

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MAN, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, Mr. RARICK, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. DOWDY, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. LANGEN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. WOLD, Mr. HÉBERT, Mr. RIVERS, Mr. HALL, Mr. HUNT, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. WATSON, Mr. FOREMAN, and Mr. ZION):

H. Res. 700. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Internal Security to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANDGREBE (for himself, Mr. CAFFERY, Mr. BRAY, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ROUDEBUSH, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. DORN, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. GROSS, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MYERS, Mr. ADAIR, and Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana):

H. Res. 701. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Internal Security

to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H. Res. 702. Resolution to proclaim National Week of Unity November 9–November 16; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H. Res. 703. Resolution toward peace with justice in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MIKVA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REUSS, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. WOLFF):

H. Res. 704. Resolution for withdrawal of U.S. forces in South Vietnam on an orderly and fixed schedule; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H. Res. 705. Resolution commanding the

November 13, 1969

American serviceman and veteran of Vietnam for his efforts and sacrifices; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Res. 706. Resolution commanding the American serviceman and veteran of Vietnam for his efforts and sacrifices; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 14811. A bill for the relief of Carol Min Houts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 14812. A bill for the relief of Alina Polkiewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

STRAIGHT TALK TO THE AMERICAN MAJORITY

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to hear a prominent American speak out plainly and honestly on vital national issues. In a time of confusing charges and counter charges, and continual controversies, words of sound commonsense are more valuable than ever.

On October 30, in Harrisburg, Pa., Vice President SPIRO AGNEW made such a speech. The reaction was predictable—the very people who for years have heaped the worst abuse on this country and our leaders suddenly complained that they were being "intemperately" attacked.

In effect, they proved that they consider freedom of speech an extremist monopoly that responsible spokesmen of the silent majority are not entitled to. This is a strange and alien concept, but it reveals the hypocrisy which lies at the root of a "peace" movement that prolongs a bloody war and injures the morale of America's fighting men.

In the end, however, the few dissident howls were drowned out by an overwhelming public endorsement of the Vice President's words. So that everyone can have a chance to evaluate this important speech in full—not just excerpts or out-of-context quotes—I am including it in the RECORD. I recommend it to those of my colleagues who have not yet read it fully, and to all concerned, patriotic Americans:

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT, PENNSYLVANIA REPUBLICAN DINNER, OCTOBER 30, 1969

A little over a week ago, I took a rather unusual step for a Vice President . . . I said something. Particularly, I said something that was predictably unpopular with the people who would like to run the country without the inconvenience of seeking public office. I said I did not like some of the things I saw happening in this country. I criticized those who encouraged government by street

carnival and suggested it was time to stop the carousel.

It appears that by slaughtering a sacred cow I triggered a holy war. I have no regrets. I do not intend to repudiate my beliefs, re-cant my words, or run and hide.

What I said before, I will say again. It is time for the preponderant majority, the responsible citizens of this country, to assert their rights. It is time to stop dignifying the immature actions of arrogant, reckless, inexperienced elements within our society. The reason is compelling. It is simply that their tantrums are insidiously destroying the fabric of American democracy.

By accepting unbridled protest as a way of life, we have tacitly suggested that the great issues of our times are best decided by posturing and shouting matches in the streets. America today is drifting toward Plato's classic definition of a degenerating democracy . . . a democracy that permits the voice of the mob to dominate the affairs of government.

Last week I was lambasted for my lack of "mental and moral sensitivity." I say that any leader who does not perceive where persistent street struggles are going to lead this nation lacks mental acuity. And any leader who does not caution this nation on the danger of this direction lacks moral strength.

I believe in Constitutional dissent. I believe in the people registering their views with their elected representatives, and I commend those people who care enough about their country to involve themselves in its great issues. I believe in legal protest within the Constitutional limits of free speech, including peaceful assembly and the right of petition. But I do not believe that demonstrations, lawful or unlawful, merit my approval or even my silence where the purpose is fundamentally unsound. In the case of the Vietnam Moratorium, the objective announced by the leaders—immediate unilateral withdrawal of all our forces from Vietnam—was not only unsound but idiotic. The tragedy was that thousands who participated wanted only to show a fervent desire for peace, but were used by the political hustlers who ran the event.

It is worth remembering that our country's founding fathers wisely shaped a Constitutional republic, not a pure democracy. The representative government they contemplated and skillfully constructed never intended that elected officials should decide crucial questions by counting the number of bodies cavorting in the streets. They recognized that freedom cannot endure dependent upon referendum every time part of the electorate desires it.

So great is the latitude of our liberty that

only a subtle line divides use from abuse. I am convinced that our preoccupation with emotional demonstration, frequently crossing the line to civil disruption and even violence could inexorably lead us across that line forever.

Ironically, it is neither the greedy nor the malicious, but the self-righteous who are guilty of history's worst atrocities. Society understands greed and malice and erects barriers of law to defend itself from these vices. But evil cloaked in emotional causes is well disguised and often undiscovered until it is too late.

We have just such a group of self-proclaimed saviors of the American soul at work today. Relentless in their criticism of intolerance in America, they themselves are intolerant of those who differ with their views. In the name of academic freedom, they destroy academic freedom. Denouncing violence, they seize and vandalize buildings of great universities. Fiercely expressing their respect for truth, they disavow the logic and discipline necessary to pursue truth.

They would have us believe that they alone know what is good for America; what is true and right and beautiful. They would have us believe that their reflexive action is superior to our reflective action; that their revealed righteousness is more effective than our reason and experience.

Think about it. Small bands of students are allowed to shut down great universities. Small groups of dissidents are allowed to shout down political candidates. Small cadres of professional protesters are allowed to jeopardize the peace efforts of the President of the United States.

It is time to question the credentials of their leaders. And, if in questioning we disturb a few people, I say it is time for them to be disturbed. If, in challenging, we polarize the American people, I say it is time for a positive polarization.

It is time for a healthy in-depth examination of policies and a constructive realignment in this country. It is time to rip away the rhetoric and to divide on authentic lines. It is time to discard the fiction that in a country of 200 million people, everyone is qualified to quarterback the government.

For too long we have accepted superficial categorization—young versus old; white versus black; rich versus poor. Now it is time for an alignment based on principles and values shared by all citizens regardless of age race, creed, or income. This, after all, is what America is all about.

America's pluralistic society was forged on the premise that what unites us in ideals is greater than what divides us as individuals. Our political and economic institutions were

developed to enable men and ideas to compete in the marketplace on the assumption that the best would prevail. Everybody was deemed equal, and by the rules of the game they could become superior. The rules were clear and fair: in politics, win an election; in economics, build a better mousetrap. And as time progressed, we added more referees to assure equal opportunities and provided special advantages for those who we felt had entered life's arena at a disadvantage.

The majority of Americans respect these rules . . . and with good reason. Historically, they have served as a bulwark to prevent totalitarianism, tyranny, and privilege . . . the old world spectres which drove generations of immigrants to American sanctuary. Pragmatically, the rules of America work. This nation and its citizens—collectively and individually—have made more social, political and economic progress than any civilization in world history.

The principles of the American system did not spring up overnight. They represent centuries of bitter struggle. Our laws and institutions are not even purely American—only our Federal system bears our unique imprimatur.

We owe our values to the Judeo-Christian ethic which stresses individualism, human dignity, and a higher purpose than hedonism. We owe our laws to the political evolution of government by consent of the governed. Our nation's philosophical heritage is as diverse as its cultural background. We are a melting pot nation that has for over two centuries distilled something new and, I believe, sacred.

Now, we have among us a glib, activist element who would tell us our values are lies, and I call them impudent. Because anyone who impugns a legacy of liberty and dignity that reaches back to Moses, is impudent.

I call them snobs for most of them disdain to mingle with the masses who work for a living. They mock the common man's pride in his work, his family and his country. It has also been said that I called them intellectuals. I did not. I said that they characterized themselves as intellectuals. No true intellectual, no truly knowledgeable person, would so despise democratic institutions.

America cannot afford to write off a whole generation for the decadent thinking of a few. America cannot afford to divide over their demagoguery . . . or to be deceived by their duplicity . . . or to let their license destroy liberty. We can, however, afford to separate them from our society—with no more regret than we should feel over discarding rotten apples from a barrel.

The leaders of this country have a moral as well as a political obligation to point out the dangers of unquestioned allegiance to any cause. We must be better than a charlatan leader of the French Revolution, remembered only for his words: "There go the people; I am their leader; I must follow them."

And the American people have an obligation, too . . . an obligation to exercise their citizenship with a precision that precludes excesses.

I recognize that many of the people who participated in the past Moratorium Day were unaware that its sponsors sought immediate unilateral withdrawal. Perhaps many more had not considered the terrible consequences of immediate unilateral withdrawal.

I hope that all citizens who really want peace will take the time to read and reflect on the problem. I hope that they will take into consideration the impact of abrupt termination; that they will remember the more than 3,000 innocent men, women and children slaughtered after the Viet Cong captured Hue last year and the more than 15,000 doctors, nurses, teachers and village leaders murdered by the Viet Cong during the war's early years. The only sin of these people was their desire to build their budding nation of South Vietnam.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Chanting "Peace Now" is no solution, if "Peace Now" is to permit a wholesale bloodbath. And saying that the President should understand the people's view is no solution. It is time for the people to understand the views of the President they elected to lead them.

First, foreign policy cannot be made in the streets.

Second, turning out a good crowd is not synonymous with turning out a good foreign policy.

Third, the test of a President cannot be reduced to a question of public relations. As the Eighteenth Century jurist, Edmund Burke, wrote, "Your representative owes you not his industry only but his judgment; and he betrays instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

Fourth, the impatience—the understandable frustration over this war—should be focused on the government that is stalling peace while continuing to threaten and invade South Vietnam—and that government's capital is not in Washington. It is in Hanoi.

This was not Richard Nixon's war . . . but it will be Richard Nixon's peace if we only let him make it.

Finally—and most important—regardless of the issue, it is time to stop demonstrating in the streets and start doing something constructive about our institutions. America must recognize the dangers of constant carnival. Americans must reckon with irresponsible leadership and reckless words. The mature and sensitive people of this country must realize that their freedom of protest is being exploited by avowed anarchists and communists who detest everything about this country and want to destroy it.

This is a fact. These are the few . . . these are not necessarily leaders. But they prey upon the good intentions of gullible men everywhere. They pervert honest concern to something sick and rancid. They are vultures who sit in trees and watch lions battle, knowing that win, lose or draw, they will be fed.

Abetting the merchants of hate are the parasites of passion. These are the men who value a cause purely for its political mileage. These are the politicians who temporize with the truth by playing both sides to their own advantage. They ooze sympathy for "the cause" but balance each sentence with equally reasoned reservations. Their interest is personal, not moral. They are ideological eunuchs whose most comfortable position is straddling the philosophical fence, soliciting votes from both sides.

Aiding the few who seek to destroy and the many who seek to exploit is a terrifying spirit, the new face of self-righteousness. Former H.E.W. Secretary John Gardner described it: "Sad to say, it's fun to hate . . . that is today's fashion. Rage and hate in a good cause! Be vicious for virtue, self-indulgent for higher purposes, dishonest in the service of a higher honesty."

This is what is happening in this nation . . . we are an effete society if we let it happen here.

I do not overstate the case. I am aware of the danger, the convicted rapist Eldridge Cleaver is aware of the potential. From his Moscow hotel room he predicted, "Many complacent regimes thought they would be in power eternally—and awoke one morning to find themselves up against the wall. I expect that to happen in the United States in our lifetimes."

People cannot live in a state of perpetual electric shock. Tired of a convulsive society, they settle for an authoritarian society. As Thomas Hobbes discerned three centuries ago, men will seek the security of a Leviathan state as a comfortable alternative to a life that is "nasty, brutish and short."

Right now we must decide whether we will take the trouble to stave off a totalitarian

state. Will we stop the wildness now before it is too late, before the witch-hunting and repression that are all too inevitable begin?

Will Congress settle down to the issues of the nation and reform the institutions of America as our President asks? Can the press ignore the pipers who lead the parades? Will the heads of great universities protect the rights of all their students? Will parents have the courage to say no to their children? Will people have the intelligence to boycott pornography and violence? Will citizens refuse to be led by a series of Judas goats down tortuous paths of delusion and self-destruction?

Will we defend fifty centuries of accumulated wisdom? For that is our heritage. Will we make the effort to preserve America's bold, successful experiment in truly representative government? Or do we care so little that we will cast it all aside?

Because on the eve of our nation's 200th birthday, we have reached the crossroads. Because at this moment totalitarianism's threat does not necessarily have a foreign accent. Because we have a home-grown menace, made and manufactured in the U.S.A. Because if we are lazy or foolish, this nation could forfeit its integrity, never to be free again.

I do not want this to happen to America. And I do not think that you do either. We have something magnificent here . . . something worth fighting for . . . and now is the time for all good men to fight for the soul of their country. Let us stop apologizing for our past. Let us conserve and create for the future.

NEW JERSEY OFFICE OF CLEAN AIR AND WATER AN EXAMPLE OF EFFECTIVE POLLUTION CONTROL

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the State of New Jersey's Division of Clean Air and Water, under the State department of health, has been writing an excellent record in fulfilling its mandate to control air and water pollution. One major reason is due to the ability and determination of its director, Richard J. Sullivan.

Most of us are familiar with the highly complex technical and political circumstances surrounding the effort to restore our polluted environment. Such a task can only be accomplished by individuals who combine energy, dedication, determination and ability. Happily, Dick Sullivan meets the rigorous tests for accomplishing the task.

An article from the October 1969 issue of New Jersey Business, describing the activities of Mr. Sullivan follows:

HE FIGHTS THE POLLUTERS

(By John T. Cunningham)

If ever there was a public official in New Jersey who adheres to the old Teddy Roosevelt advice to talk softly and carry a big stick, it is Richard J. Sullivan, director of the Division of Clean Air and Water in the New Jersey State Department of Health.

Sullivan believes that legislators were serious when they enacted tough anti-pollution laws in 1967 and the new Division of Clean Air and Water was set up to administer them.

"Our job is to enforce the law," he says in rigid summary. "If the law is not proper, then it should be repealed."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

November 13, 1969

Scores of individuals and firms have felt the unremitting sting of Sullivan's enforcement in the past thirty months. He has unhesitatingly and dramatically hauled air and water polluters into court after they have ignored his pleas and his warnings. He and state attorneys have successfully taken on giants—city and small town politicians, big coal companies, major railroads, labor unions, builders, even a combination of airlines charged with air pollution.

RULE OF LAW

His career has been stormy since he took over leadership of the new division in February, 1967, and immediately told his staff that the statute must be carried out vigorously and impersonally. "We are not separating the rascals from the gentlemen," he says. "We are not crusading. We are enforcing the law."

Sullivan and his staff of nearly 220 aides get the bulk of their attention from court actions, but most of their work is trying to educate individuals, industries and municipalities to the requirements of the law and the wisdom of obeying. They hope to emphasize through education and through warnings the emergency air and water situation facing New Jersey.

The Clean Air and Water Division sets high hopes on the \$271 million "clean water" bond issue to be considered next month by New Jersey voters.

"That bond issue is the key," says Sullivan. "If the money is approved, there will be a rush of sewer construction. Many municipalities will move immediately. Much work already has been done in planning; only the money is needed."

Thirty months of the elusive quest of air fit to breathe and water fit to drink have not made Sullivan either totally optimistic or perceptibly pessimistic, although he might be a shade soured on the inability of many to act without pressure.

"This is such a varied state," he points out. "There are so many places, so many attitudes, so many contrasts."

PROS AND CONS

He quickly ticks off areas of the state where earnest progress has been made, without threats of court action or without appeals for major state or federal support. He can also cite examples of complete indifference or outright hostility.

Sullivan is given to quiet movement and low key statements. His voice is low, whether he is talking about enlightened local action or the need to shove some individuals or municipalities into court before they act. He sits quietly at his desk, lighting and relighting a cigar and occasionally resting both elbows on the desk when he leans forward to stress a point. He doesn't look like the vigorous champion of law that recalcitrant polluters have come to know.

Occasionally he rises from his chair to use a large wall map of New Jersey, divided into eight river drainage basins within the state or along the edges. "This is how I view New Jersey," he says with a trace of a smile. "I don't see counties or towns. I see regions. I see river drainage basins."

Tapping the region near Camden, he cites Gloucester and Camden counties as two extremes in awareness of sewer pollution.

"Gloucester County is going ahead full speed," he emphasizes. "It is designing facilities, and if the bond issue passes it will build a regional sewer system that will control its inland pollution problems."

He moves his finger slightly north on the map. "But here is Camden County, one of the worst areas of water pollution in the state. It has desperate problems, yet no town in the county would join the Camden County Sewer Authority. Camden has a Sewer Authority but no members."

ALIKE, YET DIFFERENT

Two coastal counties, Monmouth and Ocean, offer another proof that neighbors differ.

"Monmouth County has had very strong leadership," Sullivan says. "It built facilities on its own initiative in the northeastern section of the county. Now county leaders are pressing for similar facilities along the Raritan Bay."

Monmouth County's growth has been phenomenal since the completion of the Garden State Parkway about fifteen years ago. Just to the south, Ocean County's boosters also have boasted persistently of the county's growth in the same period. They have also chosen to ignore the mounting pollution of the county's waterways, including those contingent to the booming seashore resorts.

Sullivan almost, but not fully, hides his impatience with Ocean County's leaders. "They have real problems," he says in what must be a deliberate understatement. "Thousands of homes have septic tanks in the sandy soil. The water table is so high that a standing joke near Metedeconk is that you must punch a hole in the bottom of your septic tank so that it won't float away. Brick Township has no sewer plant, yet its summer population rises to 80,000 or 90,000 people."

Patience wore thin in dealing with Ocean County. Sullivan's division took fifteen municipalities into court and won a ruling that the fifteen must meet with state officials. If no progress could be reported, the municipalities would be charged with contempt of court.

"They have been cooperating," according to Sullivan. "Detailed plans have been completed. They know what has to be done. The problem is to get the money."

FISCAL AWARENESS

Sullivan is not insensitive to the huge costs involved when a municipality is ordered to get its sewage facilities up to standards quickly.

"We are not expected to make a judgment on whether an area can afford proper sewers," Sullivan points out. "That point of view was upheld in the Passaic Valley Sewage Commission case. The Commission said it did not have the money to follow what we had demanded. The courts ruled that the lack of money was an irrelevancy."

That doesn't mean that Sullivan and his cohorts are insensitive bureaucratic clods. It means that they are determined that the laws against polluting the environment must be obeyed.

Realistically, Sullivan knows that "we must recognize that unless the bond issue is passed the alternate methods of financing sewer construction would be so inadequate that facilities could not be built, no matter how vigorous our enforcement."

The crisis facing New Jersey—and all urban states—in proper treatment of sewage is not due to indifference. New Jersey now has about 750 sewer plants but the majority of them are either too small or too poorly planned to cope with modern sewage treatment. Some sewer systems have by-passes that permit raw sewage to flow directly into rivers during stress periods.

Sullivan possibly has sensed this since his childhood in Jersey City. "We were all familiar with the big sewer pipes that ran across town. Jersey City had been sewered for decades. The only flaw was that the raw sewage ran through the big pipes and was dumped directly into Newark Bay without any treatment at all."

FIRST STEP

"Jersey City built a treatment plant in the early 1950s. They felt quite heroic, as if they had at long last created a means of treating their waste. Actually, all they had done was to provide primary treatment, which is mostly screening and settlement of solids and a chlorination of the outgoing water to remove bacteria."

"The flaw in simple primary treatment is that it dumps organic-rich effluent into the

waterways. Oxygen is eliminated and fish die."

Sewers were not really on Dick Sullivan's mind as he prepared for a career. He was graduated as a mechanical engineer from Stevens Institute of Technology and took a job in 1950 in the State Department of Health, working in air pollution control and various other public health engineering programs. He joined the Department of Labor and Industry in 1956 and became involved largely with enforcing the Worker Health and Safety Act. He remained there until he became head of the Division of Clean Air and Water in 1967.

Meanwhile, Sullivan continued his studies, gaining an M.A. in English at Seton Hall University and a Master of Public Health Administration from Columbia University. He then began law studies but became a "law school dropout" (his definition) after three semesters.

Sullivan thus approaches the task of fighting pollution with the technical skill of an engineer, the poetic indignation of an English major, the zeal of a public health administrator and a lawyer's faith in the courts.

STRONG POINT

Of all his varied studies, he now relies most heavily on the law. Heavy enforcement of the statute that forbids air and water pollution has "created a climate for compliance," he feels.

"There is less dallying by those responsible for pollution," Sullivan says. "They know that we will act in the courts."

Violators have come to know as well that strong publicity is given to pollution court cases. "We name names," he emphasizes. "That is one of our policies. We don't put out speeches or that kind of hogwash. We put out lists of violators."

Some of the people whose names have appeared in the press as the result of court actions have been outraged. Sullivan's reply is direct:

"We tell them that ours is public business. Our records are public. We want the public to know that we are active, that we are doing what the law says we must do."

Occasionally Sullivan is asked by a state legislator to explain or to defend his actions—as, for example, when an Assemblyman's name appeared (properly) in a list of violators. The Assemblyman agreed that the summons was proper; he just hated to see his name in print in such an action.

Other politicians call occasionally, prompted by angry constituents who complain about enforcement actions to stop air pollution or court-ordered stoppage of all building until sewer problems are solved.

There has been no "heavy-handed interference," Sullivan emphasizes. "If a legislator calls, I see him. Sensitive politicians know that people are fed up with pollution."

URBAN INDIFFERENCE

Sullivan senses particularly strong anti-pollution concern in rural and suburban areas. "People brought up in Jersey City or other cities are not generally concerned about water pollution," he believes. "They might think that foul water is one of the immutable problems of life on earth. They know that the waters flowing by their cities have always been polluted. They tend to think, 'So what?'"

The bane of Sullivan's life is in getting officials from neighboring communities to approach water pollution as a regional concern. He says, "There is still a very strong reluctance to join together."

"We show them that others have gotten together to work out their problems. We tell them of the success in northeastern Monmouth County and a similar regional success in northwestern Bergen. They sit around and look at each other."

"Even the northeastern Monmouth regional sewer program is not a complete success story."

Twelve municipalities got together to discuss regional cooperation. Six agreed to work together in an authority. The other six decided to go it alone. As work proceeded, the six independents ran into mounting troubles. The program wound up with the six original authority members and the six reluctant municipalities as their customers.

Sullivan believes that public concern will force even the most obdurate local politicians to come around. He cites a series of seminars staged last spring by the American Association of University Women at Monmouth College.

"Many people were doubtful about the seminars," Sullivan recalls. "Many asked, 'Who cares enough to attend?' More than 600 people came for each of the meetings. That astonished everybody, including local politicians. Those people set up committees and now they are attending town meetings, asking questions, demanding to know what action is contemplated."

INNER COMPULSION

Sullivan retreats behind a cautious facade if asked whether he has an emotional commitment to ending pollution. "I am a professional law enforcer," he responds. Pressed, he admits to strong personal feelings:

"When I came over to head this new division, I was well aware of air pollution. I admit that I was astonished to find the extent of the water pollution problem—astonished by the seriousness and astonished at what it would cost to fight pollution.

"I recognize that I am now very enthusiastic about this job. I have an opportunity that not many people have: to do something that will make a difference."

The strictly legal and professional attitude fades in the course of an interview. Sullivan is excited about the potential for improvement when the bond issue is passed—and he believes that it will be passed by a good majority, "if we can get across the idea that all the money will be invested in water pollution control."

This summer Sullivan, his wife and their six children (aged five to eleven) camped along the St. Lawrence River. His wife, Renee, shares his antipathy toward pollution—and sent him a card on their recent twelfth wedding anniversary to express the feeling.

The frontside of the card showed factories spewing forth volumes of horrible smoke and fumes. The message on the front cover said, "When I'm with you . . ." Inside, it finished, ". . . I don't even care if the air is polluted."

All eight Sullivans enjoyed the beauty of St. Lawrence. Sullivan leaned back in his chair in the corner of his office in Trenton after the trip and set a halcyonic mood for his future: "My goal is to make the Passaic River as clean and as pretty as the St. Lawrence."

DOUBLE IMAGE

Then, almost embarrassed that his professional role as a tough law enforcer had slipped slightly, he quickly said, "That's too poetic, I suppose, but I can't forget how things can be."

He leaned forward, the committed professional again, and said with what seemed almost like a poetic regret.

"But I suppose I'll be very much older before I ever see anyone water skiing on the Passaic."

KIDNAP TRAP VICTIM ALLEGES ASSAULT

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the Members another example of the strange ways in which justice is dispensed in the Republic of South Africa.

In October of 1968, Mr. Jacobus Engelbrecht, a white man, was on his way home from work when he stopped his car to pick up a box he had just seen a man deposit at the side of the road. As soon as Mr. Engelbrecht opened the box, which he discovered to contain a very large sum of money, he was approached by policemen and taken into custody as the apparent criminal caught in the trap the police had laid for the capture of a kidnap suspect.

Mr. Engelbrecht was then taken to the police station where he was brutally attacked and beaten. Only when his employer came to identify him and attest to the fact that he had been at work all day did the police consent to his employer's insistence that Mr. Engelbrecht be taken to a hospital. He spent 4 days in the hospital and was in considerable pain for some time thereafter.

