atmospheric carbon monoxide pollution but that additional studies would be required to draw any firm conclusions about causality.

REFERENCES

- ¹ Taylor, J. R.: Dustfall Trends in Los Angeles, 1947-1960. Los Angeles Air Pollution Control District Report, August 1961, pages 7-10.
- ² Haldane, J. B. S.: The Dissociation of Oxyhaemoglobin in Human Blood During Partial CO Poisoning. *J. Physiol. (Lond.)* 45:xxii, 1912-1913.
- ³ California State Department of Public Health: Technical Report of California Standards for Ambient Air Quality and Motor Vehicle Exhaust, 1960.
- ⁴ Hammond, E. C. in *Epidemiologic Approaches to the Study of Cancer and Other Chronic Diseases*. W. Haenszel, editor, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1966.
- ⁵ Schrenk, H. H.: Exposure to Carbon Monoxide in the Holland Tunnel, *Public Health Bull.* 278:1-57, January 1942.
- ⁶ Lindgren, S. A.: A Study of the Effects of Prolonged Occupational Exposure to Carbon Monoxide, *ACTA Medica Scand.* 167:1-135 (Supplement 359), 1961.

⁷ Grut, A.: *Chronic Carbon Monoxide Poisoning, A Study in Occupational Medicine*. Ejnar Munksgaard, Copenhagen, 1949, 229 pages.

⁸ Hofreuter, D. H., Catcott, E. J., and Kintaras, C.: Carboxyhemoglobin in Men Exposed to Carbon Monoxide, *Arch. Environ. Health* 4:81-91, January 1962.

⁹ Ramsey, James M.: Carboxyhemoglobine-mia in Parking Garage Employees, *Arch. Environ. Health* 15:580-583, November 1967.

¹⁰ Shafer, N., Smilan, M. G., and MacMillan, F. P.: Primary Myocardial Disease Resulting from Acute Carbon Monoxide Poisoning, *Amer. J. Med.* 38:316-320, February 1965.

¹¹ Ehrlich, W. E., Bellet, S., and Lewy, F. H.: Cardiac Change from CO Poisoning, *Amer. J. Med. Sc.* 208:511-523, 1944.

¹² Stupfel, M., Bouley, G., Dekov, S., Bourgeois, M., and Roussel, A., *Bull. del' N.S.E.R.* M.T. 23:309, 1968.

¹³ Lindenberg, R., reziosi, T., Levy, D., and Christensen, M. paper presented at Amer. Industrial Hygiene Assoc. Meeting, Wash. D.C., 1962.

¹⁴ Sterling, T. D., et al: Urban Morbidity and Air Pollution—A First Report, *Arch. Environ. Health* 13:158-170, 1967.

¹⁵ Sterling, T. D., Pollack, S. V. and Phair, J. J.: Urban Hospital Morbidity and Air Pollution—A Second Report, *Arch. Environ. Health* 15:362-374, 1967.

TABLE I.—CORONARY HEART DISEASE MORTALITY RATIOS AMONG CURRENT CIGARETTE SMOKERS, BY AMOUNT SMOKED DAILY

Age	Non-smokers	Under 10 per day	10 to 19 per day	20-plus per day
45 to 54.....	1.0	2.4	3.1	3.2
55 to 64.....	1.0	1.5	1.9	2.0
65 to 74.....	1.0	1.3	1.6	1.6
75 to 84.....	1.0	1.2	1.4	1.1

TABLE II.—RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NUMBER OF HOSPITAL ADMISSIONS FOR MYOCARDIAL INFARCTION, M.I. CASE FATALITY RATES AND AMBIENT CO BY DAY OF WEEK, 195 HOSPITAL ADMISSION STUDY

	Carbon monoxide (basin average)	Mean myocardial infarction admissions	Correlation ¹ coefficient admissions versus CO	Mean case fatality rate per 100 admissions	Correlation ² coefficient "admissions case fatality rate" versus CO	Mean case fatality rate per 100 man-days at risk	Correlation ² coefficient "man-days at risk case fatality rate" versus CO
All days.....	7.41	8.46	0.002	26.0	³ 0.114	3.30	0.067
Weekdays.....	7.66	8.94	-.120	24.7	³ 0.130	3.30	.039
Weekends.....	6.80	7.26	-.022	30.2	.177	3.29	.149
Sunday.....	6.53	6.94	-.251	28.3	.049	3.21	.254
Monday.....	7.71	9.54	-.234	25.4	.019	2.55	-.016
Tuesday.....	7.45	9.41	-.071	23.5	.134	3.75	.160
Wednesday.....	7.53	9.13	-.150	24.2	³ .273	3.34	.045
Thursday.....	7.71	8.08	-.019	26.9	-.030	3.33	-.167
Friday.....	7.90	8.56	-.121	23.6	2.62	3.54	.210
Saturday.....	7.07	7.58	-.040	32.0	³ .309	3.38	.040

¹ Correlation between M.I. admissions and log CO (basin average).

² Correlation between arc sin transformation of M.I. case fatality rate (x') and log CO.

³ Significant at the 5-percent level.

Note: $x' = \arcsin \sqrt{\frac{N+1}{M+1}} + \arcsin \sqrt{\frac{x}{N+1}}$, where x is the number of deaths and N is the number of admissions or man-days at risk.

TABLE III.—RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DAILY MYOCARDIAL INFARCTION CASE FATALITY RATE AND AMBIENT CO BY DAY OF WEEK—1958 HOSPITAL ADMISSION STUDY

	High area				Low area			
	Mean case fatality rate per 100 admissions	Correlation ¹ coefficient admissions case fatality rate vs. CO	Mean case fatality rate per 100 man-days at risk	Correlation ¹ coefficient man-days at risk case fatality rate vs. CO	Mean case fatality rate per 100 admissions	Correlation ¹ coefficient admissions case fatality rate vs. CO	Mean case fatality rate per 100 man-days at risk	Correlation ¹ coefficient man-days at risk case fatality rate vs. CO
All days.....	27.3	² 0.161	3.41	0.099	19.1	-0.003	2.85	-0.075
Weekdays.....	25.8	² .161	3.44	.084	18.4	.050	2.75	-.071
Weekends.....	31.7	² .280	3.34	.151	22.0	-.112	3.11	-.078
Sunday.....	29.3	.070	3.30	³ .346	22.8	.002	2.83	-.182
Monday.....	26.3	.057	2.75	.096	11.7	.081	1.89	-.207
Tuesday.....	24.5	.057	4.05	.159	21.8	.206	2.47	-.067
Wednesday.....	24.7	.192	3.50	.070	24.1	.228	2.65	-.019
Thursday.....	29.4	.164	3.45	-.160	18.4	-.131	2.86	-.031
Friday.....	24.3	² .346	3.46	³ .304	23.5	-.133	3.84	-.082
Saturday.....	34.0	² .482	3.38	-.054	21.2	-.193	3.38	-.001

¹ Correlation between arc sin transformation of M.I. case fatality rate (x') and log CO.
 $x' = \arcsin \sqrt{\frac{x+1}{N+1}} + \arcsin \sqrt{\frac{x}{N+1}}$ where x is the number of deaths and N is the number of admissions.

² Significant at the 1-percent level.

³ Significant at the 5-percent level.

TABLE IV.—COMPARISON OF ADMISSION CASE FATALITY RATES FOR MYOCARDIAL INFARCTION BETWEEN RELATIVELY HIGH AND LOW POLLUTION AREAS 1958 LOS ANGELES HOSPITAL ADMISSIONS STUDY

Week	CO (p.p.m.) weekly basin		Admission case fatality rate		Sign ¹ + or -
	More average	Less average	More average	Less average	
1	9.56	21.28	50.00	0	—
2	9.20	27.42	0	0	—
3	9.41	30.61	14.29	0	—
4	7.52	24.07	0	0	—
5	6.84	39.13	28.57	0	—
6	8.62	30.00	23.08	0	—
7	8.43	24.07	44.44	0	—
8	6.58	21.57	20.00	0	—
9	6.51	32.00	14.29	0	—
10	5.78	26.67	14.29	0	—
11	5.81	29.51	10.00	0	—
12	6.67	23.40	33.33	0	—
13	6.58	15.79	45.45	0	—
14	5.87	28.33	35.71	0	—
15	7.20	25.42	27.27	0	—
16	7.04	14.00	30.00	0	—
17	5.81	22.45	14.29	0	—
18	5.96	24.53	30.77	0	—
19	5.57	21.15	58.33	0	—
20	5.83	26.53	28.57	0	—
21	6.43	25.53	28.57	0	—
22	5.96	13.04	15.38	0	—
23	5.36	24.24	20.00	0	—
24	5.84	45.24	33.33	0	—
25	6.19	32.73	26.27	0	—
26	6.21	22.45	9.09	0	—
27	5.63	29.17	22.22	0	—
28	6.58	26.09	23.08	0	—
29	5.54	22.86	8.33	0	—
30	5.56	20.93	0	0	—
31	6.97	41.46	7.14	0	—
32	6.95	24.44	22.22	0	—
33	7.17	23.81	8.33	0	—
34	6.11	15.00	15.38	0	—
35	5.78	18.60	27.27	0	—
36	7.19	33.33	28.57	0	—
37	7.33	23.08	13.33	0	—
38	8.49	22.92	16.67	0	—
39	7.73	33.90	15.38	0	—
40	8.30	24.24	0	0	—
41	7.88	37.21	28.57	0	—
42	8.19	22.86	30.00	0	—
43	7.64	28.95	18.18	0	—
44	9.50	29.55	17.65	0	—
45	8.99	29.63	22.22	0	—
46	5.64	26.23	28.57	0	—
47	11.58	28.85	8.33	0	—
48	8.61	28.57	14.29	0	—
49	10.46	31.25	25.00	0	—
50	10.39	41.03	27.27	0	—
51	14.53	58.62	20.00	0	—
52	9.31	28.57	8.33	0	—

¹ A "+" sign is assigned if the case fatality rate in the more polluted area exceeds the case fatality rate in the less polluted area.

MARINE RESERVISTS AID SANTA CLAUS COLLECTING CHRISTMAS "TOYS FOR TOTS"

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there are thousands of organizations across the country who perform a myriad of volunteer services for the welfare of their fellow Americans. There is one organization among these that I feel is particularly deserving of special recognition at this time of year for its monumental effort to make Christmas a happy day for millions of America's less fortunate youngsters.

I speak, of course, of the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve's "Toys for Tots" program.

Initiated by three marine officers in Los Angeles, Calif., in 1947, "Toys for Tots" has grown until the present day when Marine Reserve units are spearheading toy drives in over 200 cities in 45

of our 50 States. During more than two decades of operation, "Toys for Tots" has collected 48 million toys for distribution to 20 million children.

For the past 17 years the Lehigh Valley Marine Corps reservists in my own congressional district have been collecting, repairing, and distributing toys. Last year 35,000 toys were distributed to children who might otherwise have had a bleak Christmas.

With Lehigh Valley newspapers providing news space and radio and television stations providing air time to help publicize the toy collection program, over 100 merchants, civic groups, colleges, governmental agencies, and clubs aided the marines' effort.

This year, 200 reservists of Headquarters and Service Company, the 4th Service Battalion, 4th Marine Division, U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, of Freemansburg, Pa., plan to collect over 50,000 toys. The collection begins today and will continue through December 17 under the direction of Capt. George B. Hanily, commanding officer.

This is a fine program deserving of broad community support everywhere and I congratulate the Marine Corps reservists for making each Christmas so very bright for so many unfortunate children.

A TELEGRAM TO THE PRESIDENT

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 5, 1969

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I know the President is receiving many telegrams and letters on the subject of his recent speech. He may not have an opportunity to read all of that mail and it may be that his staff likewise is overburdened. I suspect, however, that the President and his staff read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I thought that one telegram which was sent to him and which may still lie on his desk unread, might, if reported in this RECORD, be seen either by him or a member of his staff. That telegram, a copy of which follows, states a point of view with which I concur:

NEW YORK CITY,
November 4, 1969.

RICHARD M. NIXON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: We had expected your address last night to offer some hope that at last the disastrous course taken by your predecessor, which also was so sadly unfortunate for him, personally, would be reversed.

Such was not the case. We were in fact served more of the same stale explanations, excuses and historical inaccuracies.

Your mandate was and is for peace, to get us out of this loathsome, debilitating war... not to attempt to save the last shreds of tarnished honor. The inference that all dissent be labelled irresponsible or disloyal we found frightening carrying as it did the foreboding of repressive measures to come.

It also suggests that you have followed the pattern of insulation from the people started by Mr. Johnson. Mr. President, your silent majority is finding its voice and it calls for

peace now. If you doubt this we suggest you try a plebiscite on the question of withdrawal.

Respectfully,

RITA and THEODORE BIKEL.

CONGRESS AND THE COMPUTER

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of Modern Data magazine carried an article concerning "Congress and the Computer."

Washington Editor Harold Semling has shown a grasp of the "information problem" on Capitol Hill, and the great need for modern management tools and techniques to help solve it.

I include the article at this point in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

CONGRESS AND THE COMPUTER

Congress has a long way to go before it joins the computer age, but there are signs that it is making progress in this direction.

Greater access to information, principally through the application of modern information technology to the tasks of Congress, is readily available. Only recently, however, has Congress started to become concerned about the possibilities of bringing this technology to bear on its legislative and other responsibilities, and to take steps toward utilizing the new instruments and techniques of data processing.

Increased demands on the Congress have been brought about by rapid economic, technological, and population pressures. Its workload has been drastically increased in recent years. In a recent Congress, for example, out of 26,566 measures introduced, 4,016 were passed.

Congressman William S. Moorhead told a recent conference of the American Management Association that this growing role of the Congress is complicated by the fact that the present problem facing it is "not one of too little information, but too much." The big problem, he explains, is "to distinguish between the significant fact and the inconsequential detail."

Congress is slow to adapt modern management methods. In 1966 there were no computer activities in Congress except for one small payroll unit in the Library of Congress. Now there are a few more data processing systems at work on Capitol Hill, but the legislative branch is still far behind the executive branch in the use of modern data systems. Congressman Moorhead is greatly concerned about this situation. He believes that this lack of use has "jeopardized the balance which Congress must maintain between it and the executive," and that imbalance could be corrected by increased installation of computerized systems by the Legislative branch.

One of the chief promoters of the use of computers by Congress is Rep. Jack Brooks (D., Tex.), Chairman of the Government Activities Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations. "The state of the art in data processing and information handling has developed to the point where it can be of material assistance to the Congress in coping with the constantly increasing complexity and volume of data inherent in the legislative process. The time has come for us to make full use of these new capabilities. In Congress every day," Rep. Brooks explains, "we witness increasingly serious symptoms of the inadequacies of traditional

information handling techniques to meet present and future demands.

"If data processing were to provide us with only a 5% increase in efficiency in handling budget and appropriation matters, the savings under present budgetary levels would exceed \$4 billion annually."

LEGISLATIVE LAG

"It's time the United States Congress joined the 20th Century," according to Congressman Dante B. Fascell (D-Fla.). "The massive volume of information and statistics which constantly accompanies matters before the Congress and its committees cannot possibly be accorded the time and study required for the members to understand fully and act upon them intelligently."

As an example, Congressman Fascell cited the "fifty-one federal departments and agencies employing approximately one million people and expending sums in excess of \$150 billion annually" that must be provided for in a budget which, in condensed form, is contained in a book larger than the telephone directories of most major cities. "The use of computers by the legislative branch would enable Congress to have budgetary and cost analysis information from every federal agency immediately available."

Congressman Fascell points up a paradox. "The federal government is the world's largest user of computers, with more than 4,000 computer systems. Yet the legislative branch, which from a decision-making standpoint probably has the most complex and difficult role of any of the branches of government, has not kept up with these advancements. Only in recent months has the House of Representatives applied computer techniques to such mundane operations as payroll and inventory. No facet of our legislative responsibilities is supported by an adequate flow of accurate, up-to-date information such as can be obtained through the application of these techniques."

"The design of efficient computer systems is a costly and time-consuming process. Exploitation of these techniques by the Congress will take many years. We cannot afford to delay any longer in establishing an efficient management system to allow for the fullest application of computers to assist us in meeting the growing responsibilities we have to the American people," according to the Florida Democrat.

Equipped with EDP and the staff to employ it, Rep. John Brademas (D. Ind.) believes "Congress will be able far more effectively to tackle thorny public policy problems in defense and space, transportation, health and education, pollution control, and urban rejuvenation." The possibilities for using EDP to support Congress seems to him "almost unlimited."

Congressman Brademas asks if Congress will "continue to deny itself the tools of modern information technology and permit the executive virtually to monopolize access to such capability?"

The stakes are immense, Rep. Brademas warns, and "if Congress fails to create its own information analysis and retrieval capacity or to assure itself adequate access to the data machinery of the executive and the private sector, Congress will ultimately destroy its power both to create policy and to oversee the executive."

Congress is far behind the executive in its utilization of EDP. "The current disparity in computer usage between the legislative and executive branches both symbolizes and helps explain at least some of the advantages which the executive now enjoys over Congress in both generating and supervising policy," Rep. Brademas believes. He points out that the executive currently uses over 4600 computers while Congress, as of January, had only three EDP facilities.

Congress is also behind several state legislatures in the development of fairly sophis-

ticated computer systems (e.g., New York, Penn., Texas, North Carolina, and Florida).

The areas in which Congress might apply EDP include: determining the status of pending legislation, obtaining information about the activity of lobbyists, directly accessing legislative files, searching legal information and literature, developing an automated index and catalog of Congressional documents, and maintaining the payroll accounts of Congressional employees. Each chamber of Congress, as an entity, could use EDP for obtaining information on issues up for a vote, analyzing post-vote information, and electronic (remote) voting by Congressmen. Congressional committees of subcommittees could use it to schedule meetings and hearings, print histories of committee action, update committee files, collect information on Federal contract awards, and gather statistics and information on appropriations. Individual congressmen could use it to compare constituent information, reply to correspondence, and aid them in selecting their reading.

Congressman Brademas sees a further system in Congress which would provide:

Legislative research reports transmitted from the Library of Congress to members' offices.

Schedules of committee meetings and hearings automatically printed or flashed on screens in committee rooms and members' offices.

Status information on all federal contracts.

A full index of all information on file in the executive branch's data banks, which could be tapped by Congress.

Detailed analyses and background on the President's budget proposals (now almost totally lacking).

A resolution passed by the House Democratic Caucus in February called on all House Democrats to support the use of computers in Congress.

PRESENT FACILITIES

There are only a few computers now serving Congress. The largest computer is located in the Library of Congress as part of the Legislative Reference Service and serves both the House and Senate. It provides every Congressional office twice monthly with a "Digest of Public Bills," including synoptic and status information on all bills and resolutions in both chambers. Each month, it prints a "Legislative Status Report" on two hundred bills and generates selected bibliographical information which Congressional officers can request.

A smaller computer is used by the House for payroll purposes.

In mid-February, the House Banking and Currency Committee instigated a computerized system for keeping track of legislation within its jurisdiction. The Committee installed in its office an IBM 2741 communications terminal connected to a legislative memory bank in the Library of Congress. The same type of system, Congressman Benjamin R. Blackburn (R-Ga.) suggests, could be used for committee hearings and reports. He has proposed legislation which would require all legislative reports and hearings over 25 pages in length to be indexed.

About two years ago, House Clerk William Pat Jennings obtained approval from the House Administration Committee to install the first computer in the House of Representatives. This machine, an NCR-500, is presently being used in the Rayburn Office Building to maintain the payroll accounts of 7000 Congressional employees and control an inventory of more than 50,000 items of property. An NCR-100 was recently added to the system, and additional applications are under study.

FUTURE PLANS

Since becoming clerk of the House, Mr. Jennings has suggested several areas he believes could benefit by computerization.

Among the most important applications he has asked the House Administration Committee to consider are (1) a computerized addressing service, (2) an electronic voting system, and (3) an information retrieval system.

Computerized addressing service

A centrally-located, high-speed, selective addressing service would save clerical time and provide additional space in offices by eliminating addressing machines and cabinets. A similar system is presently being used by the Senate and about one-third of the Senators' addresses have been already converted to magnetic tape.

Electronic voting systems

The office of the House Clerk has for over a year been conducting research on the automated approach to member voting in the House Chamber.

"Voting electronically on the House floor is a delicate, highly-sensitive thing, and should be looked at completely and carefully," Mr. Jennings said. "A modern system should be installed which will be capable of providing functions beyond electronic voting as new technological developments occur." In addition, it should provide optimum reliability and simplicity of operation, and conform to the aesthetic and traditional environment of the Chamber.

A basic system would require individual voting stations for each member, a full display board containing all names, a projector and screen for displaying statistical data and amendments, and a CRT input console for the Clerk. Satellite CRT's placed in the offices of the Speaker, the Majority and Minority Leaders, the Whips, the Parliamentarian, and the Clerk of the House would allow them to follow closely all activities on the floor from their offices. The Clerk would be responsible for monitoring the condition of the system.

Mr. Jennings believes that if the approach is feasible, a small pilot system could be built and demonstrated to the House Administration Committee within nine months.

Information retrieval system

Mr. Jennings believes Congress should have some way to access information related to the status of legislation, committees, the budget, federal agencies, and other pertinent subject areas quickly, easily, and accurately. Because "the complexity, size, and cost of such a system is such that very careful study and planning is necessary for its proper and most expeditious implementation," Mr. Jennings recommends that a pilot system of up to 30 terminals (CRT with keyboard) using the data categories of the demonstration be installed at key locations in the House. The terminals in the pilot system could be peripherals of the computer recommended for centralized addressing.

Information retrieval systems of the type proposed by the Clerk of the House are extremely complex, and Mr. Jennings is aware of this fact. He therefore recommends that, in view of the need for the system, an independent consulting group be called in while other work is progressing. He does not think Congress can afford delaying the system any longer than absolutely necessary: "In order to meet the increased technical complexity and volume of Congressional legislation, the Congress must have dependable information which is readily available to assist in the decision-making process," Mr. Jennings states. "We have for sometime been faced with a rapidly-growing data gap—one which must and can be closed by the use of automatic data processing."

EFFORTS AND EFFECTS

For a number of years, Congress has been considering various ways it might modernize itself. The net effect of these studies, however, has been all out of proportion to the effort expended. After a 17-month study, a

Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization suggested legislation which passed the Senate in 1967 only to die in the House.

Since a key provision of most proposed Congressional reform legislation involves the use of EDP by the General Accounting Office and the Legislative Reference Service, the major obstacle has not been the EDP provisions, but the effect new legislation might have on established seniority.

A bill sponsored by Rep. Jack Brooks and seven other Representatives and approved by the House attempts to overcome some of these obstacles. The bill (H.R. 10791), which would provide Congress with an efficient information system, clearly states that the proposed system will not alter the jurisdiction of authority of any committee or any other Congressional unit.

The bill would delegate the Comptroller General of the United States (the General Accounting Office) the authority to provide and coordinate electronic data processing usage in Congress. Three responsibilities would be given to the Comptroller General:

(1) He would be charged with cooperating with the Bureau of the Budget in the development of a compatible data system to support the budget and appropriations cycle and seeing to it that any system developed by the executive branch also met the needs of Congress.

(2) He would be required to extend the basic concepts of compatibility to any other data processing system developed for the purpose of processing legislative data.

(3) He would coordinate the general management of computers in the legislative branch to assure their effective and efficient use.

CAPABILITY AND COMPATIBILITY

During a one-day hearing on April 23 to discuss the coordinated use of computers in Congress, Deputy Budget Director Philip A. Hughes said that "Modern information systems and computers play a vital role in insuring effective handling and analysis of information, not only within the respective branches of government, but in the continuous communication and dialogue which takes place between them at all levels."

By the middle of the 1970's, the Bureau of the Budget hopes to have a fully comprehensive management information system to support legislative and executive decision making. Present efforts of the Bureau of the Budget are aimed, broadly speaking, at improving the usefulness of federal program and budget information, information systems, and information management concepts.

In September 1968, the Bureau of the Budget issued BOB Circular A-90, "Cooperating with State and Local Governments to Coordinate and Improve Information Systems." This circular was designed to assist state and local governments to develop compatible information systems. Mr. Hughes stated that this was typical of the government's efforts to eliminate the incompatibilities presently handicapping the exchange of data.

A CLEAR NEED

Robert L. Chartrand, of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, has prepared a number of studies for Congress on the use of modern data technology to solve its problems. In one of them, Mr. Chartrand concludes that "the ultimate effect of providing Congress with a sophisticated, computer-oriented information system defies foretelling by even the most experienced expert. No such development could occur without an impact that would be discernible within Congress and throughout the entire nation. Each Congressional element may undergo subtle changes in thinking and mode of operation."

It is clear that it is time to bring Congress into the computer age.

ARE VIOLATIONS OF DISTRICT FIRE AND ZONING REGULATIONS TO BE ALLOWED?

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the question has been raised as to whether officials of at least two area universities and of the District of Columbia government are going to permit violation of District of Columbia fire and zoning regulations during the coming so-called moratorium.

Local press reports strongly suggest that officials of the American University and of George Washington University are going to "look the other way" when outsiders move into their university buildings, including dormitories, to sleep and to proselytize the students on behalf of those seeking the defeat of the United States.

The front page of the American University students' newspaper for November 7 is primarily devoted to honoring the 52d anniversary of the Bolshevik overthrow of democracy in Russia and victory for communism.

Inside, on page 4, a spokesman for the Student Mobilization Committee is quoted as saying, to quote the newspaper: "That he had talked with various administrators"—of the university—"and they had said that if a building was used at the time of the march without formal permission, there was not very much the university could do about it."

On page 5, the vice president of the AU Student Association is quoted directly as saying:

Come Moratorium day, the University will close its eyes to people and will permit people in an orderly way to move into various facilities on campus.

He warned against premature moves.

For the record, on page 4, the newspaper quotes the university facilities review board as rejecting a wholesale, overt turnover of facilities to the outsiders, stating:

The University cannot assume risks arising from obvious considerations for fire prevention, health, sanitation, safety and personal security which directly affect the members of the University Community.

But the board did grant use of one major building, the new lecture hall, for all-night "meetings" November 14 and 15. And the newspaper adds:

SMC leaders . . . said they would not be surprised if most of those participating in the rally happen to fall asleep during the proceedings.

This certainly raises the question as to whether university officials do indeed plan permissiveness toward overt plans to violate fire prevention and health regulations.

Meanwhile, as to George Washington University, its president, Lloyd Elliott is reported to have said on the one hand that it is against zoning laws to house people in nonresidence buildings while

on the other hand he has given permission for use of some buildings recently purchased by GW from the American University in the GW area. The AU newspaper, on page 13, states that SMC leaders told President Elliott that "their national headquarters" had been informed by the District of Columbia Zoning Commission that it was not against District of Columbia zoning laws to house people in nonresidence buildings. The paper continues:

"Elliott replied to this saying if the SMC could supply him with a written statement from the zoning commission that it was legal, he would reconsider his statement" denying some SMC requests.

All this raises questions as to whether university and city officials should encourage such permissiveness and, in effect, tacitly encourage acceleration of demands which can only lead to mob action and disruption of our system of government.

Maryland University, meanwhile, reportedly is going to permit guests in dormitory rooms for the regular \$4 fee. I wonder if fire regulations will be enforced.

SUPPORT FOR THE PRESIDENT

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, recently my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) introduced a resolution expressing the sense of the House that "the substantial reductions in U.S. ground combat forces in Vietnam already directed are in the national interest and that the President be supported in his expressed determination to withdraw our remaining such forces at the earliest practicable date."

I was pleased to become one of the well over 100 Members of the House who cosponsored that resolution. It is one of the most widely cosponsored resolutions relating to Vietnam, with the broadest support, introduced in the House of Representatives.

In response to the introduction of his resolution, Mr. FINDLEY received a most warm and appreciative letter from President Nixon and I would like to take this opportunity to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the President's letter to Congressman FINDLEY at this point in the RECORD:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 30, 1969.

HON. PAUL FINDLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PAUL: I would like to express my thanks to you for your role in the introduction of the House Resolution concerning my scheduling of troop withdrawals from Vietnam. This legislative action is greatly appreciated.

Also, please convey my sincere appreciation to the students at Quincy College for their petition in support of my efforts to bring the hostilities in Vietnam to an honor-

able conclusion. This undertaking on the part of the students is most heartwarming and their sincere statement is most meaningful.

With warm regard,
Sincerely,

R. N.

SENATE COMMITTEE ACTION ON FUNDING OF THE CLEAN WATER RESTORATION ACT

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago a vigorous campaign launched by our group of seven Congressmen from both sides of the aisle came within two votes of our goal—appropriating the full \$1 billion for water pollution abatement. The \$600 million finally appropriated by the House was labeled a "realistic figure," the only one the FWPCA could reasonably be expected to handle.

Now the Senate Appropriations Committee has reported out their bill calling for the full \$1 billion. Of course, we are delighted and applaud their action. While the House vote was a significant step forward—for finally we have broken through the \$200 million level of appropriations where water pollution control has stagnated in recent years—the Senate committee was far more "reasonable" when we consider the awesome backlog of unmet needs facing the Nation's water pollution control program.

Unquestionably, the Senate Appropriations Committee has taken a courageous, positive stand on the issue of clean water, and has acknowledged that it is not a luxury—it is a necessity, one we can no longer afford to ignore. Now let us hope that our House conferees will support the Senate action and vote in the joint conference committee for the funds promised 3 years ago: \$1 billion.

An editorial in today's Washington Post eloquently and succinctly expresses my feelings, and those of everyone who joined in the full funding fight. The editorial follows:

THE POLLUTION CRISIS

The Senate Appropriations Committee has once more raised the clean-water issue in very pointed fashion. Its call for \$1 billion in the form of matching grants to the states for water-treatment plants is in line with the demands of many civic, political and conservation groups that are alarmed by the deterioration in our environment. If the Senate looks at the problem as carefully as its committee has done, it is difficult to see how it could reach a different conclusion.

No one seems to question the need for at least \$1 billion for clean water this year. That goal was set in 1966 when Congress passed the Clean Water Restoration Act. But the government has been long on promises and short on performance. Last year Congress authorized the expenditure of \$700 million for treatment-facility grants but appropriated only \$214 million. The same figure was kept in both the Johnson and Nixon budgets for fiscal 1970, but the present administration is said to have offered a compromise figure of \$750 million when the demand for appropriation of the entire sum authorized was being pushed in the House.

In view of the fact that the \$1-billion-for-clean-water proposal failed by only two votes in the House, it is difficult to explain the final acceptance in that body of a compromise figure of \$600 million. If the Senate now takes a strong and positive stand for rescuing the country's rivers and lakes from their man-made filth, the chance of finding the two extra votes needed in the House would seem to be excellent.

Congress must be mindful of course, of excessive spending in this era of inflation. But the issue in this instance is not so much whether the country can afford \$1 billion for clean water as it is whether we can afford continued inaction in the face of progressive pollution of our environment. It is not a question of voting a luxury which the country cannot afford. It is a question of reclaiming an asset which the country once had and has now lost from neglect.

THIS IS WHERE IT HAPPENS

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if there is a Member in this body who questions the statement, "This is where it happens." We know the time and effort that each of our colleagues puts into the job of being a Congressman.

I would like to share with all of you a television commentary that is direct and to the point. Dick Tobias, director of broadcast services for Darcy Communications in Rochester, N.Y., presented the commentary on WOKR-TV, October 30, upon his return from a trip to Washington.

He had met with me and my colleagues; Mr. CONABLE, the minority leader (Mr. FORD), and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee (Mr. MILLS). I am sure you will find the following comments a pleasure and join me in expressing appreciation to Mr. Tobias:

VIEWPOINT WITH DICK TOBIAS

This probably isn't very important to anyone. But, from a selfish point of view, I want to record it. I watched our Congress in action yesterday . . . for a while, through the courtesy of Congressmen Horton and Conable, I sat above our Congress as they debated the issues great and small. Later in the day we met with a couple of America's best known leaders and were invited to the White House for a chat with the director of the U.S. Budget. All told, we weren't in Washington more than a very few hours . . . a city I have known since childhood. Nonetheless, it is refreshing and important to go back on occasion. Because, as commentators we often . . . we frequently, criticize the action and the inaction of Congress. A sharp reminder reminded me of all of this at the Capitol today. I stood with Congressman Gerald Ford just off the floor of the House as the Hub-Bub of legislative activity whirled by us. The Congressman said to me . . . "I suspect you as a commentator have had at us frequently . . . which is right and proper. But may I remind you . . . this is where it happens . . . this is where just a few hundred of us are responsible for the welfare of millions. And as of this moment, no one has invented a better system." I agree completely . . . a frequent trip to Washington is an excellent reminder of how lucky we really are.

DRONES SET NEW RECORD: BOOST SAVINGS IN FLIGHT TRAINING

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the monumental costs of maintaining a superior posture of national defense in this country are sometimes beyond the comprehension of most taxpayers. On occasion, this causes the taxpayer to wonder what is being done by the military to reduce or minimize expenditures, and to inform the public of their efforts.

It is particularly refreshing to me to witness cost-consciousness within the military community. It commands my strongest praise and encouragement, and I am sure yours as well, when economics are made apparent.

TYNDALL EXAMPLE CITED

I wish to bring one example to your attention, one which reflects not only a cost-effectiveness objective but, in return, has helped develop a new level of professionalism for those involved.

The U.S. Air Force, Air Defense Weapons Center at Panama City, Fla., recently issued a news report concerning the use of jet-powered aerial target systems which simulate hostile aircraft. These remote-controlled targets are used in weapons development, evaluation and training programs over a Gulf of Mexico target range adjacent to the Tyndall installation.

TARGET LIFE DOUBLED

These aerial targets, called Firebees and produced by Ryan Aeronautical Co. of San Diego, Calif., have been used at Tyndall for 11 years as stand-in aircraft for the "enemy." Experienced combat fighter-interceptor pilots claim there is no more realistic simulation for aerial combat.

In the published report, Brig. Gen. James L. Price noted that the average life of a Firebee target is 15 flights. He estimates the target value, with ground support equipment and all accessory hardware, to be about \$135,000.

The report pointed out that three of these Firebee targets, which are designed to automatically parachute themselves to a recovery area after a mission, had been flown 38 times. This represents the highest number of flights by a Firebee achieved in more than 20 years of use by the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

TAXPAYER SAVINGS REALIZED

This record number of flights and usage, the general estimated, saved taxpayers more than \$630,000 in replacement costs.

He pointed out that one of the Firebees has been fired at by fighter-interceptor pilots 181 times. At the time of his report, the drone target had attained 31 hours of actual flight time.

The general's report explained that a variety of electronic systems are carried by the Firebees which score weapons miss distances, eliminating the necessity of actually destroying a target to determine the weapons effectiveness or pilot skills.

FINDS REPORT HEARTENING

Finally, it is evident in this report that General Price reflected deep pride in the achievement of his officers and men in effecting this cost savings. His first and most demanding duty, as commander of the Air Defense Weapons Center, is to perfect in those who use the Tyndall facilities a degree of military professionalism that will assure them success in actual combat.

Tyndall's contributions toward this objective have been reflected many times over in the performance of our men who experienced air combat in Vietnam.

Too few of us, I fear, can share the feeling of self-confidence a combat pilot must experience as he engages the enemy over hostile territory. And the only way he can develop this feeling is through training programs such as those at Tyndall.

APPLAUDS POSITIVE ATTITUDES

It is a personal pleasure for me to apprise you of General Price's report. Through the report, we are witnesses to a source of self-confidence and security which all in our country can share. Beyond this critically important aspect, the report points to a constant, compelling effort exerted by his command to do the job under stringent economic circumstances.

I applaud this objective most profoundly, and believe I am joined by my colleagues in sharing this enthusiasm.

I append to these remarks a copy of the news report as published by the official U.S. Air Force newspaper, *Jet Scope*, of September 17, 1969:

THREE FIREBEES SET NEW RECORD—38TH FLIGHT SURPASSES NAVY MARK

A new flight record in remote-controlled aerial targets was set in a big way by the Aerospace Defense Command base at Tyndall AFB Tuesday when three Ryan Firebees soared into the air at one hour intervals on the 38th flight for each . . . breaking the old record of 37 flights by a jet drone target.

The Navy's Pacific Missile Range at Port Mugu, Calif., held the record until the Air Defense Weapons Center's triple launch.

The multi-numbered target missions flown by these targets represent a big dollar savings for the U.S. Air Force as each target costs in the neighborhood of \$135,000. Or figured another way . . . the three birds have flown a total of 114 missions representing a cost of approximately \$300 per flight.

The first record-breaking drone airborne from the ground launch site at Tyndall has been nicknamed the "Red Phantom" by Aerospace Defense Command pilots firing their weapons at the target.

This target has been fired at 181 times over the Gulf of Mexico firing range and has accumulated 31 hours of flight time. From launch to parachute recovery, a typical flight ranges up to 50 minutes with six to eight attacks made by ADC aircraft.

ALL THREE TARGETS WILL FLY AGAIN

All three record setting Ryan Firebees were recovered following flights Tuesday and will return to fly again for even greater marks. Two of the jet targets completed their missions and were flown back to the land recovery area. The third went down in the Gulf of Mexico and was quickly retrieved by the Tyndall drone recovery boat crews.

Actually the targets are augmented with various systems which prevent direct hits by the Air Force's heat-seeking and radar controlled missiles. Instead, the broad range of

electronic and mechanical devices record near-miss distances of weapons fired by the pilots from their supersonic jet aircraft.

The average life-span of Firebee targets is 15 flights, according to Bill Sved, manager of the Ryan Aeronautical Company's 57-man support team at Tyndall. He noted that infrared and other electronic devices mounted on the tips of Firebee wings help lengthen the target system's life span. Weapons fired at the target diverted from the exhaust pipe as a prime heat source by the augmentive devices.

Recovery is commanded automatically when a hit occurs in flight and a self-contained parachute system lowers the target to recovery areas on water or land.

The three record breaking drones have been recovered and returned to the hangar for refurbishing and flown repeatedly more than any other target in existence, Sved pointed out. Such target reuse offers a substantial savings to the military.

Ryan Firebees have been used at Tyndall over a period of 11 years as prime targets for Aerospace Defense Command and Tactical Air Command fighter-interceptor pilots.

These fast, elusive, high-flying targets are used at Tyndall to evaluate the efficiency of air-to-air missiles and a pilot's firing skill. The targets fly at more than 700 mph at 50,000 feet for more than one hour.

A huge overwater firing range embraces hundreds of square miles of open water, extending into the Gulf of Mexico. This makes it ideal for interceptor weapons firing, because the supersonic speeds of these jet aircraft and the range of their missiles require an ample safety margin to protect the public, real property and shipping.

As the Firebee enters the firing range, ground control intercept issues commands of "Scramble!" to the waiting pilots. Smashing into the air, the speeding jets move in for the search, intercept and kill of the foreign "invader."

Vectored into position as it zooms to altitude, the fighter's radar scans space, and locks on the target. The pilot presses the firing buttons and waits for the automatic firing as he closes range.

In a stream of fire and smoke, a deadly missile is unleashed at the drone—out of sight and pushing the speed of sound.

As the package of destruction homes in, the target records the missile's range and transmits the data to the ground scoring station. The target's electronic scoring system permits the important weapons system evaluation. It accurately records the "hit and miss distance" of the fired missile. These systems give quick results of the pilot's effectiveness in "killing" the target.

Regardless of the final outcome of the mission—kill or miss—the pilot has benefited. The training received is stored in his pocket of experience, ready to go into action instantly upon the sound of the klaxon horn that warns of an air attack.

SGT. JAMES ROBERTS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce the death of another of our brave fighting men, Sgt. James Roberts of Mt. Oliver, Pa., who was killed in Vietnam on October 28, 1969.

We owe a profound debt of gratitude and appreciation to our dedicated servicemen who sacrificed their lives for this great country. In tribute to Sergeant

Roberts for his heroic actions, I wish to honor his memory and commend his courage and valor, by placing in the RECORD the following article:

VIETNAM WAR TAKES LIFE OF MR. OLIVER MAN

Sgt. James Roberts of Mt. Oliver was killed in action on Tuesday, October 28, 1969, while serving in Vietnam with the Army Infantry.

Sgt. Roberts, a 1967 graduate of Baldwin High School, is survived by his mother, Mrs. Alberta Roberts of Margaret St., three sisters, one brother. Grandparents are Mr. and Mrs. Henry Swartz of Mt. Oliver.

REDUCE POLITICAL CAMPAIGN COSTS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, as we have seen from recent gubernatorial and mayoral elections across the country, the costs of political campaigns continue to soar. It is vital, in my view, that this trend be reversed and I believe that Congress should give full and careful consideration to a number of proposals which have been made in recent weeks.

In this regard, a thoughtful and perspective analysis of the issue was presented by Newton N. Minow, former Chairman of the FCC and current chairman of the Twentieth Century Fund Commission on Campaign Costs in the Electronic Era. Mr. Minow's analysis appeared in the November 9 edition of the New York Times and I present it herewith for inclusion in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

ISN'T CHOOSING A PRESIDENT AS IMPORTANT AS A MOON SHOT?

(By Newton N. Minow)

Jack Gould's column of October 12, "Will We All Have to Listen to Big Brother?" is a valuable addition to public debate on the issue of escalating costs of radio and television time for political candidates. His criticism of the Report of the Twentieth Century Fund Commission on Campaign Costs in the Electronic Era represents a point of view which our Commission anticipated—but I regret that he did not give any attention to our arguments on the other side.

Our Commission was composed of five men with widely different political views and backgrounds. Dean Burch, former Chairman of the Republican National Committee, was long identified with the campaigns of Senator Goldwater. Robert Price, former Deputy Mayor of New York City, managed the Mayoral campaign of John Lindsay in 1965. Thomas Corcoran, a key adviser of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, has been active in Democratic politics for four decades. Alexander Heard, Chancellor of Vanderbilt University, is a leading scholar and headed the bipartisan commission on the question of campaign finance appointed by President John F. Kennedy. I have been involved in four Presidential campaigns, most intimately in the 1952 and 1956 campaigns of Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson.

Nevertheless, the five of us came up with unanimous recommendations arrived at only after deliberate study, extensive debate, and subordination of our own partisan positions. We recognize that Voters' Time—our proposal that all radio and television stations in the

country be required to carry some prime time one-half hour broadcasts simultaneously in each time zone—is a fundamental change in the way campaigns are now carried on. But we believe such fundamental change is essential unless we accept the idea that a candidate's access to the electorate should depend upon his access to big money.

The democratic process requires open forums for political ideas and the widest possible dissemination of information. As Gould points out, this can perhaps best be achieved by debates between the candidates. We agree, and said so in our report. But no unwilling candidate can be forced to debate. President Johnson in 1964 and Mr. Nixon in 1968 both thought they were ahead—and declined to debate. It still takes two to tango—or debate. Wishing it otherwise, as Gould does, simply won't produce a debate.

There are now two kinds of political broadcasting. One is the kind the candidate purchases; the United States is the only country in the world where this kind of broadcasting exists. The other kind is the program which the broadcaster provides as a public service, e.g., "Face the Nation," "Meet the Press," the Great Debates of 1960. We applaud the latter enthusiastically—and indeed we recommend that the equal time law be suspended in 1972 as it was in 1960 to permit such debates to occur again.

But our Commission's main concern was with the other kind—and the more than \$40-million spent by the parties and candidates for radio and television time in the 1968 general election campaigns. The Presidential candidates alone spent more than \$20-million in the general election campaign of 1968 for broadcasting time—which was four times the amount spent in 1966. Around three-quarters of this was spent on "spots"—short, commercial-like announcements which contributed little to a serious discussion of the issues.

Our Commission concluded that the voter has much to lose from present arrangements. We concluded: "Letting ability to pay determine access to the great audience and fostering the development of commercial-like campaign spots rather than rational political discussions may in time subvert the democratic process."

Therefore, we propose a new kind of political broadcasting: one which does not belong to the candidate and which does not belong to the broadcaster. Instead, it will belong to the voter. Thus Voters' Time would be purchased with public funds by the Federal government from the broadcaster—at half rates—and would be carried simultaneously by every radio and television station for at least six half-hour periods in prime time in the five weeks preceding a Presidential election. The cost? Less than mailing a 5-cent postcard to every voter.

The broadcasting industry has objected to this proposal on the ground that the public would give up its freedom of choice during those half-hours. Gould argues that this would be a terrible precedent "save in a moment of genuine national emergency."

We believe a Presidential election is as crucial as a genuine national emergency. For on the decision of the American electorate hangs the fate of millions at home and abroad, war and peace, survival itself.

Of course, there will be some people who will object to their favorite program being pre-empted for a half-hour every four years. We suggest that they are under no obligation to turn on their radio or television sets during this imposition, or they can turn them off, and thus tune out their responsibilities as citizens of a republic which depends upon its citizens to cast informed votes.

We think that if Voters' Time were in effect, a great new American tradition would quickly develop in which Americans would sit down together to watch, listen, and make

judgments about the men who would lead them. We also believe that to compare Voters' Time with conventional programming is to lose sight of the unique importance of Presidential elections and would compromise the seriousness of the Presidential race. We also believe that as the institution of Voters' Time developed, this direct and regular confrontation with the candidates would give voters a sense of direct participation in Presidential politics heretofore unknown.

Broadcasters pre-empt regular program schedules periodically for events of great importance. A Presidential speech, a moon shot, a Presidential funeral. Is a Presidential selection less important?

NEW YORK NEWSPAPER ENDORSES ATLANTIC UNION

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the October 17 issue of the Citizen-Advertiser of upper New York carries an editorial written by the publisher, Mr. Lithgow Osborne, in which the newspaper urges favorable action on House Concurrent Resolution 283 which proposes the establishment of an 18-member U.S. delegation on Atlantic union. This expression of support is most gratifying and I include the text of the editorial at this point in the Record:

FEDERATION OF THE FREE: A POSSIBLE FIRST STEP

This year marked the 20th anniversary of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Official observance took place in Washington last April 10th when President Nixon set new objectives for the alliance in the presence of the foreign ministers of the 14 member nations. And next Monday the General Assembly of the Atlantic Treaty Association (ATA) will meet in Washington. The gathering will be attended by some of the original signers of the treaty among 300 other delegates.

The ATA is a private organization with branches in all NATO countries. It exists to promote closer relations and better co-operation between the peoples of the Atlantic democracies.

In our current absorption with Vietnam, there is a tendency to forget Atlantic affairs. Yet NATO has been responsible—and is still responsible—for creating the conditions of security in Europe which have allowed the non-Communist countries to attain an unprecedented level of political stability and economic prosperity.

However, the importance of the Atlantic Alliance has not been forgotten by any means, as the ATA five-day conference shows.

And on Capitol Hill two similar Concurrent Resolutions (Nos. 283 and 284) have been introduced in the House calling for the appointment of a commission to meet with representatives of other Atlantic nations to explore the long-range possibilities of federation.

These resolutions have been introduced by Rep. Paul Findley of Illinois, Republican, and Representative Donald M. Fraser of Minnesota, Democrat. Recorded support of them is also non-partisan. Ninety-two representatives, about two thirds Democrats (including Sam Stratton) and one-third Republicans, are co-sponsors.

A resolution in very similar terms was before the last Congress and received the explicit approval of Richard Nixon, Hubert

Humphrey, Nelson Rockefeller, Robert Kennedy, Eugene McCarthy and many other leaders of both parties. It was approved by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs by a wide margin. It was held in the Rules Committee and did not reach the floor of the House. The prospects for passage are much better today.

If the proposed convention ever meets, it cannot commit any of the participating countries even though they send official delegates. But it could draft a plan for greater unity for submission to the various governments, just as our Constitutional Convention of 1787 drafted an instrument of government to end the political and economic chaos which had ensued after the Revolution, which was then submitted to the thirteen states and eventually ratified.

We shall not see a Federal Union of The Free next year or the year after. But an Atlantic Convention would be a necessary first step in that direction. And a desirable one.

Because the democracies have presently so much economic and military power, we are prone to forget their weakness when divided, particularly the fact that about 70 per cent of humanity is ruled by Communist or Fascist despots whose chief objective is to destroy democracy wherever it exists.

Believers in human freedom need the strength that only comes through unity.

OUR STATE IS FAIR—A SESQUICENTENNIAL TRIBUTE TO THE STATE OF ALABAMA

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, 1969 marks the 150th year of statehood for the State of Alabama and our citizens have been proud to honor Alabama's sesquicentennial year in a number of ways. The pride which we have in our State and in its illustrious history is well expressed in the following poem, "Our State is Fair," by Mrs. Katherine Hale Hanlin. Mrs. Hanlin, of Birmingham, Ala., is the general secretary of the Alabama State Poetry Society. The poem follows:

OUR STATE IS FAIR

(By Katherine Hale Hanlin)

Heaven's ruling "Executive Board" had motion well in hand
To make a certain earth terrain into a special land.
They took the beauty, fruit and nature of a panorama,
Where, Indians, smitten with that Eden, named it "Alabama".
They rested verdant woodlands, goodly hills against her breast;
Amazing natural wealth was found a part of vale and crest;
They traced the freshest waters through her multi-favored veins,
Enriching soils and forests, making lovelier the plains.

In 1699, Canadian French brothers, LeMayne, With four conscripted vessels, one of which was the ship, "Bodine",
Brought first of permanent colonists to tend this lovely land,
Following 1540 Spanish men who had to disband.

Frenchmen, Bienville and Iberville, a colony provided,
With detachments at Biloxi, Mobile and Dauphin Island.