Mr. Engelbrecht sued the police for unlawful arrest and assault but, after an investigation, the attorney general declined to prosecute the police.

Now, a year after the incident, the state has made a financial settlement to Mr. Engelbrecht out of court, without any public investigation, explanation, or disclosure of the amount involved.

The conduct of the police in South Africa is increasingly infringing on the rights—such as we know them—of all citizens, white and black. The erosion of the cherished Western concept of the rule of law is becoming more evident daily. The Engelbrecht incident is not an isolated case, but rather it is one of the more horrifying of the tales which are growing increasingly common. I believe it is trends such as the erosion of the rule of law which should govern our public policy toward South Africa and guide our private investment there.

Thus, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point, first, Mr. Engelbrecht's account of the events as reported in the press; second, two editorials on the matter immediately after it occurred; third, a commentary by the state-run radio praising the police; and fourth, an editorial appearing last month in the Rand Daily Mail questioning the propriety and implications of the out-of-court settlement:

KIDNAP TRAP VICTIM ALLEGES ASSAULT: "NIGHTMARE OF HELL AT HANDS OF POLICE"

(By Margaret Smith)

Mr. Jacob Engelbrecht, of Johannesburg, who became innocently involved in the recent kidnapping case of the 10-month-old baby, Charles de Jongh, alleges that he was beaten up by the police after he had picked up a box containing R10,000 in new R1 notes in the veld.

A 33-year-old lorry driver, of Mayfair, and father of four small children, Mr. Engelbrecht describes the events—which resulted in his being hospitalised—as "a nightmare from hell." He is considering what action he should take.

He said these events took place after he had picked up the cardboard box, which he saw being placed among rubbish in the veld while driving past in his car.

Brigadier C. A. Buys, Divisional Commissioner at the C.I.D. on the Witwatersrand, said this week that he was not prepared to comment on the matter at this stage.

A Staff Officer to the Divisional Commissioner of Police and spokesman for the police, told me in Johannesburg yesterday that if Mr. Engelbrecht laid charges, these would be investigated immediately.

Mr. Hendrik Engelbrecht, father of Jacob Engelbrecht, has approached Mr. C. R. Swart, former State President and one-time Minister of Justice, about the alleged assaults on his son.

Both live in Brandfort, O.F.S., and are friends. He did this because he was so "shocked and disturbed" at the attack on his son.

Mr. Swart's reaction was that he could not believe the police could have acted in such a manner. He was "most perturbed" at the allegation.

Mr. Swart told me that he and Mr. Engelbrecht senior were friends and that he had seen him about the assault on his son.

Mr. Jacob Engelbrecht is travelling to Brandfort this weekend to see his father and fetch his small twin sons. He hopes to see Mr. Swart.

He says: "Mr. Swart is the most important man I know, and I want to tell him myself about the assault on me."

Mr. Swart has known Jacob Engelbrecht since he was a child.

HIS STORY

This is Mr. Engelbrecht's story as told to the Sunday Times in an exclusive interview.

On the afternoon of Friday, October 11, after a busy day, I left work in Alberton at 4:05 p.m. to drive to Johannesburg. On the way I stopped at a cafe to have a cold drink, and two Africans asked me for a lift. I agreed, and some time later, when we had just passed the Panorama drive-in cinema, I noticed a man get out of a car parked at the side of the road, and walk into the veld with a fairly large cardboard box.

Lots of rubbish is dumped in this area and I thought nothing of it until I saw how carefully he was carrying the box and with what care he placed it on the ground.

After he had done this, he cautiously looked around and then got back into his car and drove away.

My curiosity was aroused. After all, one reads of babies being abandoned in this way. So I turned my car around and went back to have a look. I looked into the box and found the contents neatly wrapped in white paper.

Back in the car, I undid the wrapping and to my astonishment I found a great pile of new R1 notes. I know now that they totaled R10,000.

I decided to take the money straight to the police at Langlaagte.

I was a bit worried that the Africans, who had seen the money, might try to overpower me and get away with it.

Near Uncle Charlie's roadhouse I dropped the Africans—with some relief.

Suddenly a car pulled up behind me. A man got out and came over to my car. He told me to switch off my engine and come with him to his car.

I did not know what to make of this, but when I got to the other car I saw the man speak into a radio such as police cars carry and I suspected it was the police.

The man started to question me and I said I was on my way to the Langlaagte police station.

I told him I had picked up a box full of bank notes and was going to hand it in. I told him the box was on the front seat of my car.

The man ran to get it and then radioed: "I have got the box and the stuff inside."

At that moment a second car, with two men, stopped next to us. One of the men got out and came over to me.

"You—dog, where is the child?" he demanded.

I stared in amazement.

Then he hit me hard with his fist in my stomach.

He continued to hit me.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

November 13, 1969

"For God's sake, tell me what child and then I'll know why you are hitting me," I said.

"You think you're clever, but before tonight you'll talk," the man said.

He then lifted his knee and kicked me between the legs. I crouched over in agony and felt that I had landed in a nightmare. In fact it was then that the nightmare started.

I was put into one of the cars and driven to a bluegum plantation near Uncle Charlie's. We went in until we were hidden by trees.

One of the men shouted at me: "Get out of the car, you —— dog. You are not going to hang. We are going to kill you."

One of the men started punching me in the face with his fist and in the stomach. I staggered, then fell down and started to crawl away on my hands and knees.

I heard one of the men shout: "Wait, if he runs away we can shoot the dog dead."

So I crawled back to them. I could not stand, but I was picked up by the back of the shirt and hit again. By this time my hair and my face were covered in blood, and it was streaming down my shirt.

FELL DOWN

All this time I kept saying: "I know nothing about the child, I know nothing." I tried to explain, between blows, that I had simply been coming home from Alberton when I had seen the man dump the box, but each time they replied: "You lie."

I was dizzy with the pain and the blows to my head. The nightmare was a whirl of blows and pain and a terrible feeling of helplessness as I looked into their distorted faces.

Through it all came the unbelievable horror that I did not know what they were talking about. I could not answer their questions and stop the blows. I was powerless in their hands.

Eventually they put me back in the car. On the main road again they stopped for another car, in which was a high-ranking police officer.

"Did he talk?" he asked. They replied that I had not, and that they must now take me to the charge office.

At a police station I was told to get out and they took me to the wash room. They told me to wash my face. Another man joined them.

When I bent over to wash the blood out of my eyes he crashed his fist into my kidneys. As I jerked upright he hit me in the face. He went on hitting me.

I kept begging and begging them to stop. I said I would try and help them find the child. They kept on beating me. By now I was screaming at their blows.

I was completely dizzy and dazed and my body ached from the blows.

"Are you going to talk?" they kept asking me.

"Yes, yes," I said, hoping only to stop them hitting me. They let me wash my face. But when they started questioning me again I had to say: "What child do you mean?"

By this time it was about 5:50 p.m. They had picked me up about 4:20 p.m.

When I looked at them I could no longer see their faces. My eyes were filled with blood and water and my sight had gone dim.

Suddenly they stopped and I heard someone say that Brigadier Buys wanted to see me. They took me into an office.

The brigadier said: "Tell me your story."

I told him. I did not speak of the hiding because he could see it for himself.

At that stage the brigadier left his office. Quickly I went to the phone and dialled the home of my mother-in-law, Mrs. Aletta van Eeden.

"Please send someone quickly," I managed to gasp. "I am being held for kidnap-

ping and they have beaten the hell out of me."

I must have collapsed then, for the next thing I knew my boss, Mr. Kai Botha was lifting me off the floor.

I learned later that the police had telephoned him to come to the police station to check on my story that I had been at work all day.

I remember Mr. Botha asking if I would be taken to hospital. They said that the District Surgeon would examine me in the police station.

He then insisted that he was taking me to the hospital.

Eventually they took me to the police car and drove me to the J. G. Strijdom Hospital.

I had 10 stitches in three cuts on my face and head. My body was bruised and swollen from the blows.

I was kept in hospital from Friday evening until Tuesday midday. They only discharged me then because I insisted that I wanted to go home.

Now the nightmare is over—but I will remember it all my life. There is terror in being at the mercy of men who behave as if they are not human beings.

I am filled with horror at what they did to me. These are the people who are supposed to protect us. Even had I been a criminal they acted in a way that brought disgrace to their calling.

If only they had allowed me to phone my boss at the start, the fact that I had been at work all day and could not have been involved in the kidnapping could have been proved in a minute.

If one day I go to Hell I already know what it is like. Hell is where you scream and they go on beating you. It is where you are at the mercy of people who are not human.

And all the time I kept thinking of my children. They are my sunshine and my life. Would I ever harm a little child? I tried to explain this to them, but their reply was to hit me again.

I have been told that the policemen concerned intend coming to apologise to me for what they did. I do not want their apologies. These could never make amends.

BLOW BY BLOW

The Engelbrecht story demands a wide and searching inquiry.

The story of Mr. J. J. Engelbrecht and the parcel of money raises questions that go far beyond the particular incident in which he was involved.

A child had been kidnapped. The police laid a trap in the form of a parcel of ransom money beside the road. Mr. Engelbrecht, happening to see the parcel being placed, stopped his car and picked it up. The police detained him and, he says, in an attempt to make him say where the child was, beat him up. They subsequently arrested and charged two quite other people. Mr. Engelbrecht had to spend four days in hospital.

The facts of this incident will be established in the ordinary way. The head of the C.I.D. says the police themselves are investigating the alleged beating-up and will lay the evidence before the Attorney General, who will decide whether to prosecute. Mr. Engelbrecht is reported to have said he intends to sue for damages.

But if the facts turn out to be as they have been reported, other and wider questions arise. Why was Mr. Engelbrecht beaten up at all? One can understand the sense of urgency which must have moved the police at the time. Here was what looked like a red-hot suspect refusing to talk. But is there no more civilized and effective way of dealing with an admittedly critical situation like this?

How widespread is this practice of assault-

ing suspects? The Engelbrecht incident, if it turns out to be true, will make the stories about the prevalence of this procedure uncomfortable credible.

Is the clobbering of suspects spontaneous—a traditional South African expression of annoyance or impatience—or is it done on orders?

And is it necessary? As a cure for obstinacy it seems dubious. It may make an obdurate witness even more so. And it may make the other kind produce false testimony or a false confession. Where does that get us? The wrong people get punished which means that the real criminals do not, and the only thing that is achieved is the propagation of violence.

PROBE INTO ALLEGATIONS AGAINST COPS

Allegations that police too often abuse their powers, especially when it comes to interrogation, have long been the subject of concern among our people.

Now comes the news of a disturbing incident in which it is alleged that a White man, Mr. Jacob Engelbrecht, was beaten up in the course of interrogation by the police.

It is reported that Mr. Engelbrecht picked up a box full of money which the police had planted as a trap for the people responsible for kidnapping a child.

The police detained Mr. Engelbrecht and questioned him. In the attempt to make him say where the child was, Mr. Engelbrecht alleges that the police beat him up seriously.

Subsequently, two different people were arrested in connection with the kidnap case.

Although a White person is involved in this case, there is no doubt that there is widespread interest among our people in the findings that the C.I.D. have promised to make available to the Attorney-General in this case.

Beating up arrested people to extract confessions or information is wrong and may defeat the ends of justice as witnesses give any information to escape being beaten up.

The police have no right to inflict punishment on people without the order of a court after trial.

If it is found that the assault on Mr. Engelbrecht did take place, the police should take the earliest opportunity to put their house in order and assure all people that such actions will not be tolerated.

KIDNAPPING CASE: ALLEGATION OF BRUTALITY AGAINST POLICE

The South African Police Force enjoys a high reputation—and it deserves it. In many Western countries today, there is acute tension between public and police. This is one of the main issues in the current presidential election campaign in America—but in the Republic there is no such issue.

Here, there are good reasons for confidence in our policemen. There is their general professional proficiency: the speed with which they so often track down criminals; their tenacity in the complicated cases; their success in holding down the crime rate while, in many another country today, it is soaring. There is appreciation, also, of the brilliance with which, in recent years, the Police Force has countered subversion, and kept this a peaceful and orderly land. There is gratitude for the part which the Force is playing now in defending South Africa against guerrilla incursions from across the Zambezi.

The personal qualities of the ordinary South African Policeman has also won the trust of the citizen: his unobtrusiveness in the streets of the cities; his helpfulness to all in remote areas; his integrity; and the courage which he regularly displays, against whatever odds, in carrying out his tasks.

There is also public confidence that the South African policeman understands that it

is his duty to apprehend the criminal, but that it is the duty of the Courts to punish him.

This is the context in which an occurrence reported at the weekend has caused wide concern both inside and outside the Police Force. According to the reports, a man was attacked by the police after he had been arrested, in suspicious circumstances, in the course of a kidnapping investigation. Later he was released; and in interviews now published, he says that he was so brutally assaulted that he had to undergo hospital treatment for some days.

The Police authorities have taken immediate action. They have ordered an investigation, forthwith, into all aspects of the case, and have undertaken that the full facts will be presented to the Attorney General for his consideration. This is what the public expects; whether or not the allegations made by the man concerned are well-founded, they are to be thoroughly examined. The machinery which has been set up for the purpose, and the speed with which it has been done, will re-assure the man-in-the-street. And for individual members of the Force who may be inclined for whatever reason, to over-reach themselves, it is a warning that brutality in the South African Police will not be allowed.

It cannot be allowed—particularly in these times when violence lies just below the surface of society, and it cannot be allowed in South Africa. In a mixed population like ours, it is essential that the Police Force should be known among all sections for its fair dealing. Among communities at widely differing stages of development, the policeman has a special responsibility to set the example of civilised standards. And in a multi-racial community, he has the responsibility for promoting harmony by setting the example in controlled behaviour.

In South Africa, the policeman has a role that extends far beyond catching criminals. It can be discharged only if there is confidence between him and the citizen; and the action taken in the present case is evidence that the authorities are determined to maintain it.

SETTLED IN SECRET

Again, a case involving serious allegations of assault by the police has been settled out of court without any public investigation or explanation. The State has made a payment to Mr. Jacobus Engelbrecht, who had sued the Minister of Police for R16,288. His claim arose from alleged unlawful arrest and assault by policemen investigating a kidnapping case a year ago. Mr. Engelbrecht says he has been told not to disclose the amount of the payment, and a State spokesman has refused to name it.

A settlement of this kind, virtually in secret, is disturbing. It is particularly so because of the dimensions to which police power has been extended in South Africa—and because the closing of such a case in this way is no novelty.

About a year ago the State paid Mr. Gabriel Mbendi, an elderly Ovambo, R3,000 towards his legal costs in settlement of an action for alleged assault during detention under the Terrorism Act. Without admitting liability, the Government had previously paid Miss Stephanie Kemp R1,000 plus costs for alleged assault during 90-day detention. And a similar action brought by another 90-day detainee, Mr. Alan Brooks, was also settled out of court, although the State denied the allegations.

Unlike these earlier cases, Mr. Engelbrecht's action did not involve the Security Police. He alleged that he was arrested after picking up a parcel containing R10,000 while the police were investigating the kidnapping of an infant. The summons issued on his

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

behalf listed 26 injuries, alleged to have been caused by police assault.

The Commissioner of Police, General Gous, was quoted as saying in a newspaper interview last year that he saw nothing wrong with the conduct of the police in this matter. And in January this year the Attorney-General decided against prosecuting the police.

Yet Mr. Engelbrecht's civil action has now been settled by a payment to him. Why? This is a matter of the highest public importance. It involves not only the paying out of public money, but also the vital question of police conduct. So the public is entitled to full details of the settlement and the reasons for it. But the public interest would have been served best by a full ventilation of the facts in open court.

ADMINISTRATION'S ACTION ON DDT: A TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE DAVID OBEY

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post indicates in a page 1 story that Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Finch is in the process of proposing an order banning the sale within the United States of the pesticide DDT. The order is reportedly now on the President's desk for approval.

I believe that this is an appropriate time to pay tribute to the leadership on this issue of my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). The gentleman from Wisconsin took responsibility within the House on this important question, and on August 5 the gentleman introduced a bill, H.R. 13340, to ban the sale and use of DDT in the United States. The bill now has 30 cosponsors with some additional identical bills introduced by still other Members.

Last week, continuing his diligent efforts on behalf of cleaner water and an environment free from accumulated DDT, the gentleman authored a letter to the President of the United States urging that he take Executive action to ban DDT sales. This letter was signed by 21 of our colleagues.

Throughout the Nation numerous conservation groups and concerned citizens have joined the call for banning this and other slow degrading chemical pesticides. Every week new reports are heard of other animals or food products which are confiscated or banned from sale because of the high level of DDT residue which they contain. The question is how long will we wait before we decide that the harm which DDT is doing to our environment is not worth the benefits which it has admittedly conferred upon us? The day will certainly come when we decide that there are other less toxic, perhaps even less expensive, alternatives to DDT. On that day, the sale and use of DDT will be banned in the United States. I believe that all citizens owe the gentleman from Wisconsin a debt of gratitude for his efforts which have helped to bring that day closer.

ANTIWAR CRUSADE CALLING FOR U.S. SURRENDER TO COMMUNISTS IN VIETNAM ENCOUNTERS BACKLASH

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weekends it has been my privilege to visit the district I represent in Texas. At Veterans Day celebrations, and at other gatherings, I had occasion to deliver a number of addresses and to talk with a rather substantial number of people. Two of those functions were in schools, attended by hundreds of students. I also appeared before several well-attended meetings sponsored by American Legion posts.

The chief subjects of my discussions had to do with the war in Vietnam and President Nixon's plan for an orderly withdrawal, to be synchronized with replacements of trained and equipped indigenous forces, and also assuming that the enemy does not escalate the war to the point that appropriate retaliatory action on our part would become imperative. In that event, the timetable for our disengagement of combat forces would, of course, be interrupted and heavy blows at the enemy would have to be unleashed.

I can say I have never seen the people with whom I met more united on one subject. They solidly support the President's plan. They oppose unilateral and immediate withdrawal as a dangerous and senseless move.

On every hand I could detect a resurgence of patriotism and a significant reverence for the American flag. People appear to be sick and tired of those who would sell our country short at a time when there is an urgent need for unity in support of our Government's plan for dealing with the Vietnam tragedy. They express grave concern about the activities of the merchants of defeat and despair who they feel are, either wittingly or unwittingly, giving encouragement to the enemy to prolong the war and kill more Americans.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a speech I recently made on Veterans Day before a gathering sponsored by the American Legion at New Braunfels, Tex. The speech follows:

VETERANS DAY ADDRESS

November 11 is Veterans Day, a day of deep and special significance among our national holidays and observances. This day has been set aside by the Congress and proclaimed by the President as a moment of homage and respect for the millions of men and women who bear the honored designation of veteran.

On this day it is well to remember that from the Revolutionary War to the present, more than 38-million men and women—of whom more than 27-million are still living—have served their country in uniform during wartime.

It is most fitting that on this hallowed day we not only pay tribute to the living veteran but also to those millions who during 190 years of our glorious history manned the ramparts of battle when their country

called on them. In their lives and in their performance they embodied the finest attributes of American courage and patriotism.

AMERICANS IN VIETNAM

Today, as we meet here, Americans are being fired upon by ruthless Communist aggressors in far-away Vietnam—in a tragic war that has already claimed the lives of nearly 40,000 of our finest and most gallant young men. Such sacrifices should serve to arouse the patriotic fervor and evoke the united support of all Americans—whether or not they have reservations about the wisdom of our commitment to a land war in Asia. The fact is we are there. Our flag is there, and thousands of Americans have given their lives in support of an American commitment against Communist aggression.

It is incumbent on Americans to support measures and policies designed to vindicate those sacrifices. Let us remember that those men, living and dead, who have fought in Vietnam were there in behalf of an American mission to block Communist aggression. They have done their duty and done it well.

It is noteworthy that General Chapman, Commandant of the Marine Corps, recently reported that during the course of that conflict a total of 39,000 Marines have voluntarily requested extensions of their combat duty rather than being returned to the States which they had a right to do. And thousands of others, in all branches of the services, have done likewise. They have fought like tigers for a cause sponsored by their government. That war was not of their making, but when sent there they never faltered in performing their duty. Our nation owes them an everlasting debt of gratitude.

HAVE SACRIFICES BEEN IN VAIN?

Have these sacrifices in men and resources been in vain? Only history can give the answer. We do know that more than 550,000 Communists have been killed in that war—by actual head count. It is well to recall that General Giap, the General who masterminded the defeat of the French in 1954, joined by Lin Piao, Red China's Minister of Defense, and, of course, by Ho Chi Minh, long ago unveiled grandiose plans for conquest, and that plan was by no means limited to South Vietnam. And we know that Communist occupation of all of Southeast Asia could be expected to seriously endanger American security in the years ahead and probably advance the date of World War III.

So, regardless of the wisdom of ever allowing ourselves to become involved in a land war in Asia, the fact is there was a laudible objective. And had the military been allowed to fight that war from its inception, to plan strategy and choose targets free of political interference, it is believed a decisive military victory could have been achieved long ago—with our losses relatively low. In any event we know the Communist plan for the big take-over has been thwarted.

OUR WITHDRAWAL PLAN

Today we must be realistic and face up to the alternatives available. The President has outlined such a plan, and he has called for united support behind it. He deserves that support, and I am convinced the overwhelming masses of Americans will give it to him.

This plan is for gradual withdrawal of American combat troops, to be synchronized with replacement of trained and equipped indigenous forces. Already substantial progress in that respect has been achieved. As of this time more than 97 per cent of all South Vietnamese troops have been equipped with our superior M-16 rifles. They're now in charge of a major portion of the crucial Mekong Delta River operations; and the South Vietnamese Air Force is today han-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

dling many air support duties. The change-over is proceeding according to plan.

Many of our military experts believe the war is being won, despite the continued sporadic suicidal attacks by the enemy—apparently inspired chiefly by the anti-war sentiment which has erupted in this country. The enemy is winning more victories in this country than he is in Vietnam.

THE SURRENDER PROPONENTS

Now, the other alternative, favored by the anti-war contingent, is a policy of unilateral and immediate withdrawal, which means virtual capitulation and the surrender of the South to the blood-thirsty Communist invaders. If this course is followed at this time, before the replacement plan is completed, the Communists would overrun the South and then would come the big blood bath.

Only last night I watched a TV interview of four amputees, all veterans of the war in Vietnam. They were asked what they think of the immediate withdrawal proposal. Each of them expressed the belief it would be a major tragedy—that untold thousands of innocent men, women and children would undoubtedly be slaughtered by the Communist victors who would be expected to take over. Some indication of what to expect was learned in the battle over Hui a few months ago when the Communists for a time gained the upper hand there and proceeded to execute 3,000 helpless men, women and children.

AID AND COMFORT TO THE ENEMY

The anti-war protesters, in the manner of asserting their protests, have in my opinion done this country a grave disservice. Some of them have been seen waving the Viet Cong flag. And none of the participants have been known to criticize those who did wave the enemy flag. There is a right way and a wrong way to assert legitimate dissent. But in time of war, when Americans are being killed on the field of battle and our flag is under attack, no American in my opinion has the moral right to engage in a form of dissent which is calculated to give aid and comfort to the enemy.

Only recently I heard an escaped prisoner of war who had spent four years in a Viet Cong prison, tell about the propaganda techniques employed in an effort to convert them to the alleged unpopularity and futility of our military mission in Vietnam. Day after day the prisoners were forced to listen to recordings of statements made by American protesters—including Stokely Carmichael, Rap Brown, and five different highly placed American politicians all critical of our presence in that conflict. From this display the ex-prisoner of war said the enemy appeared convinced the American people were on the side of the aggressors and it was only a matter of time before we would be forced by public opinion to throw in the towel and get out.

WHO LEADS THE ANTI-WAR MOVE

While I feel sure some good-intentioned people have been innocently drawn into the call for American surrender, the fact is that the leaders of this movement—or at least most of them—are not concerned with what is good for America. That crowd includes the anti-draft and the anti-military advocates. They include the pacifists, and those who oppose the ROTC and our research and development outlays for improved weapons. They include the pro-Communist Students for a Democratic Society, the Black Panthers, the Communist Party USA, and their lackeys who do their bidding—most of whom are too lazy to work and too cowardly to fight.

November 13, 1969

They include the same trouble-makers who led the abortive March on the Pentagon a year or two ago. Their leaders include the militants who create most of the campus riots, defy the courts, scream "police brutality" when they are challenged, and aided and abetted by fuzzy-headed intellectual radicals, they make a mockery of law and order in a civilized and decent society.

We hear much these days about the "generation gap," and some strive to use this to excuse the misconduct involving crime and violence. Right now I am more concerned about the "jail gap"—the presence of far too many unoccupied jail cells in the country—at a time when there are far too many unpunished criminals at large and too many guilty mobsters on the loose. And you can be certain most of these characters are a part of the anti-war crusade.

It's time we invoke the advice of the prophet Isaiah, who said: "If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land; but if ye refuse and rebel ye shall be devoured with the sword."

In conclusion, let me say this: We have but one President—one Commander-in-Chief. Many of you heard him a few nights ago as he spoke of a plan for withdrawal from the war in Vietnam—an orderly withdrawal-replacement plan. In my judgment if this plan is followed and fully supported, more lives will be saved, the war will be ended quicker, and history will treat us better. On this Veterans Day 1969 let us resolve to support our leader.

LEGAL COUNSEL FOR THE POOR

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, when the Senate passed the ill-conceived Murphy amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act, it did more than deliver a crushing blow to the hopes of millions of poor people in this country who seek to improve their lives through methods of orderly change. The Murphy amendment also represents a direct attack on the legal process, especially the heretofore sacred lawyer-client relationship.

The poor, like the rich, often have legal problems involving the State government. And the poor man's lawyer, like the rich man's, has an ethical duty to prosecute that case to the fullest of his abilities. Such vigorous representation forms the very basis of our legal system. Yet, if the Murphy amendment should be enacted, the poor man's lawyer, unlike the rich man's lawyer, will now face possible political repercussion for carrying out his ethical duty of maximum representation. This will obviously have a deleterious effect on the poverty lawyer faced with a possible suit against the State, and could easily force that lawyer to give his client substandard representation.

The Cleveland Bar Association, which has always been a staunch supporter of our city's excellent legal services program, has recognized the danger inherent in the Murphy amendment, and has recently passed strong resolutions which both condemn the Senate action and

call upon the association's membership to work for defeat of the amendment in the House. I include the resolution in the RECORD so my colleagues may have the benefit of the bar association's thinking on this vital issue:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, on October 14, 1969, the United States Senate passed an amendment to Section 242 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the effect of which would be to give the governor of a state final authority to veto, in whole or in part, the Federal funding of any Legal Services Program operating within that state; and

Whereas, under present law, the power of veto of a governor over Federal funding of a Legal Services Program may be exercised only as to the whole of such a program and not as to a part, and such veto may be overridden by action of the Director of the United States Office of Economic Opportunity; and

Whereas, the American Bar Association has twice in recent months stated its opposition to governmental interference with zealous representation of the legal rights of the poor, as evidenced by the text of Resolution and letter attached hereto;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that The Cleveland Bar Association, consistent with the action of the American Bar Association and with the traditional respect of the members of The Cleveland Bar Association for the right of each person or group of persons to be fully represented by independent legal counsel, hereby expresses its firm opposition to any amendment of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, including the aforementioned amendment, which would give the governor of a state or other state or local official final veto authority over the Federal funding of any Legal Services Program, or part thereof; and

Further resolved, that the members of this Association, as individuals, are hereby encouraged to take all steps they individually deem possible to insure the defeat of the aforementioned amendment in the United States House of Representatives; and

Further resolved, that the Executive Director of this Association is hereby directed to give appropriate publicity to the passage of this Resolution, including without limitation the communication of the text thereof to each member of the United States House of Representatives having his constituency within Cuyahoga County, Ohio.

A. ERNEST FITZGERALD

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter sent by me on November 6, 1969, to the Secretary of the Air Force:

Dr. ROBERT C. SEAMANS,
Secretary of the Air Force, Department of
Defense Building, The Pentagon, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On behalf of the tax paying citizens of the 11th District of Indiana, I request that you reinstate A. Ernest Fitzgerald, the government waste finder at the Pentagon.

To hold that a \$31,000 salary is wasted on a man who uncovers billions in government waste is not only ludicrous; it is an act of hostility to the overburdened taxpayers of this country.

Sincerely,

ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**THE ADMINISTRATION'S HANDLING
OF THE MOBILIZATION****HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, several editorials which have recently appeared in the press regarding the November 13-15 marches and demonstrations planned for Washington and the manner in which the situation has been handled by the administration.

Although I am gratified that a permit has finally been granted for a march along Pennsylvania Avenue—and I particularly want to commend Mayor Washington for his intervention and assistance—I continue to be deeply troubled by the provocative attitude being assumed by the administration. Recent speeches and statements—especially by the Vice President and Transportation Secretary Volpe—can only serve to further inflame and divide our Nation.

The whole climate being created by the administration appears to seek to invite confrontation instead of avoid it. Not since the days of Senator Joseph McCarthy has there been such a frightening atmosphere of suppression of dissent and equation of disagreement with administration policies and disloyalty.

The editorials inserted put the administration's actions in the disturbing perspective they deserve:

WHO DECIDES?

A "silent majority" is a convenient thing, when opposition to presidential policies gets uncomfortably vocal, and we're not certain President Nixon has been wise to encourage his hypothetical supporters to break their silence with telegrams and other expressions about the Vietnam war. The minute a silent majority begins making noise, it risks being tallied, appraised and estimated right along with the opposition, with the possible danger of being proved smaller than the loud minority.

The president has been heartened by the flood of telegrams reaching the White House in support of his speech on Vietnam. The wires ran 90 per cent favorable, a spokesman said, and Mr. Nixon demonstrated this graphically with two piles of yellow envelopes, one tall tower of praise and one insignificant sliver of discontent. (There was a good deal of discontent in Congress after the speech, but it didn't produce telegrams.) Many, many thousands of people obviously approved of the "Nixon war" the President has vowed to end on an orderly schedule in his own good time provided the other side doesn't do anything outrageous.

On November 15 there will be quite a number of people coming to Washington to demonstrate their desire for a different policy. No one knows how many will make the trip, but the target is somewhere around a half-million—many, many thousands indeed.

Query: If many, many thousands of people send telegrams to the White House praising the President, and 500 thousand people travel all the way to Washington to march in a parade and attend a rally against the war, are the 500 thousand still a "small vocal minority" and the other thousands still a silent majority?

And who decides?

**THE TEST OF AMERICAN GREATNESS IN
VIETNAM**

(By Anthony Lewis)

LONDON, November 7—The preeminent task of Richard Nixon's Presidency is to heal a nation torn apart by Vietnam. The President knew that when he took the oath of office, and it is no less urgently true today.

Part of the process must be to help the American people know, and accept, the unpleasant truths about the war: that we got into it by stealth and for reasons at best uncertain; that the Government we defend in South Vietnam is corrupt and unrepresentative; that in the course of fighting we have killed people and ravaged a country to an extent utterly out of proportion to our cause, and that, in the old sense of dictating to the enemy, we cannot "win."

A POLITICAL TRAGEDY

In those terms, Mr. Nixon's speech to the nation last Monday evening was a political tragedy. When he could have healed, he provoked. When he could have educated, he sought to arouse the old emotions.

Four times he warned against "defeat"; twice he spoke of "disaster," and twice of "humiliation." Those were the words of a President rallying his people to war, not one explaining the difficult but necessary price of peace.

The President did not use the word victory. But he made clearer than ever that he seeks to achieve by "Vietnamization" and gradual withdrawal exactly what we would achieve by military victory: preservation of the Saigon Government.

IMPLICATIONS FOR HANOI

Moreover, Mr. Nixon indicated that even gradual withdrawal depends on continued enemy forbearance. That is what he must have meant, if words mean anything, when he said he would "not hesitate to take strong and effective measures" in the event of increased enemy action. The Communists, then, are expected to sit by while we strengthen the troops of the regime they oppose and, perhaps, while we guarantee air and other support for years ahead; in short, they are expected to concede victory to our side.

Again, the President went out of his way to warn that, if we did not achieve our objectives in Vietnam, "remorse and divisive recrimination would scar our spirit as a people." Administration officials have been known to fear an eventual public backlash after a pull-out from Vietnam. That could be a concern, but here was the President in effect encouraging the backlash.

The puzzle is why he chose to speak as he did. He could so easily have expounded the same policy in less doom-laden rhetoric.

Any President would have to consider the possible costs of an early, total withdrawal from Vietnam: Communist savagery in the south, loss of confidence in American promises elsewhere in the area. Mr. Nixon would have been fatuous not to call those risks to the attention of the public.

But a wise President, not wanting to lock himself into one tactical position, would have mentioned the countervailing considerations that make the Vietnam dilemma so terrible. For if we would risk our honor and our influence by going, so do we by continuing to bomb and burn and defoliate a small Asian country for an uncertain cause.

The most dangerous aspect of Monday night's speech was that it may have made life more difficult for the President himself. In the end he is going to have to pull out of Vietnam, and make that fact palatable to his people and his allies. To parade the horrors of "defeat" now can only make that task harder.

Why did he do it? Parlor psychologists, who love to analyze Mr. Nixon, might see an

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

November 13, 1969

insecurity that finds ambiguous positions intolerable and looks for support in a hard line. Those familiar with him as a politician may think he is doing what he has done successfully because—gambling for high stakes on his political instinct. The bet is that the North Vietnamese and the American people will both give his policy time to work.

AMERICA'S GREATNESS

Mr. Nixon himself spoke of our "greatness as a nation" as the reason for fighting on. A great country, he said, cannot "take the easy way out."

But in 1969, in Vietnam, greatness consists in accepting less than victory. That would not be an easy way out; it would be a hard way through which a President would have to lead us. One of Churchill's mottoes in World War II was "In victory, magnanimity." That was asking a lot of people; it may ask more to say: In stalemate, magnanimity.

ESCALATION OF ABUSE

Under the guise of preparation for the Vietnam protest demonstrations later this week, the Nixon Administration is escalating both its verbal attacks on the demonstrators and its use of "precautionary" tactics that do more to provoke disorder than prevent it.

The Pentagon's announcement of nationwide troop alerts for possible airlifting to Washington, the Justice Department's alarmist rigidity in circumscribing the route of the protest march and the vituperative tone of every Administration utterance ignore the lessons pointed up in the Walker Report on the disorders that accompanied the Democratic National Convention in Chicago last year.

The report, made for the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, ascribed much of the blame for the trouble to the official buildup of anxiety and inflamed passions before the Chicago demonstrations.

"The stereotyping that did occur helps to explain the emotional reaction of both police and public during and after the violence," the report said. Yet, increasingly, it is just such stereotyping of the Moratorium's supporters that seems to guide the statements and preparations being made by the Administration.

Unquestionably, an irresponsible fringe of revolutionaries would like nothing more than an opportunity to turn a broadly based appeal of conscience into a radical shambles. The Administration has at least as great a stake as all other Americans in not playing into the hands of these ultra-militants by defaming all the organizers of the Moratorium as Communists or traitors. Sobriety is the obligation on both sides in dealing with how best to extricate America from this tragic war; the Administration's incendiary tactics are the worst of approaches to that task.

IN THE NATION: MR. NIXON TWISTS AND TURNS

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON.—If it were not so disheartening, it would be fascinating to watch President Nixon's artful twisting and turning in the inexorable bind that has gripped so many others: Vietnam. Even when he manipulates the historical record, as many a President has done before him, it is hard to make out his purpose.

In his Election Eve speech, for instance, Mr. Nixon trotted out the familiar notion of the war's origins as a deliberate maneuver by world Communism. "Fifteen years ago [1954]," he said, "North Vietnam, with the logistical support of Communist China and the Soviet Union, launched a campaign to impose a Communist government on South

Vietnam by investigating and supporting a revolution."

INDISPUTABLE FACT

The indisputable historical fact is, instead, that on July 16, 1955, before any "revolution" had been "instigated" by anyone, President Diem of South Vietnam repudiated that part of the Geneva Agreements of July 21, 1954, that called for "free general elections by secret ballot" to arrange the reconciliation of North and South.

"Within a few months after the deadline [for elections] had passed in 1956," according to the late Bernard Fall, the outstanding American authority on Vietnam, "the killing of village chiefs in South Vietnam began—by stay-behind guerrillas, not the 'outside aggressors' of 1959-60" later cited in State Department documents. Fall and the French authorities, Lacouture and Devilliers, all agree that the fighting began in 1956, not 1954, and after Diem's repudiation of the elections and establishment of his own dictatorial regime; and that it was "launched" by South Vietnamese opponents of Diem who did not have the real support of Hanoi, much less China and the U.S.S.R., until 1959 or 1960.

A FACILE INTERPRETATION

Mr. Nixon ignored all this and chose to present the war as a straight North Vietnamese and Communist aggression against a blameless, "free" South Vietnam. With an equally facile interpretation of history, he then pictured the horrendous bloodbath he said would follow victory for the Communists in South Vietnam. They would, he said, "repeat the massacres which followed their take-over in the North fifteen years before" when "they murdered more than 50,000 people."

Well, there was a massacre in North Vietnam in which as many as 50,000 may have died. But it took place in 1955 and 1956, not 1954; it resulted from a severe land reform program, as Ho Chi Minh's regime consolidated itself, not as part of the original "take-over"; and, whether for tactical reasons or otherwise, it was followed by the dismissal of Truong Chinh, who was judged responsible, and by repeated public self-criticism from Ho himself.

It is certainly true, however, that the North Vietnamese Communists eliminated their organized political opposition ruthlessly, and no doubt if they had complete control in Saigon they would do that much again. Mr. Nixon suggested that this ax would fall most heavily on "the million and a half Catholic refugees who fled to South Vietnam when the Communists took over in the North." In fact, just about 860,000 refugees fled into South Vietnam, of whom just over 600,000 were Catholic.

What is interesting about these revisions, other than the sloppiness of Mr. Nixon's research, is that to the extent they are accepted, his flexibility for making peace will be restricted, not enhanced.

If the President wants peace, either by negotiation or through his Vietnamization scheme, and wants that peace to be accepted in this country, it would be more logical for him to use such occasions as Monday's appearance to make a positive case that the American commitment to Vietnam has been honored.

The most ever claimed for that commitment was that the United States had obligated itself to halt an aggression and give the people of South Vietnam an opportunity for self-determination. Dating from the first air strikes against the North in 1964, the "aggression" has been staved off for five years, at a cost of more than 30,000 American lives and untold dollars. In that time, the American Government itself shepherded an elected and constitutional government into existence in Saigon.

Surely if the American people could be shown that the United States has done as much as possible of what it supposedly set out to do, it would be easier for Mr. Nixon to persuade the nation to accept something less than military victory.

THE OUTLOOK

Instead, the President chose to appeal to "the moral courage and stamina" of Americans. They should not, he said, allow "the last hopes for peace and freedom of millions of people to be suffocated by the forces of totalitarianism." This overwrought peroration, resting on tricky variants of history, encourages the fear that Mr. Nixon really aims to continue the war at some politically "acceptable" level of American participation until a non-Communist South Vietnam can be guaranteed. And his generals in Saigon have just estimated that it will take until mid-1971 even to withdraw United States ground combat forces; they said that would leave a "reasonable hope that the South Vietnamese will be able to hold their own"—with, of course, the help of the 200,000 United States air and support troops who would still remain.

IN THE NATION: MOBILIZATION AND CONFRONTATION

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, November 10.—Dean Rusk is said to have remarked at a White House dinner last week that as a member of the "loyal opposition," he had become "more loyal than opposition" after President Nixon's Nov. 3 speech on Vietnam. The all-inclusive sprawl of this speech is aptly suggested by the fact that others here heard it as an outright pledge to withdraw all American troops. One prominent antiwar Senator, Senator Mansfield of Montana, now is joining in sponsorship of a resolution of support for Mr. Nixon.

But however the speech may have obscured the facts of the President's policy toward Vietnam, it left no doubt of his attitude toward domestic critics. Mr. Nixon's theme was that the only way to get peace was to support his policy, whatever it is; and that visible dissent was, in fact, support for a Communist prolongation of the war.

The predictable result of these echoes of Lyndon Johnson was to arouse the anger of those who have learned to discount the notion of Presidential infallibility, and who are rightly convinced that if the war is one step nearer an end today that it was in 1967 it is only because of sustained public dissent and political opposition. They know that to say what Mr. Nixon said was, in fact and effect, to equate dissenters of every character with what Vice President Agnew has more forthrightly called "rotten apples."

This reaction was so predictable, in fact, that Mr. Nixon must have known—or at least feared—that his remarks would increase the emotional content, if not necessarily the size, of the Mobilization demonstrations to be held in this city this weekend. Then it also became known that the Justice Department would deny permission for a march up Pennsylvania Avenue past the White House, on grounds that the threat of violence was too great.

SPURRING A CONFRONTATION

But there can be no doubt whatever—not for anyone who has tried to learn anything from the urban riots and student demonstrations of the past few years—that it was the Nixon speech and the Justice Department's denial of the Pennsylvania Avenue permit that really raised the possibility of some kind of a confrontation.

Denying the use of streets and public places to throngs of demonstrators, as Mayor Daley did last year in Chicago, almost inevitably makes an inherently unstable sit-

uation that much more dangerous. Loosing the police to retake by force buildings seized by college students has almost always made matters worse. Building up an atmosphere of toughness and hostility in advance of an incident merely increases tensions all around.

These are not theories but the conclusions that any thoughtful person has to draw from the troubled history of demonstrations in the last few years. Yet the Justice Department appears—not only by the permit denial but by making difficulties about parking, public buildings, restrooms, and the like—to be preparing for the possibility of violence in a way that increases rather than diminishes the likelihood that it will occur. If so, it is not only bad law enforcement, it is likely in the long run to be bad politics for the Nixon Administration.

AN UNWANTED EFFECT

Surely Mr. Nixon does not wish the world to see protesting Americans clubbed in the streets with the White House as a backdrop. That would provide the exact opposite of the impression of national unity he wants to give to the world; it would mock American pretensions to political and intellectual liberty; it would inflame those passions the President said he hoped to calm when he took office promising to "bring us together."

The Johnson Administration permitted massive march on Washington in 1967, then maintained order in the city with relatively little violence. Mr. Nixon can hardly wish it said that he permitted less dissent, and more violence resulted; yet that is exactly what could happen if his Administration maintains its present attitude. And while tough action against the demonstrators might be momentarily popular with some of the President's supporters, that would be offset by the degree to which the antiwar forces would be further embittered and aroused.

In fact—aside from any pious rhetoric about the evils of violence—neither side has anything to gain from a violent confrontation. It would only dramatize the dissent Mr. Nixon wants to dampen and obscure the cause that inspires the marchers. So if a chance exists for accommodation, both sides ought to seize it out of sheer self-interest; and from the same practical political point of view, the Justice Department, which has the power to initiate a compromise, would do well to use it swiftly.

DID MR. NIXON MAKE HIS JOB HARDER?

The President's speech on Vietnam seems to have had an initially good reaction, and perhaps the political effect he intended. But as an exposition of policy on Vietnam, it was quite disappointing, and may have stirred up future trouble for him.

Mr. Nixon has an irritating debater's device (he employed it three times in his speech last week) of reducing the choices before him to two: one the "easy" and "popular" way, but, no, he will resist that temptation; the other the "right way," his.

Thus, he said, when he took office he could have ordered the immediate withdrawal of all American forces from Vietnam. "I could blame the defeat [on L.B.J.] and come out as the peacemaker," he said, and "from a political standpoint this would have been a popular and easy course to follow." Well, why so? Why would it have been so easy and popular a thing to do, if, as he argued throughout the rest of his speech, those who urge such immediate withdrawal are only a "vocal minority" in the nation who are trying to "prevail over reason and the will of the majority"?

Despite all the advance billing, the President had no new initiatives to propose—no new withdrawals to announce, no cease-fire overture, no "postwar" vision. That, it turned out, was not his purpose. Instead he wanted

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

to explain his course—and to plead for a nation "united for peace" behind him. But in reducing the available alternatives of a complex situation, and the many shadings of how people felt about it, to two—one patriotic, the other imposed from the streets in a threat to a free society—the President did in fact take the easy way.

One of the touching aspects of Moratorium Day was the widespread anguish about participation—whether in wearing an armband or lighting a candle, one could express moral revulsion against the war, or a simple longing to have it ended, without "helping Hanoi" or being counted for precipitate withdrawal. The Moratorium sponsors, eager for numbers and respectability, encouraged this ambiguity. Some promoters of next weekend's scheduled marchers and demonstrations, however, are of quite a different kidney, eager to polarize the nation. The serious concern over President Nixon's simplistic reduction of the problem to "only two choices" is whether he has added to the unity of the country or to its continued division.

Senator Fulbright, who probably is not one of the first converts Nixon expected to make, had a cogent comment on Nixon's use of old-style rhetoric of a war against an international Communist conspiracy, which if not stopped here would spread elsewhere. "If you accept the Nixon and Johnson assumption," he said tartly, "there is no justification for winding down the war."

Nixon is in fact now winding down the war. This comes through in key passages, though it is elsewhere obscured by Nixon's particular style of argumentation. The clearest evidence is the troop withdrawals, and all that flows from them.

"Nobody wants their President to fail," Lyndon Johnson used to like to say. In Nixon's first months in office, he has had majority approval in the Gallup Poll for his handling of the war, and that majority has even increased since the Moratorium. But though casualties are down, and 60,000 troops are being withdrawn, the question bothering many Americans, whether or not they are silent or a majority, is whether all that can be done on our side to bring peace is being done.

The negotiations in Paris, Nixon says candidly, have made "no progress whatever" since Jan. 20. And he put on record some of the private approaches he has made, including a direct letter to Ho Chi Minh, answered unyieldingly by Ho a few days before his death. Some of the Peace Now demonstrators may question the sincerity of the President's commitment to peace, but it is noteworthy that governments and peoples abroad now generally accept the genuineness of America's peace intentions. But they have also concluded that Hanoi feels it can afford to wait us out.

And so, the President has begun the phased withdrawal of U.S. combat troops from a struggle we cannot hope to win militarily. This is a course LIFE supports, and we accept his argument for not announcing a fixed timetable for withdrawal.

Where men of just as much patriotism as the President can disagree is over his stated conditions for withdrawal. This, he says, has all been "worked out in cooperation with the South Vietnamese"; the "withdrawal will be made from strength and not from weakness" and phased not only to the level of enemy activity but to the "progress of the training programs of the South Vietnamese forces." Around this point debate legitimately gathers. In a new book, Townsend Hoopes, Air Force Under Secretary until last February, argues that we should not be "committed to the endless support of a group of men in Saigon" who he thinks "could not remain in power for more than a few months without our large-scale presence" and warns

against "a course of partial withdrawal in Vietnam while leading the public to believe all will end well."

Optimism is indeed rising again in the U.S. command in Vietnam, though it gets expressed a little apologetically, remembering the past: security is said to be much improved in the countryside, the rice getting to market, the enemy attacks weaker. The President indicates that things are going so much better that he now hopes to get all our ground combat troops out sooner than he expected, presumably even earlier than the end of next year.

Critics like Under Secretary Hoopes also favor a deliberate, orderly withdrawal, but without the optimism: they would leave believing our original objectives unobtainable without paying too high a price in continuing domestic discord. Hoopes would use our impending departure as a pressure on the Thieu government to "move decisively to a settlement during the limited time our remaining military presence can provide supplementary leverage," and though he wouldn't "abruptly abandon" the government, he thinks there are other "submerged factions" in South Vietnamese society that should be allowed to participate in charting the country's course in the interim before our withdrawal. These groups would then have a better chance, after we are gone, to avoid being dominated in a new government by the National Liberation Front.

Perhaps the Nixon administration too is putting pressure on Thieu at this point, for in foreign affairs, a President may often do what he is not free to acknowledge. So far as the public record—and last week's speech—is concerned, however, the Nixon policy is all the way with Thieu and Ky.

At this stage in extricating us from the war, President Nixon has freed himself from too much dependency on Hanoi's cooperation. He has not, in the more complicated relationships with an ally, shown himself independent of Saigon. This is his gamble.

FINANCING GRIPS REAL ESTATE BUSINESS

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

MR. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Peter F. DiMaria is an outstanding real estate man in my congressional district. Recently he was invited to be the guest editorialist for the Menlo Park, Calif., Recorder, and he submitted an editorial regarding the problems of the real estate industry.

I am sure that readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be interested in reading Mr. DiMaria's editorial, which follows:

[From the Menlo Park (Calif.) Recorder, July 30, 1969]

LENDERS KILLING REAL ESTATE BIZ?

(By Peter F. DiMaria)

How far can the moneymen go in capitalizing on an inflationary spiral and still attempt to pass off their outrageous actions as noble attempts to avoid further inflation?

At the present time it is virtually impossible to obtain a take-out loan for apartments from a conventional lending agency that doesn't contain a ten year lock-in clause. Now who is likely to get inflated when the lock-in term was increased at a time of the highest

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

interest rates in our history? Consider this along with other gimmick contractual provisions such as points and participation.

The business of lending is so attractive now that lenders are stepping all over one another to attract depositors. And why not? Banks still pay four percent on savings and five percent on time deposits. But that is all they were paying their depositors when the prime rate was only six and one-half percent. It is now eight and one-half percent! The hot race for funds to lend would cool somewhat if lending agencies were compelled to pay their depositors in direct proportion to the prime rate, which, incidentally, is arbitrarily set by some large noble bank and is hastily followed by all other banks.

Corporations, particularly those engaged in war or space related industry, are not discouraged from borrowing because of high interest rates. The cost of money is compounded into the price which the government (You) will pay. Furthermore, corporations start in a fifty-two percent income tax bracket . . . interest is deductible. Industrial expansion is attracting money away from America's largest single complex of economic activity—construction. Would it be asking too much of such corporations to issue debentures in the event expansion is desired instead of borrowing funds that would otherwise be diverted towards alleviating a fearful housing shortage? It would force them to re-consider plans for expansion. The sale of debentures for such purposes would dilute the interests of the stockholders instead of having the government, you, pay.

In the state of California it is usurious to charge interest in excess of ten percent per annum on a loan secured by deed of trust on real estate. Let's examine the methods employed to circumvent the intent and purpose of the existing legislation. "Points," delicately referred to as loan fees, are the most notorious and offensive. Any number of points may be charged as a loan fee and the amount is predicated generally on how many of the buyer is forced and willing to accept. A point is one per cent of the subject loan. If the loan fee is five points and the amount of the loan is \$100,000, the borrower actually is loaned \$95,000. But he pays interest on \$100,000 and pays principal in the same amount. Further, insurance companies, always prominent in the business of lending, also currently insist on some form of participation, i.e., two percent of gross income or 20 percent of any increase in the projected rents upon which the amount of the loan is originally predicated.