Thrilling venture, builded country, village, city or a town.
Invited kindness kissed the land; stars fell softly on her crown.

Yet, under five of sovereign flags, the country grew and flourished;
A State evolved from Territory, which was rightly nourished
From 1819, when that most blessed land became a State
To 1969, our Sesquicentennial date.
William Wyatt Bibb, first Governor of that Panorama,
Was also chosen to head the new State of Alabama.
The Latin words, "Audemus Jura nostra defendere",
On our coat-of-Arms, means "We Defend Our Rights", always.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT NIXON ON VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the ways in which the silent majority is heard is in the editorial columns of the newspapers that serve them. Far from the fevered banks of the Potomac reporters and writers report and observe every day the events in this country. If we lay aside the great national organs of opinion and pick up the papers from home, we often get a more accurate picture of the Nation's pulse.

Following the President's televised speech on Vietnam last Monday, a number of newspapers and radio stations in and around the Sixth District of Wisconsin made themselves heard on the President's policy statement. During this "Week of National Unity" I believe it is worthwhile to survey the diverse yet unified observations of these spokesmen. The editorials follow:

[From the West Bend (Wis.) News, Nov. 6, 1969]

NIXON BEGS VIETNAM SUPPORT—TIME FOR SILENT MAJORITY TO SPEAK OUT

Now is the time for all good men in the silent majority to make their views known concerning the war in Vietnam.

On Tuesday, the President asked for the support of that majority, stating: "The more support I have from the American people, the sooner that pledge (to end the war in a way that we can win the peace) can be redeemed; for the more divided we are at home, the less likely the enemy is to negotiate in Paris."

The unusual Presidential plea for backing for a war policy became necessary because of the broad response to the demonstrations mounted by a vocal minority in the country last month. That minority has parlayed the basic desire of peace on the part of most Americans into a public opinion force the President must cope with.

Millions responded to the Moratorium activities on Oct. 15, and millions more will surely participate when the moratorium demonstrations begin again in ten days, this time for two days instead of one.

There is the very real possibility that these demonstrations, unless checked by visible support for the President, will back the Administration into a corner.

President Nixon has showed he intends to end the war, and he has already taken most

of the steps advocated by critics of the war during the 1968 campaign. He has made substantial progress, and deserves the time and support necessary to carry his plan further.

The demonstrators would have him get out immediately—at any price.

But he cannot do that. The peace that ends the war must be a relatively stable arrangement, not one that paves the way for a takeover by Hanoi. We have paid too much in lives and national treasure to settle for less.

The silent majority, including most of the people in the Washington county area, realize this and support the President in his methods.

The demonstrators have no monopoly on the desire for peace.

They may, however, have a monopoly on short-sightedness.

They accuse the government of having blundered into the war. Now they want to blunder out of it.

While the President has refused to be pinned down to a specific timetable on disengaging from Vietnam, he did say in no uncertain terms that as the South Vietnamese become stronger, the American commitment will be reduced.

This change-over will take some time, perhaps several more years.

In the meantime, President Nixon needs support.

The demonstrators, effectively using the media, made their point of view known last month.

The silent majority should make its viewpoint known this month.

[From the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press, Nov. 4, 1969]

NO CHANGE IN VIETNAM

Americans, we believe, were disappointed Monday evening. They were disappointed, not so much because they have reason to disagree with Mr. Nixon's Vietnam policies, but because the President had very little to report.

They expected more in a major presidential address which had been heralded for three weeks. It will be useless, however, to speculate on why all the fanfare about the address. Why the big build-up for the dramatic announcement that there was a fruitless exchange of letters with Ho Chi Minh? Why a national telecast to tell us that the American policy is to Vietnamese the war—a policy announced long ago? We all knew that there was a schedule for the withdrawal of American troops; that for obvious reasons the schedule could not be publicly announced, and that in reality it was flexible depending on the level of enemy activity in the field. These things the President and his spokesmen had made clear.

The situation in Vietnam today is much the same as it was Monday with little hope of dramatic change. The same then is true of American policy. If that policy, as reiterated by Mr. Nixon, was a sound policy last week, it continues to be a sound policy today. The unhappy disappointment must not be allowed to cloud an appraisal of the situation. Although we were hopefully prepared to examine a new set of facts, changing attitudes in North Vietnam and even the domestic consequences of a lower level of hostility, we must again face the familiar, frustrating Vietnam war as we have known it for so long.

Disappointing as the situation is, we continue to count ourselves among those who support the President's policies—those policies which have regard for the South Vietnamese people and their right for self-determination without coercion from the north. Those policies, difficult and challenging as they are, remain the same today, the President's speech notwithstanding.

[From the Ripon (Wis.) Commonwealth Press, Nov. 5, 1969]

PRESIDENT NIXON'S SPEECH

Pres. Nixon didn't release the magic genie or drop a verbal bomb Monday night when he discussed Vietnam.

There were no dramatics, no flash, no anger. Just a plea for national unity and an understanding of this country's commitments and heritage. Just plain talk and a request for Americans to understand why we can't just turn our backs on a people and dump them.

Nixon made it quite clear that moratorium or not he will not bend to the wishes of those persons who advocate a quick withdrawal. Not that he wants the war. He would like nothing better than to become the "peace president." This is the kind of stuff election victories are made of.

But Nixon has expert intelligence from people who are "on the scene" in Vietnam. They state that to abandon a people who are trying to defend themselves would expose an innocent people to subjugation and mass terror and would severely damage American relations around the world.

He has stated his plan for peace—an orderly withdrawal based on a firm show of good faith on the part of the North Vietnamese.

Is this poor judgment? Is this a man who wants war to continue?

We are certain the moratorium people are 100% true blue American. We are certain Nixon is too. But, Nixon is also a realist, working with facts and faced with the awesome responsibility of preventing a World War.

Americans should rally behind the President. Some will march against him. Moratorium fever will burn in mid-November. But until the "instant withdrawal" advocates come forth with a positive, practical program that will not undermine the American position, we suggest they keep still and let the North Vietnamese and Vietcong fight their own battle.

Pres. Nixon has called for the "silent majority" to become vocal in their support of his attempt for peace. We hope this majority will make its voice heard, especially on November 14 and 15.

Nov. 5, 1969.

[From the (Wis.) Post-Crescent, Nov. 5, 1969]

THE NIXON REPORT ON VIETNAM

President Nixon's report to the nation on Vietnam was a calm and reasoned one. He did all that he can do at this time, tell it like it is. He didn't have any surprises to announce, because there are no surprises. And he didn't make any dramatic promises, because there are none to make.

The gist of the current situation is that there has been absolutely no progress in attempting to negotiate a settlement with North Vietnam and there is little likelihood that there will be any progress in the future; that we are going to withdraw our troops from South Vietnam on a planned schedule which will at least offer the government of that country the opportunity to organize its own defense.

The strategy of North Vietnam also becomes crystal clear. The President said that "I have not and do not intend to announce the timetable for our program" because Hanoi "would simply wait until our forces had withdrawn and then move in." The fact is that Hanoi has always believed time was on its side in this struggle and certainly continues so to believe. They will wait out our withdrawal, whatever the timetable is, and then attempt to move in. The key question is whether Saigon in the interim can organize an effective defense.

The President's program is a logical course

for this nation to follow. We are not abandoning South Vietnam. But we are telling President Thieu bluntly and clearly that we can no longer help him if he won't or can't help himself. This is the so-called new Nixon policy in practice. As he phrased it: "We shall furnish military and economic assistance when requested in accordance with our treaty commitments. But we shall look to the nation directly threatened to assume the primary responsibility of providing the manpower for its defense."

This is, incidentally, exactly the policy Russian and Red China have followed toward North Vietnam.

We offer one criticism of the President's address. In his initial summation of the phases of our involvement in Vietnam and the situation as he found it when he took office in January, he omitted a most significant event, an omission which failed to recognize an important contribution his predecessor, President Johnson, made toward ending our involvement in the war. He said that in January, "540,000 Americans were in Vietnam with no plans to reduce the number."

This is factually correct. But what the President did not say was that during the year 1968 President Johnson came to a memorable decision that we could not win a military victory in Vietnam as the Defense Department had maintained, that he ended the bombing of North Vietnam, that he vetoed a Defense Department request to send thousands more troops to Vietnam, and that he established diplomatic contact with North Vietnam by offering to scale down our offensive military efforts, thus giving Hanoi an opportunity to reduce its own offensive efforts.

And it was that decision which prepared the way for President Nixon to begin the withdrawal of American forces. The record should be made complete in that regard.

President Nixon has answered critics of the war in this country, and he has answered them well. Surely his answer will not quiet or satisfy the most extreme of those critics. Their demand for immediate withdrawal with no regard for the consequences to the South Vietnamese people is entirely illogical and therefore it cannot be answered with logic.

His report was designed to appeal rather to what he called "the great silent majority of my fellow Americans." He appealed for their support. And on the basis of his report he is entitled to that support.

[From the Fond du Lac (Wis.) Commonwealth Reporter, Nov. 7, 1969]

NIXON PUTS PRESTIGE ON LINE

It would be a tragedy if a course of action which offers the only hope of ending the Vietnam war within the reasonable future without entailing an outright surrender to Hanoi and abandonment of South Vietnam, a strategy which would have been greeted with overwhelming enthusiasm in 1968, were to prove to be in 1969 not too little but too late.

It may be that the time is out of joint, by at least a year.

Had presidential candidate Richard Nixon 12 months ago revealed a plan to "Vietnamize" the Vietnam war, and had he promised that one of his first acts if elected president would be to withdraw 50,000 American troops immediately and as many thereafter as military conditions permitted, he would likely have been swept into office with a far greater margin than the razor-thin plurality he achieved.

There may be any number of reasons why he did not make such an announcement at that time, including the very good reason that he had not yet arrived at such a solution to the war. A presidential candidate, while something more than an ordinary private citizen, is still not a president, with access to all the information which floods the Chief

Executive's desk. There was, also, the hope that a fresh team of negotiators could get the stalled peace talks in Paris moving. Or, from a more cynical viewpoint, candidate Nixon may simply not have wanted to lay himself open to the charge of playing politics with the lives of 500,000 American fighting men.

But the ironic possibility now is that, having achieved the presidency and having decided upon this plan in the face of continued North Vietnamese obstinacy, Richard Nixon may be swept, not out of office, but out of effective leadership over the nation, even as Lyndon Johnson in his final months became a shadow of the strong, consensus-wielding president he once was.

The time is not only out of joint but growing short. Its temper can be read in the fact that those who have supported the President in his handling of the Vietnam problem throughout the first 10 months of his administration praised his television address to the nation as a vigorous reaffirmation and defense of his policies. But those who have opposed him or who have supported him only tentatively expressed reactions ranging from disappointment to outright rejection.

So weary have Americans become of this war, so far has emotion replaced calculation regarding Vietnam, so many have the disillusionments been in the past, that a policy which is a 180-degree turnabout from the policy of the previous administration can be dismissed as offering "nothing new."

As the President said, North Vietnam cannot defeat or humiliate the United States. Only Americans can. It all depends upon that "silent majority" he referred to.

If the President can beg, borrow or steal another 10 months of support, grudging though it may be, from the American majority, and if Vietnamization does indeed begin rolling, he spoke truly when he said that it will not matter then what the critics say now.

In the meantime, however, America seems as sadly divided as it was before the President's speech. A period of even greater domestic turmoil may be ahead for the nation.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Sentinel, Nov. 5, 1969]

THE ONLY WAY

Without a zig or a zag, President Nixon, in his Monday night address on Vietnam, outlined the only honorable course to be followed to a just peace.

In all the advance speculation about the speech, the worry developed that Mr. Nixon might have zigged to the left to make some gesture intended to placate the bugout Charles.

The possibility that he might have zagged to the right to please the hawks was more remote, for their pressures, compared with those of the doves, have been moderate.

Courageously, Mr. Nixon avoided the temptation to play politics with the war, to raise false hopes or to appease his unappeasable critics. He chose instead to tell it as it is and he intends it to be during the 1,173 days left in his term as commander in chief.

Mr. Nixon's "plan for peace" is to withdraw American forces from South Vietnam as fast as possible consistent with our one and only—and reasonable—nonnegotiable condition, the right of the people of South Vietnam to determine their own future. The withdrawal already is well underway.

Altogether properly, Mr. Nixon said he does not intend to announce a timetable for the withdrawal. To do so, he pointed out, "would completely remove any incentive for the enemy to negotiate an agreement."

Mr. Nixon said the rate of withdrawal will depend on developments on three fronts. One is the Paris talks, which might as well be forgotten. The other two factors are the level of enemy activity and the progress of the training program of the South Vietnamese forces.

The rate of withdrawal also depends on

developments on a fourth front which Mr. Nixon did not list but which he was acutely conscious of in his conclusion calling for unity and the support of "the great silent majority of my fellow Americans." That would be the home front.

The loud minority, aided by the biased news media, undoubtedly will continue its efforts to force the United States to surrender to the Communists. As soon as Mr. Nixon's speech ended, the critics renewed their pressures for a precipitate withdrawal from Vietnam. Another national protest demonstration is being planned for Nov. 14-15. It threatens to be ugly.

But there is a tide running the other way. Patriotic Americans are awakening and rallying. The great silent majority is being urged to express itself during the week of Nov. 10-16, and particularly on Veterans day next Tuesday.

Such an outpouring might help show the Communist aggressors that they are not going to be able to win in the streets of America what they haven't been able to win on the battleground of Vietnam. They have to be shown that their friends in America have won them all the concessions that they are going to get.

Protesters are saying they were "disappointed" in Mr. Nixon's speech, which is exactly the reaction to be wished for them. We were disappointed by it, too. But for an entirely different reason—that Mr. Nixon was unable to report that the Communists have indicated the slightest inclination to negotiate a settlement on any terms other than absolute victory for their side.

Enough of putting all the pressure on America to end the war! It's high time to put the pressure where it belongs, on North Vietnam. As the growing dissent to the dissenters movement puts it, "Tell it to Hanoi!"

WTMJ EDITORIAL

The importance of President Nixon's Monday night's broadcast to the nation lies not in what he didn't say but in what he did say. While the President didn't disclose figures on future troop withdrawals from Vietnam as anticipated, he did give a timely refresher course on how we got into the war in the first place. He also fully explained the consequences of an abandonment policy.

Mr. Nixon revealed his frustrations at trying to negotiate peace personally, at the United Nations and in Paris. Yet, while he was unable to get results through established avenues of negotiation, Hanoi showed its preference to speak to private individuals in this country. This method, it apparently believes, will wear down our determination to hold our commitments, fire up anti-Nixon sentiment at home and abroad and finally cause the United States to accept North Vietnam's demands. Hanoi even brazenly stepped up its offensive action on the eve of Nixon's broadcast to force a counter-action.

The war has now been put into a true perspective by the President. He has stopped the escalation and cut casualties. He is not sending more troops to Vietnam but instead bringing them home. Our side has attempted to cool off the fighting while Hanoi steps it up.

On the basis of Hanoi's past performances, an abrupt U.S. pullout from Vietnam would bring about a bloodbath with thousands of South Vietnamese slaughtered. Furthermore, America's word and leadership throughout the world would be sharply devalued and the development of peace and democracy in Southeast Asia and other underdeveloped parts of the world would be reversed or slowed down.

President Nixon has growing public support for his Vietnam policy. He has asked for the great silent American majority to speak out. He could have no better selling point for peace than their support. We urge that you speak out on this issue.

EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, there is no one better qualified to speak on a given topic than someone who deals with that topic as his everyday occupation. That is why we seek a physician's advice about health, an attorney's advice on legal matters, or a plumber's advice about leaking water taps.

It is obvious, then, that there is no one more qualified to discuss educational problems than an educator.

There are few problems more pressing in our Nation today than that of education. These problems were outlined sharply and graphically in a recent statement by George D. Fischer, president of the National Education Association.

Mr. Fischer made some pointed comparisons between the campaign promises of last year of presidential candidate Richard Nixon, and the subsequent actions and recommendations of President Nixon.

In a direct attack on the Nixon education record, Mr. Fischer charged that the President had reneged on his campaign promises by ordering drastic cuts in key Federal education programs. He accused the President of playing politics with the Nation's schoolchildren by proposing to eliminate illiteracy while "wiping out money for the purchase of reading materials."

Mr. Fischer also challenged President Nixon's recommendation of Judge Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr., for a seat on the U.S. Supreme Court, charging that the Nixon administration had "sold out to racism" in making the nomination.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this point to reprint Mr. Fischer's statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and highly recommend it to the attention of my colleagues as an excellent analysis of this Nation's educational crisis from a highly respected educator who speaks for some 1 million teachers throughout the Nation.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY GEORGE D. FISCHER

Earlier today, I testified before the House General Education Subcommittee in favor of general federal aid to education, in the form of an NEA-drafted bill to provide about \$8 billion per year to state and local education agencies. This bill would provide for increased teacher salaries and help meet the urgent needs of our public schools. It would improve the education of every child, and ease the tremendous pressure on our state and local tax bases.

This program is in sharp contrast to the non-program of the Nixon Administration. You may recall that during his campaign for the Presidency, Mr. Nixon wrote a letter to the nation's teachers, soliciting their support for his candidacy. In this letter he stated:

"As we wind up the 1968 campaign, I ask your help in achieving the goals to which Governor Agnew and I are dedicated—

American opportunity begins in the classrooms of this nation for young and old alike; When we talk about cutting the expense

of government—either federal, state, or local—the one area we can't short-change is education;

Education is the area in which we must keep doing everything that is necessary to help achieve the American Dream; and

We call upon every citizen to join with us in an action program for education."

Upon his election, however, the Nixon tune changed. Not content with the cuts in education proposed by the Johnson Administration budget, the Nixon Administration proceeded to slash programs to the extent that some would be wiped out entirely.

Here are a few examples:

Mr. Nixon proposed only 39% of the authorized amounts for Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—the program for deprived children and youth; 20% of the authorization for vitally-needed supplementary education centers and services; 37% of the authorized money for strengthening state education departments; only 15% of the money earmarked for educating the handicapped; 25% of the authorization for bilingual education; and just 30% of the funds Congress deemed necessary for school operating expenses in areas with high concentrations of federally-connected children—the "impacted areas" program which has been almost fully funded since its inception in 1950.

The most cynical action of this Administration was the declaration, by Commissioner of Education James E. Allen, Jr., that we need an "educational moonshot," a program to teach everyone to read. Yet the Administration requested no funds at all for Title II of ESEA, which provides funds for textbooks and school libraries. We did not reach the moon without the kind of commitment that resulted in spending tens of billions of federal money in the effort. I just frankly resent anyone, especially the President of the United States, assuming that you can sell platitudes about the elimination of illiteracy at the same wiping out money for the purchase of reading materials.

Here is another example. In 1967, Congress transferred control of the innovative and supplementary services program, Title III of ESEA, to the states. The states have been funding local projects that, on the whole, are more meaningful and will have more real impact on improving education—and at less cost—than those formerly funded by the Office of Education, often through profit-making agencies.

Now that the states have begun to make a good start on spurring innovative programs under Title III, the Nixon Administration recommends that federal grants for this Title be cut by \$50 million.

The Nixon rhetoric on education is the same as his promise to end the Vietnam war. I don't blame the President for either problem—he inherited both—but I am startled and chagrined by his lack of convincing proposals to solve these problems.

Furthermore, the NEA is disturbed with Mr. Nixon's postures on desegregation of public schools. The Association is on record, through its official resolutions, in opposition to dual school systems and any other form of racial discrimination.

On November 4, 1969, the NEA asked President Nixon to withdraw the nomination of Judge Clement F. Haynsworth to the U.S. Supreme Court. On that day, the NEA Executive Committee held a telephone conference call at which I raised the question of whether NEA should take a stand on the Haynsworth nomination. I reported at that time that the Southern Council of the California Teachers Association had passed a resolution that week urging Senators to vote against the nomination. The members of the NEA Executive Committee shared the view that NEA should oppose the nomina-

tion. During the discussion it was pointed out that such opposition would be consistent with NEA resolutions on equal educational opportunity and desegregation and with the 1969 action of the Representative Assembly on the school desegregation guidelines.

A motion was made proposing that I send a telegram to President Nixon urging withdrawal of the nomination and a telegram to members of the United States Senate urging them to vote against confirmation of Judge Haynsworth. This motion was seconded and approved by a unanimous roll-call vote.

The action of the NEA Executive Committee was fully consistent with NEA policy, which has supported prompt school desegregation involving the actual integration of students and teachers. Continuing resolutions of the NEA state the belief of the Association that education should "be non-segregated" (1969 Resolution C-1) and that "individual personality is enhanced and the national interest furthered by educational opportunity that involves children, formally and informally, in diverse cultures" (1969 Resolution C-4).

In its Philadelphia resolution the NEA Representative Assembly insisted that there be no deviation by the federal government from the established timetable for desegregation set by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare guidelines. The Assembly directed me at that time to send a telegram to President Nixon informing him of this resolution—a telegram that has produced no adequate reply. In addition, NEA has filed, as a friend of the court, briefs in support of prompt and meaningful school desegregation, such as the brief supporting the decision of Judge Skelly Wright in *Hobson v. Hansen*, and, more recently, the brief filed in the Mississippi school desegregation case just decided by the U.S. Supreme Court.

As an analysis of his judicial opinions amply demonstrates, the accession of Judge Haynsworth to the High Court bench would conflict with basic NEA philosophy reflected in the foregoing actions. Judge Haynsworth has consistently taken judicial positions which would have the effect of retarding rather than advancing meaningful school desegregation. In 1962, he dissented from the majority opinion in *Charlotte-Mecklenburg school desegregation case*, which outlawed the practice of granting transfers to pupils in the racial minority in a particular school. This dissent subsequently was repudiated unanimously by the Supreme Court. In 1963, Judge Haynsworth held that the Court of Appeals should stand by idly while Negro children in Prince Edward County continued to go without schooling. Judge Haynsworth has repeatedly upheld freedom of choice plans, which were conceived to retard and did in fact retard the integration of school children in the South. In *Bowman v. County School Board of Charles City County, Va.*, and *Green v. County School Board of New Kent County, Va.*, he upheld freedom of choice, a position reversed unanimously by the U.S. Supreme Court in the *Green case*.

These actions of Judge Haynsworth had the effect of perpetuating unequal dual school systems in the South and postponing desegregation of teachers as well as students. Indeed, in *Bradley v. School Board of Richmond*, he wrote a majority opinion which failed to take action against the practice of allocating teachers on a racial basis. That decision was unanimously overruled by the Supreme Court, which did not even hear oral argument.

In light of this record, it is evident that the Haynsworth nomination is inconsistent with the basic goals and principles of the National Education Association, and with the best interests of quality education in the United States.

AMERICAN LINKS WITH RHODESIA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, November 11, our sister Republic of Rhodesia celebrated its fourth anniversary of independence.

Probably no other people in the world have a more common bond with us of the United States.

Rhodesians, like Americans, became independent by the unilateral severance of their ties to the British Crown.

In each case, independence was not achieved by the revolt of indigenous natives against the rule of a colonial power. It was, rather, the act of civilized colonials casting off the yoke of tyranny from a faraway sovereign which had become unresponsive to the needs of the people. They, like us, acted to preserve their civilization.

Despite the politically motivated U.N.O. boycott sanctioned by the party in power, all liberty-loving Americans applaud these courageous Rhodesians on this their fourth anniversary of freedom and self-determination.

Since the earliest days of civilization in Rhodesia, America has had close links with that country and her people. In fact, many Americans live in Rhodesia today and there are the descendants of other Americans among her population.

I include a story by the renowned author, Prof. R. W. S. Turner, describing the American links with the early days of Rhodesia, and several news clippings following my remarks:

AMERICAN LINKS WITH EARLY DAYS OF RHODESIA

(By R. W. S. Turner)

For more than a hundred years Americans have been attracted to that part of Africa which has been named after one of the greatest Englishmen of the nineteenth century—Cecil John Rhodes. Probably the first American to come into the Rhodesian area was Adam Render who, in 1867, penetrated to the Zimbabwe ruins. He thus became the first white man to see the massive, mysterious, dry-stone structures that some have held to be the source of King Solomon's golden riches.

Before Rhodesia was so named the country was rather vaguely referred to as "Zambesia", the "Far Interior", or the "Far North". Certainly, there are many striking resemblances between the African "Far North" and the American "Far West". There was, for example, the limitless freedom and the challenge of an open frontier; there was the unrivalled excitement of the chase—bison in America, elephant in Africa; there was the danger of hostile tribes; there was ample work for the torch-bearers of Christianity; and there was the same spark that ignited a great chain reaction of events—the lure of gold.

Several Americans served with distinction in the Pioneer Column. This famous body of men was organized by Rhodes to occupy Mashonaland, and its dangerous trek through hundreds of miles of trackless veld was to Rhodesia what the voyage of the *Mayflower* was to New England. The Column was guided to its destination, Salisbury, where the Union Jack was hoisted in September, 1890, by Frederick

erick Courteney Selous—of whom more shall be heard later.

The best-known of several Americans in the ranks of the Pioneer Column was Captain Maurice David Heany, a Virginian and cousin of Edgar Allan Poe. Heany had served in the U.S. Army and fought in several engagements against Red Indians, narrowly missing being massacred at Custer's last stand during the Sioux campaign of 1876, when over 200 men lost their lives. Heany commanded "A" Troop of the Pioneer Column, fought in the Matabele War, and took part in the Jameson Raid in the Transvaal, where he was taken prisoner and sent to London for trial. He was later released because of his American citizenship. Heany junction on the Bulawayo-Salisbury line is named after him.

Another prominent member of the Column was William Harvey Brown. He was born in Des Moines, Iowa, and came to Africa in 1890 on the quest for specimens for the Smithsonian Institute—joining the Pioneer Column to further this aim. He subsequently engaged in mining and farming, becoming a prominent Rhodesian and a member of the Legislative Council. Salisbury's Harvey Brown Avenue is named after him.

The son of an Alabama cotton planter, Thomas Alexander Ross joined the survey section of the Pioneer Column. He has the distinction of laying out both Salisbury and Bulawayo townships. The intersection of streets and avenues at right angles in both these centres, which are now Rhodesia's major cities, is therefore entirely American in origin. Henry George Sawerthal, a later surveyor from across the Atlantic, rose to be Assistant Surveyor-General of Rhodesia, and to him several names of American origin, such as Shiloh, can be traced.

The six-gun, rough-riding days of the American West produced a tough breed of frontiersmen who were matchless in the arts of the wilderness—of hunting, of finding their way over trackless terrain, of scouting and smelling out the enemy. Americans with these skills were in demand in Rhodesia. Two American scouts, Frederick Russell Burnham and Pearl Ingram, an ex-miner from California, have the distinction of being the first men to enter the smouldering ashes of Bulawayo when the Matabele abandoned their capital during the war of 1893.

Burnham, the author of *Scouting in two Continents and Taking Chances*, was a colourful and flamboyant character who returned to Rhodesia to take part in the uprising of 1896, serving in the Matopos with Colonel R. S. S. Baden-Powell, later Lord Baden-Powell, the founder of the world-wide boy scout movement. The scout movement was conceived amongst the granite boulders of the Matopos, where Rhodes now lies buried.

Once Rhodes established a settled administration a steady stream of immigrants with their families were attracted to Rhodesia. American enterprise was not lacking in this process of colonisation. Such farm names as "Bunker Hill", "Arlington Heights" and "Kentucky" (the last mentioned being the site of Salisbury's international airport), remind modern Rhodesians of the part that some of their adventurous forebears from the other side of the Atlantic have played in the development of their country.

Americans who played a prominent part in the early history of Rhodesia. Captain, afterwards Major, Maurice David Heany, a Virginian and cousin of Edgar Allan Poe. He commanded "A" Troop of the Pioneer Column. Heany Junction is named after him. Bishop Joseph Crane Hartzell of the American Methodist Episcopal Church. He established the mission in Old Umtali. John Hays Hammond, from San Francisco, was Rhodes's chief mining engineer. Major Frederick Russell Burnham, from Tivoli, Minnesota. He

was the first man to enter Bulawayo during the Matabele War. William Harvey Brown from Des Moines, Iowa.

Coleman Joseph, an ex-Philadelphian, was one of these early farmers, and was a famous marksman despite the disability of only having one arm. He built the first synagogue in Rhodesia in the new Bulawayo after the conquest of Matabeleland. Most of these early colonists arrived in stage coaches made by the California firm of Cobb and Company.

Many American missionaries have blazed trails over the Rhodesian veld, and many have sacrificed their lives so that the gospel may be brought to the "Far North". Probably the first of this intrepid band was Myron Pinkerton, who trekked to the Eastern Highlands in 1871 and perished somewhere near the virgin forest of Mount Selinda. The American Board Mission established a permanent station in this area in 1893, and Dr. W. L. Thompson became its first medical missionary.

Another pioneer was the tireless Bishop Joseph Crane Hartzell, of the American Methodist Episcopal Church. When Umtali had to be moved to a site near the railway, the Bishop negotiated with Rhodes and took over Old Umtali, where his mission flourishes to this day.

An intimate friend of Rhodes once said of the great man that he was devoted to the old flag but his ideas were American. This explains many of the strong bonds between America and Rhodesia. John Hays Hammond, who was born in San Francisco, was Rhodes's consulting engineer. Hammond and another American, Gardner Williams, drafted Rhodesia's first mining laws, which have remained substantially unchanged.

Rhodes's regard for Americans is perhaps best illustrated by the allocation of his famous scholarships: there are more American Rhodes Scholars than any other nationality.

Frederick Courteney Selous, the man Rhodes chose to guide the Pioneer Column, has already been mentioned. What is not generally known is that this outstanding Rhodesian pioneer was a close friend of Theodore Roosevelt and that there is a wad of letters in the National Archives of Rhodesia, extending over almost 20 years, addressed to Selous from the 25th President of the United States.

Theodore Roosevelt was one of America's greatest presidents. A man of tremendous vitality, widely versatile and completely self-confident, he was unafraid of the jungle, be it inhabited by wild animals or equally dangerous big business-men with vested interests. When Roosevelt began writing to Selous he was Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Navy, a post he resigned to command his battalion of Rough Riders Regiment that fought with sparkling distinction at San Juan Hill, Cuba, during the Spanish War.

Roosevelt's next post was Governor of New York State; he was next elected Vice-President of the U.S.A., succeeding to the Presidency when William McKinley was assassinated in 1901. He was re-elected in his own right in 1904 with an overwhelming majority, and was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1906. He put America on the international map.

But to return to the Roosevelt letters that repose in the Rhodesian Archives in Salisbury, Roosevelt, like countless Victorians, especially the younger generation, admired Selous to the point of worshipping him. Selous, the son of the chairman of the London Stock Exchange, was, indeed, an outstanding character. Sir Henry Rider Haggard's hero Allan Quartermain in *King Solomon's Mines* was modelled on him.

Selous was a great hunter and also a great naturalist. At first, Roosevelt's letters to

him were confined to these subjects, but gradually the letters took on a personal note and he opens his heart to Selous on a wide range of subjects. Selous' biographer, John G. Millais, makes this point: "Selous' intimacy with the President was of the charming character which unfortunately we now only associate with early Victorian days."

Roosevelt's letters thus have a significance that transcends their African context. Space will permit extracts from only a few of them. During the Second Anglo-Boer War, Selous refused to fight on the British side and his sympathies with the Boers got him into trouble in England. Roosevelt, himself of Dutch extraction, in a letter dated March 8, 1901, comments:

"It makes me melancholy to see the Boer War hanging on. Your limit of 18 months is rapidly approaching. Of course there can be but one ending; but it is a dreadful thing to have that ending come only by the exhaustion of the country and of the fighting men. How I wish you could be made administrator of all South Africa! Somehow I felt that you could do what no other man could do and really bring about peace. I begin to be afraid you have been right about the war. I hope we shall see things go right hereafter."

On February 7, 1908, Roosevelt gives an illuminating insight to his personality:

"I am up to my ears in work and am ending my Presidency with all kinds of fighting. But I guess it is inevitable in an office like this, if the man really tries to run the office as it should be run, and I don't mind it much; at any rate I don't mind it enough to have it spoil my genuine enjoyment."

During childhood Roosevelt suffered from delicate health. His determination that overcome this drawback affected his entire attitude to life. On December 4, 1914, he writes to Selous:

"I wish to heavens that this country would wake up to the hideous damage, moral and physical, caused by the dedication of mere industrialism, of softness, and of self-indulgence. National acceptance of the need of hard labour, of facing risk, and of the exercise of foresight is necessary to national greatness. If I must choose between a policy of blood and iron and one of milk and water—especially of skimmed milk and dish water—why I am for a policy of blood and iron. It is better not only for the nation but in the end for the world."

About America entering the First World War, Roosevelt remarks in a letter dated August 28, 1915:

"The professional pacifists have done this country a damage that cannot be overstated."

Apart from letters there is the original draft of Roosevelt's foreword to Selous's *African Nature Notes and Reminiscences*, published in 1908. Has any other author had the distinction of having a nine-page foreword by the President of the United States of America? Roosevelt's admiration for Selous is clear from his first few lines:

"Mr. Selous is the last of the big-game hunters of South Africa; the last of the mighty hunters whose experience lay in the greatest hunting ground which the world has seen since civilised man has appeared thereon."

Soon afterwards Selous organised a hunting trip for Roosevelt to East Africa. The correspondence continued until shortly before Selous was killed at the age of 65 by a German sniper in 1917. Roosevelt died two years later.

These then are some of Rhodesia's links with the Stars and Stripes. There are many others. And what is more important, new links are continually being forged between the two countries. In particular, Americans have played a notable part in developing Rhodesia's resources—mineral, industrial and

agricultural—thereby not only building up the country of their adoption but also making a major contribution to the strength of the Western World.

[From the Washington Star, Nov. 11, 1969]

RHODESIAN SANCTIONS REVEAL DOUBLE STANDARD

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

It is Veterans Day in the United States, but it's Independence Day in Rhodesia, marking the fourth anniversary of Rhodesia's historic separation from the Crown.

The act of Nov. 11, 1965, was historic for two reasons: It marked the first time a British outpost had declared its unilateral independence since another small country, better known to us all, proclaimed the same intention on July 4, 1776. Second, Rhodesia's action produced within the United Nations the worst blunder in the U.N.'s brief history—a blunder that may yet prove fatal.

The punitive sanctions imposed upon Rhodesia have proved a great folly. As Dean Acheson has remarked, the sanctions constitute a flagrant violation of the U.N.'s own charter. More than this, the sanctions stand as a continuing monument to the emptiness, the impotence, and the massive hypocrisy of the United Nations as an instrument of international order.

Manifestly, the sanctions have failed in their purpose, which was to bring Rhodesia to its knees. The sanctions have had precisely the opposite effect: Rhodesia survives; it flourishes; its economy is strong and growing stronger. And instead of whipping Rhodesia back to the arms of Mother England, these toothless mandates have succeeded merely in obliterating any prospect of reunion.

It is the purblind hypocrisy—the imposition on Rhodesia of a naked double standard—that reduces the U.N. to imbecility and contempt. Why were these drastic sanctions imposed? It was because the established government of Rhodesia, in the view of the General Assembly, had failed to provide for majority rule and for participatory democracy by all the Rhodesian people.

The notion that Rhodesia's independence constituted a threat to the peace was pure fiction. Rhodesia had failed to provide a system based upon one man, one vote; and Rhodesia, therefore, must be ostracized and her economy destroyed.

It is useful to glance at the news from Africa in recent weeks.

President Shermake of Somalia was assassinated on Oct. 15. A military junta seized power the following day. All civil liberties, including a right to vote, have been suspended. What will the U.N. say of democracy in Somalia? Not a word; not a single word.

On Oct. 19, the government of Burundi uncovered a "plot" and jailed 30 putative leaders of the opposition. Here, too, participatory democracy is a fiction. Will the U.N. reproach Burundi? Men will walk on Mars before that day arrives.

On Oct. 26, the government of Tanzania jailed six prominent politicians under the same kind of "preventive detention" that is so denounced in South Africa and Rhodesia. Tanzania has not even a pretense of majority rule. But the U.N. will remain as silent as the desert sands.

On Oct. 27, Jomo Kenyatta jailed his only major political opponent, along with all opposition members of his parliament, and outlawed the Kenya Peoples Union. Democracy is a dead letter in Kenya. But you will not learn this from the United Nations.

The same picture obtains in Uganda. It obtains in Zambia. It obtains in Ethiopia. One-party rule is the almost universal practice of Africa. Participatory democracy, under the rubric of one man, one vote, is unknown. The

only difference, when it comes to imposing sanctions and discovering threats to the peace, is that the ruling minority in Rhodesia is white; and the ruling minorities elsewhere are black. And so long as the United Nations adheres to this indefensible and hypocritical position, the U.N. is doomed.

[From the Barron, Nov. 10, 1969]

SANCTION FOR DECEIT: IT'S TIME TO END THE ECONOMIC WAR ON RHODESIA

Elder statesmen in or outside of government, have one thing in common with middle-aged editors; unlike ordinary mortals, they can speak their mind and generally get away with it. After a long and distinguished diplomatic career, Dean Acheson, adviser to Democratic Presidents and one-time Secretary of State, lately has been making the most of the privilege. In an eyebrow-raising newspaper interview last month, Mr. Acheson took deadly pot shots at such sacred cows of the liberal establishment as John Kenneth Galbraith, J. Robert Oppenheimer, the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists ("the greatest bit of nonsense since The New Republic") and Dr. Spock. Turning to foreign affairs, the ex-diplomat was savagely quotable. "France is more deeply split than appears. Italy is hardly a country and the Germans have a Government with a parliamentary majority of two . . . the British are a bankrupt people conducting a banking business, and they should get out of it." The world, he concluded waspishly, is "very largely a struggle" between long- and short-term views, between "intelligence and stupidity."

Vintage Acheson, and pretty heady stuff. For our money, however, nothing cited above or in his new book, "Present at the Creation" (Norton, \$12.50 until December 31, \$15 thereafter), matches the force of his scathing denunciation 18 months ago of U.S. policy toward newly independent Rhodesia. "It will surprise some of our fellow citizens," so the senior partner of Covington and Burling told the American Bar Association, "though hardly anyone here, to (learn) that the United States is engaged in an international conspiracy, instigated by Britain and blessed by the United Nations, to overthrow the government of a country that has done us no harm and threatens no one." Since then, of course, Lyndon Johnson has left the White House, while Arthur Goldberg, renegade Democrat, is no longer U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. Late last month the Subcommittee on Africa of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs held hearings on the impact, at home and abroad, of Washington's sanctions against Salisbury. For perhaps the first time since they were imposed nearly three years ago, someone in authority is questioning their wisdom.

High time, too. By any standard of power politics, not to mention international law, sanctions have been a disaster. For one thing, they have dismally failed to achieve their purpose: far from bringing Rhodesia to her knees in a matter of "weeks, rather than months," as Prime Minister Harold Wilson once cockily forecast in London, they have served to unify the country and to stiffen its resolve. Today, on the eve of the fourth anniversary of independence, Rhodesia is richer and stronger than ever. What is worse, as executives of Foote Mineral and Union Carbide—as well as an Assistant Secretary of Commerce and the Deputy Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness—testified the other day, sanctions have cut off the U.S. from its principal supply of strategic chromite, thereby raising the threat of a serious shortage by the end of next year and making industry and the national security dependent on the Soviet Union, which happens to be the only other major source. Finally, to appease the so-called Afro-Asian bloc, whose anti-

Americanism is legion and whose racism makes any other look pale, Foggy Bottom, in Dean Acheson's eloquent words, has pursued a course of "barefaced aggression, unprovoked and unjustified by a single legal or moral principle." Even in the Parliament of Man, that's too much to pay for votes.

The Great Society evidently felt otherwise. Pursuant to a resolution of the U.N. Security Council in December 1966 (reaffirmed and strengthened in May 1968), President Johnson by Executive Order promptly imposed sanctions on Rhodesia, violations of which are punishable by fines of \$10,000 and prison terms up to 10 years. Thereby Washington actively sought to oppose—"overthrow," in the Acheson view—a government the existence of which, by U.N. lights, constitutes an affront to humanity and a threat to world peace. Rhodesia, you see, rejects the concept of one man, one vote; indeed, in its newly approved constitution, it has taken pains to provide that the huge black majority, while amply represented in the legislature, can never rule. That's not apartheid; white and black mingle freely, in and outside of Parliament. It is white supremacy, enforced by a regime with perhaps more emergency power than it should have (Salisbury not long ago is reported to have jailed a financial editor for allegedly revealing state secrets, a move that strikes uncomfortably close to home). In liberal circles, not to mention those with more sinister motives, it is anathema.

Hence the sanctions, about which the first thing to note is their failure ("utter," according to the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity). True, they have had an impact, notably on Rhodesian tobacco farmers and their native help (many of whom doubtless in their own best interests, have been thrown out of work). By and large, however, the country has never enjoyed greater prosperity. Industrial production last year increased by 5%, while consumption of electricity rose 15%. Compared with \$986 million in 1965, the year of independence, gross national product in 1969 will reach an estimated \$1.2 billion, up 10% from 1968. In foreign exchange markets the Rhodesian pound (still officially valued at \$2.80, by the way) is firm, while local stocks have boomed. Foreign goods, supposedly banned by the U.N. resolution, are plentiful. Here is a recent first-hand account of Salisbury by a foreign correspondent of The Wall Street Journal: "The O.K. Bazaar, like other of the city's department stores, teems with shoppers. Appliance stores display Grundig and Zenith radios, Sony and Akai tape recorders and various other electronic gadgets from major nations of world. New French-made Citroen and Peugeot automobiles vie with German-made BMW cars. There are so many automobiles on the streets that parking is a problem. A gasoline station attendant scoffs at suggestions of fuel rationing..."

From the U.S. standpoint, indeed, sanctions—to judge by last month's Congressional testimony—have backfired. Thus, according to the vice president, purchases, of Corning Glass Works, a growing scarcity of petalite, a unique lithium-bearing mineral available in commercial quantity only in Southern Rhodesia, threatens the continued output of glass-ceramic products and the jobs of over 20% of its 18,000-man domestic work force. Far more serious is the looming shortage of metallurgical-grade chromium ore, which, in ferro alloys, is vital to the production of stainless and high-temperature alloy steel. Since sanctions were imposed, U.S. industry has grown heavily dependent on chrome from the USSR; like the most rapacious capitalist, Moscow charges all that the traffic will bear (prices, for a product of dubious quality have doubled). Nonetheless, according to industry and federal officials alike, the U.S. by the end of 1970 will face a

shortfall of 200,000 tons, or roughly one third of total demand. Government stockpiles have been depleted to the point where cessation of Soviet shipments—such as occurred for nearly a decade after the outbreak of the Korean war—would leave industrial users empty-handed in barely 12 months' time.

By boycotting Rhodesia, in short, the U.S. has fostered trade with the Soviet Union, a mortal enemy in Vietnam and elsewhere, and a totalitarian state which denies its people freedom of any kind. There's a triumph of hypocrisy of which the State Department might well be proud. Any alleged threat to world peace, moreover, comes not from Salisbury (it wants only to be left alone), but from hostile neighbors which time and again have mounted terrorist forays across the border (while simultaneously doing a brisk business, in transportation, tourism and tobacco with the "racists"). As for Rhodesia's blacks, their plight periodically moves The New York Times to righteous wrath. Yet somehow—as even African Nationalist leaders concede—they shun their would-be liberators and line up with their alleged oppressors. Perhaps—like some in more progressive lands—they can't tell friend from foe. Perhaps they can.

In any case, as Dean Acheson has persuasively argued, it's nobody's business but their own. President Nixon, another good lawyer, seems to agree. Thus, in his Inaugural Address, the Chief Executive observed: "Let all nations know that during this Administration our lines of communication will be open. We seek an open world—open to ideas, open to the exchange of goods and people, a world in which no people, great or small, will live in angry isolation. We cannot expect to make everyone our friend, but we can try to make no one our enemy." Rhodesia is a fine place to begin.

BIG TRUCK BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a letter from the Honorable John Volpe, Secretary of Transportation, relative to the administration's position on the big truck bill. His letter very clearly sets forth the unequivocal position that the bill, H.R. 11870, as introduced, will be totally unacceptable unless all of the amendments requested by the administration are adopted. This is a very forthright position and Secretary Volpe is to be commended for speaking out so clearly. I feel the letter should be made a part of the RECORD so that proponents of the bill clearly understand the administration's position.

Mr. Speaker, I should at this point also make it quite clear that my position on the bill has not changed. I am unalterably opposed to the bill until we have adequate study and research on the safety questions involved. I will oppose the bill even if all of the amendments requested by the administration are adopted. I intend to introduce a bill in the next few days which will provide for the establishment of a Presidential Commission to conduct a study of these safety questions.

The letter referred to, follows:

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D.C., November 7, 1969.

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRED: In reply to our telephone conversation yesterday it is our position that if Congress should decide to approve a bill to provide for increased truck sizes and weights using the Federal-aid Highway System, that bill should include all of the amendments or revisions which were discussed in the testimony of Federal Highway Administrator Turner before the Committee on Public Works September 3, 1969.

We feel strongly that these conditions are essential. It is our opinion that without these revisions the bill as introduced would not be in the public interest.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. VOLPE.

LOOK FOREIGN EDITOR VISITS VIETNAM AND SAYS "GET OUT NOW"

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of Look magazine contains a powerful argument for the orderly, deliberate, and complete withdrawal from Vietnam that I and several of my colleagues have advocated.

J. Robert Moskin, Look foreign editor, is well versed regarding all aspects of the situation, including the Paris negotiations.

Quite significantly, the editors of Look have written a short editorial following Mr. Moskin's article endorsing his position.

Because of the thoroughness of Mr. Moskin's article and the significance of the action he urges, I commend this article to my colleagues' attention and, under leave to extend my remarks, wish to include it in the RECORD at this point:

VIETNAM: GET OUT NOW

(By J. Robert Moskin)

We should get out of Vietnam immediately. That—bluntly and simply—is the conclusion I bring back from my most recent trip to South Vietnam, plus conversations with leaders on both sides of the negotiations in Paris. I have never been a dove over Vietnam, but I cannot close my eyes to these hard facts: We have failed to win the war in the field. Even with 500,000 men there, we cannot win it.

We have also failed to create a Vietnamese Army that can carry on its own struggle. To try to achieve that long shot will cost more tens of thousands of American lives.

And we have failed to help build a popular or democratic or cohesive government in Saigon. The current regime is a military dictatorship that depends wholly on our presence.

I have never been a Vietnam hawk either, but I respected the judgment of four U.S. administrations that called the fate of South Vietnam vital to our national interest.

Now, President Nixon has reversed this judgment, for which 39,000 Americans have died, 250,000 have suffered wounds and about \$100 billion have been spent. In his policy-setting May 14 speech, he said, "We are prepared to accept any government in South Vietnam that results from the free

choice of the South Vietnamese people themselves." This means our Government no longer believes that it is in our vital national interest to keep South Vietnam free from Communism.

It is a fair standard that young Americans should not be ordered to die unless their sacrifice is vital to their country.

We have absolutely no sane reason left for killing more than 1,000 young Americans before the end of this year. Our present course—spooning out American lives in an infinitely complex, inscrutable Asian game—is inexcusable.

It is difficult to conceive that the present South Vietnamese Government can survive the end of the hostilities or that South Vietnam, even if we go on fighting, will not be Communist-dominated soon after we leave. It really doesn't seem to matter whether we march to the transports today or dribble out before the 1970 U.S. elections or over the next three years. The results will be the same—except in the number of the dead.

In 1967, I traveled for Look along the frontier of American power on the western edge of the Pacific Ocean, and came home convinced that our involvement in the future of Asia is irreversible. That conviction remains. We are not about to scurry back into a Fortress America. Our presence across the Pacific is too massive, our interest too deep. But on this latest trip to Vietnam, I saw that we have overreached ourselves. America's historic westward-driving wave has crested.

No one I talked with—certainly no Vietnamese—believes we should stay in Vietnam. Everyone said we should get out. They differed only on the speed with which we should do so. The most militant—sometimes those most scared for their own skins—said in three years. At a conservative estimate of 100 U.S. dead per week, that means 15,600 more coffins.

Why is South Vietnam's political self-determination still worth dying for? Because, I was told in Washington and Saigon, we have committed our word, and if we leave precipitously, our word will be dishonored. We will lose face. Three years ago, Secretary of State Dean Rusk gave me the same reason for continuing this war. He called it "the credibility of the American commitment."

The Nixon Administration believes we will be "severely hurt" if we "bug out." It wants "a reasonable solution," praying for reasonableness from Hanoi while recognizing that it is against the Communists' interest to be "reasonable."

But by staying, are we telling Thailand, for example, that if it gets into trouble with Thai or North Vietnamese guerrillas, we would help? No one expects, I was told, that we would then send an expeditionary force to Thailand.

The outcome of this "war of national liberation" has no relevance to the chances of having more such wars in the future. Just about every Asian leader knows we have had enough in Vietnam.

Singapore's Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew told me, "Vietnam was a bad place to draw the line."

Why then are Americans dying today in Vietnam? To give the South Vietnamese time to prepare to govern themselves and defend themselves. Are these reasonable goals?

We thought they were. We thought the South Vietnamese leaders would use the time we helped buy for them—with American lives and money—to good advantage. But they have not.