What is this thing called usury? And in view of the demands of participation by insurance companies as lenders, are the so-called responsible lending agencies detracting from the ever-mounting and harmful inflationary psychology?

The belief that money is just another commodity and therefore is subject solely to the law of supply and demand can only be ludicrous. It just so happens it is the only commodity that controls the production and consumption of all other commodities, and this entitles it to some special considerations.

THE MAJORITY VOICE

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, a fine, young constituent of mine, Mr. Steve Dugan, of Fort Valley, Ga., has founded a movement to make the voice of the silent majority heard. I congratulate Steve and wholeheartedly endorse his

efforts and I hope that this movement will gain national support.

I am inserting in the RECORD the letter I received from Steve and the information he provided me regarding this effort.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRINKLEY: I am now chairman of a movement which is made up of members of the silent majority of Americans who love their country and the things that make it great.

Our movement is called 'The Majority Voice' and we are dedicated to speaking up for the real American attitude. I am enclosing a pamphlet that explains our movement and we hope you are able to find time to read it.

When it seems that so many of our nation's leaders are simply politicians, it is more than nice to know that our district has given America a statesman.

With warmest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

STEVE DUGAN,
Chairman, The Majority Voice.

WELCOME TO THE MAJORITY VOICE

DEAR FRIENDS: For too long now, a small group of radicals has been giving the world the false impression that Americans are losing their morals, their character and their principles.

Like the vast majority of our people, I do not want to be represented by a vocal minority which has no conception of what has made this nation great. Because I do not want to be represented by these radicals, and because I feel 85% of our people do not want to be represented by them, I am beginning an alternative movement, "The Majority Voice".

By participating in "The Majority Voice", you and I can join efforts and stand up together for our nation and the principles which make her great.

We need your prayers, your membership and your contributions. If we work together we can show the world that tomorrow's America will be just as equal to its task as yesterday's. We can improve the world's confidence in us and restore our confidence in ourselves.

Please write me for information and assistance in helping our movement. God bless you and good luck.

Sincerely,

STEVE DUGAN,
Chairman, The Majority Voice.
FORT VALLEY, GA.

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES AND PURPOSES OF THE MAJORITY VOICE

We, the Charter Members of the Majority Voice, do organize our movement because:

(1) We believe in God and pray he will direct us, while at the same time we respect the beliefs of all men.

(2) We affirm the positive good in military service for our country because such service gives us the opportunity to put our country and our principles above our own personal lives and to work actively for world peace.

(3) We appreciate the blessings we have been given since birth.

(4) We are humbly proud to call ourselves Americans and we love our country, our region and our state.

(5) We respect the generation of our parents and gratefully acknowledge their unselfish sacrifices in war and peace for our security and happiness.

(6) We are thankful for the unprecedented freedom which our society has given us and we wish to use it wisely.

(7) We believe there is no Generation Gap, and that the only gap in society is between those working constructively and those working destructively or not at all.

(8) We believe there is a definite need in all prospering societies for moral standards and self control as expressed in reasonable laws.

November 13, 1969

(9) We respect the fact that we do not have the wisdom or the right to impose our principles or will on others and we will refuse to allow others to impose their will or principles on us.

(10) We see as harmful the unnecessary use of drugs and stimulants because these are in most cases illegal, medically unproven and represent nothing more than a retreat from reality and life.

(11) We believe that love expresses itself most beautifully in work, dedication and sacrifice and that all who say they love should strive to live accordingly.

(12) We believe that a key to happiness in life is self respect and that this can only be attained by contributing to, and not detracting from, society and mankind.

Therefore, We, the majority of our nation's people, do hereby join together in rejecting the philosophy expressed by radical groups who seek to retreat from life and destroy our country and we do further pledge ourselves to act responsibly, with the help of God, to build on the great heritage we have been given.

ORIGINAL PRACTICAL PROJECTS OF THE MAJORITY VOICE

(1) To wage a "Drug Education Campaign" on all campuses, pointing out the medically dangerous and criminal aspects of drug abuse.

(2) To support stronger enforcement of drug control laws, doing everything possible to eliminate drug abuse.

(3) To support the continuation of ROTC as an accredited subject on all campuses since it requires time and effort comparable to other subjects and contributes to strengthening the individual and the nation.

(4) To sponsor "on campus" addresses by speakers who can well represent the philosophy we share . . . believing that such speakers will give our campaign the opportunity to reach thousands of new people with a philosophy which is capable of winning their support and offering an alternative to radical groups.

(5) To make "Alternative Think Material" available to thousands of people. (Included in this would be, for instance, copies of Kenneth McFarland's speeches and his recordings.)

(6) To support candidates for local office and student government offices, as well as national offices, who run on a platform consistent with our philosophy.

(7) To work unceasingly towards greater harmony, communication, understanding and cooperation among business leaders, political leaders and college men and women by holding "exchange sessions" during which members of these groups would be brought together for informal discussions.

A VIETNAM PETITION

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, citizen concern over the Vietnam war has manifested itself in many forms. Among those, has been the exercise of the public right to petition.

Recently, a group of faculty members from Hofstra University, one of the fine schools we have on Long Island, filed such a petition. In light of its lucid presentation and the importance of its contents, I would like to extend my remarks to include this petition and the names

of the 29 full-time faculty members who signed it.

The petition and signatures follow:

PETITION ON VIETNAM

Whereas we believe the war in Vietnam to be unwise and unwinnable, possibly illegal, and in many ways immoral;

Whereas we believe that U.S. military presence in Vietnam is unjustified in terms of national interest or of human freedom;

Whereas we believe that continuance of the war can only add to the already incalculable loss of human resources, physical and spiritual, on the field of battle and on the home front;

Whereas we believe that the present South Vietnamese Government of Thieu and Ky, which the U.S. Government supports, is oppressive and is not supported by the majority of the people of South Vietnam;

Therefore we, the undersigned, as citizens and as educators of citizens at Hofstra University, call upon our representatives in Congress to put all pressure on our Government

(1) to order prompt and rapid withdrawal of all military forces from Vietnam;

(2) to disavow the undemocratic government of Thieu and Ky; and

(3) to work for free elections in South Vietnam, to be supervised by the UN.

(Signed on 24 October 1969 by the following full-time faculty members:)

E. J. Agnello, Charles M. Barry, Donald Berwick, Robert Buncrot, Allan R. Davis, Eleanor B. Dowling, Charles Fleischman, M. Friedman, John R. Jeanneney, Shirley Langer, William N. Leonard, Alexander Lesser, L. R. Lopez, William A. McBrien.

Sylvia Pines, Ruth Prigozy, Wilbur S. Scott, Ele Siegmeister, Ruth Stauffer, Gitel Steed, Robert Stein, Richard Sypher, Albert Tepper, Lynn Turgeon, Bess Vogel, Jacob Weissman, Bowman Wiley, Murray Yanowitch, June Zacccone.

OUR NATIONAL HONOR IS AT STAKE

HON. MARTIN B. McKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. MCKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, we have just observed Veterans Day, 1969. This year, those who participated in the day's activities throughout the Nation not only honored our Nation's war veterans, they also expressed their support of President Nixon's Vietnam policy and his recently announced plan to extricate us from this tragic war.

In the next few days, we will witness the second moratorium demonstration by those who oppose our Government's policy and advocate immediate withdrawal regardless of the consequences.

I should like to commend to my colleagues today an editorial by Ward Poche, which appeared in the Newburgh, N.Y., Evening News, which brings out clearly a point which is central to the issue which seems to be dividing our Nation today:

[From the Newburgh (N.Y.) Evening News, Oct. 20, 1969]

POLITICAL WORD SHOULD BE HONORED
(By Ward Poche)

"In my time, men would go down on their political word."

Thus the late Walter Brown, court clerk of Orange County for half a century, decried

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

some 10 years ago the fact that no one paid much attention anymore to their "given political word."

In a larger sense, his comment is appropriate to Vietnam. This nation has given its political word and is trying to decide whether or not to honor it.

We must honor our word as a nation whether we are engaged in a popular war or not.

Because they have our word, the Vietnamese are fighting and by fighting they have given North Vietnam all the excuse it needs for a blood bath in the south when they take over if we pull out.

This is what the flower children don't want to hear—what they ignore.

The war is not popular. Surely no one in this country wants war for war's sake. No one wants to see Americans killed and maimed but how many Vietnamese are we willing to sacrifice by going back on our word through a withdrawal. We'll never know—there won't be anyone there to count the bodies.

We are in Vietnam to stop a blood bath. The lists are out. We have the example of Castro and Hitler—and who knows fully what has happened behind the Iron Curtain?

There are many things the flower children want to ignore because they're not nice to think about. One is the spread of communism which would destroy this country and the American way of life.

We are in Vietnam to stop the spread of communism. To me, it has always been that simple.

Eventually, there is going to be confrontation between slavery and freedom as I like to think of the two major powers in the world today. I expect it in my lifetime and I'm not looking forward to it.

The world is looking at this nation of wealth. Break our word with the Vietnamese and whatever trust the world has in us disappears and we will be alone at a time when we can't afford to be alone.

Sooner or later, as England found in World War II, you can no longer appease an opposing political philosophy.

The flower children, I think, disagree, which brings to mind another quotation: "The only way this nation will be destroyed is from within."

Is this what they want?

CELTIC CULTURAL SOCIETY
CHARITY

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed by my distinguished friend, Mr. John Doherty of the Celtic Cultural Society, Inc., of Brookline, Mass., that the annual Thanksgiving dance sponsored by this outstanding group for the benefit of orphans in Ireland will be conducted on November 28, at the Knights of Columbus Hall, 541 Cambridge Street, Allston, Mass.

This is one of the events sponsored by the Celtic Cultural Society to raise funds for the very wonderful cause of helping to make life brighter and easier for Irish children without parents or relatives in a position to care for them.

Many prominent people, including a large number not members of this dedicated society, are identified with its campaign for funds to help this cause

in support of poor, unfortunate children being cared for in Irish orphanages.

This cause is gathering national interest and sustaining support, not only from persons of Irish blood, but also from their friends, and many other people from all ethnic groups, who are eager on a humanitarian basis, to join those who are working so sincerely to secure better conditions for helpless children denied parental and family loving care, and who must rely on the generosity of persons blessed with genuine, humane spirit and love of suffering humanity.

I want to commend Mr. Doherty and his colleagues who are engaged in this work of charity and mercy, with which I am pleased to associate myself, and I hope and pray that they will have another very successful, very rewarding response from their vigorous efforts in behalf of Irish orphans who need substantial help from others if they are to exist under trying conditions and ultimately find opportunities for some measure of education, training, care and guidance that will enable them to make their own way in life and grow up as healthy, enterprising and happy citizens of the great Irish Free State of which we are so proud.

May the Celtic Cultural Society be very successful in their fine efforts for helpless, Irish children, and may this shining body of loyal Irish-Americans and their friends, long continue to work for those who are not able to assist themselves and need a helping hand to face the difficult problems of life.

GEORGIA CAPITAL THREATENED
BY FEDERAL JUDGES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the leadership behind the disloyal manifestations scheduled to commence tomorrow afternoon has revealed itself to be hard-line Communist and closely allied to Hanoi. There is no point in naming again the traitors to our fighting men in Vietnam. Their names have been published repeatedly in the last 2 weeks, despite an obvious effort by the national news media to play down their Red identity and their role.

The administration appeared to have taken a proper position in planning to handle the local manifestations of this sickness. Recognizing that many of the participants are coming to Washington for the express purpose of provoking riot and civil disorder, parade permits and other encouragement were properly refused.

Something must have happened, however, and the Justice Department now announces that there is little chance of violence. At any rate, parade permits have been issued, and advance details of the 82d Airborne have arrived.

It should be of interest to the administration, which now does not anticipate

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

violence, that there are circulating in the "inside mail" in this House calls for volunteers for what is called "M-Day Blood Drive" on November 14, soliciting blood donations to help the injured. Individuals who desire information are to call 3161 or 6987. The blood is not said to be for our troops.

Meanwhile, the assault preparations continue elsewhere in the country.

This morning in Atlanta, I picked up a local newspaper to read that a U.S. district judge appears to have assumed jurisdiction over the Governor and capital of the sovereign State of Georgia, by what authority I am at a loss to understand.

It seems that some of Hanoi's "dear American friends," filed suit to restrain the Governor from interfering with their occupation of the State capital. Perhaps they want to have Georgia withdraw its armed forces from Vietnam.

The Federal judge handed down what purports to be a ruling that the Governor of Georgia has no authority to prevent such a takeover. He broadly implied that he would act if the Governor of Georgia failed to surrender and attempted to protect the capital against Hanoi's fifth column.

If the AP story correctly reports the facts and correctly quotes U.S. District Judge Sidney O. Smith, it appears that this House should consider impeachment proceedings against at least one other Federal judge in addition to William O. Douglas. In the meantime, we should congratulate Gov. Lester Maddox of Georgia on his commonsense and patriotism, and wish him success in his impending confrontation with Hanoi's fifth column, aided and abetted by a Federal judge.

Daily, the American people become more aware that we live in a never-never land—where Americans are never right, and Communists are never wrong.

Two Georgia newscuttings follow:

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Nov. 12, 1969]

STATE CAPITOL ANTIWAR RALLY IS RULED LEGAL—JUDGE REFUSES WRIT—SAYS DISORDER IS FORBIDDEN

ROME, GA.—A federal judge ruled Tuesday that the Atlanta Vietnam Moratorium Committee has the legal right to assemble peacefully on the state Capitol grounds and protest the war—and that Gov. Lester Maddox has an equal right to try to bar them if they become disorderly.

U.S. District Judge Sidney O. Smith refused to grant an injunction sought by the committee against Maddox after the governor advised moratorium organizers they could stage their demonstration on state property only if they supported the President's war program and the country's fighting men.

The group plans an anti-war demonstration Thursday in connection with national protests that include a march in Washington on Saturday.

As Smith's ruling was issued in federal court here, Maddox addressed a "Re-affirmation Day Rally" on the state Capitol steps and Georgians around the state flew flags and held parades in observance of Veterans' Day.

Judge Smith warned that "any physical interference by the governor or his agents or any arrests or prosecution solely for peaceful, orderly assembly and non-violent expression of their views by anti-war activists" would be illegal.

Judge Smith explained that he could not legally issue an injunction barring Maddox from moving against anti-war demonstrators before the governor made any such move.

Maddox's telegram to the committee advising them they could not use the Capitol to protest the war was not an executive order barring the demonstration, Smith said.

He indicated that he felt the Capitol grounds were chosen for the anti-war demonstration to cause a confrontation, and in part because of Maddox's well known stand against war protesters and civil rights activists.

The case, Smith said, seemed to have been "precipitated . . . and . . . compounded by the desire of both parties to achieve some very questionable publicity at a time when our people are divided and troubled enough by the war in Vietnam."

The dispute ought to be resolved by a simple conference between the governor and the moratorium committee, he said.

"It is manifestly unfair for the governor of a state to afford the use of government facilities to one group because of its beliefs and to deny their use to another group because of its contrary beliefs," Smith said.

And it is permissible for a public official to make private or public statements condemning the activities of any group with which he disagrees, Smith added.

However, the moratorium group also has the right to assemble on state property, based on the fact that the grounds have been used in the past for other gatherings.

Therefore, Smith concluded, "Each side has an equal right to the full exercise of free speech."

Assistant Atty. Gen. Harold Hill, representing Maddox, argued that protests against the war, staged under the constitutional right of redress of grievances, should be staged in Washington, D.C.

The State of Georgia, he said, should not be required to provide a forum for redress of grievances against the federal government.

Hill said Maddox had authorized him to tell the court that he dictated his reply to the moratorium committee hastily, and that if he had thought it over, he would simply have said "No."

One of the plaintiffs in the suit, Tom Houck of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, said Tuesday night that demonstration organizers hope to meet with Gov. Maddox Wednesday "to arrange ground rules" for Thursday's assembly at the Capitol.

"We're going to give every thing we can to cooperate with the governor to maintain a peaceful demonstration, and we hope he will reciprocate," Houck said. He added, "We're pretty satisfied with the results of the court decision."

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Nov. 12, 1969]

PROTESTERS TO USE PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE

WASHINGTON.—The government agreed Tuesday to compromise and allow antiwar protesters to use part of Pennsylvania Avenue for a massive demonstration this Saturday.

The agreement was announced by Mayor Walter E. Washington and Deputy Atty. Gen. Richard G. Kleindienst, who declared last Thursday that "under no circumstances," could the Pennsylvania Avenue route be used.

The agreement followed several days of virtually continuous negotiations with sponsors of the march. It provides for the procession to proceed down the traditional parade avenue from the Capitol as far as 15th Street and from there to the grounds of the Washington Monument for a rally climaxing three days of antiwar activities.

This route makes no provision for a

November 13, 1969

swing by the White House—one point that the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam had demanded.

Kleindienst and Washington also said the government agreed to the route after the New Mobilization promised to provide enough parade marshals to ensure order during the mammoth march, which is expected to attract about 200,000 in what could be the biggest antiwar protest in history.

"The New Mobilization Committee has offered every assurance that order will be maintained during the Nov. 15 march," Kleindienst said.

"We are confident that the New Mobilization Committee will honor its commitments as we will honor ours to insure a peaceful assembly and exercise of First Amendment rights in the nation's capital," they said.

Meanwhile, a small advance party from the 82nd Airborne Division flew here from Ft. Bragg, N.C., to prepare for possible movement of paratroopers to the capital in connection with the weekend demonstrations.

NEW HOPE FOR THE CHILD WITH DYSLEXIA

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

The "mirror reader" child baffled educators for years. This child confused "b's" and "d's" and printed letters backwards.

Through research, done extensively at the Mayo Clinic, I am happy to say, this symptom is now recognized as a neurological dysfunction and the condition is referred to as dyslexia.

While no cure has been found, special education methods have been developed to help these children learn to read. For the edification of my colleagues, I submit for the RECORD two articles in a series on this subject appearing in the Rochester Post Bulletin:

[From the Rochester Post-Bulletin, Oct. 15, 1969]

JUST WHAT IS THIS DYSLEXIA, SPECIFICALLY?

(By Barbara Cook)

How many times have you heard someone say, "I can't remember names—but I never forget a face."

Or, "I have a terrible sense of direction—you'll have to tell me where to turn."

Or, "I like to sing—but I can never remember how the tune goes."

Familiar? Chances are you're chuckling now because you recognize one of these funny little quirks as your own. If so, you're in good company because nearly everyone has a similar peculiarity.

Dr. Manuel R. Gomez, head of the section of pediatric neurology at the Mayo Clinic, calls them neurological idiosyncrasies and says they reflect a minor dysfunction in the neurological area of such a slight degree to be undetectable by electroencephalograms or any known brain test.

But they are there—and we all have the symptoms to prove it.

And they aren't very important. Just a little inconvenient and embarrassing at times.

Unless the neurological idiosyncrasy happens to be the inability to perceive and/or recall the sounds and symbols of the written

word. This particular little idiosyncrasy (known as specific dyslexia) is more than inconvenient and embarrassing. It is discouraging and even crippling for the child who must function in today's world of words.

His whole future—education, livelihood and even the ability to find his way by reading street signs—depends on the one thing he can't do.

His funny little quirks isn't funny at all.

"Put yourself to this test," suggests Dr. Gomez, "supposing that in order to communicate with each other we had to use music instead of a spoken, written language. I would be in real trouble."

He estimates that if musical notes or colored symbols were the only means of communicating an even larger number of the population would be affected than are now handicapped by a specific language disability.

Yet, basically, specific dyslexia is not as serious as some of the neurological idiosyncrasies for which there is no remedy, since it is remedial and is often diminished by maturation.

But it is deadly serious to children for whom everything depends on learning to read and write. And waiting for maturity isn't the answer for two reasons. It doesn't always work. And, even if it did, by then the years of doubt and ebbing self-confidence will probably have created emotional problems even more difficult to overcome.

Consider the child with the minor dysfunction that results in a major handicap simply because of our method of communication. He is not a problem child—but he is a child with a problem.

His teacher may not recognize his disability (though she may herself be tone deaf or have a poor sense of direction). His parents may think he isn't applying himself and blame him for his failures at school. He is intelligent and he knows it—but he can't prove it. And eventually even he doesn't believe it anymore. By the time he's a teenager he's pretty sure he's no good. And he may steal a car to prove it.

Or, he may be lucky. He may be sent to the school psychologist by a teacher who suspects his disability by comparing his reading and writing skills with his ability and achievements in other areas.

If his parents take him to the Mayo Clinic for testing, the procedure will begin with a complete physical examination followed by a neurologic examination, vision and hearing tests and then a psychological assessment.

"We see a number of children whose parents bring them for 'reading problems' because they aren't satisfied with the child's marks at school," notes Dr. Wendell M. Swenson, head of the section of clinical psychology.

"They would rather be told that he is dyslexic than just an average or slow learner."

Obviously all poor readers are not dyslexic, but the clinical evaluation can pinpoint those who are.

By means of tests the psychologist assesses the child's intellectual potential and notes the variability in performance in several different areas (concepts, awareness of details, perception of shapes) that may indicate specific dyslexia.

His performance in the ability to perceive and reproduce symbols is examined by methods such as the Bender-Gestalt Test and is followed by an assessment of his reading ability, not including comprehension or recall, to determine his grade level in that skill.

General information, arithmetic reasoning, auditory memory and vocabulary (the yardstick for verbal intelligence) provide further clues for the differential diagnosis.

None of the patients seen in the section

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

of child and adolescent psychiatry at the Mayo Clinic are presented as reading problems.

Yet, Dr. James Delano, head of this section, reports: "Of the 250 children seen in this section in the past year about 40 appeared to have a language disability—chiefly in reading.

"Of that number 75 percent have emotional problems that are secondary to the disability. If these children get proper help for their reading disability their behavior may improve to the point where their parents feel they no longer present a problem.

"If they hadn't been dyslexic they might never have had emotional problems. Early detection, therefore, is very important."

Dr. Gomez agrees that "failure to learn to read produces frustration and shame in many intelligent children and may explain some cases of school drop-outs, unemployment, juvenile delinquency and crime."

"Reading," he points out, "is the key to everything else."

[From the Rochester (Minn.) Post-Bulletin, Oct. 16, 1969]

THE DISABLED READERS: LOST UNTIL FOUND

A child is lost.

The news spreads on a wave of alarm as neighbors anxiously join his parents in the search. If he isn't found soon, a whole town or community may unite in tramping through fields and combing woody areas.

Often the searchers don't even know the child, or his parents—but there is something about a lost child that softens the hardest heart.

Even lost pets and animals merit a concerned search.

A farmer will make every effort to find one cow that has wandered away. And a shepherd will leave his flock to look for one lost sheep.

A child who is lost in a world of symbols and sounds he can't unscramble and/or reproduce wants someone to find him, too—and lead him out of his dilemma. But there aren't enough searchers.

In fact, no one may know he is lost.

One of the difficulties in finding the child with specific dyslexia is that the S.O.S. signals sent out aren't transmitted in a consistent or predictable pattern. And, in addition to the variations in symptoms, the severity of dysfunction ranges from minimal (the most difficult to detect) to major.

A diagnosis can only be made by the medical team, but even without training in the complexities of the disability it is possible for parents or teachers to be sufficiently suspicious of some classic symptoms—such as persistent letter reversals in reading, writing and spelling—to run up the distress flag.

The child with specific dyslexia can't differentiate between reversible letters like "b" and "d" or between words like "not" and "ton." He may transpose letters within a word ("form" for "from") and there is no consistency to the reversals and transpositions.

The confusion may be auditory as well as visual. Hearing "stand" he may reproduce it in spelling as "stad" or "sand"—omitting one of the sounds of the word that he can't recall.

And each dyslexic child is unique. The only thing they have in common is their difficulty with written language skills.

Severely dyslexic children, formerly known as "mirror readers," have been recognized since 1895. And for those with less serious disabilities, the earlier teaching methods—using strictly phonic approaches—were sometimes adequate.

But the advent of the whole word method in about 1925, by which most children could learn to read more quickly, left the dyslexic child without an important tool for his learning needs. Which is one answer to the

question, "Why weren't there all these dyslexic children when I went to school?"

The whole word (or "Look and Say") method presupposed that the student would be able to recognize a word when it appeared again in the same context. And many public and private schools now use methods which include some phonics.

But methods that are generally used in regular remedial reading classes for children with limited ability, emotional problems, poor schooling or other problems unrelated to specific dyslexia in origin won't work for the youngster with difficulties in visual and/or auditory perception.

The method by which most dyslexics can learn is a process of painstaking phonetic analysis in which words are unlocked by a thorough knowledge of the sounds of letters and their combinations.

This provides a system for the structuring of associations so the child no longer has to learn each word as a visual pattern. This system enables him to break down each word until it becomes sufficiently familiar to evoke its own immediate associations.

The techniques used for retraining involve the three pathways to learning:

Visual—the youngsters look at individual letters on flash cards;

Auditory—they hear and repeat the phonetic sounds of the letters; and

Kinesthetic—their muscles sense the "feel" of the letter as they write it, pronounce it, and see it simultaneously.