You need only go out in the countryside to see the failure of the succession of South Vietnamese governments to win the people's loyalty. Go to the upriver village of Dien Ban, about ten miles south of Danang, our great northern base in Quang Nam Province. You can get in safely only by helicopter. Here, American marines have to wear their flak

vests in the road just outside their walled compound. This area has been fought over for years; there is still fighting every day. If the refugees were resettled in the countryside, officials fear, they would join the Vietcong.

I visited Dien Ban with the chief of the pacification program, Ambassador William G. Colby, who ranks Quang Nam 38th out of the 44 provinces in security. Terrorist attacks are heavy: government officials and ordinary civilians are being assassinated, wounded, kidnapped. The province chief, an Army of the Republic of Vietnam (ARVN) colonel, figures that the Vietcong have 900 officials of their own in the province. Our side sends out "Political Recon Units" to terrorize and kill VC leaders.

Destruction in Quang Nam Province has been massive. Five years ago, the province had 557 hamlets; only 308 are left. The number of refugees has jumped in five years from 35,000 to 124,000. (One of every 12 people in South Vietnam is a refugee today.) Less than half of the province's rice land is cultivated. Fishermen may not return to shore after 6 p.m. Anyone walking about in the countryside after dusk without a light is shot automatically. In this province of 540,000 people, only one Vietnamese doctor remains, and while I was there, he was vacationing in West Germany. The people in the villages know nothing about the peace negotiations in Paris.

"Ninety percent of the people would cut our throats if they had the chance," a top American in Quang Nam told me.

Ambassador Colby says, "It's been a war between two apparatuses, and the people wish they would both go away."

Warren E. Parker, senior U.S. adviser in the province, describes the situation today: "It's like a Cadillac pushing a Model T through a muddy road with four flat tires with a driver who doesn't know where he's going and doesn't really care."

On an island in the river below the provincial capital of Hoi An sits the Xuyen Long Refugee Camp. It vividly tells part of the story of Vietnam's hopelessness. Here live 3,125 refugees. Only 240 are men. Until this summer, these people all lived on another nearby island that was regarded as a VC stronghold. A swift military sweep scooped up the women and children and a few of the men and transferred them to this desolate sand-dune camp. The rest of the men still are hiding with the VC in the tall grass. Moving their families in this manner made no converts, won no friends.

Yet President Nixon found himself able to tell U.S. troops in Vietnam this summer: "I think history may record this as one of America's finest hours."

In Paris, the diplomats debate semantics over whether troop withdrawals should be called "mutual" or "simultaneous." In Saigon, the politicians, fragmented in dozens of parties, struggle for a piece of the spoils. And out in the countryside—where there is firing every night, assassinations repeatedly, where 12-year-old girls carry rifles—you feel that whatever happens in Paris or Saigon, the word will never get down to the bitter, frightened peasants in the fields and the thatched huts. The struggle, the terror, the dying of this desperate 23-year war—in which more than a million people have been killed and wounded—will go on and on. Says a wise American official there, "You can't negotiate an end of this war. We can only negotiate our way out of it."

In a lovely house in the handsome Paris suburb of Verrières-le-Buisson, Mrs. Nguyen Thi Binh, foreign minister of the National Liberation Front's self-appointed Provisional Revolutionary Government, told me much the same thing in more dogmatic terms. An attractive woman, she left a husband, a boy, 13, and a girl, 9, in Vietnam to head the VC delegation in Paris. Wearing a pale pink *ao dai* and black silk trousers, she sat in a sunny

upstairs parlor next to a vase of red roses. Her eyes were hard, but she smiled as she talked: "I am, politically, a woman who resists American aggression for national independence. I am not a Marxist or a bourgeoisie. I love my country. I long for peace to come back so I can lead a normal life with my children."

But there is no hint of compromise: "If the American Government realizes its erroneous policy of aggression and is willing to end the war of aggression, we are ready to discuss with the American Government putting an end to the conflict. . . . If the American Government obstinately pursues its policy of aggression, the South Vietnamese people are resolved to struggle to victory."

Both sides claim they want elections in South Vietnam, and Mrs. Binh says, "The question is how to organize genuinely free, democratic general elections. The first condition is there must be no presence of American troops of aggression—and without foreign interference."

"I consider the Saigon administration has no competence to organize these elections because if the Saigon administration would organize these elections, they would only give birth to another puppet government."

"The Provisional Revolutionary Government has not asked to organize these elections or put forth election laws, and we (advocate) the formation of a provisional government that will organize the election."

That same day, Nguyen Thanh Le, the thin bespectacled spokesman for the North Vietnamese Government, sat in a room behind a heavily guarded stone wall in the Paris suburb of Choisy-le-Roi, puffed English State Express cigarettes, sipped amber tea from a signet ring and said, "There can be no genuine free election while 500,000 American troops and 60,000 satellite troops remain in Vietnam." He asked if there could have been free elections in France when it was occupied by Hitler's troops.

I asked him why his government, if its objective is to get the United States out, doesn't agree to a cease-fire and simultaneous withdrawal of U.S. and North Vietnamese troops—and then the Americans would be gone.

Le tapped his right forefinger emphatically on his yellow cigarette box and said slowly, "Let me make it simple. Suppose there is a house, and a robber broke in and wrecked the property and killed the wife and children. The master of the house has the obligation to fight back. Simultaneous mutual withdrawal equates the bandit and the master of the house." He added, "The Johnson war is now becoming the Nixon war. Mr. Nixon is even more cunning, more perfidious."

I asked Le about the fear of many that when U.S. forces get out, there would be a bloodbath, especially of anti-Communist Catholics. He called this propaganda of the ruling class. "There are now in South Vietnam many Catholic patriots and many Catholics and people of other religions who participate in the advisory council of South Vietnam and in the leadership of the NLF and the PRC."

"We have no discrimination against any religion. We unite with every patriot to defend the country. So far, those who previously participated in the puppet administration or army, no matter how their pasts were, if they favor the independence, peace and neutrality of South Vietnam, we will cooperate with them and we welcome them."

In Saigon, Sen. Nguyen Gia Hien, who heads South Vietnam's largest Catholic party and who studied at the University of Montana and Iowa State for six years, disagrees. He foresees a massacre. "I'm sure of it. We are not scared of it. The killing is going on now already, not only soldiers but civilians. They will attack anyone who is not working with them—not only Catholics."

The truth is somewhere between a massacre and a welcome. Certainly, the Commu-

nists will try to eliminate their most ardent opponents, and asylum will have to be provided for thousands. But this is a problem that will have to be met whether we get out now or later.

Hien's party, a member of President Nguyen Van Thieu's six-party coalition, the so-called National Social Democratic Front, is strongly anti-Communist and consists mostly of refugees from the North. Hien says it was originally subsidized by the late Francis Cardinal Spellman of New York, and Hien had a three-hour meeting last winter with Cardinal Terence Cooke in New York. Today, Hien accepts the eventual withdrawal of U.S. troops. "Withdrawal of the main American force should take about three years. Give us a period of three years. Two years is too quick for us. If after three years we cannot take care of ourselves, we have nobody else to blame. If the Communists take over, some people will fly off, and we will be guerrillas. And it will go on again."

Meanwhile, he presses Thieu for social and land reforms. "We can do more for peace by being more liberal, being better organized, less corrupt."

Truong Dinh Dzu, who ran second to the Thieu-Ky ticket in the 1967 presidential elections and who favored talking peace with the Vietcong and creating a coalition government, was thrown into jail. But there are still some political figures in Saigon who advocate what Le and Mrs. Binh call "independence, peace and neutrality." One group of intellectuals calls itself the Progressive Nationalist Force. Its chairman is Tran Ngoc Lieng, a 46-year-old lawyer. He told me, "We advocate a complete and immediate cease-fire. We call for a government of reconciliation that will have the responsibility for holding elections in Vietnam." Such a government, he says, would be composed of non-Communist nationalists of both sides, and all its members would have to be acceptable to both sides. This rather idealistic plan would naturally exclude members of the Thieu government as well as the Communists in the PRG.

Although Lieng will not admit it, he is reportedly close to Gen. Duong Van "Big" Minh, who is perhaps the nearest thing South Vietnam has to a popular politician and who has now been allowed to return from exile in Thailand.

Saigon politics is atomized among north-erners, southerners, several factions of Buddhists, Catholics, religious sects like the Cao Dai and the Hoa Hao, neutralists and anti-Communists. Splitting these groups are layers upon layers of individual feuds and historical animosities that go back to the period of French rule. And, above all, most of the politicians are out for their own gain.

Says retired Maj. Gen. Edward G. Landsdale, who knows Vietnamese politics, "It's a family quarrel, and a very savage one, as a family quarrel can be."

The feuding factions seem no longer able to get together before it is too late. But if these anti-Communist and non-Communist nationalists do not unite, there is no chance that they can survive in the postwar political turmoil.

Sen. Tran Van Don, a former general who led the 1963 overthrow of President Ngo Dinh Diem, says, "The problem is with the NLF. The problem is inside ourselves. . . ."

"I don't believe President Thieu can lead the country alone. He needs to rally the army and the people. It is not enough to rally the United States. But he is very proud. He is very jealous of his power. He wants to keep power for himself. I think he would like to become a dictator."

Responsible estimates of the number of political prisoners being held by the Thieu government range as high as 30,000. Many politicians, editors, intellectuals have been

jailed by military courts or by "administrative procedures" at the government's whim. They are held for arbitrary lengths of time. The secretary general of the House of Deputies of the National Assembly, Tran Ngoc Chau, says, "Many times people get kidnapped in the streets and taken to places no one knows about."

A woman secretary in the National Assembly was jailed for a month because she has a relative in the Vietcong. A neutralist politician was given a year in prison for calling an illegal meeting—a press conference. A Saigon University professor's two-year sentence for criticizing U.S. policy was suspended; but ten months later, he was still held on the prison island of Poulo Condore. Publisher Nguyen Lau of the Saigon *Daily News* was sentenced to five years because he talked with a Vietcong agent. (Thirty newspapers have been closed down.) Such cases do not increase confidence in the possibility of free elections.

U.S. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker does not condone these actions, but he says, "We have to remember they are at war. The war is right on their own soil—right in Saigon."

A courageous lawyer, Tran Van Truyen, 56, who has represented a number of such political defendants, says, "We have a national assembly, the president of the republic elected by a general election. But I tell you we have a *seeming* democracy. . . . This government permits no criticism."

Sen. Tran Van Lam, a leader of Thieu's National Social Democratic Front who became South Vietnam's foreign minister in the recent cabinet shuffle, wants the military courts eliminated and all cases tried in civil courts.

Of an American withdrawal, Lam says: "Personally, I think it would be a very good thing. This must be a Vietnamese war."

The government in Saigon is not a popular government. It is basically an army regime, and the people universally fear the army—any army. Hopes that the cabinet changes in September would bring into the government a broader range of civilian views were dashed by the appointment of a right-wing general as prime minister.

The real power behind this government is in the hands of the generals, and Thieu has constantly resisted American pressure to democratize his methods and broaden his political base. What little has been achieved is mainly the result of American persuasion and arm-twisting. Ambassador Bunker, Thieu's confidant, has by all accounts been superb at this. But it has not been enough. A knowledgeable American in Saigon says of Thieu, "He wouldn't have a chance in hell if the Communists weren't pounding at the gates."

The Vietcong obviously want to avoid an election, even if internationally supervised, that would be managed on the rice-roots level by province chiefs, district chiefs, soldiers and police beholden to Thieu. The common guess in Saigon is that the Vietcong's Provisional Revolutionary Government would win 20 to 25 percent of the vote. But since Thieu won in 1967 with only 35 percent, and a major part of that came from the army and the bureaucracy, he has little margin of safety. With PRG putting up a common front and the Saigon politicians divided, the political struggle threatens to be as hopeless as the military one has been.

Since a political solution that will leave South Vietnam non-Communist is so iffy, it's up to the army, the Arvin, to hold off the Communists. Crucial is the speed with which the Arvin can replace the GIs. The process of preparing the Arvin to take over the fighting is what we mean by "Vietnamization."

U.S. officers now admit that one of the great failures of our military effort has been our neglect of the Arvin. The result of this—plus the Arvin's war weariness, corruption,

low pay and the killing off of many of the best officers—is an army that is incapable of defending its country, even if given all the benefits of the United States technology.

Says one American general in a position to judge, "They'll be reasonably self-sufficient in time—three years from now." The question is, can we wait?

When Vietnamization started, no one expected to prepare the Arvin to handle the North Vietnamese Army. The hope was that, in time, it could stand up to the Vietcong. Now, the Nixon Administration dreams of preparing the Arvin to cope with the NVA, too, as a possible alternative to mutual withdrawal.

Of course, even if a cease-fire or peace were arranged and/or American forces withdrawn, there is no way to insure against reinvansion from the North in overwhelming force months after we go.

Ironically, the greatest American hero of the war, Gen. William C. Westmoreland, who commanded our forces there and now is the U.S. Army's Chief of Staff, has become a scapegoat in Vietnam. Some American officers who want to keep fighting today claim that Westmoreland fought the war all wrong, "clobbering everything in sight" in World War II style with big unit battles and massive air support, while the enemy was fighting a semi-guerrilla war.

The military public relations people's new hero is Gen. Creighton W. Abrams, the able current U.S. military commander, whom they love to call "The Spoiler." Abrams' approach is not to wait until the enemy has massed but to hit him as he is preparing his battlefield and gathering his forces from his headquarters safely out of reach in Cambodia.

Abrams told me, "There is a limit to what the United States can do. The solution here has to be Vietnamese." He adds, "I'm in favor of taking out some American troops. There is such a thing as helping too much."

Yet, the fact remains that the Arvin continues to need a great deal of help. It has three main problems. First, it is hated and feared by its own people. One American official in the field tells how a Vietnamese Ranger battalion, supposedly an elite unit, recently went through a village, stealing chickens and belongings. He said with disgust, "You don't make friends that way."

Second, a tremendous effort is needed to train the Arvin's officers and men to handle complex weapons and communications systems, from radios to helicopters. As an American officer told me sardonically, "We'll know we're making progress when we can get a phone call to the Arvin straight."

Third—and most urgent of all—is the problem of leadership. American observers say the Vietnamese, when properly motivated and led, can be excellent soldiers. But the Arvin's officers and even noncoms are too often personally over-ambitious and corrupt.

All in all, I return from Vietnam this time with a sense of hopelessness, deeper perhaps than the personal despair expressed by Look correspondent Sam Castan before he was killed in combat there in 1966.

Politically and militarily, the South Vietnamese are still, after all these years, not yet prepared to take care of themselves. It would cost more thousands of American lives to give them any chance to do so. Now that our Government no longer judges it vital to our security that South Vietnam not go Communist, what justification is there for further American sacrifices?

The simple truth is that the price of keeping South Vietnam non-Communist has been raised to a level the American people are no longer willing to pay. That is a realistic definition of defeat.

If we learn the lesson of Vietnam—that American power has its limitations—this war may at least mark the end of an era and the

beginning of a new, less punitive and more imaginative role in the world for the United States.

Look's May 14, 1968, issue carried an editorial which concluded that "the most important national business before us in this year of political debate is to wind up our involvement in the Vietnam war as quickly and as honorably as possible, and to go on from there to the creation of a world order in which America's ingenuity will truly serve the cause of peace."

Eighteen months, scores of meetings, hundreds of speeches, thousands of deaths, millions of tears and billions of wasted dollars later, we think these words are worth repeating—here at the end of Bob Moskin's eloquent report—in the hope that someday soon, someone in Washington will have the courage to say: "We made a mistake. This is not our war. Let's stop it—now."

Simple? Yes. Politically risky? Perhaps. Humiliating? No—because that would be a new kind of American victory—a victory won over our own willful and self-defeating pride. A victory the whole world would applaud.

PRAISE FOR UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE FOOTBALL TEAM

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, with all the concern over trials and taxes, murders and maimings, poverty, protests, and pot, I certainly welcome this opportunity to speak a few words of praise.

This past Saturday I watched one of the finest football teams in the history of the University of Delaware beat Lehigh, 42 to 14.

The game was not unusual. In six contests prior to Saturday, the Blue Hens have run rampant over their opponents; the Delaware team has lost only once.

I would like to point out to my distinguished colleagues that I am not alone in my praise for the University of Delaware football team. According to the latest UPI poll, the Blue Hens are the third-ranked small-college football team in the country.

Rather than single out any individual star on the field, I must say that I applaud the entire team for a string of fine performances. I would also like to add that after the final game of the season, when Delaware beats Bucknell, I will be delighted to salute the Blue Hens as the champions of the University Division of the Middle Atlantic Conference and, I hope, the winners of the Lambert Cup.

It would be appropriate, too, to say a few words here about Delaware's outstanding quarterback, Tom DiMuzio. Those who are critical of today's young people should have been with me on Tuesday, Veterans Day, when Tom and I toured the veterans' hospital at Elsmere, Del., together. I was particularly impressed with Tom's poise, intelligence, and congeniality, and can easily understand how such a leader off the gridiron can instill drive and determination among his teammates at game time.

THE SHAPE OF THE PARIS PEACE TABLE

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, a week ago Monday, when the President spoke to the Nation, he stated that in over a year of talks with the North Vietnamese and Vietcong in Paris, we have been able to agree on nothing except the shape of the peace table—and as I recall, that alone took several months.

When President Nixon took office, he began formulating what was to be the first major Vietnam peace formula for our delegates to propose in Paris. He announced this peace offensive last spring. Still, like the first year of Paris negotiations, talk sessions since then have been nothing more than talk sessions. For a long time, the Communists were able to use the Paris platform to reiterate absolute demands that we withdraw unconditionally. Finally, last month, Ambassador Lodge responded to a repeated onslaught of North Vietnamese propaganda by walking out of one of the talk sessions.

The resistance of the Communists to any solution of the war by negotiation evidences their determination to wait out the willingness of the United States and its people to assist the people of South Vietnam.

So gloomy have the prospects for a political settlement of the war been, that the President has wisely set a course for Vietnamization of the war and withdrawal of U.S. troops even without progress at the peace table. He has said that the pace of U.S. withdrawals will depend on the safety of remaining U.S. troops, on American casualty rates, Communist infiltration rates, and on our progress in readying the South Vietnamese to carry the full burden of combat.

In his November 3 speech, the President expressed optimism on the pace of future withdrawals because of the progress of the South Vietnamese forces, the much reduced pace of infiltration from the North, and reduced American casualty rates.

Earlier this fall, I cosponsored a resolution introduced by Congressman PAUL FINDLEY of Illinois, which supports the President's efforts to withdraw American forces from Vietnam at the earliest practicable date. In a speech on the floor on October 15, I indicated that the program of troop withdrawals should proceed without regard for progress or lack of progress at the Paris peace table. At that time I indicated my belief that no political solution would be arrived at anytime soon, and that there was a high probability that war would rage on South Vietnamese soil for years after American withdrawal. Thus, while we must work for a just peace in Paris, the goal of American troop withdrawal and strengthening of the South Vietnamese for self-defense must proceed upon the assumption that the next 18 months of

negotiations in Paris will bring little more in terms of a settlement, than the last 18 months have produced.

But by separating the prospects for a political settlement from the much brighter prospect of early and substantial U.S. troop withdrawals, we do not have to abandon all hope for political self-determination for the Vietnamese people. We must still work on the diplomatic front for a just peace, at the same time that we prepare the South Vietnamese to fight on without American ground troops.

Thus today, Mr. Speaker, I joined with a firm majority of House Members in a resolution expressing support for the planks of the President's plan for a negotiated peace. I feel it is important for Ambassador Lodge and the North and South Vietnamese delegates in Paris to know that a majority of the Congress supports the plan for a negotiated peace which President Nixon launched last spring.

This resolution reads as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives affirms its support for the President in his efforts to negotiate a just peace in Vietnam, expresses the earnest hope of the people of the United States for such a peace, calls attention to the numerous peaceful overtures which the United States has made in good faith toward the Government of North Vietnam, approves and supports the principles enunciated by the President that the people of South Vietnam are entitled to choose their own government by means of free elections open to all South Vietnamese and supervised by an impartial international body, and that the United States is willing to abide by the results of such elections, and supports the President in his call upon the Government of North Vietnam to announce its willingness to honor such elections and to abide by such results and to allow the issues in controversy to be peacefully so resolved in order that the war may be ended and peace may be restored at last in Southeast Asia.

The President has proposed a plan for internationally-supervised free election in South Vietnam which would give candidates advocating every kind of political and economic system a chance to win the support of the people. It would not preclude a free government; it would not preclude a Communist government; it would not preclude a coalition government; and it would not require or guarantee that those who now hold power in Saigon would continue in power.

I think it is important to underscore the meaning of this plan for a political settlement of the war. Our delegates should be given every chance to negotiate meaningfully the points of this plan, simultaneously with continued Vietnamization and de-Americanization of the war. There could be no clearer or more sincere demonstration of our desire to leave the defense and the political destiny of the South Vietnamese people in their own hands.

The resolution I have coauthored today does not in any way mean or imply that American troops can or should be kept in Vietnam until the political self-determination envisioned in our peace proposal is accomplished. On the contrary, the resolution goes hand in hand

with the earlier Findley resolution together, they express support for the President's efforts to remove American troops from the battlefield, and to remove American influence from a political solution which should be determined only by the South Vietnamese themselves.

Today, Members of Congress representing nearly 150 million Americans joined in support of a negotiated settlement which would offer true, internationally supervised free election and self-determination for the South Vietnamese people. I join in the hope that this support will strengthen the hand of our delegates in Paris, so that the shapely block of wood which we and the North Vietnamese agreed on months ago will at last begin to resemble what it was meant to be—a table of peace.

RAILROAD RETIREES FACE DELAY IN ANNUITY CHECKS

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise, today, to bring to the attention of my colleagues the serious condition facing our retired railroad workers. In a time when inflation is on the rise these senior citizens, on a fixed income and least able to cope with rising prices, are being notified of a delay in the payment of their supplemental annuities. The situation is described in the following letter dated October 29, 1969, from Mr. Howard W. Habermeyer, Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, addressed to the National Railway Labor Conference and the Railway Labor Executives' Association. I quote:

GENTLEMEN: As I explained in my letter of September 16, we have been temporarily withholding new supplemental annuity awards. This action was taken to conserve funds for the November 1 supplemental annuity checks due annuitants already on the rolls.

Now that all November 1 checks have been issued, we are going to resume making new awards. Payment of the backlog cases should begin some time before November 15.

Though we will have enough funds to cover new awards, we will not have enough for the December 1 supplemental annuity checks. Issuance of those checks will have to be delayed unless additional funds are made available by legislation. The delay will apply to everyone on the supplemental annuity rolls, including those just awarded.

Any related tax credits to employers will be withheld during the period the annuities are withheld.

Advance notice of the delay in the December 1 checks will be mailed to annuitants on November 10. It will be released to all annuitants who were on the rolls for the November 1 supplemental annuity check. Annuitants awarded a supplemental annuity in November will get a similar notice with their award letter.

Some time between December 20 and December 31, we will be able to issue the checks due December 1. We are not certain about exact date of payment because we will have

to wait to see when enough taxes have been collected to cover the December 1 benefit rolls.

Sincerely yours,
HOWARD W. HABERMEYER,
Chairman.

On September 30 this House passed by a vote of 372 to 17, H.R. 13300 which contains the necessary legislation to correct the financial deficit of the fund and to insure that never again will our retired railway workers have to fear for the payment of their supplemental annuity.

There was, and there still is, opposition to some features of the bill. Unanimity on all sides is not, and never has been, either a realistic expectation or a prerequisite to action on a complicated matter such as this. The provisions of H.R. 13300 reflect the agreement reached by the majority and it does offer what appears to be the best solution available consistent with the purpose of the legislation.

I ask my colleagues of this House to join with me in urging immediate consideration of H.R. 13300 by the Senate in the hope legislation can be enacted in time to prevent the delay to the payment of the December annuity checks. Surely the Congress can act with dispatch and prevent these senior citizens from receiving a reduction in their supplemental annuity at Christmas time.

S. SGT. DAVID D. WINKLER

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, S. Sgt. David D. Winkler, a fine man from Maryland was killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend his courage and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

SECOND MINE IS FATAL FOR LA PLATA GI,
DAVID WINKLER

A 30-year-old career soldier from La Plata, Md., who was wounded by an exploding land mine in April, was killed in a second mine explosion Sunday while on a mission in Vietnam, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

Army Staff Sgt. David D. Winkler was aboard a personnel carrier outside Da Nang when the fatal explosion occurred. Seven months earlier, he received internal injuries when a tank he was commanding rode over a land mine.

He spent about three months in Walter Reed Army Medical Center in Washington after the mine explosion destroyed his tank. He then served several months at Fort Knox, Ky., before returning to Vietnam October 13 to begin a second tour.

"He loved the Army. That was his life. He never had anything bad to say about the government. He was a professional soldier," Mrs. Barbara Hitt, the sergeant's cousin, said yesterday.

Sergeant Winkler served in Vietnam with the 1st Battalion, 69th Armored Division, and he was awarded a Purple Heart.