The imperfect sense of direction of spatial relationships can't be cured and children who "see things differently" will probably always be rudimentary spellers. But, with the exception of about one per cent, youngsters with the puzzling problem can overcome much of their impaired perception and master the art of reading.

Following the diagnosis of her disability at the Mayo Clinic, the little girl called Wendy Barbour (not her real name) in an earlier article was instructed for one summer in these techniques by a tutor affiliated with the Remedial Reading Center in Rochester, operated by Mrs. Howard Rome and Mrs. Arthur C. Osman.

Since her dysfunction was minimal her tutor terminated the sessions in the fall and Wendy was able to continue on in her own grade, using her new skills as a supplement to classroom instruction.

Now in the fourth grade, spelling and number reversals still give evidence of her problem. But she is reading well and, in addition, makes a game of "unlocking" words in foreign languages—something that many of the other good readers in her grade aren't yet able to do.

Timmy Hughes, the other case history reviewed earlier, whose name was also changed, still needs regular sessions with his tutor from the Remedial Reading Center.

But his behavior has improved with the knowledge that he isn't "dumb" after all and his progress so far has given him hope. Because of his severe disability the techniques will be more difficult for him to master, but he reports that "they make sense" to him.

Children with a borderline disability such as Wendy's can be helped in the classroom under the direction of specially trained reading consultants, but the severely dyslexic youngster requires special education on a one-to-one basis or in very small groups.

Special education really means special attention.

This specialized help is not yet generally available for the dyslexic child through public education. And private tutoring spells a financial sacrifice for some parents and a financial impossibility for others.

The national advisory Committee on Dyslexia and Related Reading Disorders is aware of the problem.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

And, "while it doesn't expect to be able to reconcile all the differences of opinion or produce an iron-clad definition of dyslexia, it does hope by this fall to make a report of its studies carrying recommendations pertinent to the reading problems not only of school children but of adults as well."

The search has begun. But unless they are found in time, the bright children with the "funny" neurological idiosyncracy face an uncertain future.

Their school failure—and all that it implies—can be predicted.

NEW OFFSHORE DRILLING CONTROLS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, 10 months ago all our images about existing precautions against water pollution were shattered by the tragic oil spill off Santa Barbara.

Since February when the leak was finally, but not completely, controlled, we have heard a great deal about the need for stringent Federal restraints over offshore drilling operations, but in reality, today the situation is not much better.

Significant—but not huge—leakages still stain the California coast, new leases have been granted, Federal control is still somewhat nebulous and quite incomplete.

I recently introduced a new bill, H.R. 14644, which attempts to set a hard line on two important phases of the offshore drilling program.

The first section of the bill forbids the Secretary of the Interior from granting any offshore oil, gas, or mineral lease until a full public hearing on the proposed lease is held.

The idea that the Federal Government is always the best sole judge of what is or is not in the public interest is not only wrong, but, as indicated by the disaster in Santa Barbara, very dangerous.

I believe that the people involved in a given local situation are better qualified to determine what is in their own best interests and they should have the opportunity to be heard.

It is within the Federal Government's responsibility to gather pertinent scientific data and determine whether a particular action—such as oil drilling offshore—is safe for all concerned. Thus, the second part of the bill requires that the Interior Department observe a moratorium on all further offshore leasing until standardized Federal construction codes and tough drilling standards applicable to every aspect of the offshore operation are set up.

Let us hope that the alarm and disgust created by the blackened beaches of Santa Barbara is enough to awaken the people and the Government to the serious problems concerned with conservation, and that appropriate action is taken before another such disaster occurs.

MARINE CORPS LEAGUE AT
WATERTOWN, MASS.**HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly impressed with the recent installation of the distinguished Marine Corps League at Watertown, Mass., in my district, which I recently had the honor and privilege to attend. The meeting was held in the spacious and well arranged quarters of this outstanding unit and was largely attended by members and friends.

I appreciated the warm reception given me by these outstanding Americans and friends, and welcomed the opportunity to briefly address the meeting. I pointed out the fact, which is well understood by an overwhelming number of people, that we live in a very dangerous world, and that we must make sure that we realize our position, and the need for defending ourselves and our country's safety and security against every possible contingency that may arise in a world that is torn with revolutionary spirit, violence, intimidations, threats, and disorder.

I alluded to the need for unity, understanding, and brotherhood in our country, so that we can minimize dissension wherever it exists, and combat those who are doing their best to undermine our free institutions and the order, safety, moral structure, and peace of our society, and who would substitute the radical, police state for our precious freedoms.

I also stressed, as I always do, the need for peace in this Nation and the world, not only in Vietnam, but elsewhere, emphasizing that the people of our country and the world are seeking and yearning for peace and that it is a time to join hands to bring hostilities in Vietnam to an honorable end as soon as possible.

At the same time, I pointed out the urgent need to protect our forces and our boys fighting in that bloody war during their withdrawals from land, sea, and air operations.

I also said that we must do everything in our power to reach an understanding with the enemy and its powerful allies that stability and effective, peaceful conditions shall be agreed on and assured that will rule out and prevent the slaughter and bloodbaths that might well result in that war theater when fighting ceases.

We must have some concern and definite understandings about the fate of the indigenous people of Vietnam, whom we have sacrificed so many precious American lives to defend against aggression, and the loss of their freedoms.

The installation was conducted with great solemnity and impressiveness, and very capable new officers were inducted to furnish the able, dedicated leadership and to continue the public-spirited activities of this fine Marine Corps League of Watertown that has made such splendid contributions and will continue to make them in the interest of the community, State, and Nation.

November 13, 1969

The new commandant is my distinguished friend, Mr. Peter Dwyer, a brilliant and very able young man, and his counterpart as president of the auxiliary is Mrs. Linda Cooper, a lovely, gracious young lady, so representative of the dedicated and charming young ladies of the auxiliary.

All of the other officers of both the league and auxiliary are able and devoted to their tasks, and I am sure that, like their predecessors in office, they will give a splendid account of themselves in what is certainly a very fine, especially, well-organized and well-conducted unit of our great Marine Corps League.

I shall long remember the very warm reception I received from this outstanding, concerned group of former servicemen and servicewomen whose background, as members of one of the world's greatest fighting organizations, the U.S. Marine Corps, and other gratifying attributes of character, loyalty, and service to the Nation, uniquely qualify them in these uneasy days, to furnish the leadership which we need so badly in our country today to fight against those abroad and at home, who are hostile to the American way of life, and to defend and protect the Nation.

Let us hold out the olive branch of peace to every nation, the Soviet Union, Red China, and all the rest that they may respond in truth and good faith to our latest of many sincere overtures of peace and friendship to stop all bloodshed and fighting and join as human beings all for the peace, prosperity and betterment of the human race.

May God grant that our pleas and our prayers may be heard and answered by all the nations throughout the world, especially our enemies, and those who support and encourage them.

May the day soon come when we lay down all weapons of force, violence and destruction forever, and blessed peace and brotherhood may come to the whole world.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1969

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I was displeased that I was unable to be here and cast my vote in favor of the final passage of H.R. 13827, the omnibus housing bill of 1969. I was pleased, however, that I was not alone in feeling that this was a meaningful piece of legislation, as the House passed the bill by a vote of 339 to 9.

Perhaps this legislation is not as comprehensive as some hoped it might be, but it does contain changes that are needed if we are going to meet the present and future demands for housing.

We are currently faced with a prime interest rate of 8 percent as well as a shortage of money for home mortgages. Many of the traditional long-term investors, upon which the bond and home mortgage market rely, are now investing their funds in high-yield fast-turnover

investments. Since December of 1967, the cost-of-living index has increased by 12 percentage points. All of this contributes to the shortage of long-term money, since there is the reluctance to tie up large sums of money for long periods of time. We are also faced with a rising cost of construction that has caused the cost of the average home to increase from \$21,000 in 1966 to \$27,000 in 1969.

These problems must be overcome if we are going to supply the need of 2.6 million housing units per year for the next 10 years and still make these units available to those who need them. This is the goal of H.R. 13827 and this is what it will aid in accomplishing.

One provision of the bill I found gratifying was the expansion and liberalization of the flood insurance program. This is particularly significant in light of the devastation resulting from Hurricane Camille. In future disasters of this type, more people will be protected against complete financial catastrophe resulting from losses of real and personal property.

Urban renewal will be assisted by the expansion of the important neighborhood development program so that the financing of the first 2 years of a project, the most important and costly, will be financially guaranteed. A most significant addition to the bill was the adoption of the Anderson amendment which directs the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to take steps to insure the development of the operation breakthrough program, recently announced by Secretary Romney. This innovative program certainly looks like a solution to the demands for urban housing.

The bill also contains provisions to assist private homeownership. Among these are lower downpayments for FHA and VA mortgages, an increase in mortgage insurance from \$1,800 to \$2,500 per space in a mobile home court, mortgage insurance for mobile homes, and an additional \$1.5 million in order that GNMA—Government National Mortgage Association—may participate to a greater degree in the low cost home mortgage market.

These are just some of the changes that assist in making available the homes that our Nation so vitally needs.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I am happy this legislation has been given such resounding approval by the House, and I certainly hope the bill will be forwarded to the President within the very near future.

BOOKLET ON PEOPLE POWER

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an outstanding publication, entitled "People Power," which has been prepared by the League of Women Voters of St. Louis, Mo., under the guidance of Mrs. Marjorie S. Pharis,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

chairman of the intercity project of the league.

This booklet, concisely written and excellently illustrated, concerns the power which can be wielded by the people of this country through the ballot box. It emphasizes the importance of being informed and concerned in our society today, and of turning our concern into effective action by exercising the right to vote. The ultimate, residual, and continuing power of the people is, indeed, the vote.

I would like to commend the efforts of the St. Louis League of Women Voters in publishing this fine document. Copies of the booklet are available and may be obtained by writing to the league at 1143 Macklind Avenue, St. Louis, Mo. 63110.

SPECIAL STUDY OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN THE POLITICAL, ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, AND CULTURAL SPHERES

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on September 4, Dr. Isaac Lewin, the distinguished historian and internationally published author of the book "War on War," and other works, addressed the United Nations subcommission on the subject "Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities." His special study of racial discrimination in the political, economic, social, and cultural spheres which was delivered on behalf of the Agudas Israel World Organization, covers the areas of neonazism and Arab-Jewish relations. It has aroused considerable interest.

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

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

ADDRESS BY DR. ISAAC LEWIN

Ambassador Hernan Santa Cruz of Chile devoted Chapter X of his interim report submitted to the Sub-Commission, to the subject of "The Danger of the Revival of Nazism and Racial Intolerance." In that chapter he states as follows:

"In order to understand what nazism is, and why nazism and similar ideologies based on terrorism and racial intolerance are incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Genocide Convention, and the Declaration and Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, it is necessary to recall how these ideologies developed in the past, how they gave rise to serious violations of human rights, and how failure to eradicate them promptly and with finality led ultimately to war and barbarous acts, including genocides."

The Special Rapporteur is undoubtedly correct in this statement. One might even add the observation that by explaining the origins of nazism we may best be able to prevent its resurgence. The most scientific method of preventing the rebirth of nazism and fascism would be to eliminate the circumstances which caused its appearance among nations.

Mr. Santa Cruz feels that "fascist movements emerged with varying success in various parts of Europe between the two World Wars." He explains their success, partly, "by their appeal to extreme and exclusive nationalism and chauvinist expansion," and, partly, "by their 'revolutionary' call to the masses."

i

Historically, however, nazism and fascism were rooted in earlier movements. There is real present danger of its resurgence because the new movement in Germany (which we call neo-nazism, but its adherents, for obvious reasons, refuse to tie to the "old" nazism) goes back to the pre-nazi ideology. It is much easier to propagate the ideas of nazism if one can avoid branding them with the nazi trademark. After all, the cruelty and barbarity of nazism are known to the world. It is easier for individuals who, in fact, are nazis to disguise their association with the ideas they believe behind a screen of false names.

The task is easy for them because they need only go back to the tradition which formed the basis for Hitler's ideology, and may simply skip the Nazi period in modern German history. Why not hark back to Christian Lassen, a professor in Bonn, who published in the year 1844 a book called "Indische Alterthumskunde" in which he wrote (Vol. I, p. 414):

"Civilization has been the gift but of a few nations. Of other races only Egyptians and Chinese, and of the Caucasian only Semites and Aryans have built up human civilization. History proves that Semites do not possess the harmony of psychical forces which distinguishes the Aryans. The Semite is selfish and exclusive. He possesses a sharp intellect which enables him to make use of the opportunities created by others, as we find it in the history of the Phenicians and, later on, of the Arabs."

It all began with an attack on the Arabs. The followers of Lassen enlarged his group by turning against other Semites—the Jews.

It is quite obvious that neo-nazism will follow the same pattern. It will, without identifying itself openly with nazism, follow the racist ideologies of the 19th century. It will be nazism not in name but surely in character. Here lies the real danger of the revival of nazism and of its tendency to genocide. Nobody can tell whether the "old-new" racial smears will immediately brand all Semites or, at the outset, only Jews. What is certain, however, is its character as a calculated conspiracy against the principles of human understanding and tolerance. The road toward the attainment of such goals, once it has been opened, leads to the destruction of everything that is sacred to humankind as it emerged from World War II.

Let me illustrate this by examples from the German past. In 1873, Wilhelm Marr coined the term "anti-Semitism" and applied it, in his book "Der Sieg des Judentums über das Germanentum," to the fight with the Jews. He formulated the problem of the Jews in Germany not as a religious one, but as a problem of race. He asserted that the Semites left Palestine in order to conquer Europe. He stated that the Jews (or "Palestinians") had conquered the German press, parliament and political parties. If this goes on, said Marr, the end of Germany is in sight—"finis Germaniae." Thus was the racist movement against Jews born. An anti-Semitic league was founded in 1880. An international Congress of the league was held in Dresden in 1882, where an appeal was made by some participants that the Jews be deported to Egypt. It is ironic that the founders of modern anti-Semitism viewed Egypt as the Jewish homeland. The Congress did not accept this suggestion and instead adopted a proposal by Adolf Stoecker to abolish Jewish equality.

Distinctions among Semites were drawn by

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Eugene Duehring in his work "Die Judenfrage als Rassen- Sitten- und Kulturfrage," published in 1881. He asserted that the Jews were the most inferior group in the semitic race. The Bible, he said, is much below the standard of hellenism. What the Jews created was, according to Duehring, simply valueless. Christian blood should not be mixed with Jewish, and a wall must be erected between Christians and Jews. Jews should be returned to Egypt, said Duehring, in their old role as slaves.

From Duehring, the next step was Houston Steward Chamberlain, whose book "Die Grundlagen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts" became the pseudoscientific foundation of nazism. Chamberlain was the father of the theory of the superiority of the Aryan (i.e. German) race, and the inferiority of the Semites. The two races, said Chamberlain, must battle eternally until the last Semite is eliminated from Europe.

These examples are sufficient to fix the ideological basis for neo-nazism. May I therefore suggest that the chapter dealing with "The Danger of the Revival of Nazism" be rewritten by adding a discussion of the history of racist ideology and its direct influence on the development of nazism and fascism.

II

May I now turn to the Arab-Jewish problem.

For many centuries Jews and Arabs lived in peace and friendship. History tells us that in the dark period of the Middle Ages, Jews had no better friends than the Arabs, and vice versa. Arabs helped the Jews, and Jews contributed tremendously to Arab culture and welfare. The Caliphate of Harun Al-Rashid in Bagdad in the 8th century and of Abd Al-Rahman III in Cordoba in the 10th century constituted real progress in the dark era. Arabs and Jews co-operated then to the fullest extent. The most important contributions to philosophy made by Jewish scholars like Saadia Gaon, Salomon Ibn Gabirol, Bahya Ibn Paquda, Yehuda Halevy, Moses ben Maimon, were written in Arabic.

When, in 1492, Jews were expelled from Spain, and, in 1497, from Portugal, the Moslem Sultans of Turkey received them with open arms. The Jews, in turn, richly rewarded their friends. Bayazid II is quoted to have said, when he learned of the expulsion decree of King Ferdinand of Spain: "This King is anything but clever; he ruins his country and enriches ours." A Christian traveller, Nicolaus de Nicolai, who visited Turkey in 1551, later reported on the tremendous contributions of the Jews to the economic development of Turkey. He stressed that the Jews who came to Turkey from Spain and Portugal were instrumental in industry and in many sectors of life.

It is one of the greatest tragedies of modern history that the Arab-Jewish friendship has turned to hatred.

Who is to blame?

I must emphasize that I speak not for the State of Israel. I represent here the Agudas Israel World Organization and speak on behalf of religious Jews the world over. We have national branches in twenty countries and our members number hundreds of thousands. Before World War II, we were over a million strong because we had vibrant groups in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Romania and Hungary. The Nazis, by their brutal destruction of Jewish communities in these countries also put an end to the huge Agudist centers they contained. However, what I am going to say now is, I know, a feeling shared by all Jews in the world:

We want peace with the Arabs.

The Jewish people has given enough proof in the past that it is a nation of peace. Nothing is more abhorrent to us, nothing is more strange to our people, than war and bloodshed.

Before me this honorable assembled body heard from the representative of the World

Moslem Congress, and he stated that the Jews persecute the Arabs, that in the State of Israel there is no equality for Arabs (and even none for Sephardic Jews) and that the "Al Aqsa" mosque was burned so that the Jews might build, in its place, a new, Third Temple.

These assertions are so totally incorrect and without any basis in fact that they daze and astound the listener. Only blind hatred could have brought the representative of the World Moslem Congress to utter such statements. One would have imagined that the time of crusades and holy wars is past.

May I remind you of a historical incontestable truth. When, in 1947, the United Nations voted to establish a Jewish State, the Jews stood absolutely without arms and weapons. The Arabs attacked them. It was only by a miracle that the Jews survived and began to build their homeland.

In the State of Israel, democracy prevails. All citizens, Jews as well as non-Jews, enjoy full equality of rights.

The "Al Aqsa" mosque was burned by an Australian Christian who has freely admitted his guilt. To say that Jews seek now to build a Third Temple on that site is plain nonsense. Jewish tradition forbids the construction of such a Temple before the coming of the Messiah.

I appeal to Arab leaders and to the governments of the Arab States to let reason prevail and to treat the Arab-Jewish problem in the historic tradition of co-operation between Jews and Arabs. Let us return to the glorious past of peace and dignity, and solve our differences accordingly.

The People of the Bible, which was devastated by the holocaust of World War II and lost one-third its men, women, and children, wants peace. We have suffered enough from Genocide, from cruel and wanton murder, and we want only peace. The Psalms which are sacred to us and are also recognized by the Moslem tradition contained a beautiful expression of this wish (chapter 29, 10-11):

"The Lord sat enthroned at the flood;
Yea, the Lord sitteth as King for ever.
The Lord will give strength unto His people;
The Lord will bless His people with peace."

Even when a flood of hatred appears to engulf the world, the Lord sits as Supreme Judge over nations and the Jewish people appeal to Him for strength—not the strength of might and bloodshed, but the strength of peace.

Peace, the greatest blessing for Jews and Arabs alike, will be a blessing for all of mankind.

GRATEFUL FOR THE HIGHER EDUCATION ASSISTANCE ACT

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, as you know, Members of Congress are frequently criticized for their actions and words of praise and gratitude are few and far between. For this reason I wish to share with you and my colleagues in the House a portion of a letter I received recently from two parents who are extremely grateful for the Higher Education Assistance Act.

This letter was received from Mr. and Mrs. Michael F. Connolly of Portland, Maine, whose son has just entered Florida Southern College with the assistance of a student loan. Mr. and Mrs. Connolly ask the question:

Should we write to someone to express our gratitude—if so—who?

November 13, 1969

They go on to say:

We're making plans to go to Florida in four years to see him graduate, but meanwhile we want to thank whoever is responsible for this financial aid. Our whole economic situation would be shaky otherwise. Many thanks for your part in this educational program.

Since the Congress, through legislation, has made these loans available to students, I believe the Congress should share in this expression of thanks.

ON ENFRANCHISING THE DISENFRANCHISED

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the franchising industry has enjoyed a tremendous spurt of growth in the past few years. Why it was confined for so long to gasoline stations and soft drink bottling is hard to understand when the potential for growth was there all the time. However, about 10 years ago the sleeping giant came awake and started exploding into all the fields that are the traditional preserves of small business.

This was natural, of course; franchising is the easiest and most obvious means of establishing successful small businessmen. But I suspect that one of the factors leading to this sudden awakening, in California at least, was the entry into franchising at this time of a 30-year-old businessman named Al Lapin.

That first year—1961—his company confined itself to one endeavor, developing the International House of Pancakes business into a nationwide chain of outlets. But in succeeding years it rapidly diversified into home-equipment rentals; women's apparel shops; secretarial, data processing and accounting schools; refreshment centers and restaurants. This year it is acquiring a credit collection business, the first step toward establishing franchised credit collection offices throughout the country, and at least one operation will be franchised in Europe or the Far East.

The object of giving this thumbnail sketch is not simply to recount a Horatio Alger success story, but rather to draw a picture of an American with unusual drive and vision. It comes as no surprise, then, that when such a person focuses his attention on a social problem of great importance and concern to us all—racial strife—he would propose a program to help solve this problem which is at once both practical and visionary.

He started with the fact that I mentioned—that franchising is the easiest and most obvious means of establishing successful small businesses. He added to that the premise that racial inequality is directly related to economic inequality, and therefore the basic responsibility for solving our Nation's racial problems lies with the business community. As he said in a recent address outlining the program he has developed:

It doesn't take a sociologist to comprehend the effect of unemployment and underemployment on a black family living in a

squalid ghetto. The social impact is drastic and sweeping.

The program Mr. Lapin has developed for minority businessmen, called "Two Plus You," is built on the usual methods of franchising to start a small business, but is tailored to meet the special needs of black citizens—economic gaps, educational gaps, and social gaps between where they have been and where it is hoped they will be able to go.

The "Two" refers to the 2-percent downpayment black franchisee applicants will be required to make. This minimal downpayment recognizes the economic reality that normally a black applicant could never hope to raise the 60-percent downpayment required by the standard franchising contract. Additionally, the potential black businessman will have 10 years to repay an interest-free loan for the balance of the contract versus the standard 4½ years at 7.5 percent interest.

The "You," of course, is the black applicant with the potential—however undeveloped—to succeed in the business world. This is the heart of the program. After an initial screening of applicants neutrally designed to test aptitude—not educational levels—the applicant is carefully exposed to and immersed in a series of training experiences. Basically they are the same as for the ordinary franchisee but with greater emphasis on on-the-job training and greater availability of remedial training. Great flexibility is an essential of the program: the slower trainees may have their training programs extended; the faster may move on to night manager and assistant manager responsibilities.

During the entire program, the trainee is earning a good salary—high enough to put money aside to meet the 2-percent downpayment if he did not have it to begin with. If for any nonfinancial reason a trainee fails to qualify at the end of his apprenticeship, he is still the beneficiary of extensive training and is able to qualify for a skilled position with opportunities for advancement at the franchise level or within the parent company itself.

What follows the successful training period is almost the most significant part of the whole program. At this point, the company has underwritten the trainee to a considerable extent, and is prepared to continue to do so for another 10 years. The performance of the black franchisee now becomes a straight business proposition. To succeed, he must have the same points going for him as any other franchisee, white or black. Therefore, the new black businessman will not be located in the middle of a ghetto which usually cannot generate sufficient sales to cover costs and return a fair profit, but rather will be located in whatever area the company's marketing research indicates gives him the best chance to succeed. In most cases, this means in traditionally white neighborhoods.

I have indicated that location of the business is motivated primarily by business considerations. But with the vision you would expect, Mr. Lapin sees a plus that goes far beyond business considera-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tions. As he put it when he introduced this program:

We are all familiar with the Iron Curtain of Europe. But we often fail to recognize the Black Curtain, or more appropriately the Ghetto Wall, that tends to stifle and seal off Black Americans from the mainstream of our society . . . Our hope at International [Industries] is that we can help break down this wall.

Mr. Speaker, no program, however altruistically conceived, has a chance to help solve the complex and deep-seated problems of racial injustice in this country unless it is based on a full understanding of the nature and scope of the problem. I have called this program to your attention because of its clear understanding of the social and economic realities faced by disenfranchised black Americans. If this example is followed throughout the country, we can at last start to break down the artificial wall based solely on skin pigmentation which has separated one American from another throughout our history.

THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is always refreshing and gratifying to read the words of a constituent who finds new meaning and inspiration in "The American Way of Life."

Such words have been set down by Henry G. Mazlen, of Brooklyn, N.Y., in an essay entitled "The American Way of Life," which he has submitted for a 1969 Freedom Foundations Award. Its message has meaning for all Americans. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

(By Henry G. Mazlen)

The American Way of Life rests on the firm foundation of Jefferson's philosophy. It means freedom of the person, the mind and the spirit. As early as 1638, the Reverend Thomas Hooker of Massachusetts preached, ". . . the foundation of authority is laid, firstly in the free consent of the people." Our Constitution gives us the right to speak our thoughts or to publish them within the legal constraints we have ourselves imposed governing libel and slander. Without the laws and the courts we established by our own consent there would be neither law nor order. The civilized society our forebears envisioned has become part of the American Way of Life.

The American Way of Life continually reminds us of the heritage which makes us our own masters. Men of good will, in the tens of millions, cast off the shackles of bondage, took their worldly goods and their families and found sanctuary on our shores. This exodus remains unequalled in all recorded history. Here they found no iron curtains of barbaric terrorism, no psychological disintegration. With their experiences behind them they forged unbreakable bonds in our Shield of Liberty. From the heterogeneity of cultures that blended over the centuries, there has emerged a people who

made the great wilderness blossom, who cut the timber, laid the rails, dug the ores, set up the oil rigs, tended the blast furnaces—and with hand and heart constructed that unique economic covenant of free enterprise that is the mainstay of the American Way of Life.

The American Way of Life reflects a land of irrepressible minds and indomitable spirits; a land of courage, creativity and enterprise. We know what freedom of person really means to the law-abiding citizen. We go wherever it is our pleasure; to seek work and find it where it exists; to compete for the opportunities of business as our individual capabilities permit; to be scholars or artists or scientists. Ours is the right to live in peace in the community of our own choosing without fear. Ours is the right to conform or not to conform—as we please. Nobody can force us to eat the same food, wear the same clothes, read the same newspapers, attend the same church. It is this freedom of individual choice which makes our elections so entrancing to those who still live under the thumbs of despots. Unquestionably, it is a major facet of the American Way of Life.

It is the American Way of Life for any citizen to achieve the best education the nation has to offer; to aspire to any public office and to attain such objective on one's merits. We are what we choose to make of our ourselves with the gifts our Maker gave us. Aware of these blessings of freedom, we are not indifferent to the needs of those less fortunate than ourselves. Americans are the most charitable people in the world. Time and again, we have proved it by giving unselfishly of our productivity, of our incomes of our flesh and blood—to countless millions far removed from our shores. This too is the American Way of Life.

Amidst the threatening images of a world of confused human relations we are an island of refuge. In the midst of international unrest, aggression, power plays and political intrigues beyond belief we stand ready to hold out our hands to the enslaved and bewildered. The future is brightly promising on issues which require the insight, patience and perseverance of intelligent peoples the world over. The freedoms which are our birthrights require vigilant protection against abuse. In truth, we do not stand alone; but that is small consolation in the face of tenacious malevolent forces which have sapped our economic strength and taken the lives of thousands of our finest young men over the past two decades. In the United Nations we have many sympathizers. Gradually, it is our hope, humanization will be the key to ultimate agreement among peoples with divergent ideologies. Gradually, collective bargaining will become the only method used for the solution of difficult international problems. Primarily, that is why the home of the United Nations is in the United States, in our largest metropolis—where representatives and visitors from other lands can see in operation and learn to understand the many shining facets of the American Way of Life.

The stupendously dramatic impact of Apollo 11's achievement makes all earlier technological feats seem almost insignificant. No revolutionary event which altered the course of history can claim man's imagination as this encounter with the forbidding surface of the moon. Reverberations have been started in the depths of men's souls which must now echo through eternity. We may well wonder whether the moon landing will help to instill or restore faith in the free enterprise system where it was either abandoned, or just not heretofore possible. We may well wonder if it has not produced an undercurrent of belated respect for the American Way of Life among peoples propagandized for generations against it.

Perhaps America needed this wonderful feat to bring some recalcitrant nations into closer idealistic rapport. It is indeed a form of political ratiocination which works in our favor as long as we out-do. For this reason alone we cannot brook failure of our goals. We are now committed to still greater efforts in space exploration. It is the American Way of Life. Godspeed!

NEW GLORY TO OLD GLORIES

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Coordinating Council of Metropolitan Nashville-Davidson County, which is my congressional district, recently sponsored a Veterans Day essay competition.

The results of this competition have been announced, and I have been impressed with the excellence—and the number—of the entries in this most worthy project.

The council is under the chairmanship of Maj. Gen. William R. Douglas, who serves as the very capable assistant adjutant general of Tennessee, along with the council directors, Allen Cornelius and Benton Crump.

There were 10 finalists in this essay contest, and each deserves recognition:

Miss Barbara Bowden, an 11th grade student at Donelson High School, was the second place winner.

Miss Nancy Johnson, a senior at Hillsboro High School, was the third place winner.

Miss Mary Jane Jordan, a senior at St. Bernard Academy, was the fourth place winner.

Miss Sharon McRedmond, of St. Bernard Academy, was the fifth place winner.

Other finalists included:

Miss Pamela Browne, an 11th grade student at St. Bernard Academy; Miss Kathleen Chatham, a senior at Stratford High School; Miss Marian Meredith Cox, a senior at Hillsboro High School; Miss Rita Fitzgerald, an 11th grade student at St. Bernard Academy; and Miss Maureen Jameson, an 11th grade student at St. Bernard Academy.

The winner was Miss Pat McNellis, a sophomore at St. Bernard Academy, and her essay, entitled "New Glory to Old Glories," is outstanding. At a time when there are deep divisions in our Nation and doubts of our purpose in various parts of the world, it is deeply gratifying to read such thoughts from one of our children who, with her prose, rekindles a spirit of patriotism and expresses with eloquence the sense of "glory" each of us has in being an American.

It is a distinct pleasure to share with my fellow Members of the Congress these thoughts, and I know that all of you join with me in extending congratulations to Miss McNellis for her award-winning essay, "New Glory to Old Glories."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The text of the essay follows:

NEW GLORY TO OLD GLORIES
(By Pat McNellis)

An uproar of cheer rose in the control room of Cape Kennedy. Hands were shaken, backs clapped, and a long round of hugs and tears encircled the occupants. The panel screen showed a flag. The American Flag standing erect on the moon's surface, and the proud grins of our astronauts alongside. Someone in the crowd whispered, "Thank God, America, we have done it!" Yes, we have done it . . . but wait a minute, what have we done? Why have we done it? I think I am confused.

The moon does not belong to America, it does not have to. She has set a path, opened a new door on progress, a progress to be shared by all nations, all peoples as brothers. Now, more so than ever, she has gained new respect, New Glory. But can you set an age on glory? Does glory achieved a hundred years ago die or become "old glory"? No. It is relived over and over, and fifty years from the present we will not want to call the first flag staked on the moon an "old glory" . . . it, like all others, shall remain new.

You have seen the kind of shape in which glory can come. But what is the recipe? What makes up "glory"? It does not just happen. Glory begins with a new idea, a flicker of hope toward a new horizon. Next comes the body, a group of men willing to sacrifice and suffer, to know that once they begin even hell cannot bar their way . . . and there you have it. This is only the foundation, of course, but on it all glory is constructed.

Glory is usually recognized in the United States with a medal, a document, a picture or notice of some sort. But this leaves us with quite a bit that is not acknowledged . . . and we can only begin to realize that it is the *glory* that is "glory" and not the recognition.

A young man clutches his gun between two mounds of dirt, and his mind wanders . . . four months of constant fighting, dirt, wounds, not many letters . . . tears form in the corners of his eyes. He recalls the words of the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy, ". . . Mankind must put an end to war; or war will put an end to mankind . . ." They echo and drift away. A tear etched a path down his grimy winced cheek. Even a brave man cries, and there is no medal for his loneliness, but there is glory; perhaps unnoticed by many, but it shines more brilliantly than *any* medal. He waits, alone, in his glory.

"I pledge allegiance to the flag . . .", young crisp voices rang out in the open lot. VISTA volunteers and the children of a poverty stricken area raised their eyes to the American flag. Some of the children had never seen an American flag nor heard the Pledge of Allegiance until a few months before, yet they were Americans, and their American brothers brought it to them. The volunteers roomed in the area and slept on hard mats, and the pay was paltry . . . but the smiles, oh! those smiles are the grandest. These are Americans; this is glory.

I could go on telling you more of glory, for America has a thousand beautiful tales of glory. Look around you, is glory so scarce that the only means of finding it is to have me tell you about it, need you hunt for glory? Certainly not; you're an American, you live glory. Even the fact that I can write these very words on this paper with no fear for my life or loss of rights is glorious, for not so far away any material such as this is banned and citizens dare not object.

America cannot set an ultimate for herself in glory, she will surpass this and reach heights and glories never imagined. This is Glory!

November 13, 1969

THE NEW FIORELLO H. LA GUARDIA HIGH SCHOOL OF MUSIC AND ARTS

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the High School of Music and Art, which in 1936 opened its doors to offer special opportunities to New York City's boys and girls to develop their ability in the arts while pursuing academic high school studies, was characterized by the late Mayor La Guardia as "the most hopeful accomplishment of my administration." I am happy to report to the Senate that this school now bears the name of the man who, after serving with distinction for many years in the House of Representatives, gave New York City 12 years of the type of government which has since stood as the model for Mayor John V. Lindsay's administration and of what an outstanding municipal administration should and can be.

On October 17, 1969, a special program was held at the school's auditorium in upper Manhattan to mark the change of the name of the High School of Music and Art and the High School of Performing Arts to the Fiorello H. La Guardia High School of Music and the Arts. At this ceremony, Mrs. Marie La Guardia, his widow, unveiled a head of Mayor La Guardia by the distinguished sculptor Luis Sanguino, which was donated to the school by the Port of New York Authority. Participants in the program included President Joseph A. Monserrat of the board of education; Judge Eugene R. Canudo, chairman of the La Guardia Memorial Association, who stated:

When one recalls La Guardia's pride in his native city, his keen appreciation of the arts, and particularly his warm affection for all young people, it is easy to understand why the creation of this wonderful institution of learning meant so much to him.

And Mayor John V. Lindsay, who said:

This high school was one of La Guardia's proudest achievements. He believed in it, he fought for it; and he got it. In dedicating it to his memory—in giving it his name—we merely ratify the past. For this has always been the Fiorello H. La Guardia High School.

The first principal of this extraordinary school and the author of the book "Accent on Talent," which tells the story of its establishment and its first quarter century, Dr. Benjamin Steigman, was introduced by Principal Richard A. Klein with these words:

The man who is the embodiment of the soul of music and art—the man who devoted his life to the fulfillment of the dream of a school for the musically or artistically gifted youngster—and the man who skillfully steered the course of this pioneering school from its inception and for 22 years beyond is seated on this platform for the first time since his retirement in 1959.

The following are Dr. Steigman's remarks:

If in a remembrance of Fiorello La Guardia's New York there seems to be an analogy with New York today, it's to be taken here as coincidence, and not as a political gambit.

When La Guardia was elected Mayor 36 years ago, New York was in serious trouble—financial and administrative trouble—after many preceding years of mismanagement. The voters had lost faith in the organized political parties, and when La Guardia ran as an independent candidate, he was enthusiastically elected. And he was reelected twice so that he might complete the work he had begun in his first term.

That work gave him precious few hours for himself. Of these, as many as possible were given to music. He loved music. His father was a band conductor. Fiorello learned to play the trumpet. His school program didn't include music, no credit was given for music, and that was one of the things he found wrong with our schools.

And so when he became Mayor, despite the many complex problems he faced, he had a high school of music and art established.

He kept a watchful, an affectionate eye on the school. "It's my baby," he would say. At competitions in music and art with other schools he beamed with pride when we took prizes, as we generally did. And when we didn't he'd shake a pudgy finger at us. If we got into any trouble—we sometimes did—he'd bawl us out, like any good parent. When he cooled, he showed he loved us.

There was the time when three editors of our school paper decided they must have a front page editorial from the Mayor that very day, to meet their deadline the next day. So that evening they went to the Mayor's home. He wasn't in. He was busy at City Hall. They decided to wait for him in the lobby. At one o'clock in the morning the Mayor found them there. He gave them a tongue-lashing, told them to go home and go to bed. "And report tomorrow morning at nine in my office at City Hall! You'll get all that's coming to you!" he added.

The three editors were there, at nine o'clock, shaking at the knees. The Mayor's frown changed to a grin. He dug into his pocket. "Here's your editorial. Now hurry back to school. If your teacher marks you late, say you had business to attend to at City Hall."

He would bring the school gifts to show his interest in us. Paintings presented to him at City Hall by foreign dignitaries found their way to the walls of our school.

A police sergeant on motorcycle would come dashing up St. Nicholas Terrace with a sheaf of tickets for our senior class for Carnegie Hall where Toscanini was to conduct the Philharmonic in Beethoven's Ninth. He'd send a chamber orchestra, or a famous choral group up here to our auditorium, for a rehearsal before our entire assembly, with Fiorello La Guardia an enthusiastic listener sitting among the students in the audience. Once, I remember, the bell rang at the end of the period, but it was in the middle of the concert. La Guardia raised his hand. "Mr. Principal," he said, "may we stay here instead of going up to classes, so we can hear the rest of the program?" You should have heard the applause he got. When the applause was over he said slyly to the students: "I'm sure it isn't because you're trying to escape a math or a French exam."

He understood music. He had a newly discovered Haydn symphony given its first performance in this auditorium. He introduced it at our assembly, he explained how the symphony was discovered and what its musical value was. An extraordinary tribute to La Guardia's love of music appeared the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

morning after his reelection in 1941. On election night a candidate for office usually sits nervously watching the returns. La Guardia spent it listening to an orchestral rehearsal in empty Carnegie Hall. The next morning a large picture appeared in The New York Times of Bruno Walter rehearsing the Philharmonic—with all the seats in Carnegie Hall empty except one—occupied by La Guardia.

Of the many gifts La Guardia sent the school the most memorable stands out there in our entrance hall: the bust of Toscanini by sculptor Ruotolo. He had it brought here, said La Guardia, to be a tribute to what excellence means. As such we hope it will be there as long as our school endures.

And now this message to our Mayor:

When this high school was established it was an uncertain experiment. There was no precedent for such a school, combining the development of talent in music or art with a full academic program. With the success the school has had, it has outgrown the limitations of this building for music and art. And the additional arts that have since become part of the school's program—the arts of the dance and the theatre arts—these are really in desperate need of new quarters. These added arts are still housed in a dilapidated old building on West 46th Street. That building should have been razed twenty years ago. The building is an alarming fire hazard, plagued with rats, lacking decent sanitary conveniences. It hasn't a lunchroom, the students must eat their lunch in the halls, or—weather permitting—on their shabby street between Sixth and Seventh Avenue.

The boys and girls who have put up with these deplorable conditions are exceptionally talented in their fields. They and their teachers have been praised by outstanding leaders in the arts of the dance and of the theatre. A group of them have joined us here today. They and their devoted teachers are deserving of something better from our city than the disheartening building they still have to use.

Now when President Eisenhower ten years ago broke ground, for what is now Lincoln Center, the plans were for erecting there not only the Metropolitan Opera, the Philharmonic, the two theatres and the music Library, but the plans were also to include Juilliard and also the new building for the greater High School of Music and the Arts. Juilliard's 30 million dollar building was opened, as you know, two weeks ago. There is no sign there of the planned new building for this school.

A site has been reserved there for it—across the street from the rear of the Metropolitan Opera building, on Amsterdam Avenue between 64th and 65th Streets. That block is still untouched after ten years. The architects, Belluschi and Westermann, who designed the splendid Juilliard building, designed at the same time their splendid plans for this school. Mr. Mayor, without your help the architects' plans are likely to remain on paper—indefinitely.

When La Guardia left City Hall he said this school was the most hopeful achievement of his administration.

We hope our Mayor—over whose desk there hangs, appropriately, the portrait of La Guardia—when he leaves City Hall (hopefully in the distant future) will then have cause to say the same about his achievement of the greater, rebuilt, Fiorello H. La Guardia High School of Music and the Arts.

Dr. Steigman's remarks were followed by Mayor Lindsay's assurance that the current status of the plans gives every indication of "full speed ahead" for the construction of this modern educational facility to carry on, in expanded form, this fine contribution to the cultural life of New York City.

PROBLEMS OF THE FOOTWEAR INDUSTRY

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the U.S. Congress three articles written by Mr. Philip Balboni of the United Press International on the subject of the problems faced by the footwear industry. It is very apparent that Mr. Balboni made a thorough investigation into this matter and he reveals many facts.

These articles appeared in the Quincy Patriot Ledger on November 5, 6, and 7 this year.

The articles are as follows:

[From the Quincy Patriot Ledger, Nov. 5, 1969]

NEW ENGLAND SHOE INDUSTRY IN DEEP TROUBLE

(By Philip Balboni)

PITTSFIELD, N.H.—The New England shoe industry is sick, dying, many believe.

HEADED FOR COLLAPSE

Heavy with the weight of its many problems, suffering from the effects of old age and exhausted from a battle for survival with constantly increasing imports, the shoe industry in New England and in many other parts of the nation, as textiles before it, appears headed for a collapse.

Few in the industry any longer can find the basis for hope in the future. Most of those who do look to Washington and the Congress for some assistance which, if it comes (and it is not at all likely), may come too late.

Others, the giants of the shoe industry, have found strength through diversifying operations, becoming importers themselves and by fleeing the Northeast for the South or Puerto Rico where cheap labor is still available.

How did one of the nation's oldest and proudest industries with a history dating from only nine years after the Pilgrims landed in 1620 arrive at such a dismal condition? And why did New England's approximately 220 shoe manufacturers who produce one-third of all the shoes in the United States allow themselves to travel to the brink of a major collapse?

PRICE WAR

The answers are not easy to find. Basically, however, it is now a price war between imported and domestic shoes and the spiraling cost of labor in an affluent society. Wages cost the manufacturer 30 to 40 per cent of production cost of a pair of shoes.

American manufacturers say they cannot compete with Europe and Asia where wages are one-fourth and less than paid in this country and which allow imports to sell for 25 to 40 per cent cheaper than domestic shoes, even after shipping and other costs are deducted.

Also, there has been the great battle of style as fashion-wise foreigners enticed American consumers with more appealing shoes. But the importance of the style factor seems to have declined considerably in the last three years and most directly affects high price shoes which make up the smallest proportion of the imports. More than 50 per cent of the imports sell for \$10 or less and U.S. producers say they simply cannot make shoes this cheaply with wages as high as they are.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

New England is the hardest-hit region of the country because its wages are the highest and because 90 per cent of its shoe factories are small to medium in size, employing 500 workers or less. In addition, the majority of New England plants are makers of women's shoes, a market in which imports have soared to the point where in 1968 they equaled 80 per cent of domestic production.

OLD-FASHIONED FACILITIES

Finally, many factories in the region are old and badly in need of modernizing. Yet given the constant rise in imports and dwindling orders from wholesalers, many manufacturers either are unwilling or afraid to invest in new plants or are unable to convince banks, already hard pressed from all sectors of an inflated economy, to loan them the money.

An example of these problems can be found in the gently rolling hills of this rural New Hampshire community where the Pittsfield Shoe Corp. is fighting a not altogether successful battle for survival.

With 400 employees in a modern plant using the best available and most modern equipment, Pittsfield Shoe like most other New England factories constitutes the economic life-blood of this small town. Only this spring Arthur Hershberg, president, was forced to close a subsidiary plant in nearby Newmarket because of import competition. He opened the plant seven years ago when it appeared business was expanding.

Hershberg hopes to hold the line in Pittsfield, but admits his business is operating at a loss this fall. But he learned from his experience in Newmarket.

"We saw the percentage of imports increasing and we decided to close. Our customers told us not to expect the normal number of orders. They advised us we better make plans not to expect as much business in the future," he said.

"Our workers have expressed a very serious concern about the future. What will happen to Pittsfield if the plant closes? That is what really bothers me."

GROWING FAILURES

If Hershberg's plant closes, it will join a dismal and growing catalogue of failures: 18 so far this year in New England; 16 shoe plants closed their doors in 1968, 15 in Massachusetts, the nation's second largest shoe producing state and until two years ago No. 1 in the country.

But what is happening in Massachusetts, Maine (4th in the nation) and New Hampshire (6th) is only part of a nationwide phenomenon.

The total number of shoe companies declined from 900 in 1968 to 700 last year or a drop of 22 per cent. What is even more significant is that for the first time in history there were few companies entering the business; only two new plants opened in New England this year.

While over-all shoe production in the United States grew only 10 per cent in the 10 years between 1958-68, from 587 million pairs to 646 million, imported footwear was up an incredible 643 per cent from 23.6 million pairs in 1958 to 175.4 million last year.

Today, one in every four pairs of shoes bought in this country is imported.

According to latest figures, the trend is worsening in 1969. During the first seven months of this year, U.S. manufacturers produced 10 per cent fewer shoes than during the same period of 1968, while imports grew 13 per cent.

LOW WAGE RATES

Most of the increase was accounted for by Spain and Taiwan where wage rates are the lowest of any shoe exporting nation—about 50 cents an hour. In this country, wages average \$2.71 an hour, including fringe benefits, and \$2.86 an hour in New England where shoe workers are generally the best paid in the nation.

It is estimated that by 1975 imports will reach 90 per cent of domestic production or more than 460 million pairs, which means that there will be one pair of imported shoes on the shelf for every American pair.

Maxwell Field, executive vice president of the New England Footwear Association and also of the American Footwear Manufacturers Association, recently told his members in a confidential memorandum:

"It is imperative that you make every possible saving now in the cost of operating your business—by increasing efficiency and technical improvements, by greater productivity and by even more styles, if called for."

"Cutting down the time of operations to speed up deliveries to customers is a major competitive weapon to fight imports," Field wrote.

This message certainly has not been lost on men like Arthur Hershberg. "Until we were hit between the eyes by imports, we really didn't realize what was happening. There was a very rapid change, an explosion almost. But we have a young, aggressive organization. We hope to be one of the survivors."

[From the Quincy Patriot Ledger, Nov. 6, 1969]

AVON AGAINST STOUGHTON: SHOE MANUFACTURERS VERSUS SHOE IMPORTERS

(By Philip Balboni)

AVON.—The Victory Shoe Co. moved out of what its president called a "hellhole" two years ago and into the first modern shoe factory to be built in the Brockton area in 60 years.

BLEAK FUTURE

Today the company is suffering so seriously from import competition that it has lost \$875,000 in business from only six of its customers. The future, says Herbert Nagle, president, is bleak.

The manufacturer of medium priced men's shoes, Victory is among scores of New England shoe plants struggling to survive in an industry which each year since the 1950s has watched an ever-increasing share of its business gobbled up by the major shoe exporting nations of Italy, Spain, Japan and Taiwan.

"Our business was built over the years with wholesalers, volume dealers, and for a variety of reasons in 1967 we decided to move from Brockton to a new plant," Nagle explained. "Our business when we moved had a fairly sizeable profit margin."

"When the decision was made, we were aware of imports. We knew they were here, and were going to stay."

TREMENDOUS IMPACT

"Since then the impact of imports has been so tremendous that our whole method of doing business, our whole concept of merchandising, has changed. We want to get out of the wholesaling business and sell directly to retailers. A wholesaler now says to us, 'Why am I bothering with Victory Shoe? I can buy a pair of shoes from Italy and Spain for \$3.50, so why should I pay Victory \$5?'

"Nagle has a modern plant with semiautomated equipment, the best now possible in the shoe industry which demands time-consuming labor. He says he is doing everything possible to compete with imports: streamlining and modernizing his operations, improving his merchandising and switching to a higher quality shoe. Nevertheless, he is convinced that without large-scale help from the federal government, there is little hope for survival beyond the next two years.

"When I made up my mind to move, I sank everything into a growing American population and tried to perpetuate a family business which made American shoes for American people. We took our people out of a hellhole and gave them a place to work with conditions they deserve," he said.

Much of the criticism of the shoe industry from importers and others claim that the

November 13, 1969

American manufacturers cannot compete because their operations are archaic and inefficient. The experience at Victory at least puts the lie to that argument. The problem here is not a failure to modernize, but simply the lack of business which has gone to imports because of lower price.

TURNED TO IMPORTING

Victory Shoe is only several miles away from the nation's largest importer of men's shoes, Verde Inc. of Stoughton, whose elegantly attired and knowledgeable president, Robert S. Green, once operated a shoe factory himself in Brockton before turning to the vastly more profitable business of importing.

"We would like nothing better than to be able to sell shoes made by American manufacturers," Green writes in an advertisement. "They would, however, have to give us what we need. That is, what we could sell, and what the public wants. Unfortunately, they have not been able to do this. It is sadly acknowledged that domestic footwear has generally been at a styling standstill."

Later he says of the fashion revolution in America, "Pioneers of the importing industry saw limitless sales potential in imports and have been proven right. It's largely a question of style. Imports seem to have it, people seem to want it."

There is no doubt that Green knows the ins and outs of fashion. His showroom at Verde's ultramodern plant boasts more than 150 pairs of beautiful shoes from Italy, Spain and England.

"The consumer would be the loser in the long run if there were restrictions on imports," Green says, and his display would appear to back him up.

But Nagle points out, "Sure we were complacent about style. Sure we were behind the times. But not today. We're right on top." And the quality and style in his shoes would seem to bear him out.

Of course, both men are right, at least partially. The problem, however, essentially is that Green can buy shoes in Europe for much less, because of the much cheaper labor market, than Nagle can make them in this country. Even assuming that comparable shoes in style are being made in this country, and there is every indication that they now are, it seems unlikely that Green or any other importer would reject the 20 to 40 per cent greater profits available in buying foreign shoes over U.S. products.

SEES EVENTUAL DEATH

Green believes that the small American manufacturer will eventually die out. "I believe the reason why the small manufacturer has been able to do a job in New England is on individual skill. But mass production will be a reality before too long. This will completely take out the individual skill and craftsmanship once necessary. These small factories are going to go anyway. They failed to modernize, to keep up with the trends," Green said.