He graduated from Archbishop Neale High School in La Plata. In 1959, a year after his graduation, he enlisted in the Army.

He was raised on a farm near La Plata. The

sergeant married his childhood sweetheart, the former Nancy Wedding, of Indian Head, Md., in 1964.

Surviving, besides his wife, are two sons, J. C. and Tommy Lee Winkler, both of Indian Head; a sister, Mrs. Martha Cantrell, of La Plata; four brothers, Navy Seaman Charles Winkler, of Norfolk, Mac Winkler, of Waldorf, Md., William Winkler, of Wheaton, Md., and Michael Winkler, of La Plata; his mother, Mrs. Mary Edith Winkler, of La Plata, and his paternal grandmother, Mrs. Hattie Winkler, of Pomfret, Md.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I put into the permanent RECORD an open letter to the President, signed by Eugene A. Simon, president and publisher of the Daily Dispatch, New Kensington, Pa.

Mr. Simon has been a longtime worker in the field of peace, international good will, and human relations.

I believe this letter is worth reading by the Members of Congress. It shows the type of editing, and reporting Mr. Simon is known for in the four newspapers that come under his publishing firm. These dailies, the Daily Dispatch and the Valley Daily News, cover 43 municipalities in our four-county Allegheny-Kiski Valley area of Westmoreland, Allegheny, Armstrong, and Butler Counties. Their daily circulation is now almost 41,000. The weeklies, the North Hills News-Record and Butler County News-Record, which are averaging 60 pages standard size per issue, have nearly 32,000 circulation and represent the largest and fastest growing weekly operation in Pennsylvania and this section of the country. The Butler County News-Record covers 23 municipalities in the area north of Pittsburgh to the Butler County line. The News-Record not long ago, received the top "General Excellence" award among 2,300 weeklies in 44 States. This organization has nearly 300 employees, with about half being shareholders.

It is also noteworthy that these newspapers devote far more space to news as related to advertising than does almost any newspaper in America. This is simply because they believe that news is the guts of this business. These newspapers have also won an unusually large number of writing and public service awards.

Mr. Simon believes in keeping public officials informed, and has never closed his columns to any worthwhile news or opinion expressed by public officials or the everyday citizen.

Mr. Simon and his staff portray clear-cut positions when they editorialize, and factual reporting of the news in their news columns.

I am very happy to be privileged to serve this district, and personally compliment Mr. Simon and his organization for their excellent productions.

The open letter follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The wire services and nation's newspapers, including ours, quoted you during the presidential campaign last fall as saying you knew how to end the war in Vietnam. You indicated you had "a plan for peace" and would "act on it quickly and vigorously" if elected President.

Nearly 10 months have passed since you have been our President. It seems reasonable to inquire what has been accomplished to back up your campaign promise. There is strong evidence that your "peace we can be proud of" is no closer to realization now than it was when you became President last January. Further, your tendency to ignore sincere and conscientious disagreement on the part of millions of Americans who equally love their country, and to equate this with a lack of patriotism, is sounding more and more like your predecessor.

The futile impasse and needless killing in tortured Vietnam meanwhile continues and American boys are still dying beyond the 40,000 whose lives have already been sacrificed. And still there is no end in sight nor any "quick and vigorous action on a plan for peace."

Increasing skepticism of our generals about the Army of South Vietnam indicates it is no more prepared to take over the fighting now than it was in 1962. It was then that Vice President Johnson called South Vietnamese President Diem "the Churchill of Asia", Defense Secretary McNamara later said "the boys would be home for Christmas" and the Joint Chiefs of Staff maintained we would stop the flow of men and supplies and bring North Vietnam to her senses if we started the bombing. No matter now that the bombing greatly increased the flow southward and escalation simply brought on more escalation.

Now while the Saigon regime sells our hardware for the profit of its generals, President Thieu asks for more and more, including atomic weapons so his shattered country can be further shredded and desolated. Yet his million troops and our half million still cannot contain the less than quarter-million Viet Cong and North Vietnamese troops combined that our military experts say are in Vietnam. Perhaps it would be helpful if some of our government's military and civilian geniuses ascertained the reasons for these incongruities.

We realize the problem of Vietnam is tremendously complex and extremely difficult. We know you inherited the mess from previous administrations. We also appreciate that you are pulling some troops out while the last President was sending them in, and that casualties and violence currently seem to be declining while in 1968 they were rising.

But we also realize that our President and Commander-in-Chief, in the most powerful office in the world's most powerful country, can make the difference if he fulfills the leadership potential of his tremendous office. Only YOU can do this, Mr. President, and only you are the President of the United States of America. As former Vice President Humphrey said, "We only have one President at a time", and now he is Richard Nixon in the office he so rigorously sought.

And so, Mr. President, when are you going to demonstrate the imagination, the intelligence, the vision, the courage, the leadership necessary to get our country out of Vietnam? Hasn't there been enough disruption and waste of human life and resources as taxes and prices continue to rise without crucial national problems being solved, with crucial needs going begging? When are we as a great nation going to stop the destructive futility of a conflict that never was in the best interests of America? When are we going to establish and implement the national priorities and needs that will truly make our country great and a real beacon to the world?

Only then will the tremendous resources and potential of our wonderful country be fully marshaled and united under a common effort for the national good and benefit of all mankind by all our people working together. So stop the killing, Mr. President, and get out of Vietnam before it destroys you as it did your predecessor.

Sincerely,

EUGENE A. SIMON,
President and Publisher.

FREEDOM RALLY

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, at the Freedom Rally on November 11 at the Washington Monument, the Honorable JOHN H. BUCHANAN delivered a magnificent and stirring address to the patriotic Americans who came to demonstrate their loyalty to this country, to stand behind those gallant men who are fighting and dying in Vietnam and to prove to this country and to the world their faith and confidence in the leadership of President Nixon in his effort to resolve the Vietnam war with honor.

I was present at this rally and I heard the magnificent address of Mr. BUCHANAN. A great speaker, a great theologian, and a dedicated American, Mr. BUCHANAN stirred the crowd with one of the greatest addresses to which I have ever listened. I asked Mr. BUCHANAN to permit me to insert this valuable document in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for present and future generations to read. I am enclosing herewith the address of this great and good American:

REMARKS BY HON. JOHN H. BUCHANAN, JR. AT VETERANS DAY FREEDOM RALLY—WASHINGTON MONUMENT, NOV. 11, 1969

We are gathered here today in support of world peace, that just and lasting peace which can only be maintained when tyrants know that the forces of freedom are strong and have the will to use that strength to resist aggression. We are gathered to pay tribute to those brave men who have fought in American uniforms to preserve freedom and resist aggression in a series of conflicts through our nation's history and those who are doing so today in Southeast Asia. We particularly honor this day those who have given their lives that freedom might live in our time.

There are those in our country who do not seem to understand that we are confronted today by a world-wide communist movement which in its varied expressions controls more than 25% of the earth's surface and more than one billion of the world's people and which challenges the freedom and self-determination of the remainder of the world. This force has chosen the path of militant atheism, of repression of the human rights and liberties of those who fall under its power, and of government of the many by the few through means of military force and police power. It could well be characterized as neo-Nazi or neo-fascist movement.

This is the nature of the enemy we face in Vietnam, which would destroy the freedom and self-determination of the people of that Republic. In this situation we do indeed need a moratorium—a moratorium on totalitarianism and on communist aggression. I for one recognize the right of Ameri-

can citizens to dissent from government policy and to demonstrate and voice their protest. But given the nature of the challenge we face in our time, it is my personal conviction that there is more hope for the world in one Boy Scout standing tall, proudly holding this flag of freedom in his hand than in the entire protest movement in the United States.

As my colleague has well said, the true aggressors, the peace breakers, the law breakers who have destroyed the world's peace are not those who fight for their own freedom or those American soldiers who sacrifice to help the courageous people of South Vietnam to preserve that freedom; but those who would impose upon an unwilling population a communist dictatorship in South Vietnam.

There is in truth an evil force which we are fighting against in Southeast Asia. Let us look for a moment at what we are fighting for. Within the past two years we have witnessed the birth of a miracle in Vietnam. For in the midst of the fire and upon the ashes of a protracted war, the courageous, resourceful, energetic people of the troubled land have drafted a constitution, adopted by popular referendum, establishing a democratic republic with elected executive and legislative branches and an independent judiciary. They have added to this by holding local elections in over 80% of the hamlets and villages. The government in Saigon, so scorned by its critics here and elsewhere, is one created and elected by the people of that country as an expression of their self-determination.

This stands in vivid contrast to the government in Hanoi, as well as to every other communist government in the world. Not one was created as an expression of self-determination of a people. Not a single leader of any communist country has been elected in a free election. None have ever been held and none will be held. For every communist government, up to and including the Soviet Union itself, has reason to fear the exercise of self-determination by the people which it governs.

In South Vietnam, even as we have helped our courageous allies to fight, we have helped them to build. One concrete example is in the educational system, so vital to a developing country, or for that matter any country. Since 1954 we have assisted in building more than 12,000 local schools in Vietnam, transforming education from a privilege of a favored few to an opportunity for the many. We have assisted in the building of new colleges in that land and college enrollment has increased from 8,000 to 40,000.

It has been my privilege to meet many of the men who serve in the legislative and executive branches of the government of the Republic of Vietnam. I have found among them character, dedication, high ability and a deep determination to build a strong and truly free society there. The 1968 Tet offensive, so misunderstood in this country, was a disaster for the communists, destroying much of their political infrastructure and military leadership and most of the truly Vietcong manpower. North Vietnamese regular army forces have constituted the overwhelming majority of the enemy forces we have faced since February 1968 and this is increasingly the case. The people who had already learned to fear the communists were horrified by the communist atrocities committed during that offensive and for both negative and positive reasons have increasingly swung behind the Saigon regime, giving it their growing support. Governmentally, militarily, and in public support the government in Saigon is growing consistently stronger.

The above is testified to by the unbelievably high morale of the American forces fighting in Vietnam. Despite the voices of protest at home and the cynical use of the

protest movement in Vietcong propaganda which, of course, damages this morale, most of us who have visited the troops there know that our American fighting men deeply believe in the rightness of their cause and that they shall succeed in their mission. I share that faith and that confidence.

Because these things are true, it is my conviction that the President's policy of step-by-step withdrawal and Vietnamization of the war can and will succeed. For too long the raucous voices of dissent have filled the microphones and noisome protesters have occupied the spotlight and the center of the stage. It is time for the 77% to make our voices heard loud and clear. We love our country. We honor its flag. We stand behind our President. We support our fighting men. And we believe that under the providence of God and with the support of the American people, they shall succeed in their mission in Vietnam. In so doing, we the American people will truly serve the cause of peace.

POINT REYES NATIONAL SEASHORE

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, the urgency of authorizing additional funds to complete purchase of land for the Point Reyes National Seashore was vividly pointed out in an editorial of the San Francisco Chronicle on November 10, 1969. The editorial commends Congressman ASPINALL for recognizing the necessity for immediate action if we are to preserve the Point Reyes National Seashore from commercial development.

It is imperative that we complete the acquisition of land for Point Reyes and do so now.

I should like to share with my colleagues, the full text of this editorial which I place in the RECORD at this time:

MORE FUNDS FOR POINT REYES PARK

Congress created the Point Reyes National Seashore in 1962, but, seven years later, has authorized only enough money to acquire less than half of the 53,483 acres which are included with the park's proposed boundaries. Inflation and a land boom triggered by the mere decision that the area would become a National Seashore have sent land values spiraling.

Congressman Wayne Aspinall's renewed effort to obtain additional funds for the project, which he announced last Thursday, is thus both wise and prudent. He has lent his powerful support to a bill for new appropriations, which is expected to be approved by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which he is chairman.

Aspinall decided to seek the money in the face of continued lack of action by Robert P. Mayo, the director of the Bureau of the Budget, who has clamped a budgetary limit on the funds available to the National Park Service for new parks or proposed ones.

The funds, it is contended, are available. Congress has authorized an annual \$200 million appropriation to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, but the director of the Bureau of the Budget has refused to allocate all of the money up to this limit.

Point Reyes National Seashore provides a persuasive argument for release of some of this money and for its expenditure immediately. For escalating land prices make it

predictable that delay means only sharply increased cost. And delay also means that some areas within the park's proposed boundaries are increasingly threatened with subdivision development.

Secretary of the Interior Walter Hickel, speaking recently in Chicago, said that the department was planning intensive concentration in the development of parks in metropolitan areas "where urban recreation of outstanding quality can be provided by the Federal Government." He wanted, he said, to put the parks where the people are.

There are certainly few areas in the Nation which fit the Secretary's definition more precisely than Point Reyes. It is easily accessible to the 4.5 million people of the nine Bay Area counties. It is already heavily used. It is urgent that it be saved.

PROXY CONTESTS, CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion recently of corporate mergers, acquisitions, and the way they are accomplished. Mr. Thomas J. Deegan, Jr., chairman of Thomas J. Deegan Co., Inc., a New York public relations firm, spoke to the Federal Bar Association in Washington recently and discussed the involvement of public relations in mergers and acquisitions, particularly those with proxy fights.

In considering the public interest, Mr. Deegan has made some valuable points. I commend the speech, which follows, to my colleagues:

PROXY CONTESTS, CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

(By Thomas J. Deegan, Jr.)

I am delighted to be here with you today. I understand it was my old friend, Joe Borlin, who suggested that I be invited to speak to you, and I feel very much indebted to him.

After all, how often does a man in public relations get to talk while more than 300 lawyers listen quietly? I have frequently had trouble getting even one lawyer to listen to me.

We usually have a kind of snake and mongoose act, your profession and mine. We are often, and sometimes justifiably, accused of trying to practice law, and you are charged with practicing just about everything but law. Or worse yet, you too are sometimes accused of trying to practice law.

Having had much to do with legal counsel, I know your admonition that a lawyer who pleads his own case has a fool for a client. Same here.

To put a new tooth in another old saw, it is sometimes said that a good lawyer knows that if the facts are against him, he must argue the law; if the law is against him, he must argue the facts; if they are both against him, he has to retain a good public relations firm. But I beg your leave to amend that. If the law and the facts are against him, then heaven help him. A public relations firm cannot. I have passed too many summers and winters to accept the idea that we are miracle-workers.

I have been reading about Washington lawyers in the current *Fortune*, which purports to explain why many of the best lawyers in the country gravitate here. But it does

not say why some of the best "public relations" men also come here—I mean people like Clark Clifford, John Mitchell, Richard MacLaren and Richard Nixon.

And Ralph Nader is such an ace at publicity that most of the country isn't even aware he is just another Washington lawyer in disguise.

Well, there are many times and places when our two professions are seriously at odds with each other. But one place where they come together, and where close collaboration between them is essential—to come to the subject of my talk today—is in proxy contests for control of corporations.

As I am certain you are aware, it is all but impossible to pick up a newspaper today without reading about a proxy contest—or its first cousin, a tender offer—for a major corporate prize.

If it isn't Ling-Temco-Vought or Northwest Industries, then it's Gulf & Western or Textron or I.T. & T. absorbing some other company, or quite frequently a smaller fish swallowing a bigger one. In one story on Page 63 of the *New York Times* last week, there was news of ten different corporate takeovers, involving names like Corning Glass, Chase Manhattan Corporation, Shell Chemical Company, International Salt Company, Mead Corporation and Colt Industries—some of these acquiring and some being acquired.

In this year's tabulation of the 500 largest industrial corporations in the U.S., *Fortune* announced that 31 had disappeared from the list since 1968—26 of these via the acquisition route.

The *Harvard Business Review* just reported that, between 1960 and 1968, the number of mergers and acquisitions in this country had more than tripled, from around 1,200 and 3,800. Not all mergers and acquisitions involve the kind of blood on the floor that often goes with proxy fights and tenders, by any means, but they usually go up or down together. Between 1962 and 1966, for example, the number of proxy contests involving election of directors increased from 17 to 37.

These developments have made such subjects as corporate raiding and the growth of conglomerate enterprises a matter of major public concern. The government, as you know, has been anything but a silent bystander while all this has been going on. Both the SEC, with new disclosure rules, and the Anti-Trust Division of the Justice Department, with legal action against conglomerate takeovers, have moved in on the act. There is also a lot of interest among members of Congress, including Wilbur Mills.

Proxy contests have been an important concern of the SEC as long as there has been an SEC, and rightly so. And over that period of many years I have been involved in quite a few major proxy fights myself.

Most recently our firm counseled M-G-M management in two successful proxy contests in 1966 and 1967 when it staved off the challenges of Philip Levin, a major stockholder. Just last week, of course, it was announced that Kirk Kerkorian had been able to obtain about a third of the M-G-M's stock via the tender offer technique. What he plans to do has not yet been disclosed, but there has clearly been a substantial change in the situation.

Of course, the classic proxy contest was the so-called "Battle of the Century," the fight for control of the New York Central Railroad. Maybe it was because we were all younger then, but somehow that was much more exciting than the power struggles we read about today. And maybe it was because all the things we had learned in the fights for the Chesapeake & Ohio, for the Pullman Company and in our first try for the Central were being put to work for the first time and we were inventing new techniques as we went along. As Joe Borlin pointed out in his fine book on Robert R. Young, we

spent seven years in preparation, and we went after this \$2½ billion empire with everything we had.

It was a hard and bitter battle, and the opposition gave us no quarter. As for our side, we managed to throw a few punches that fell within the Marquis of Queensberry rules of proxy fighting at that time. They were legal, of course, then—although I'm not sure the SEC would be too happy about them today.

For one thing, there was a little matter of 800,000 shares of New York Central stock that were owned by Young's Allegheny Corporation, but that were tied up as collateral in a trust. Those shares were sold to Clint Murchison and Sidney Richardson, but in a way that was so hedged over with safeguards against loss as to hardly constitute a real sale. But Young felt that he had to find some way to have the stock owned by his own company voted in his favor.

There were also our newspaper ads which constituted one of the first efforts ever made to rally broad public opinion behind one side in a proxy fight.

Since the whole communications strategy was pretty much my affair, this may sound a little like boasting, but it is also a little in the nature of *mea culpa*. A lot of you will remember, and others will have seen it in Joe's book, the great ad that was headed "A hog can cross the country without changing trains, but you can't."

There were also several ads that ran as "memos" from the Chesapeake & Ohio to the New York Central—one urging the elimination of tipping in rail travel, and another pressing for the development of the high-speed "Train X" for passenger service. And one ad was published in Yiddish!

The point here is that the C&O sponsored these railroad passenger service ads although its passenger revenues amounted to only about 3 percent of its total. But we knew, even then, that one day we would be playing a larger role in the railroad industry, so we used the C&O as our sounding board—in the public interest.

It was a pleasure to serve as Chief of Staff to Robert Young. As Joe's book makes clear, he was an innovator. He understood the use of mass communication techniques to seek the support of the public.

I remember the occasion, for example, during the Battle of the Century, when the late William White, who was then president of the New York Central, was undergoing a pre-trial examination, in a public hearing. The prestigious law firm of Lord, Day & Lord was handling the matter for us, with a senior partner in charge. Young instructed him, somewhat to his chagrin, to let me sit at the counsel table and feed questions to him. The way Young explained it to me was, "We probably aren't going to win this one, anyway, but the press will all be there, and you know which questions will embarrass Bill White."

I suppose gambits like that always have their own use and their own rationale. Our justification for them was that a proxy fight in those days was pretty much loaded on the side of management. To a lesser extent, the same thing is true today.

Both state laws and the SEC Proxy Rules, for examples, forbid an insurgent group from submitting a proposal to a stockholders meeting, unless it is a proper subject for stockholder action. Management is under no such constraint, however, and it can be a good idea for management to get good marks from the shareholders by asking their advice on running the business.

The management side also has a lot more information at its disposal about the stockholders. If it is wise, it will get even more information and work on establishing a sound line of communication. That can best be done when everything is going well, not when things get rough.

The SEC Rules don't require that management turn over its shareholder list to a dissident group, but most state laws do. When we asked for the Central's stockholder list, they sent it right over—a big bundle tied together with an old pair of suspenders. I don't know whether that idea came from their public relations adviser or from their general counsel, but it became our first collector's item in that historic contest. You might say that there was some symbolism in it—we got the suspenders because our adversary would soon no longer need them.

Insurgent groups have some natural advantages, however, if they stop to think about them. For one thing, there are all the unhappy and disgruntled stockholders out in the woods. Every company manages to accumulate a few, whether they are presidents who have been fired or people who bought the stock at the top of the market.

For another thing, there is the basic American sympathy for the underdog, the come-from-behinder—and small stockholders tend to feel this more than the big ones. Insurgents may also have the advantage of surprise, because the first move is usually up to them—although this is an edge that the SEC has just about managed to eliminate.

There are also a lot of proposals that an insurgent group can legitimately bring before a meeting. They can pick issues that might embarrass the management without alienating too many other stockholders, such as calling for cumulative voting, a new firm of independent auditors, or a woman or minority group on the board.

For either side, it is vital to use all its resources as well as it is able. A major proxy contest combines the elements of a national election and a war. The other side's weak spots must be sought out and exploited, and salt poured in the rawest wounds; the public must be wooed; the available forces have to be deployed where they can do most good, and time and a fine sense of timing are always of the essence.

Over the years, I have been involved on both sides of a number of proxy fights, and I have watched a great many more. What has been most amazing to me is the frequent assumption by corporate management that it is loved by the stockholders and that the fight will take care of itself. It will not. It must be worked at.

My own starting point is a document that I call "the 39 steps." There may be considerably more or considerably less than 39, because companies and proxy contests differ. But this is the check list. There are some items on it that are common to all companies with stockholder rebellions on their hands.

Item Number One on the list is to assume, at the very first sign of trouble, that there will be a proxy contest. Here are just a few others:

Security is a prime consideration, because the element of surprise is so important.

The shareholder list has to be analyzed and broken down from many aspects—a straight marketing task.

The "swing" is vital. When you get a large block to vote for your side, you are also eliminating that block as potential votes for the other side.

There should be one key spokesman for your side.

In addition to the overall plan of a campaign, there is no substitute for knowing all the nitty-gritty details. It can usually be assumed, for example, that a mailing is going out. But does the mail room know that it should go first class? And is the envelope the right size for the mail slots in apartment houses? The good visual impression of a mailing piece may be undermined when the letter is folded on the bias, the way all mailmen love to do.

Lack of attention to detail can be almost fatal. So can too much attention, sometimes.

I remember an overzealous minor aide to Bob Young who almost fouled up our end of the New York Central contest. Young was here in Washington to address the National Press Club, and he and I came down early and stayed at the Mayflower. That day Clint Murchison and Sid Richardson were meeting with Bill White and Harold Vanderbilt in New York to see if a compromise could be worked out.

We were hanging on our chairs, waiting for the phone to ring. And no call came, we sweated out the best part of three hours in dead silence. It turned out, we later learned, that this young aide had left explicit instructions with the hotel that we were not to be disturbed by calls from anyone. It also turned out that no agreement had been reached with the Central. But if one had, Young would not have been available to ratify it!

A well-run proxy contest has to be organized like any other well-run enterprise, with defined functions and clear lines of authority. The team needs lawyers, accountants, public relations experts, professional proxy solicitors, security analysts, and often others.

The lawyer, of course, should know the statutory provisions and common law decisions on any problem that may come up. He should be especially familiar with the SEC and its procedures. Corporation counsel should not be bashful about calling in outside firms with that knowledge.

The same thing is true in the communications area. The company may have a very able public relations staff, but most company men usually have not had much experience in proxy contests. These executives on the team must not only be competent, but they have to be given a significant voice in major decisions affecting the campaign.

In a proxy fight, after all, it is important to create a vast public conversation. This is more than a mere dialogue or debate, because many parties must be reached and many must be heard from—among the public, in business, at many levels of government.

Even though the major effort is to influence important groups of stockholders—and surely we all agree that, in the corporate democracy, some stockholders are more equal than others—it is most important to get the message across in an idiom that most people will understand. You must be able to talk to the stockholders as partners and as people—and in order to reach them you have to talk to everybody.

The same thing is true of a proxy statement or a prospectus. These documents, circumscribed by a maze of legal and technical requirements, can be bewildering to laymen. The stockholder may very well resent them, unless special efforts are made to clarify and simplify them.

In their book called *Proxy Contests for Corporate Control*, two lawyers, Edward Aronow and Herbert Einhorn, ask for clearer and better language that "calls for the advice and assistance of one skilled in writing for the general public."

The same kind of recommendation came just a week or two ago from SEC Commissioner Richard B. Smith, who said that some proxy statements and prospectuses "almost defy understanding." It is obvious that such documents, bogged down in a miasma of prolix and complex prose, must fail in their primary purpose, which is simply communication. And those of us in the profession like to think that an important part of our expertise lies in communication through the written word.