But Herb Nagle refuses to be written off. He demands government help in restricting imports, whether it is done voluntarily by the exporting nations or by order of Congress.

"We feel we should be allowed to exist in a suitable, equitable quota framework," Nagle said. "I question if our senators and congressmen know what will happen if our industry is allowed to be destroyed."

"Our legislators have to take a look at the shoe industry and determine where we are going to fit in, if we are going to fit in. If something isn't done about the imports, the effect will be so catastrophic in the New England area that our senators and congressmen will suddenly find themselves saying with all these people out of work, 'What happened?'"

Nagle's brother-in-law, Norman Leiber, who helps run the business, was bitter about federal government inaction. He explained that two years ago the Defense Department sent Victory Shoe a telegram "demanding that we

bid on combat boots for the Vietnam War or lose our other business."

WILL BE GONE

"So we bid on them. We made them because it was an emergency. Now that the emergency is over the same government says the hell with you. This is the same government that wants to wash out the industry. They'll be sending the telegram again, but there'll be nobody left to receive them," Leiber said.

"Somebody has to wake up down there in Washington and answer the question: Is the industry important enough to survive? Unless something comes along, a hell of a big windfall, we're not going to come home," Nagle interjected.

And Leiber said, "We as an industry, we as victory shoes, we can prove that we have been damaged to the Nth degree and we want reparations. We deserve it. We as citizens. We can prove irreparable damage."

"The government pays farmers in Maine to throw potatoes down the river and farmers in the Midwest to do the same thing. They can pay us too. They need us. We want grants to offset the effect of imports. We're entitled to grants."

And Nagle said, "We are operating at a loss right now because we can't get the volume due to imports. We have to break our backs to get an order now. We can't afford to do this much longer. There isn't a vendor who doesn't come through this plant that doesn't say, 'What is happening to this industry? I travel from Maine to Connecticut and everywhere I go there's no business.'

"It's a question of becoming a friend or foe to our political representatives now. The only help we get is government help," Nagle concluded.

[From the Quincy Patriot Ledger,
Nov. 7, 1969]

POOR PROSPECTS FOR SHOE INDUSTRY PROSPERITY

(By Philip Balboni)

HAVERHILL.—Warren M. Weitzman has been making quality shoes for women for 10 years. Once he rode a small wave of prosperity, but today Weitzman says he probably would lock up his factory if he and his brother were not still young and determined to preserve a business handed down by their father.

SCANNING THE HORIZON

"If we were a public corporation with no feeling, we would probably close down in a year or maybe six months," says Weitzman, president of Seymour Shoes Inc. "Being a family business, we will stick it out and wait for a break."

"I care too much for my workers to brazenly stick the key in the door and lock up the plant."

But in scanning the horizon of the New England shoe industry and listening to the predictions of business, labor and government, several conclusions seem inescapable:

The decline will continue among the small to medium-sized firms which constitute 90 per cent of New England's 220 shoe factories.

Imports which already have soared to the point where they account for nearly one-third of the U.S. market will continue to bulge.

The top 50 shoe companies, including the handful of giant corporations which now control 50 per cent of the market leaving the remainder to about 650 shoe firms, will pick up the spoils as smaller plants close down.

CRAFTSMAN REPLACED

The individual craftsmanship which has characterized the industry since its inception in 1629 in Salem will be replaced by out-and-out mass production to avoid the increasing labor costs which have made competition with imports almost impossible.

Government will take no effective action

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

while it continues to bemoan the demise of the shoe industry which provides nearly 7,000 jobs in New England.

Each given the determination of men like Weitzman to survive, one has only to look around this once great shoe capital to see written in idle factories and idle workers the decline of the New England shoe industry and the death of the best intentions to save it.

Maxwell Field of Boston is one of the best informed men in the shoe industry in America today. He is executive vice president of the New England Footwear Association and of the American Footwear Manufacturers Association. His analysis of industry problems and prospects is grim.

"We are hurting. We are evangelical almost that government help is the only way to save the industry. We are hoping that other companies in the meantime can really gird their loins and tighten up," he said.

"Our industry is in 1969 at the lowest level in a decade in production, and it is losing employment month by month. A delay in a favorable decision by the Administration to give our industry quota relief leaves most manufacturers in the position to decide: 1. to cease operations entirely; 2. to curtail operations to meet lower demand from customers; 3. in order to continue to compete with domestic and foreign producers to install every possible labor-saving device in the market.

OUTLOOK FOR 1970'S

"The outlook in the 70's unless effective quota measures are instituted to limit or restrict the volume of imports is for fewer manufacturers and reduced employment in the industry," Field said.

"As this trend of decreased output and employment and lower profit margins continues for the footwear industry, similar conditions will prevail among the hundreds of additional plants affecting thousands of additional workers in our supplier companies such as shoe machinery, leather tanning and the manufacturers of such items used in shoe production as threads, heels, laces, linings. Further, each community where plants are located will lose business in all activities and services," he concluded.

The forecast of a leading labor figure, James A. DeRosa, executive vice president of the United Shoe Workers of America, AFL-CIO, was no brighter. His union represents 10,000 shoe workers in New England.

"These plants trying to survive have two choices: sell out or get squeezed out. It's a slow death just waiting for the small ones to die out. There'll be enough business left for the big ones," DeRosa said.

Predicting more factory closings, production slowdowns and more strikes in the months ahead, DeRosa said, "During the past 15 years these companies have exhausted all of their competitive strength. Now they are folding. These little fellas can import shoes if they want but as far as making them, they can't stay with it. The big boys, they'll be the ones in business," he said.

INACTION ANGERS

DeRosa is skeptical about help from the federal government in controlling imports and angry about inaction in the past.

"They (the lawmakers) are just going to let the industry decay, rot away. The manufacturers are on the skids and the people in Washington, instead of putting grease on the skids, should put some sand on to slow it down.

"If I had a son or daughter, I wouldn't put them in a shoe factory. Why should a young person put his career in a sick industry, that's the word for it, a sick industry," DeRosa concluded.

Government, while not as alarmist about the problems of the shoe industry has undeniably aggravated the situation by its inability to provide assistance.

Yet government's concern is everywhere evident. On the state level the governors of the three most seriously affected New England states—Francis W. Sargent of Massachusetts, Walter Peterson of New Hampshire and Kenneth M. Curtis of Maine—have expressed their concern using terms such as "catastrophic" and "tragic."

But there is little state government can do except chronicle the decline. Carroll P. Sheehan, Massachusetts commissioner of commerce and development, says, "The state can't subsidize one industry. We just don't have that kind of money. And if we did it for one, how could we turn down the others who asked for help?"

Here in Haverhill, where 70 percent of the city's manufacturing forces is dependent on the shoe industry, Mayor James Waldron says that without some control of imported shoes, "You will eventually see the city of Haverhill and other such cities bankrupt without the necessary payroll to support its citizens and its public activities."

BACK TO FEDS

So the problem is thrown back to the federal government.

Currently there are two bills in the Senate, the Orderly Marketing Act and the Hollings-Cotton Bill, and two companion measures in the House, all of which are designed to fix a mandatory quota on shoe imports.

Informed observers in Washington and New England give these bills little chance at passage. First, they must get out of committee, and they never have. Second, they must win passage on the floor, and it is felt there are too many "free traders" left in the Congress to allow that.

The only other hope in Washington is for negotiation with the major shoe exporting nations of Japan, Spain, Italy and Taiwan to place voluntary quotas on shoes. To that end, 66 senators and 330 congressmen signed a petition to President Nixon and a large delegation met with the President in September to ask him to negotiate voluntary agreements. He promised his assistance and voiced his concern over the plight of the industry.

At least publicly, however, the Administration has done nothing to date. And again informed observers say the President, like the Congress, will duck the issue for fear of setting a precedent for textile and steel interests which long have sought import controls.

Sen. Thomas J. McIntyre, D-N.H., who is as concerned as anyone in the Congress about the shoe industry, has held hearings before his subcommittee on small business but by his own admission, they were as much "to keep the issue alive as anything else."

Where does this leave men like Warren Weitzman who wants to continue making a living manufacturing shoes?

"I'm 33 and my brother is 28. There's nobody younger in the business. We've got lots of years ahead of us. If I were 60 and had lots of money in the bank, I might not care as much about making it go. As it is, I believe we're going to be here in the years to come. But we may not be as financially sound."

PATRIOTISM PROCLAMATION

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Juanne L. Dalton is a truly exceptional American. She is the wife of a serviceman in Vietnam and her perspective relates to the very foundation of our country. She authored the following docu-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ment, which I commend to the attention of my colleagues.

Mrs. Dalton's effort is designed to support the Commander in Chief, our President, in his effort to bring us together again. Her wish is to make this country, in this age, truly the "United" States of America, a nation under God.

The document follows:

PATRIOTISM PROCLAMATION

(By Mrs. Juanne L. Dalton)

John F. Kennedy: "And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country. My fellow citizens of the world, ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man."

We hereby state our intent to support, uphold and defend our government—those elected officials and representatives who represent us, our fellow men and our country.

We believe we should channel any suggestions, protests and differences of opinions through the same democratic manner as our forefathers did. We recognize that "United we stand, divided we fall". And furthermore, we feel that the majority must govern, not the minority, as has been the case recently in so many instances. We offer our renewed and continued allegiance to God, under whom this country was founded.

We shall not and will not, tolerate the actions of those among us that would attempt to circumvent law and order, desecrate, destroy, vilify, agitate, pit us one against the other, ruin, overthrow, devastate, or in any manner cause harm to our country or our fellow man. We serve notice to all that we will with all the lawful means at our disposal, stand up to, resist, refuse to allow this destruction.

We deplore the sickness of spirit that is indicated in apathy, indifference, intolerance, prejudice, and exploitation of youth, for we recognize that our country need not fear the enemy without, but rather the enemy that is within our very confines. We need to renew our courage, determination, concern, intestinal fortitude, and faith.

Furthermore, we would remind all that our country—richest of all nations—was founded on strength, not permissiveness, and with faith in God, supported by Him. We can hope to endure only as long as this faith continues. We believe in freedom of religion, rather than freedom from religion, as some would have it.

II Chronicles 7:14 expresses our conviction of what America needs: "If my people who are called by my name, humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then I will hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin and heal their land."

UKRAINIANS OF NORTH DAKOTA SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT'S VIETNAM POLICY

HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include the following copy of a letter I received from Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., State Branch of North Dakota. I believe it is important that we listen to those who know the true meaning of Communist aggression. Also, I believe we can regard this as one of the many expressions of the "silent majority."

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States of America,
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Speaking on behalf of over 25,000 Americans of Ukrainian ancestry in North Dakota I am honored to present to you our full support for your Vietnam policy.—We stand beside you as our elected President in your efforts to secure a just and lasting peace.

After your historical speech last week I have been in attendance at many meetings of American-Ukrainian communities and I can assure you that you have 100% support of our people. No doubt you know Ukraine, country of our ancestors was the first victim of Russian-Communist aggression, bloodbath and tyranny for many years.

At same time our people are strongly urging the United States Senators and Congressmen regardless of party affiliation to give full support to your policy in order to prevent our defeat in Vietnam and to secure freedom for our great Country the United States of America. God bless you.

Respectfully yours,

DR. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President, UCCA State Branch of
North Dakota.

SILENT MAJORITY IS NO LONGER SILENT

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1969

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Dousman Index is not the largest weekly newspaper in Wisconsin, but it speaks with a civic voice that has helped to make Dousman one of those progressive, interesting villages where the people who are the backbone of America live and rear their families happily. The Index's editor, Jeanne Hill, is one of those people who speaks her mind, and frequently makes her voice the voice of a solid community majority. Last week she spoke her mind in a front page editorial that deserves wider circulation than the usual readership of the Index provides. I command to my colleagues her words that bespeak the wisdom of Smalltown, USA:

SILENT MAJORITY NO LONGER SILENT

(By Jeanne Hill)

The majority of Americans who have kept a bewildered silence the past two years are at last aroused; the "Silent Majority" is no longer smothered in stillness.

President Richard M. Nixon explained in detail the secret and public steps he has taken to bring the Vietnam war to a peaceful end. Hanoi, however, seat of the North Vietnamese leaders, has ignored and defied all the U.S. government's attempts toward a peaceful end to the conflict.

The former "Silent majority" listened well to the President's Nov. 3 speech. The White House announced Tuesday the overwhelming response President Nixon received upholding his views on how to end the war and win the peace . . . honorably.

In his speech the President explained what would happen to the South Vietnamese if the U.S. simply brought the "Troops home."

Communist North Vietnamese would quickly, through mass killings, take over the South Vietnamese. This administration's thinking is positive: Our troops are being brought home as quickly as South Vietnamese are trained to take over the protection of their country from the Communists. The

November 13, 1969

North Vietnamese are—remember—provided with all war supplies by Russia and China.

Those who shout for another "War Moratorium" Nov. 13–14–15 are helping prolong the war and costing our fighting men their lives. Through "End the War Now" cries . . . these people encourage the Communists to simply sit back and wait for the U.S. to "give up and pull out."

If communism is allowed to sweep through, taking over Indochina—then Asia—the chance of World War III will be vastly increased because the balance of power will be on the Communist world's side. We are actually fighting in Vietnam for the survival of all FREE countries.

For too long a time the Communists and their dupes in the United States have pulled the Red strings. Nov. 3 the President of our country asked for the vocal support of the country's majority. He has received this support because the "Silent Majority" has at last found its tongue.

GOVERNMENT SLATED FOR "MISUSE OF POWER"

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Rand Daily Mail, Oct. 22, 1969]

GOVERNMENT SLATED FOR "MISUSE OF POWER"

MARITZBURG.—Mrs. Jean Sinclair, national president of the Black Sash, last night accused the Government of "monstrous misuse of power to secure the domination of the 1½-million Afrikaner people at the expense of the welfare of the other 18-million inhabitants of South Africa."

Delivering the opening address at the Black Sash national conference in Maritzburg, Mrs. Sinclair said the powers taken to control the lives of Africans, Asians and Coloureds were "unreasonable and tyrannical."

"In a situation where only one-fifth of the population is enfranchised and the vast majority of South Africans have no say in the laws which govern them, the unpopular policy of apartheid can only be enforced by the use of excessive powers."

Rights had been removed from individuals, the judiciary, provincial councils, local authorities, the Press, publishers, artists, industrialists, businessmen and others and control over all of them was vested in the Cabinet, Mrs. Sinclair said.

"One realizes that bureaucracy is a concomitant of a modern industrial society, but in present day South Africa the number of public servants is out of all proportion to the size of the population and the extent of industrial development."

According to the latest figures, Mrs. Sinclair said, there were 322,096 people employed in the Government service, 171,183 employed by the provincial councils and 204,690 by the local authorities in December, 1968.

"The vast number of officials required to administer the apartheid laws, the numerous Government appointees sitting on boards, commissions and advisory committees, the evergrowing numbers employed in Government departments are an increasing strain on the country's manpower."

Apartheid legislation was causing misery, insecurity and poverty, but it was not only in the field of apartheid legislation that the Executive had accumulated power.

REIMPOSED

The role of the judiciary had been curtailed and its powers and responsibilities had,

through legislation, been vested in Cabinet Ministers.

Detention without trial, banning orders, banishments, listing people as communists, confiscating and withholding passports were all punishment without trial.

Banning orders for many appeared to be punishment without end. Many banning orders of five years duration had been reimposed when the original orders expired as in the cases of Helen Joseph, Peter Brown and Mrs. Sisulu.

"Bannings and banishments are a particularly vicious form of punishment," Mrs. Sinclair said.

"To keep a person incommunicado, to all intents and purposes, for 10 years on end is nothing short of persecution."

Referring to the call for patriotism, she said authority in South Africa placed the narrowest construction on the meaning of patriotism. It has come to mean the compulsion to accept the policy of apartheid without question.

CORROSION

"Patriotism has become the public's refuge and its apology for its apathy, silence and acquiescence. There has been a moral corrosion of the public mind.

"It has made it easy for authority to depart from the accepted principles of parliamentary government and even from accepted standards of humanity, decency and justice.

"Patriotism is not a valid moral basis for government. Neither is the acquisition of absolute power compatible with action based on moral principle.

"If power is exercised in such a way that individual rights are violated, parliamentary government gives way to tyranny."

WE ARE ANGRY AMERICANS

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the "angry Americans," those fed up with self-righteous critics of our country and the "instant foreign affairs experts," are speaking up across our land as we approach the second Vietnam moratorium day Saturday in the Nation's Capital.

A Danville, Va., radio station, WDVA, has joined the overwhelming majority by calling for support of our country in time of peril by suggesting that motorists drive with their car headlights on throughout Saturday, burn their porch lights Saturday night, and fly Old Glory to proclaim that the silent majority are "angry Americans" who believe in supporting our fighting men who are sacrificing to defend the freedom of all Americans.

An editorial by Homer Thomasson, an official of the radio station, WDVA, has been broadcast several times and appeared in the Danville Register. The editorial is so timely and expresses the views of so many that I am including it in the RECORD:

WE ARE ANGRY AMERICANS

We are angry Americans—Fed up with the mobs of unwashed, long-haired hippies who seek to rule the United States from the streets; who preach peace and breed conflict.

We are angry Americans—Nauseated by the self-righteous critics who set impossible

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

standards for our country, yet fail to apply the same yardstick to other nations; who see nothing right in Washington, and nothing wrong in Hanoi.

We are angry Americans—Sickened by the vicious attacks on our President who assumed office during our country's most difficult years; and who is striving valiantly to lead us through these perilous times.

We believe our leaders who know far more about it than we do got us involved in Vietnam; and other leaders will get us out as soon as it is safe. But in the meantime we believe we should support our fighting men, and not support our enemies by attacking our government.

We scorn those who have set a second moratorium day on Saturday, November 15th; and we have neither patience nor respect for those citizens or lawmakers who heed their cowardly protests and threats.

And we look with shame upon the years you and I, the vast majority, have remained silent spectators while Old Glory has been burned and walked on by the dirty bare feet of the mobs.

Good citizens, we have been quiet too long!

On moratorium day, November 15th, let's show the Commie-sympathizers a real demonstration . . . and let the world know we're firmly behind our President! On demonstration day . . . D-Day . . . we're asking every solid citizen of Big D Country to come off the sidelines . . . and carry the ball.

If you believe as we at WDVA do . . . join in. On November 15th, drive with your car headlights on throughout the day. That night . . . keep your porch light burning. And, of course, fly Old Glory from your home and your place of business.

Our nation can only be defeated from the inside. Let's show one and all that the United States of America is still United . . . a fortress of freedom in a troubled world.

A BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF CAROL MIN HOUTS

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, in introducing this bill for the relief of Carol Min Houts, I wish to bring the uniqueness of her case to the attention of my colleagues.

Born in Seoul, Korea, in 1955, Carol Min was admitted to the United States at the age of 8 in 1963 for medical treatment as a polio patient. Her treatment was sponsored by Mr. and Mrs. Harold Houts, of Albuquerque, N. Mex.

Since 1963, Mr. and Mrs. Houts have cared for Carol Min as their own daughter and she has become a member of the Houts family. The personal love and care lavished on this child by Mrs. Houts included the cultivation of Carol Min's musical talent through piano lessons which have resulted in her becoming an accomplished pianist.

In 1967, Mr. and Mrs. Houts legally adopted Carol Min, thus giving a de jure status to a relationship that already existed de facto.

Under her present student visa, Carol Min has received an extension from the Immigration Service to December 13, 1969, at which time her student visa will expire. It is possible, of course, for her

to apply for an adjustment of status to that of permanent resident, with all the attendant delays and uncertainties. This is a time when her treatment as a polio patient has a minimum remaining period of 10 years.

This private relief bill is intended to eliminate those delays and uncertainties by granting her immediate right to naturalization under all other normal requirements of the naturalization process, thus providing her access to the full rights and responsibilities of American citizenship.

I can personally attest to Carol Min's deservingness to those rights and to her willingness and ability to live up to those responsibilities. I ask my colleagues for unanimous support of this worthy case and I give my personal assurances that this young new citizen will be a credit to our Nation and to this distinguished body.

MORATORIUM AND OUR COMMUNIST ADVERSARIES

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues two excerpts from letters I have received from constituents.

One is expressing his views on those who participated in the recent moratorium and the other on our Communist adversaries and our position in the world. I commend these letters to my colleagues' attention.

First is an excerpt from a letter by Mr. Lee Ragsdale of Valparaiso, Ind.:

This is a sad day for America. They call it moratorium day, but it seems to be an American day. Led by those nothings and nobodies McGovern, McCarthy, Fulbright and other loud-mouths we seem to be sliding into isolationism and pacifism, with old-fashioned patriotism gone underground. Your expressions have been the clearest that have come to my notice; more power to you. It would appear they regard Russia as all sweetness and light, longing to live in peaceful co-existence. Russia dropped her veil with Czechoslovakia. Her goal since 1917 has been destruction of the U.S. and she'll never change. If the time comes when the time seems right to strike at us she'll not wait a day. Russia is the reason for Castro and Viet Nam. We'd have put Castro in his place and cleaned up on Ho Chi Minh but for Russia. She opposes us everywhere, she lies and slanders us constantly and takes her stand as the friend of every enemy we have and the enemy of every friend. The time may come for us to fight Russia, then whom can we depend on, a bunch of pacifists?

Second is part of a letter from Mr. Malcolm Anderson, an attorney, in Cherterton, Ind.:

It is absolutely obvious to me, and I am sure to you that the Russians are out to conquer the World. Their submarine force is three times ours. In every phase of military activity they are approaching or surpassing us. I am terribly worried over this. Since the British Empire has become a third-class power, the United States of America is the only defense the free world has. If we become a second-rate nation, that means the entire

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

world will fall to Bolshevism. We will then experience a dark age which will make the previous dark ages like a Sunday School picnic.

Over twenty years ago when I was in school in Valparaiso University I had a professor whose father came from Czechoslovakia. Among other things he told us that in Russian history and in Russian philosophy there is a school of thought which believes that Russia is destined to become the third Rome. The first Rome, according to their philosophy, was the empire that centered in the City of Rome. The second Rome was the Eastern Roman Empire with its capitol at Constantinople. According to their point of view, the third Rome is to be Moscow, and it is to dominate the entire world. According to this professor, that view was adopted even prior to the Bolshevik Revolution. Now, with the added stimulant of Bolshevism, it seems to me they are determined to carry it out.

It is my firm opinion that the only way we can prevent a new dark age from descending upon us, is to keep the United States of America the strongest nation on earth. In fact, it is my firm opinion that we must be stronger than all other nations of the world combined. It is our Christian duty to do this. If we fail to do it, our Christian Church and our Christian people will be annihilated. The atheistic Bolshevik will stop at nothing to eradicate us.

THE RURAL AFFAIRS COUNCIL

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I heartily commend President Nixon on his decision to create a Cabinet-level Rural Affairs Council to deal with the problems of rural America. President Nixon's initiative demonstrates his awareness that the problems of rural America are as every bit important as are the problems of urban America.

Each year, nearly 600,000 farmers and farm youths leave the farm. They leave largely because they think the life they lead is neither enriching nor rewarding. The feelings of these frustrated individuals are grounded in dismal facts; for example:

Over half the Nation's substandard homes—more than 4 million—are in rural America.

Nearly 30,000 rural communities are without adequate water systems, and about 45,000 others lack adequate water systems.

Thousands of rural communities lack medical centers, public libraries, good schools, and public recreation programs.

In the last 15 years, 14 million new jobs were created in America. Of this number, very few were created in rural areas.

Rural unemployment in many areas averages almost 18 percent, as compared to the national average of about 4 percent.

Farmers are beset by rising production costs, rising taxes, and rising living costs. Yet when the farmer goes to market he discovers that he sells wheat at 1942 prices, cotton at 1942 prices, corn at 1944 prices, and livestock at 1952 prices. In addition, he discovers he sells most of his farm products for less than it actually costs to produce them.

Mr. Speaker, solving the problems of

rural America is in everyone's best interest. By virtue of the urban migration, almost 70 percent of our entire population lives on about 1 percent of the land. It is predicted that in the years to come, this concentration of population will be even intensified.

If we are to avoid becoming a nation of urban ghetto dwellers, incentives must be created which will encourage people to move out of the over-crowded smog-ridden cities and resettle in the countryside. This would not require a reorientation of our thinking, for over half the urban population would like to work and live outside the city if it were feasible to do so.

History will record whether our society truly attempted to provide meaningful and fulfilling life styles, patterns, and opportunities for our people. Many critics think that to date, society's efforts have been largely unsuccessful ones. I am confident, however, that even our most bitter social critics will hail President Nixon's decision to create a dynamic Cabinet-level Rural Affairs Council as being a singular attempt to create a vehicle from which decent living conditions and economic opportunities can be provided all Americans.

NO PEACE AT ANY PRICE

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, much is being written and said about our involvement in Vietnam. Last week the President on nationwide television asked for patience, understanding, and full support of his policy as outlined in connection with the Vietnam war.

Mr. Dan M. Tucker, editor of the Chase City Progress, a newspaper published in Mecklenburg County, Va., has written a learned and well reasoned editorial on the subject entitled "No Peace at Any Price." In order that my colleagues may have the benefit of this sound view, I am inserting the editorial in the RECORD:

NO PEACE AT ANY PRICE

President Nixon appeared "dead serious" in his report to the nation Monday night. He spoke of peace, he offered peaceful negotiations, yet he carried a big stick also. We only wish he had made this speech six or nine months ago. He told the nation what many wish to hear, that American troops would be withdrawn from Vietnam, inferring in increasing numbers. He asked the great silent majority to support him in his search for a peaceful settlement of the war with honor.