Beyond that capability, the public relations specialist in a proxy fight, like the lawyer, must have some background in dealing with the SEC. He would know, for example, whom to call and when to discuss a press conference or a public announcement.

He would be aware of the techniques in which a last-minute press release can be cleared with the SEC.

I must emphasize, however, that usually neither the legal nor the public relations expert in proxy contests get enough opportunity to perform his very best services. For the time when his advice is most needed is long before the trouble begins. And we both know that our most beleaguered clients have a tendency to wait until the last minute before calling us.

An insurgent group of stockholders is rarely successful without a good measure of unwitting cooperation from management. What paves their way is very often the apathy, arrogance and unawareness on the part of those who control a business.

In stockholder relations, preventive medicine is always better than remedial measures. Of course, the best way to prevent proxy contests is to run a business so well that no one would dare to challenge such management.

But the trouble with this today, is that a business that is being run exceedingly well can look especially tempting to the astute corporate raider. If the proxy contest normally aims at a sick company, the acquisition by tender more often focuses on a healthy one.

The tender offer as a means of acquiring control of a company is a device that has flourished in England for a long time, but it became popular here only a few years ago. When Manuel Cohen was chairman of the SEC, he pointed out that cash tender bids had grown from a total of \$200 million in 1960 to about five times that much just six or seven years later.

There are bona fide corporate acquisitions by tender that can be advantageous to all concerned. There are some that take place with the knowledge and approval of management. And surely some of the tender bids we have been hearing about would have been knock-down-drag-out proxy battles just a few years ago, before it became obvious that an insurgent group with real issues to work with could be pretty effective.

The great danger lies in the possibility of destructive take-overs. We are all familiar with the "Chinese money" operators, the raiders who look over a situation, note the presence of large amounts of cash or other liquid assets, and who move in for the kill—or the killing.

These people are essentially predators, who use corporate assets for their own purposes and their own aggrandizement, and who may be totally ignorant of the operation of the businesses they acquire. Usually they couldn't care less about the stockholders, the management or the future of the company itself.

There is also another clear and present danger in the Mafia takeover, in which illegitimate operators acquire a business to use as a front and a tax cover. These elements are usually both destructive and insensitive to the practices of normal business men, and they sometimes bring illegal methods into businesses that until then operated entirely within the law.

Under our system, there is not too much that can be done about corporate acquisitions on the open market. If someone wants to pay the going price for stock, no one asks where the money comes from. Even the Michigan Supreme Court has said:

"It is one of the risks of publicly-held corporations that a total stranger may purchase a controlling interest in a particular corporation. If the purchase is not unlawful, the courts may not superimpose their suspicions, predilections, and judgments upon the actions of the entrepreneur."

As far as the Mafia is concerned, all we can say is—some entrepreneur! But we have to agree with the court, until some more effective way is found to fight legally against badly-motivated takeovers and the shady characters who engineer them.

All of business, Justice Brandeis once said, is invested with a public interest. Over the years, however, there have been gradual changes in just what constituted the public interest, in who it was felt could serve it best and in what regulation and legislation were required to safeguard that interest.

There was a period in the development of our country when business leaders felt they were the proper custodians of the public interest. And, except for occasional diatribes, like Teddy Roosevelt's against "the malefactors of great wealth," that position went largely unchallenged.

Chauncey Depew—again as Joe Borkin pointed out in his book—was chairman of the New York Central from 1898 to 1928, and held that office right through the period when he served in the United States Senate. "Conflict of interest" was a phrase one just didn't hear in those days.

It was once pretty easy in this country for the managements of most large corporations to perpetuate themselves by simply asking the stockholders for their proxies. They didn't tell the stockholders any more than they absolutely had to about the business, and that wasn't very much.

That know-nothing era came to a fairly abrupt end in 1935, when federal regulation of proxy solicitations began to provide what was called "fair opportunity for the operation of corporate suffrage." This introduced the somewhat revolutionary notion that if publicly-held companies were to be run on a democratic basis in our business society, then even the smallest stockholder must have some voice in selecting or rejecting management. It said furthermore that he was entitled to the information he needed to make an intelligent judgment.

On the whole, Congress and the SEC have done a pretty good job of keeping up with the changes needed in a time of transition, and with curbing the worst abuses in corporate disregard of its constituencies. The SEC got its real franchise with the Securities Act amendments of 1933, and the amendments of 1964 closed some broad gaps, such as those in unregulated companies. When the Williams Bill was passed last summer, it sewed up a major loophole by putting cash tender offers under SEC control. Its key provisions lay in the required disclosures of information—who was making the offer, what was its purpose, and where the money was coming from.

All these measures have helped define, not just what the public interest is, but who the many publics are. One sizable public, for instance, is made up of the employees who depend on a company for their livelihood and well-being. Another is made up of the members of the community in which a business operates; the wrong kind of management has been known nearly to destroy a community that depended heavily on a single industry or plant. And many of our larger corporations have an appreciable impact on our total economy, as well.

Stockholders themselves make up an increasingly large part of the general public in the United States. The number of Americans who own stock in corporations and mutual funds rose from 17 million in 1962 to more than 26 million last January, according to the New York Stock Exchange. Another 100 million people—which is about half our population—have an interest in stocks through their memberships in pension and profit-sharing funds and their ownership of insurance policies.

It is to the interest of all these people to have our corporations succeed, grow and prosper. It is also in their interest that there be proxy contests and the threat of proxy contests by bona fide interests.

These are the public's guardians against complacency, against managements that get mired down in the past, against managers so preoccupied with their own com-

pensation and perquisites that they fail to provide for the needs and future of the business.

It is also to the public's interest, however, that there be some regulation, some limitations and some reins on proxy contests and on takeovers. These regulations should not be strangulating, but they ought to provide some clear-cut ground rules.

The rules we have today are just not good enough, either to protect the public or to give corporations and insurgent groups a clear understanding of their rights and obligations.

Take the simple matter of money spent in contests, for example. The New Haven Railroad fight cost each faction \$94,000. The Fairchild Engine battle cost management \$134,000 and the challengers \$126,000. The Republic Corporation contest of a few years back cost the management \$257,000 and the insurgents \$365,000. The New York Central fight cost the management group \$857,000 and it cost us \$1,309,000.

In every one of these instances, the insurgents won. By precedent fairly well established some 15 years ago, both sides were entitled to reimbursement of their expenses by the corporations.

That means that the stockholders had to pay both sides for fighting over them. The battles may have been fascinating to watch, but were the ringside seats really worth that much?

The Northwest-Goodrich fight, won by management, was said to have cost the challengers \$2 million. And this may very well be only the first round, since we have seen that such battles don't end simply because the tender offer expires. The mere possession of a large block of stock in the hands of one group is a sword of Damocles hanging over a corporation's head.

Unfortunately, while the amounts of money involved in proxy fights may seem sizable, they are actually considered very small by management, when compared to other intangible costs—but these are costs that the stockholding and general public ultimately pays.

The New York Central contest ran for about four months, and the recent Northwest-Goodrich thing for about seven months. These absorbed most of the effort and energies of management, with little thought given to anything but the contest. The stockholders have invested heavily in their managers—not to fight off challenges, but to run a business!

A proxy or tender fight can shatter the morale of an organization. Employees at many levels, never knowing which way the cat's going to jump, may be frightened into immobility. And when it is all over, there are inevitable residues of factional bitterness. The company will have suffered both as an organization and competitively. The costs of all this dwarf the dollars spent on the contest.

There ought to be ways to make this warfare less costly, less destructive, less debilitating. There must be some workable formula, for example, on limiting the dollars spent, based on the sales of size of the company. And it should be possible to make this work through honest reporting, in the same way that the income tax is made to work.

Even better, however, would be some limitation on the time that a contest is permitted to take. The longer a contest continues, as a rule, the more bitter it becomes and the longer-lasting are its effects.

Ideally, a proxy fight should be held to the minimum time required—say two or three weeks—to prepare a single statement for each side, and to have a single solicitation. Perhaps this could be stretched to a statement and a rebuttal, but not to endless rebuttals and counter-rebuttals. The quicker and more clean-cut a proxy contest can be made, the closer it gets down to just enough time to

accomplish the basic physical things, the more everyone will benefit.

There will still be some loopholes, of course. The shrewdest and sharpest operators can always find ways to duck or get around laws and rules, both in tender offers and in proxy fighting. As in any kind of warfare, new offensive weapons can be devastating until a new method of defense is developed to neutralize or counteract them. Then the planners and signers on the offensive side have to go back to the drawing board.

Unlike warfare, however, proxy fighters and proxy regulators have a different underlying purpose than just to destroy. That is to make our business society work better and more effectively for most of the people. If we really believe in the values of an open, competitive society, this is the distinct and necessary service that must be performed.

One of the great strengths of our society is that we have some built-in machinery for change. That machinery usually grinds to a halt or rolls into action in some reasonable relationship to the time when change is most needed.

I know that we have a role in promoting change and in informing about change and in keeping it fluid. I know that lawyers and the law have a very vital role in defining the limits of permissible change and in holding it to those limits. I know that we must both exercise our roles as a matter of doing our jobs and earning our keep.

But we also need to exercise those roles as a matter of serving the public interest. The public interest is our interest, too, both as citizens and professionals. Should we ever lose sight of that, there will not be much else worth working for.

A NEW DAY FOR THE MERCHANT MARINE

HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, in his message to Congress on the U.S. merchant marine, President Nixon recommended legislation to provide new initiatives for strengthening the maritime industry. Mr. Speaker, I support the President's program as an effort to reverse the present downward trend of the merchant marine.

The decline of our merchant marine is particularly acute in the vessel and shipbuilding aspect. The privately owned U.S. fleet has dropped sharply during the past decade or so, and now consists of about 950 vessels. Though this number may appear large, it is inadequate to maintain the growth of the entire American economy. Even more significant, more than two-thirds of these vessels are over 25 years old or fast approaching this age.

It is alarming that our present vessel replacement schedule is only about 10 ships a year, or far less than the number of vessels which will be entering obsolescence annually in the next 4 or 5 years.

The President's proposal, projected for a 10-year period, will permit the construction of about 30 vessels a year. During this duration, a strong, modern merchant marine could be developed and once it has reached a state of vigorous health, it should be maintained.

I hope that Congress will speedily consider the legislation which implements this program.

**JUSTICE VITO J. TITONE—DE-
FENDER OF DEMOCRACY**

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, from Staten Island to Shea Stadium, the American flag flew high throughout New York City last October 15, despite the misguided views of a small minority that it should be flown at half-staff on moratorium day. One man refused to remain part of the "silent majority," and in speaking out—clearly and firmly—delivered a landmark decision rivaling all free speech cases. State Supreme Court Justice Vito J. Titone was that brave, patriotic jurist who took politics out of the classroom by courageously ordering the board of education to rescind a directive allowing pupils and teachers to skip school for the protest and permitting schools to hold special discussions on the war. Justice Titone ordered the board to see to it that schools conducted "usual and normal" activities. He held that the board directive forced pupils to take positions for or against the war in Vietnam and that the board had no authority to "involve itself in such controversial matters or moral issues." Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Justice Titone's landmark opinion.

MEMORANDUM OF THE SUPREME COURT, RICHMOND COUNTY, OCTOBER 14, 1969

The petitioners are James A. Nistad, 13, a student at Junior High School 27, and his mother, Mrs. Marian Nistad. They seek an order directing respondent Board of Education of the City of New York to hold classes as usual on October 15, 1969 and such other relief as the Court deems appropriate. On October 8, 1969, the respondent issued a statement declaring that teachers and pupils who wish, as a matter of conscience, to participate in planned programs outside the schools would be permitted to do so, and the pupils would not be penalized for their absence; the teachers are permitted to charge the day against their personal business allowance. The programs referred to are the so-called Viet Nam "War Moratorium" for which October 15 has been designated. The petitioners assert that this action of the Board of Education violates their right of freedom of speech under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution in that it places the affirmative support of government behind a controversial political hypothesis, and that it illegally compels the infant petitioner to profess his views on this conflict.

The issue before this Court is whether or not the Board of Education of the City of New York has the power to act in an area so touching upon matters of opinion and political attitude. The Court thinks it has not. No one takes issue with the fact that the Viet Nam War question comes high in the order of priority, and that it is an emotional and controversial and moral matter. There is no argument with the fact, nor is there an issue before the Court, as to whether or not we are all involved in this. However, the propriety of the issue, emotion, involvement, good in-

tent, etc. cannot be allowed to cause us to turn our backs on our Constitutional heredity and allow the slightest breach of our personal liberties in the name of good intent or honest effort.

The Board has stated that during the so-called Viet Nam "War Moratorium" on October 15, 1969, no pupil will be required to attend school, although absences will be noted, and that all teachers may refrain from their duties that day, although it will be charged against personal leave, if in good conscience they are opposed to the Viet Nam War, without penalty. The element of compulsion is clear. Students and teachers who do not attend school that day will be deemed to be against the Government's Viet Nam War policy, and those who attend will be assumed to favor such policy. It forces people to take a position when, as a matter of constitutional law, they are not required to do so.

The case of *W. Va. Board of Education v. Barnett*, 319 U.S. 624 (1943) is in point. There, the Supreme Court held unconstitutional a resolution of a Board of Education that required all public school students to recite the pledge of allegiance to the flag. The petitioners in that case objected to the recitation on religious grounds and claimed that it violated their right to freedom of speech. After observing that it was dealing "with a compulsion of students to declare a belief" (319 U.S. 631), the Court said:

"The very purpose of a Bill of Rights was to withdraw certain subjects from the vicissitudes of political controversy, to place them beyond the reach of majorities and officials and to establish them as legal principles to be applied by the courts. One's right to life, liberty, and property, to free speech, to free press, and freedom of worship and assembly, and other fundamental rights may not be submitted to vote; they depend on the outcome of no elections."

The Court also said:

"If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion, or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein. If there are any circumstances which permit an exception, they do not now occur to us."

"We think the action of the local authorities in compelling the flag salute and pledge transcends constitutional limitations on their power and invades the sphere of intellect and spirit which it is the purpose of the First Amendment to our Constitution to reserve from all official control."

Highly pertinent to the instant case is the following from the concurring opinion of Mr. Justice Murphy:

"The right of freedom of thought and of religion as guaranteed by the Constitution against state action includes both the right to speak freely and the right to refrain from speaking at all, except insofar as essential operations of government may require it for the preservation of an orderly society, . . . as in the case of compulsion to give evidence in court. . . . To many, it is deeply distasteful to join in a public chorus of affirmation of private belief." *Id.* at 645.

Those people who are strongly against this country's Viet Nam involvement have a constitutional right to remain silent; some of these might prefer to attend school on October 15th, rather than participate in any visible demonstration favoring their position. Yet, their school attendance would be interpreted as supporting the very view they oppose. Similarly, those who support the government's present Viet Nam stance are not required to make their views known. Members of this group also may wish to attend school for the sake of receiving an education and not as a show of their support for the war. Nevertheless, the action of the Board compels the implication that those who attend school on October 15th support the Viet Nam war. Similarly, there may be those for

and against the government's policy who are ill on October 15, 1969, and physically unable to attend school. The implication will be that they support the "Moratorium" and are opposed to the war. All these groups are being pressured to reveal their position by the Board's action.

Equally important are those who fear for the safety of their children, both because of the anticipated absence of supervisory personnel at the school and the real possibility of demonstrators, picket lines, and the like, in school areas.

There is a further and more compelling reason why the Board's action cannot stand. The Board has relegated to itself the power to determine what is or is not a momentous "Issue" of great moral magnitude, apparently thereby justifying the action it has taken. Its own statement, as shown in its opposing papers, begins: "The Board of Education and the Acting Superintendent of Schools recognize the universal desire of the American people to end the war in Viet Nam. We also recognize that there are differences among the people and their leaders as to how this can best be achieved." It is no business of the Board to "recognize" the desires or differences of the American people.

The action of the Board falls within conduct proscribed by the Supreme Court in *Engel v. Vitale*, 370 U.S. 42 (1962), which declared that recitation of the so-called regents' prayer violated the First Amendment clause prohibiting an establishment of religion. The prayer was composed by the New York State Board of Regents and recited on a voluntary basis at the beginning of each school day. The Court pointed out that as a matter of history the very practice of establishing governmentally-composed prayers was one of the reasons which caused our early forebears to emigrate from England to this country, and that it was part of the basis for the establishment clause in our Constitution. The Court referred to the Book of Common Prayer and stated:

"The controversy over the Book and what should be its content repeatedly threatened to disrupt the peace of that country (England), as the accepted forms of prayer in the established church changed with the views of the particular ruler that happened to be in control at the time." (370 U.S. at 46).

The same result would occur if the Board of Education were permitted to determine what issues and controversies merited some sort of participation or observance or action by the public schools in various and sundry causes. This determination would depend upon the political outlook of the board members at a particular time. Indeed, it is entirely possible that a year from now participation in a demonstration in support of the Government's Viet Nam policy would be declared. The point is clear: Government may not involve itself in such controversial matters or moral issues. The following excerpt from the Appeal of American Civil Liberties Union, 36 State Dept. Rep. 97, 98, is appropriate:

"... The public schools are supported by the whole body of citizens; within their walls assemble children of rich and the poor, the children of parents of every shade of religious belief and unbelief, the children of almost every race and color. Therefore, nothing that will tend to foster intolerance, bigotry, animosity or dissension should be allowed to inject itself into the public school system of this great state". . . .

The prestige and power of the Board of Education may not be used to support, influence or condone on matters of this nature.

There is a practical problem also, namely, where does this sort of thing end? For example, the leaders of this "Moratorium" publicize their intention of having a two-day moratorium next month, and three days the month after that. The Board may very well

find itself morally committed to allow students to participate, as in the instant case.

Students would quickly get the impression, if they have not already, that they have total freedom, by official edict, to move about and participate in whatever they, in "good conscience," feel right at any time, and absent themselves from school in so doing. An implication might arise, contrary to state law, that attendance in school is secondary to their right to participate in causes morally worthwhile in their minds.

The respondent contends that it is in fact observing normal attendance regulations in that there is no punishment or penalty for a one-day absence. Then it states:

"Attendance records are considered by colleges and employers and for purposes of school awards. It is self-evident that a pupil with a poor record will be hindered thereby."

The Board failure to warn the students of these possibilities in its statement of October 8, 1969. Also, if attendance records are available to employers and others, as respondent states, a prospective employer could check specifically to determine whether or not a person was absent on this highly publicized day, October 15, 1969, and might draw an inference about that person's politics. The harm is obvious.

The respondent's contention that the petitioners lack standing is without merit (*Engel v. Vitale*, 18 Misc. 2d 659 (1959), 11 A.D. 2d 340 (2nd Dept. 1960), 10 N.Y. 2d 174 (1961), 370 U.S. 421 (1962)), as is their assertion that the petition fails to state a cause of action, *W. Va. Board of Education v. Barnett*, *supra*.

Accordingly, the Court orders that the respondent shall forthwith issue a statement or directive rescinding its statement or directive of October 8, 1969 and also stating that the public schools will conduct their usual and normal school day on October 15, 1969.

The foregoing constitutes and shall be deemed the order of the Court.

VITO J. TITONE.

SPEECH OF HAMILTON FISH, SR.

HON. MARTIN B. McKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am pleased to include the following address by a former distinguished Member of the House, Hon. Hamilton Fish, Sr., before a meeting of the Fishkill Historical Society on Thursday, October 23, 1969. Mr. Fish's remarks are entitled "New York State—the Battleground of the Revolutionary War" and very accurately describe the historical significance of New York State with respect to the Revolutionary War. I am very honored to represent the 27th Congressional District which includes Newburgh and New Windsor where Gen. George Washington had his headquarters for 3 years during that war.

The address follows:

SPEECH OF HON. HAMILTON FISH AT THE FISHKILL HISTORICAL SOCIETY, OCTOBER 23, 1969

We are rapidly approaching the 200th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, the greatest event in the history of the United States and one of the most important in the history of the world. The Declaration of Independence not only gave the reasons for our separation from Britain, but was also our birthright of freedom. It was dedicated to the fundamental truths of freedom and

had enormous influence among the civilized nations of that era.

The committee that wrote the Declaration of Independence was presided over by Thomas Jefferson, but he had distinguished colleagues in John Adams of Massachusetts, Chancellor Robert Livingston of New York, and Benjamin Franklin of Pa. When that immortal document was proclaimed in Philadelphia on July 4, 1776 it was a mere scrap of paper until, under the leadership, courage, determination and faith of George Washington in war and peace, it was translated into a government actuality as our Representative and Republican form of government, the oldest continuous form of government in the world today.

I am naturally proud of the fact that my direct ancestor, Lewis Morris of New York, was one of the signers of the Declaration. The 200th celebration, which is less than seven years away, should be the greatest national celebration in the history of our country. The preservation of freedom, which was vital to our ancestors, is even more important in our day and generation. The world Communist conspiracy and totalitarian forces seek to undermine and destroy our free institutions, our Constitutional freedoms and Freedom, in all the free nations. The preservation of those freedoms is the paramount and single greatest issue in the world. It transcends all partisanship. It amounts to the survival of our country and civilization, based on our heritage of Freedom.

We in the Hudson River Valley, particularly Dutchess, Orange and Ulster Counties, played a very vital part in winning our war of independence. They were all on the American side whereas Queens and lower Westchester were pro-British. At that time Dutchess County which then included Putnam, was the second largest county in population in the State. Albany was first because it included most of Columbia, Schoharie, and the adjoining counties. Actually, Dutchess was larger in population than either Westchester or New York, but not by much.

I hope to be alive for the 200th anniversary celebration of the birth of our great country. I hope to live to see the truths of history re-written from the distorted and slanted Revolutionary War history as written by eminent historians from Massachusetts. They over-emphasized the Boston Tea Party, Paul Revere's Ride, Lexington, Concord and Bunker Hill, and virtually ignored the part played by New York State, which was the center and battleground of the Revolutionary War for seven years. Approximately 90 battles and skirmishes were fought in New York State including Ticonderoga, Crown Point, Brooklyn, Harlem, White Plains, Fort Washington, Oriskany, Fort Stanwix, Bemis Heights, Saratoga, Bennington, Fort Montgomery, Stony Point, and Sullivan's campaign against the Iroquois Indians. Furthermore, New York produced some of the greatest individuals in the Revolutionary War; General George Clinton, Governor half a dozen times and Vice President for two terms; Alexander Hamilton, first Secretary of the Treasury and the greatest genius of the Revolution; John Jay, US Chief Justice and Governor of New York State; Gouverneur Morris, Ambassador to France who played a conspicuous part in writing the U.S. Constitution; Chancellor Robert Livingston, and a host of other distinguished patriots.

I want on this occasion, to emphasize the important part played during the war by the little town of Fishkill in Southern Dutchess. It was the center for the maintenance and distribution of quartermaster's stores of all kinds from munitions to clothing and food, for our Continental Army stationed on both banks of the Hudson River. It also contained a hospital and a prison. No army can fight without food, clothing and equipment and Fishkill was the great storehouse of these

supplies during the war. It should be one of our historic revolutionary shrines as it was not only a storehouse, but was also an army encampment.

I visited the Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge on Constitution Day, September 17th of this year as a guest of the Foundation. Valley Forge was only used as a winter quarters for Washington's Army for one cold and stormy winter. Fishkill was the center of our army supplies for seven years.

I suggest that within the next seven years, the old Wharton House in Fishkill be renovated, that some Revolutionary War huts be built in proper locations as they have been at Valley Forge, and that a Revolutionary War Museum be established in the Wharton House. All of this could be done at a moderate cost which probably could be raised locally and throughout Dutchess County. And from a small acorn there might develop a mighty historical oak, as has been done at Valley Forge.

Within a few miles of Fishkill, there was another hospital adjoining the Brinkerhoff House. Here General Lafayette, the French champion of Freedom, was hospitalized with a very serious case of pneumonia for several months and was on the verge of death. He was visited there by General Washington a number of times, who was then in camp at Fredericksburgh, 18 miles to the East. I also urge that a road be constructed from Cold Spring, only about a mile to Constitution Island, opposite West Point, where there are a number of Revolutionary War stone fortresses, of which there are very few left in our country. This could easily be made into an historical attraction and possibly a picnic ground for motorists from New York, just as Fishkill should also be made into an attractive historical center for motorists from New York and New England.

The time has come to change and revise the history of the Revolutionary War, written by distinguished New England historians, in order to place New York State in its proper position, on the basis of truth, as the center and battleground of the Revolutionary War. We even forget now that New York City was in the hands of the British Army for seven years and half the population of patriots amounting to 7,000, were mostly destitute and poverty stricken refugees living in the towns and on the farms of the Hudson River Valley supported by the people in those districts. These refugees lived out a tragic life as refugees generally do, for seven long years. These thousands of refugees from New York City, who suffered all kinds of hardships, were among the greatest patriots of the Revolutionary War.

I am four score years and a large part of my life has been devoted to public service. I believe the people in the Mid-Hudson district will approve of my non-partisan remarks as they are loyal and patriotic Americans. The Communists, subversives and the anarchists will naturally disapprove as they despise freedom and hate our Constitutional form of government, which is the greatest charter of human liberty and freedom ever devised by the mind of man. I served the Dutchess, Orange, Putnam district in Congress for 25 years and never was defeated in that district. I never had the support of our enemies from within and perhaps that is why I was always re-elected. Condemnation from such sources is the highest possible commendation.

I give this advice as a legacy to all office holders—Democrats and Republicans—never to compromise with those elements who would destroy our free institutions and the Government of the United States.

Let us join in Dutchess County in rebuilding Fishkill as a shrine of Revolutionary War Freedom and above all, let all of us in New York State on the 200th anniversary

of the Declaration of Independence, make clear the historical truth; that New York State was the center and battleground of the Revolutionary War.

On our 200th anniversary, let Freedom ring from every city, town, village, hamlet and mountain side. If there is any country worth living in, defending, fighting for, or even dying for, it is the United States of America. God Bless America.

To those who may question that N.Y. State was the center and main battleground of the Revolution, let me point out that George Washington, Commander-in-Chief of our Armed Forces had his headquarters in New York City or within 60 miles of it in New York State for almost four years and for another 8 months in the State of New Jersey within 60 miles of New York. Several important battles such as Trenton, Princeton and Monmouth were fought there.

After the Declaration of Independence there were virtually no battles fought in Massachusetts or in New England outside of British raids on New London, New Haven and Southern Connecticut. There were, however, important battles fought in Pennsylvania at Brandywine and Germantown and in Virginia there were numerous small battles before the surrender of the British Army at Yorktown. North Carolina was also a famous battleground; Guilford Courthouse and Cowpens; South Carolina had its Camden and Charleston and Georgia its Savannah.

During the war Virginia, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania had a larger population than New York State and their enlistments in the Continental Army were larger. These troops participated gallantly in most of the battles fought in New York State and helped equally in winning our freedom and independence. But actually there were more battles fought in New York State during the Revolutionary War than in all other states combined.

It is time the record was made crystal clear. Veritas magna est et prevalebit—the truth is mighty and will prevail—even if it takes 200 years.

THE FATE OF MAYOR LINDSAY

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, first it was the Jets; then the Mets and now John Lindsay has moved from near defeat to triumph. As one reporter observed, "there seems to be no bounds to New York's pretensions."

State Senator John Marchi and Controller Mario Procaccino deserve due recognition for running public-spirited campaigns, but as an old philosopher once said, "You can't fight City Hall." Indeed.

Now who would have begun to say

A year ago today

The ups and downs of Fate

Would play

To give the win to Lindsay . . .

The other two men had support

With party's help, and "Time for Change"

But finally a switch! John's sort of luck and skill arranged

A win for him!

A fickle hand of Fate plays on.

And with this start, perhaps we'll see

Less strife and trouble

For our great City!!!

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND TO THE POLISH NATION

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was Veterans' Day and the Nation dramatized in respect for the contributions which the veterans have made for the defense of our freedom. We must recognize that our veterans have fought and preserved our freedom, a fact which is too often taken for granted.

Other nations have been less fortunate. November 11 is also the Independence Day of Poland commemorating the restoration to that country of freedom in 1918. We recognize that history shows the tragedy of Poland being the first nation to fall in battle against the Nazi hordes, then to have its people denied freedom by the Soviet-imposed government in 1945.

I remind the Members that the Polish government in exile continues to function in London and the voices of its officials are far more representative of the people of Poland than the mutterings of the Moscow-controlled puppets in Warsaw.

Therefore, I insert into the RECORD the address of His Excellency August Zaleski, president of the Polish Republic in exile, on November 11 on the occasion of Poland's Independence Day:

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND TO THE POLISH NATION

POLISH GOVERNMENT (IN EXILE),

MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS,

London, November 1969.

Citizens of the Republic of Poland and Poles in the Free World:

The eleventh of November marks the anniversary of events of great importance not only in the history of the Polish people. On this day which saw the fall of the dynasties responsible for the partitions of our Commonwealth not only Poles regained their independence. Still, not all the nations of the former Commonwealth, that had been a voluntary association of "the free with the free" and of "equals with equals", were able to throw off the yoke of oppression, notwithstanding the aid which the new Polish State was in a position to render them under its Chief of State Joseph Pilsudski.

The right of peoples to self-determination, reaffirmed in the Atlantic Charter as one of the war-aims of the Allies in World War II, could not become a reality owing to the imperialism of Russia which has remained unchanged, in spite of the Russian Communist revolution.

This imperialism has destroyed the Baltic States, all of which have been forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union. Poland, Hungary, Rumania and Czechoslovakia are being held captive in the sphere of Russian colonialism. The acquisition by Russia of these Central European areas presents a threat to the entire free world.

We trust to God that the world will come to see that there can be no peace without restoring freedom to peoples who are being kept in a state of subjection against law and justice.

AUGUST ZALESKI.

THE BIG MESSAGE FOR
SMALL FAMILIES

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 11, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post carried an editorial today that I hope all Members of Congress will read. The editorial is directed to a change in our thinking about family size. As chairman of the Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population, I commend this editorial. We all have an enormous task to educate the American public about the consequences we face in environmental degradation, resource depletion, and generally, in human needs, as a result of continued population growth.

A 3-year study just released by the National Research Council concludes that there are already too many people on the earth. This is not very encouraging. If we are to solve our pollution problems, our hunger problems, our transportation problems, our housing shortage, and know a world in peace, we must direct ourselves to some new thinking.

The Nixon administration's goal to provide family planning services to the estimated 5.3 million poor and near-poor American women who want these services, but cannot afford them or do not know how or where to get them, is an excellent start. The United Nations increased effort in world population activities is very promising. The proposed Commission on Population Growth and the American Future requested by President Nixon can contribute significantly to the creation of public awareness needed to convince young Americans that small families are economically advantageous, not only to the individual family, but to the society as well.

The American communications media would perform a great service by giving the population problem more and more attention in an effort to reach the general public and make visible the related problems between population growth, environmental quality, and depleting resources.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial is offered at this time for the benefit of my colleagues:

THE BIG MESSAGE FOR SMALL FAMILIES

Speaking recently to the Planned Parenthood World Population organization, Dr. Roger O. Egeberg offered the usual, but still alarming statistics of dire overpopulation. The United States now has 200 million people and in 30 years it will have 300 million; we will have to build the equivalent of one new city of 250,000 inhabitants every 40 days for the rest of the century. After calling for more family planning services for the estimated 5 million American women who likely want but can't get them, Dr. Egeberg correctly said we needed a different goal, "one much harder to achieve. We are going to have to work for change in national mores, a change based on public acceptance of the demographic facts of life."

What this means, precisely, is that if the country is to solve the population problem collectively, it will have to be done individually—couples saying, in effect, "because of overpopulation, we will limit our offspring to two or less children."

The number of children a couple will propagate is not a matter the government or anyone else should legally intrude upon. But neither is family size strictly the sole concern of an individual husband and wife. The traditionally large family of four or more children was often thought to offer comfort and security. It was also doing God's work, as commanded in Genesis, "be fruitful and multiply." In addition, the desirability of a large family is a carry-over from the era of high infant mortality.

The time has not yet come when tax burdens should be levied on many-child-drened families, but voices like Dr. Egeberg sound more and more reasonable, if not convincing. Repeating the same idea, but in more direct language, author Marya Mannes said this week, "with the condition the world is in today, to have a large family is public disservice."

No one has yet proposed a way of getting married couples to take individual responsibility for the overpopulation problem. But at least the idea is now going beyond the push for birth control and into the area of human attitude. Perhaps this is what was needed all along.

NEED FUNDING FOR PARK LANDS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of October 22, 1969, carried a most perceptive column by Marquis Childs with regard to the folly of the present policy of inadequate funding for acquisition of park lands. I agree with Mr. Childs that the time is running short and the Federal Government must act if we are to preserve many unique areas for the use of future generations. So that my colleagues may be aware of Mr. Childs' comments, I include his column at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SUBDIVIDERS ARE THREATENING LAST AREAS
OF UNSPOILED LAND

(By Marquis Childs)

SAN FRANCISCO.—The lure of California is one of the most remarkable phenomena of our time. Like a great magnet it pulls people—young, old, a vanguard of hippies, escapees, opters out—from the rest of the country to this slope on the Pacific shore.

Even for the Chamber of Commerce boosters this is almost too much of a good thing. Like the frantic movement of the lemmings to the seashore, with an instinctual drive that sends them finally to their destruction, there will soon be standing room only if the present rate of growth continues.

Nothing could illustrate this better than the controversy over the Point Reyes national seashore. A beautiful, still relatively untouched peninsula about an hour from San Francisco, Point Reyes is one of the few spots on the coast that has not fallen to the developers and the subdividers. With the parks in the metropolitan bay area hideously overcrowded, Point Reyes is a natural outlet for city dwellers in search of quiet and unspoiled beauty.

But the sub-dividers are on the doorstep and pressing hard. Less than half the land for Point Reyes has been acquired by the federal government since the project was authorized in 1962. With each passing year land values have sharply increased. And now the White House is saying through the

Bureau of the Budget that a freeze is imperative through 1973 to hold down spending and hold inflation.

Other parks and seashores staked out by Congress to save a part of vanishing America before it is all paved with concrete are also threatened by the double-squeeze of inflation and economy. Besides Point Reyes, Cape Cod in Massachusetts, Assateague Island in Maryland and Padre Island in Texas are in half-completed state, threatened by the land speculators who stand to gain from federal delay.

The Nixon administration has been generous with rhetoric. Secretary of Interior Walter Hickel, in a speech to the National Park and Recreation Association in Chicago, proposed a \$6.3 billion development program for urban parks.

Point Reyes precisely fits this description. But Hickel in the same speech included an escape hatch that negated much of the fine rhetoric. "Present fiscal restraints" would very likely make it impossible to ask Congress for any funds to make the grandiose dream a reality. The Hickel speech coincided with a letter from Budget Director Robert Mayo to House Interior Chairman Wayne Aspinall warning that under "present constraints" land purchase for parks and recreation areas would not be completed until mid-1973.

The conservationists are going into battle over Point Reyes, and nowhere is the breed more aggressive and determined than in California. Aspinall is moving to get added funds out of Congress. So, that untouched shore may still be saved.

But the economizers have the final say. Congress can propose by the Bureau of the Budget disposed by freezing extra money that may be voted. As the people push accelerates, the standing-room-only sign covers more and more of a once-free land.

PORNOGRAPHY—THE CORRUPTOR
OF YOUTH

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply troubled over the rash of pornographic movies and the distribution of smut through the mails. There does not seem to be any limit to the filth that has been spreading across our Nation like a prairie fire.

I have come to regard pornography as a kind of poison infecting the minds of an increasing number of our young people. Their elders, who engage in this field for the sake of either profit or depravity, are directly responsible for one of the worst evils of our time.

The film industry, for its part, has been disturbingly deceptive with the American people. To reach that conclusion, one has only to look at the rating code adopted by the industry last year. The code has proved to be a self-serving, transparent gimmick that has actually promoted pornography for profit—especially among young Americans.

Films given an "X" rating, for example, are supposed to be for adults only. But we all know how many times the "X" has been used to add to, rather than to restrict the potential audience. After giving a film an "X" rating, the industry

will constantly use that fact to its advantage with the placement of advertisements containing passages such as: "Rated X Naturally."

In short, the film industry does everything within its power to arouse the interest and curiosity of our young people in order to draw them into the theater to see the movie which has been given an "X" rating. Now, we all know how very few youngsters are turned away from the box office when they are willing to pay to see a movie with an "X" rating.

As a parent concerned for his family and neighbors, I am fully aware that the process of corrupting our youth also extends to the distribution of mail. And as a Member of this Congress, I say it is time we did something about it.

American homes are being bombarded with the largest volume of sex-oriented mail in history. Many who receive such mail do not solicit it, do not want it and are deeply offended by it.

Some may argue about the right of free speech and the liberty of human expression. But there are other rights involved—the right of a parent to shield his child from what he may consider harmful, the right of a person not to have his privacy invaded, the right of a community to maintain high moral standards.

In my own New York City congressional district, there obviously has been a sharp rise in recent weeks of unsolicited pornography mailed to adults and young people alike. These mailings are not only increasing in volume, but also in the repulsive nature of the enclosures.

One woman turned over to me very lewd material promoting the sale of a book, entitled "Illustrated Sex." It was mailed to her 9-year-old daughter. It was so obscene that I seldom saw the likes of it during the 23 years that I spent on the New York City police force.

When do we draw the line and say we have had enough of this kind of business? I say we have waited too long, but let us not wait any longer.

If a bill that I introduced some 3 months ago was enacted into law, it would surely represent a good beginning for a crackdown on the spread of pornography. My distinguished New York colleague, LESTER WOLFF, joined me in the sponsorship of that bill known as H.R. 13510.

Passage of this bill would go a long way toward controlling unsolicited mailings because it would require the senders to pay the postage when such materials are returned by individuals who do not want them. In addition, the sender would be required to pay administrative costs to the post office for the return of the unsolicited material.

To achieve the maximum results from such legislation, I am sure that parent-teacher organizations and other civic groups would be only too happy to encourage and coordinate a campaign that would prompt the wholesale return of unsolicited mail to the senders. Once the profit is taken out of smut, the evil of pornography will die or destroy itself.

I ask that you give H.R. 13510 your utmost consideration in light of this worsening problem. I also ask that this

body strive for the ways and means of strengthening existing laws to curb the rising tide of pornography that is sweeping our Nation.

We can no longer afford complacency. Too much is at stake. The issue is clear and simple. It is the corruption of young Americans in increasing numbers. We owe them and their parents much more than we have given them.

EFFECTIVE STATE ACTION ON NARCOTICS HIGHLIGHTED IN RECENT BULLETIN

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of attention is currently being focused on the Federal Government's attempts to crack down on the current levels of illegal drug smuggling into this country, primarily from Mexico. I have watched the fortunes of "Operation Intercept" and "Operation Cooperation" with interest—interest which rises from my concern with the increasingly serious drug abuse situation in our country today.

While the Federal Government naturally must and does carry a great portion of the responsibility for antismuggling efforts, I would like to cite the high degree of aid and cooperation which our State government in California has lent to the Federal and international efforts. Many State groups and agencies have played a role not only in the recent activities related to Federal border operations, but in the whole, continuing spectrum of activities designed to aid in law enforcement, education, treatment and rehabilitation related to drug abuse.

The narcotics problem is one of the most complex we have ever had to face and it demands more than single-purposed, myopic solutions; rather, we need a multisided approach that takes into account the myriad types of individuals who turn to drugs, the levels of use or addiction involved and the varying degree of potency contained in the great variety of drug substances.

Accordingly, individuals and groups in California are active on many fronts. The California Council on Criminal Justice circulates a most interesting and informative bulletin on anticrime activities, and I would like both to commend them for this service, under the chairmanship of California Attorney Thomas C. Lynch, and to bring some of the contents of their recent bulletin to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the California Council on Criminal Justice Bulletin, Oct. 15, 1969]

ACTION ON NARCOTICS

The Council's State and local Task Forces on Narcotics, Drug and Alcohol Abuse were alerted this month to the widespread impact of "Operation Intercept," now known as "Operation Cooperation," and other current efforts to control the drug problem.

Attorney General John N. Mitchell and Treasury Secretary David M. Kennedy issued a joint announcement from Washington on

the goals of "Operation Intercept" which was described as a massive enforcement program to cut off the flow of narcotics, marijuana and dangerous drugs into the United States from Mexico.

Governor Reagan pledged "full support" for the federal drug blockade which he said would help put an end to the epidemic of narcotics and drug abuse in California.

"Most officials estimate that as much as 80 percent of the narcotics and dangerous drugs that flow into this country are smuggled across the Mexican border," he told a press conference in Sacramento. In the past eight years, he said, the volume of marijuana, narcotics and dangerous drugs have increased 300 percent among adults, and more than 2,000 percent among young adults.

The California Delinquency Prevention Commission reports the narcotics problem is costing the nation in excess of \$3 billion each year. Added to this, says the Commission, is the "loss to society of productive human beings." A report issued by the Commission earlier this year emphasized the difficulties in controlling narcotics smuggling from Mexico. It was pointed out that more than 22 million persons cross the border from California into Mexico each year.

The newly announced "Operation Cooperation" continues the earlier mission of "Operation Intercept" to reduce the flow of narcotics into the U.S. The main difference between the program will be the involved strategy. Operation Cooperation will result in the lessening of the number and extent of border inspections with a reciprocal increase in enforcement by Mexican officials.

The Commission of the Californias, which brings together representatives of both the State of California and the border cities of the State of Baja, endeavored to find a cooperative approach to the problem. The Commission was created to strengthen the existing bonds of friendship between the United States and Mexico, and to foster economic and cultural ties.

TESTIMONY IN WASHINGTON

Attorney General Mitchell, testifying before the Dodd Committee in behalf of the administration's proposed "Controlled Dangerous Substances Act of 1969", stressed that prison is not the only alternative in dealing with drug offenders. "In some cases, it may be advisable to use Federal rehabilitation programs, halfway houses and private medical treatment while on probation and parole," he told the lawmakers.

State Attorney General Thomas C. Lynch, chairman of the California Council on Criminal Justice, voiced concern at a Senate Juvenile Delinquency subcommittee hearing in Washington, D.C., that a crackdown on marijuana would lead to increased use of dangerous drugs. "As the sources of marijuana continue to be cut off and prices rise, the abuse of dangerous drugs will rise accordingly—this is the history in California in this decade," he told the lawmakers.

The Attorney General pointed out that California law enforcement agencies booked 29,947 juveniles and 64,639 adults on drug offenses during 1968 and that the figures are running even higher this year. "Dangerous drug arrests have doubled and marijuana has increased, but at a slower rate," he said.

ACTION AT STATE LEVEL

Major steps have been taken during the past year by Governor Reagan, assisted by the Office of the Lieutenant Governor, to develop solutions to the drug abuse problem—emphasizing help from private and volunteer segments of the community.

Action was initiated in mid-1968 with the California Parent-Teachers Association, California Medical Association and California Peace Officers Association to encourage formation of drug abuse committees on junior and senior high school campuses.

An Interagency Council on Drug Abuse was formed last October through cooperative efforts of the Governor's Office and the California Medical Association. Dr. Edward R. Bloomquist of Glendale was named chairman of the group.

Goal of the Interagency Council is to bring together all agencies of government and concerned citizens in a coordinated attack on the drug problem. The group includes doctors, lawyers, judges, law enforcement and correctional officers, educators, public health officers, student representatives, State and local lawmakers and others. Statewide Task Forces were formed in the fields of research, education, legislation and government, treatment, and administration of justice.

First action was a mass media public education program started in June of this year to reduce the information vacuum about the effects of dangerous drugs with informational material that is direct, accurate and medically sound, Reagan said. More than 55 business firms, associations and foundations have contributed funds to sustain the public education campaign, and Jack Webb and other celebrities have contributed their talent to the drive. Pledges of support were received from the California Newspaper Publishers Association, California Broadcasters Association, Southern California Broadcasters Association and the California Outdoor Advertising Association.

The California Medical Association and California Blue Shield cooperated with the Interagency Council on Drug Abuse in publishing two new pamphlets which are currently being distributed to inform the public on the hazards of drug abuse. They are "Drug Abuse: The Chemical Cop-Out" and "Damaging Effects of Drug Abuse." Both pamphlets are available by writing to the Drug Abuse Information Center at 693 Sutter Street, San Francisco, California.

NARCOTICS WORKSHOP

A "Workshop for College Deans and Campus Security Officials" relating to the drug abuse problem will be held March 17-20 in San Francisco, sponsored by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, U.S. Department of Justice.

The workshop will include instruction in Federal laws dealing with narcotics and dangerous drugs; drug identification; use and abuse of narcotic, stimulant, depressant and hallucinogenic drugs; Supreme Court decisions on drugs and narcotics; search and seizure laws, and other topics.

Enrollment will be open to college deans, security personnel and certain other officials concerned with the problems of drug abuse and control on the campus.

The Juvenile Delinquency Act further provides that States submitting a comprehensive plan are eligible to receive block grants to fund sub-grants to local units of government. These include allocations for rehabilitative and preventive services, and technical assistance, to be administered by the Council. Under the act, rehabilitative programs will be 60 percent federally funded, and 20 percent each from State and local government. Preventive programs, which will constitute a major portion of the juvenile delinquency allocations, will be 75 percent federally funded, with State and local contributions of 12½ percent each.

Until further notice applicants seeking funds for experimental or research programs should apply directly to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, since allocations in these areas are not presently contained within the block grant concept. In this connection, planning for projects or programs may be financed with 90 percent federal funds. Applications for improving training, techniques and practices have no specific matching requirement and may re-

ceive 100 percent federal financing if approved by the HEW director. A copy of all applications sent directly to HEW for juvenile delinquency monies must be forwarded to the CCCJ for review and comment.

WORKSHOP PROCEEDINGS

A new "Plan for Action" publication of the Council entitled "Santa Barbara Workshop" is being distributed. The 362-page volume contains proceedings of the Criminal Justice Workshop, held May 25-29 at UC Santa Barbara. A limited number are available from General Services, Documents Section, Post Office Box 20191, Sacramento, California 95820. All orders for the "Santa Barbara Workshop" publication must be accompanied by a check or money order payable to the State of California. Price for a single volume is \$5.25, including sales tax and cost of mailing.

The Workshop presented outstanding speakers in the field of criminal justice program planning, budgeting and evaluation.

VETERANS DAY

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and an honor to pay tribute to all the loyal and patriotic veterans in our country who originally were brought together by this Government to wage war in the defense of freedom.

Within the many veterans' organizations, several million American survivors of this century's four major wars are banded together to continue their former military association along constructive civilian lines.

With their distaff auxiliaries they are a potent force for good. They are concerned citizens alert to the demands of citizenship and responsive to those demands. They are bolstered in their work by an unshakable faith in God and country, the kind of faith which enabled the Founding Fathers to create a self-governing Nation.

That same spirit, and that same faith, are needed today to perpetuate and enlarge upon that which the Founding Fathers and all of our forebears insured for us by their personal sacrifice and their love of country.

It was from that spirit of unity and service for America that veterans took the strength and the courage to accept the Spartan life of the Armed Forces, to turn back the ambitions of power-mad dictators and totalitarian governments, to preserve the freedoms, not only of Americans, but of America's free-world allies.

It is in that spirit that our men and women serve today in Vietnam.

Even as man has reached the moon and continues to reach for the stars, we recognize the need here on earth for the veteran's sense of unity of purpose, of dedicated service, of love of country, and faith in God, to help us find the answers to our more mundane problems of crime in the streets, riots that rock our major

cities and campuses, and the poverty, illiteracy, and despair which hold sizable segments of our population in bondage.

One of the more important and vital roles that veterans' organizations can and do play is in the field of legislation before Congress. Time and again, different veterans' groups have acted as well-organized and equally well-informed bodies acting in an advisory capacity to Congress.

I believe such organizations of veterans are beneficial because they help to bring to the attention of the Nation's lawmakers needed legislation, improvements and revisions in programs already in effect, as well as measures under consideration.

A good example of this was the bill to increase compensation for disabled veterans due to the rising cost of living, which passed Congress during the last session and was strongly supported by veterans' organizations.

I further believe these veterans' groups to be necessary because they voice their opposition to legislation and proposals which may be unjust or biased.

Exemplifying this is the veterans' stand against the bill to grant, regardless of need, a general pension to every veteran who served in World War I for at least 90 days.

We can be proud of our veterans. They represent everything that is good and fair in our democracy. Their lofty principles and constructive action are needed more than ever before. Let us pray that there are no more wars, but let us hope that there is always a majority of Americans who conduct themselves as our veterans do.

Veterans Day is a time to commemorate the dedication of American servicemen. Veterans Day is a time to take note of the bravery which our GI's have displayed. It is therefore fitting that Congress commemorate the American serviceman who has given his life or has been wounded in the Vietnam conflict. It is fitting that the House of Representatives honor each serviceman and Vietnam veteran for his individual sacrifice, bravery, dedication, initiative, and devotion to duty.

For this reason, I am cosponsoring a resolution in Congress to do just this. Only by letting our veterans know that we are proud of them can we hope to sustain and protect the democracy for which the American serviceman has fought and died.

We should not permit the efforts and sacrifices of our servicemen in Vietnam to be clouded or obscured by the debate in America today over the future course of the war. Whatever Americans may personally think about the rightness or wrongness of our involvement, they should understand that the GI is fighting in Vietnam out of a sense of duty to his Nation and its people.

It does not make it any easier for the serviceman in Vietnam to risk his life for a war that is politically unpopular back home. This kind of sacrifice takes unusual devotion, and it is the kind of devotion to America of which we as a Nation can be proud.