In event that Hanoi would misinterpret his desire for peace Mr. Nixon warned that if North Vietnam would step up military pressures and jeopardize U.S. Forces, "I shall not hesitate to take strong and effective measures to deal with that situation."

Another key warning was given the home-front. "I have chosen a plan for peace, I believe it will succeed . . . Let us be united against defeat. Because let us understand: North Vietnam cannot defeat or humiliate the United States. Only we Americans can do that."

Directing his attention to those who would apply pressures through street anti-war

November 13, 1969

demonstrations and otherwise, Mr. Nixon warned: "If a vocal minority, however fervent its cause, prevails over reason and the will of the majority, this nation has no future as a free society."

From the address we conclude that Mr. Nixon is making every effort to bring the Vietnam war to a close. We would hope that he is firm in his convictions and his statements.

He has warned Hanoi. He has offered plans for peace and a plan affording the South Vietnamese to determine their destiny. If negotiations continue to drag in Paris, and if Hanoi steps up military pressures, we would hope that Mr. Nixon would use the full strength of American military to effect a just and sensible conclusion of the War. The Asiatics understand military power more than any other means. When all other efforts fail, military power remains. That is what we believe Mr. Nixon said to the North Vietnamese.

To the people at home he asked patience, understanding and full support of his policy as outlined. We agree with him and the delay in saying these things has already been too long.

AMERICAN PRISONERS IN NORTH VIETNAM

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in this day of "misunderstood youth" and "misguided parents" I am continually thankful for the great majority of the residents of the district I have the honor of representing in this body. Two items have come to my attention recently which renew my faith in the principles that made this country great.

One of these items is a letter I received from a young lady who attends a high school in my district. She wrote in regard to Americans being held prisoner in North Vietnam. The other is a newspaper column by Editor Wesley Izard of the Amarillo Daily News.

I would like to share these two items with my colleagues in the Congress and insert them at this point in the RECORD:

MULESHOE TELLS IT LIKE IT IS

Members of the U.S. House Subcommittee on Education are making a survey. They want to know the sort of trouble high schools are having with their students, and how they are handling it—if they are.

Questionnaire cards have gone out, presumably to most of the nation's schools.

Muleshoe High got one. It was referred to B. M. Gramling, high school counselor.

His reply should be read in full by every member of Congress and by all officials connected with the U.S. Office of Education.

Here it is, addressed to Roman C. Pucinski, chairman, and Alphonso Bell, ranking minority member, of the subcommittee:

"The survey card is enclosed . . . The card will show that we have not had any trouble covered by the questions asked.

"Our town is somewhat isolated geographically, but our students read and watch television, and they question and challenge authority just as young people everywhere do.

"The difference here is that our young people know how far they can go without coming in for punishment.

"Punishment in our school means corporal punishment or suspension, and corporal punishment means a spanking administered by someone committed to the idea.

November 13, 1969

34191

"Our children are really no different from children all over the world. They want to know what is expected of them—how far they can go."

"As soon as they are shown the limits they are satisfied. They will occasionally re-test these limits to see if they are real, but they will be satisfied if they are shown consistent restraint."

"The most insecure and unhappy young people are those who do not have the benefit of restraint."

"We believe that treating children as children gives them an identity. They do not always like their identity, but at least they have one."

"The most pathetic situations develop among children who have been given little or no restraint, but a lot of 'rights' they are not prepared to accept."

"This gives them no identity. Consequently, they feel compelled to superimpose one on themselves, invariably by adopting bizarre modes of dress and behavior."

"The courts, and many school officials, have fallen into the trap of trying to be all things to all people. In their preoccupation with protecting individual rights they have lost sight of the common good."

"Our school rules are all formulated for the sole purpose of maintaining a good learning atmosphere for the benefit of the students, so they can do what they presumably want to do—get an education."

"If this sometimes means abridging the 'rights' of a few, we are prepared to do it."

Private note to President Nixon: "Why don't you call counselor Gramling to Washington and put him to work in your Office of Education?"

AMARILLO, TEX.
November 7, 1969.

Congressman BOB PRICE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PRICE: I have just finished reading an article in the *Reader's Digest* about the American prisoners of war in Vietnam. After telling of the atrocities suffered by our noble men taken as prisoners by the Viet-Namites, the article urged American citizens across the country to write letters to their Congressman urging a joint resolution demanding proper treatment for the prisoners and missing men. I have also written a letter to the editors of the newspaper in my hometown of Amarillo, Texas, urging the citizens to send letters to you and to Xuan Thuy, chief North Vietnamese negotiator in Paris. Sir, as I am only a high school senior and a girl, public opinion seems to be the only course open to me to be utilized as a weapon against the enemy. I am most sincere in my wish to help our fighting men in any way that I can. I am consumed and driven by this frenzied desire to help these unfortunate, tortured, and most gravely mistreated POW's. Please do something in your dynamic way to help these men.

If there is anything I can do to aid in this matter, please let me know. Perhaps I can help organize an all-out drive in my school and community that will evince a feeling of public opinion strong enough (at least in my city) to influence action conducive to helping American prisoners in Vietnam.

Thank you very much. I am assured that with you as our Congressman, something of value will be accomplished in relation to this matter.

Most sincerely yours,
JANIE EDDINS.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WHAT ARE STANDARDS OF OEO FIELD STAFF?

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, this morning I have written a letter to Don Rumsfeld, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. OEO has just hired as a community organizer for the poverty program a lady with questionable qualifications. I quote below my letter which was addressed to Rumsfeld:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., November 12, 1969.

Mr. DONALD RUMSFELD,
Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DON: I am most concerned about a situation that has been brought to my attention by a number of concerned Dallas residents. This regards the employment of Mrs. Ruth Jefferson, a Community Organizer for the War on Poverty Program in Dallas, Texas. So many questions have been raised regarding Mrs. Jefferson's professional qualifications for this very significant position that I feel the subject is deserving of your immediate, personal attention. It is essential that the Office of Economic Opportunity establish a definite set of professional standards for employment in such major programs as the War on Poverty.

Mr. Robert Medrano, the top official in the West Dallas Center on the War on Poverty, cited the major reason for Mrs. Jefferson's selection as a Community Organizer was because of "her past performance as a Community Organizer." After a careful review of Mrs. Jefferson's record of Civic involvement, I note only the role she played in organizing was a "Sit-in" in the Dallas Welfare Office in November, 1968. For this action, she was found to be in contempt of Court by the Presiding Judge of the 160th District Court on December 6, 1968.

On August 25, 1969, several hundred of Mrs. Jefferson's fellow residents in the Dallas Housing Authority petitioned for her removal because she and a group of her associates were using her apartment as a base to "preach hate." Mrs. Jefferson numbers among her close associates Ernest McMillan and Donald Ray Williams, fugitives currently carried on the wanted list by the United States law enforcement officials.

Ruth Jefferson has been assigned to perform organizational activities for the War on Poverty in precisely the same area where her former neighbors petitioned for her removal just three months ago. At the time Mrs. Jefferson was forced to vacate her apartment in the Dallas Housing Authority, she owed over \$400 in past due rental payments.

Mrs. Jefferson was convicted in Torrance, California, in 1964 for shoplifting, and was sentenced to two years in prison for the offense. The sentence was suspended. The twenty-nine year old Mrs. Jefferson was again arrested on June 25, 1969, in Dallas for burglary and disturbing the peace. The charges were later dropped. On April 29, 1969, Federal Law Enforcement Officials secured a warrant to search her Dallas Housing Authority home for the purpose of determining if there were firearms available in violation of the 1968 Federal Firearms' Act. The search uncovered three twelve-gauge shotguns, one shotgun of undetermined gauge, and eight sawed-off shotgun barrels. The stock and trigger housing groups that were originally joined to the sawed-off shotgun barrels were not found in the apartment.

On repeated occasions, Mrs. Jefferson has attempted to purchase additional weapons in the Dallas area. On April 4, 1969, she attempted to purchase an M-1 Carbine on credit at Cullum and Boren, but store personnel refused to grant her credit. On April 7, 1969, she did succeed in purchasing a twelve gauge shotgun from Ray's hardware in Dallas.

At the time Mrs. Jefferson filed her application for employment with War on Poverty officials, she failed to record the fact that she had previously been arrested or convicted of a law violation. Both the California conviction for shoplifting, and the Dallas arrest for burglary and disturbing the peace should have been recorded on the employment form.

It is also significant that Mrs. Jefferson has only held one position of gainful employment since 1964. For a period of six weeks in late 1968, Mrs. Jefferson worked as an employee of the Dal-Tex Waste Material Company of Dallas at the rate of \$1.60 per hour. For the remaining four years and ten months, since 1964, Mrs. Jefferson has been a welfare recipient.

In April of 1969, Mrs. Jefferson purchased a 1968 luxury Caprice automobile with a \$1,000 cash down payment, and she subsequently returned with an additional \$1,700 cash payment to complete the transaction. At the time of purchase, Mrs. Jefferson listed the following as sources of income: \$300.00 per month in salary; \$120.00 per month from the National Welfare Rights Organization; and \$243.00 per month in child support. This represented a total monthly income of \$663.00 per month. On the purchase application, Mrs. Jefferson made no reference to her status as a welfare recipient.

As a Member of the House Education and Labor Committee, the Committee in the United States Congress charged with establishing guidelines for Office of Economic Opportunity programs, and as the Member of Congress from the Third Congressional District where this problem has arisen, I urge you to immediately send a representative of your Office to Dallas to investigate this appointment.

Yours sincerely,

JAMES M. COLLINS,
Member of Congress.

PETER LEKTRICH RETIRES

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, although I was aware of the fact that Peter Lektrich, who served under the Clerk of the House, was anxious to move south where the winters are milder, I was surprised to learn of his recent retirement.

All of us who have had the privilege to know Pete, and to seek his counsel and assistance, regret to see him leave. He gave conscientious attention to his work and always went the "extra mile" to be helpful. Nothing was ever too much trouble for him.

For several years, Pete and I were tenants in the same apartment building. Regardless of the weather, Pete was out in it and on his way to the office. Neither wind nor snow nor rain nor sleet would deter him.

In my contacts with him, and from comments that have been made by my colleagues and others with whom he was

associated he showed a rare and deep understanding of the problems of others. I marvel at his constitution and his tremendous inner courage.

To say that we will miss him is an understatement.

Along with Pete's many friends, I wish him an abundance of happiness and contentment in his retirement that he has so justly earned during his many years of faithful and dedicated service in the House of Representatives.

CODE FOR REPORTING CIVIL DISORDERS

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR. OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, this week, thousands of Americans are participating in rallies both opposing and supporting President Nixon's policies in Vietnam. Naturally, the presentation and interpretation of these demonstrations in the mass media will have a strong influence on their success or failure.

Since these demonstrations apparently influence foreign observers' judgments of U.S. public opinion, I feel that it is of crucial importance that the news media place these activities in their proper perspective. Too often the press will over-dramatize an event, thereby serving as the activists' press agents. Moreover, it is of equal importance that public safety remain a paramount concern of the news media.

I submit for the consideration of this body an article by Mr. Edmonde Haddad, news editor of KPOL radio in Los Angeles, in which he discusses a code for the reporting of civil disorders. This code was presented to Sigma Delta Chi, the National Journalistic Society.

I feel that this code is an excellent example of a set of rules to be followed by press, radio, and television reporters during their coverage of civil disorders. It certainly deserves the consideration of this body, and of every newsmen in America, as a proof that American free enterprise can "police" itself without Government intervention.

Finally, I cite especially section 16 of the code, an injunction which should remain foremost in the minds of newsmen:

The potential for inciting public disorders demands that competition be secondary to the cause of public safety.

The text is as follows:

The following are Suggestions for the Reporting of Civil Disorders and other events that may reflect public tension. These reminders to newsmen in Southern California are based on experience in various cities of the United States, including Los Angeles:

1. Avoid emphasizing stories on public tensions while the tensions of a particular incident are developing. Ask the law-enforcement agency involved whether the developing incident is designated as a disturbance of the peace or otherwise. Report the official designation of the incident.

2. Public reports should not state exact

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

location, intersection, street name, or number until authorities have sufficient personnel on hand to maintain control.

3. Immediate or direct reporting should minimize interpretation, eliminate airing of rumors, and avoid using unverified statements.

4. Avoid the reporting of trivial incidents. Reporting should emphasize the partial and local aspects of the particular incident, avoiding implication that the incident represents widespread or general events. Editing also should place the reporting of an incident in realistic perspective.

5. Because inexpert use of cameras, bright lights, or microphones may stir exhibitionism of some people, great care should be exercised by crews at scenes of public disorders. Because, too, of danger of injury and even death to news personnel, their presence should be as unobtrusive as possible. Unmarked vehicles should be used for initial evaluation of events of this nature.

6. Cruising in an area of potential crisis may invite trouble. It is suggested that reporters make full use of the law-enforcement headquarters nearest such an area until a newsworthy event occurs.

7. Reporters who are at the scene of an explosive or potentially explosive situation should avoid reporting of interviews with obvious "inciters." Reporters should interview responsible representatives of the affected locality.

8. Reporters should inform in advance any person who is interviewed that the interview may be made public.

9. Scare headlines, scare bulletins, and sensationalism of other kinds should be avoided in magazines, newspapers, radio, and television.

10. All news media should make every effort to assure that only seasoned reporters are sent to the scene of a disaster.

11. No report should use superlatives or adjectives which might incite or enlarge a conflict, or cause a renewal of trouble in areas where disturbances have quieted.

12. Reporters should emphasize efforts by law enforcement officials to restore order. Advice to the public should emphasize avoidance of areas of potential danger, observance of any curfew, or similar suggestions that originate with public safety officers.

13. Advisory data for discretionary use by newsmen should be written in calm, matter-of-fact sentences. This is for the purpose of avoiding inflammatory results from unintended public report of discretionary information. Honest and dispassionate reporting is the best reporting.

14. Reporters should not detail how any weapon is obtained, made, or used.

15. Reporters should not identify precise locations of command posts of public officials, police, fire units, or military units.

16. Every reporter and technician should be governed by the rules of good taste and common sense. The potential for inciting public disorders demands that competition be secondary to the cause of public safety.

CHILDREN'S PRAYERS

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, each week I am placing five short children's prayers in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The purpose is to provide our Nation's schools a source for children's prayers for use at the start of the school day.

November 13, 1969

This is necessary because the Supreme Court has banned prayer and Bible reading in public schools, but by reading prayers from the RECORD, which is a public document, no laws will be violated.

I think the Supreme Court decision was wrong; it is harmful to America, and it is a sad commentary that such devotional exercises have been banned in a Nation that was founded on religious principles.

The prayers follow:

I
Bless us, Lord, and grant that we Good and true and brave may be.

II
Teach me, my God and King, In all things thee to see,
That what I do in anything,
To do it for thee.

—George Herbert.

III
All good gifts around us
Are sent from Heaven above,
Then thank the Lord, O thank the Lord,
For all His love,

—Jane Montgomery Campbell.

IV
Make a joyful noise unto the Lord,
all ye lands.
Serve the Lord with gladness:
come before his presence with singing.

—Psalm 100.

V
The earth is the Lord's
and the fulness thereof:
The world,
and they that dwell therein.

—Psalm 24.

THE TRUTH SEEKS A LITTLE TWISTED

HON. DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this week's issue of Advertising Age contains an editorial which raises an interesting question with regard to the application of a dual standard of fairness, accuracy, and truth to radio and TV advertising. It points an accusing finger at antismoking commercials which contain untruthful and misleading statements. Surely regulations dealing with deceit and misrepresentation should be fairly and equally applied to all advertising regardless of the purpose of that advertising. The editorial follows:

THE TRUTH SEEKS A LITTLE TWISTED

This is not an attempted defense of cigarettes or cigarette advertising.

It is a simple affirmation of the belief that the rules of fairness, accuracy and truth in advertising should apply to all advertisers—including the American Cancer Society and the American Heart Assn.

Commercials currently appearing on the air on behalf of these organizations—and they are very good commercials, as we have testified frequently—make untruthful and misleading statements which no commercial advertiser could hope to get away with.

They should be stopped.

These commercials say, without any qualification, that cigarette smoking, on the average, reduces a smoker's life by 8.3 years, and

that every cigaret you smoke takes a minute of your life. These are wild, unsupported allegations. They should not be permitted on the air.

The theory that "anything is all right if the right people do it" holds no water at all. All advertising should be truthful, in fact and in implication. This particular statement is neither. It should not be permitted.

THE PRESIDENT'S NOVEMBER 3 SPEECH ON VIETNAM

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 4, 1969

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the "President Is Doing What He Can in Difficult Vietnam Situation," is the title of an editorial which appeared in the Greeneville, Tenn., Sun on Wednesday, November 5, 1969. It was written following President Nixon's address to the Nation on Monday night, November 3, when he called on the silent majority to speak out.

The silent majority is becoming an aroused majority.

The Greeneville Sun is one of the outstanding daily newspapers in the State of Tennessee and contributes greatly to the cause of freedom and the development of the area for a better way of life.

I am pleased to share this editorial with the readers of the RECORD:

PRESIDENT IS DOING WHAT HE CAN IN DIFFICULT VIETNAM SITUATION

President Nixon's address to the nation Monday night added to the continuing debate over Vietnam an important element that had been missing, namely, an articulate defense of his policy toward the war and his efforts in behalf of peace.

Many Americans had been led into expecting too much from the speech. The impression had gotten around that the President could be expected to announce some dramatic step—a cease fire call, perhaps, or even a firm pullout timetable—that would amount to at least a partial repudiation of U.S. goals in entering the war and pursuing it for the last several years.

So far as we could tell, this impression was pretty much manufactured by leading critics in the Congress. The President himself had revealed nothing about what he was going to say.

What he did say was neither particularly conciliatory nor particularly defiant. It did not promise more than it had a right to, but it was determined, hopeful, and guardedly optimistic. It did not offer an instant solution to the Vietnam tangle, for there was not one to offer.

The speech was, however, informative, as a review of the origins of the U.S. involvement in Vietnam and the steps that the Nixon Administration had taken toward peace. It was frank, in its clear statement of the consequences that a quick U.S. pullout would have in South Vietnam and around the world, and in the United States itself. And it was challenging, in its call for Americans to stand firm and together for the sake of long-run peace.

One thing that the address did was ask the previously silent or undecided to take a position. The effect seems likely to be that many of those in the middle on the war issue will make a choice about where they stand. Both sides will probably become vocal and determined in the weeks ahead.

In our view, the President has understood

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the problem correctly, set the right goals for the United States, and found the best method we can think of to work toward those goals. We would ask, in addition, that he remain constantly alert for new opportunities for a just settlement.

Beyond these requirements, however, it is unreasonable to make demands or dictate tactics. We think that President Nixon is doing the best he can to achieve the peace that all Americans want. If there are others who think so as well, this would be an excellent time to let him know.

SHAWNEE MISSION SERTOMA CLUB SUPPORTS THE PRESIDENT

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include here for the attention of my colleagues the views of 220 men and women members of the Shawnee Mission Sertoma Club and the "silent majority" who are no longer silent. These outstanding Americans stand in firm support of our President in his effort to secure peace in Vietnam. Their resolution follows:

The Shawnee Mission Sertoma Club, the oldest civic group in Northeast Johnson County, and one of the largest with 160 business and professional members, has seriously considered the Vietnam Moratorium move initiated on October 15, 1969.

Our Freedom Committee was authorized by the club's Board of Directors to present the following Resolution at an open meeting of club members, with their wives, on October 21, 1969:

"Whereas, the Vietnam Moratorium Day propagandists advocate our troop withdrawal from Vietnam, and such appeasement in the past has caused increasing demands on the part of Communists, leading to ultimate surrender to them, and

Whereas, surrender to Communists in Vietnam will signal the beginning of a monstrous massacre of the thousands of South Vietnamese people who have resisted Communist aggression in their country all these years, and such a massacre is certain, based on the history of Communists slaughtering over 50 million people during the past 52 years, and

Whereas, such surrender would cause the United States of America's prestige to be so badly damaged throughout the free world that those resisting Communist aggression could never again trust us,

Be it therefore resolved, that the Shawnee Mission Sertoma Club commend President Richard M. Nixon for standing firm against those who would appease our enemies, and further commend President Richard M. Nixon for his efforts to secure peace without appeasement in Vietnam;

Be it further resolved, that the Shawnee Mission Sertoma Club go on record as favoring peace with honor instead of peace at the price of surrender and massacre of the South Vietnamese people, and

Be it further resolved, that a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to all members of Congress from the States of Missouri and Kansas, and to all other Sertoma Clubs."

This resolution approved with no dissenting vote by 220 men and women present.

HAROLD GEORGE,

President.

LLOYD GRIFFIN,

Secretary.

Dr. E. L. PETRY,

Freedom Commission Co-Chairman.

JOSEPH BELL,

Freedom Commission Co-Chairman.

SWEDEN

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in his column in the Washington Post of November 12, Marquis Childs comments on the situation of Sweden, a nation which has been known for its traditional policy of neutrality, having avoided war since 1812. As a participating nation in the United Nations' peace keeping efforts, Sweden has set aside 1,600 troops as a United Nations standing force. Some 12,000 have served over the years, mainly in the Middle East.

The United States maintains formal diplomatic relations with Sweden. However, President Nixon has failed to appoint a U.S. Ambassador to Sweden to succeed former Ambassador Heath whose service ended on January 23. The chill on United States-Sweden relations results from Swedish criticism of our policy in Vietnam and its recognition of North Vietnam.

The United States has Ambassadors serving in the Soviet Union, the Union of South Africa, and other nations with which there are strong disagreements. Yet, Sweden, which ironically was the first nation to grant diplomatic recognition to the United States—aside from the colonists' ally, France—on January 23, 1783, has not been sent an Ambassador since President Nixon took office.

Incidentally, Sweden took a very strong stand and denounced the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968.

In New York City George Spitz has announced that a committee—the Fair Play for Sweden Committee—is being formed to bring this issue to public attention.

As Marquis Childs said:

The lot of a neutral is an unhappy one. The Nixon administration has not sent an Ambassador to Stockholm, which is one way of frowning. But it is also denying an authoritative voice that might help to explain American policy and, in turn, come closer to understanding the feelings that run so deep here.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 12, 1969]

UNHAPPY LOT OF THE NEUTRAL IS EXEMPLIFIED BY SWEDEN

(By Marquis Childs)

STOCKHOLM.—Neutrality in today's turbulent world means balancing on a tight rope over the abyss. That balancing act, as the Swedes have discovered during the past 30 years, makes for jealousies and resentments, the suspicion and even the alienation of neighbors and friends.

Sweden is currently under the stern, disapproving gaze of Washington. Neutral? Not at all, say American policy makers; neutral in favor of America's enemy, North Vietnam.

What is happening here may or may not foreshadow the pattern elsewhere as the relentless tides of change beat against old forms and old beliefs. A new generation has taken over the Social Democratic Party that has governed the country for nearly four decades. This younger generation feels as passionately about the war in Vietnam and its horrors as do the thousands of demon-

strators in the United States. Their leader and spokesman is Olof Palme, the new Prime Minister.

The frown on Uncle Sam's face was visible when Palme, then Minister of Education, marched in a demonstration with the North Vietnamese Ambassador to Moscow who was visiting Stockholm in February, 1968. The frown grew darker and sterner when on Jan. 10 of this year the government recognized the regime in Hanoi and accredited the Swedish Ambassador to Peking to North Vietnam as well. Sweden is the only country in Western Europe to recognize Hanoi as well as Saigon.

Then in September, as the leadership changed, Foreign Minister Torsten Nilsson made a speech to the Social Democratic Party Conference that brought the roof down. As reported in the first news stories, he seemed to be saying in what was apparently a fuzzily worded speech that Sweden intended to give \$40,000,000 to Hanoi. The political opposition here and most of the press reacted with indignation and in the United States this was the final affront.

As invariably happens, the correction never catches up with the sensational headlines. Members of the new government explained that the \$40,000,000 was to be used for reconstruction in both Vietnams and only after the war had ended in the north and south. The only exception would be for humanitarian purposes. Under this exception Sweden has given Hanoi about \$1,000,000 in hospital equipment and medicines.

The tight rope in the balancing act is suspended between the two superpowers, Moscow to the east and Washington to the west. The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 gave the government of the Social Democrats an opportunity to offset the attacks on America's Vietnam policy. The first response, as the Russian tanks rolled into Prague, was a sternly worded note to Moscow denouncing the action of the giant to the east.

In September the Swedes went to the polls to elect a new parliament. For the first time, the Social Democrats won a clear majority of 125 out of 232 seats in the lower chamber, which has the governing power. They would no longer be dependent on a coalition with the Farmers' Party.

Many observers believe the invasion of Czechoslovakia was the reason for the victory. As elsewhere in Western Europe, Communist Party members in Sweden were outraged. The Communist voting strength dropped from 7 to 4 per cent and in parliament they were reduced from eight seats to three. Palme and the new leadership had held the left wing and the young.

That a country of 8,000,000 people, the largest of the Scandinavian powers, should have an impact on the course of world events is in itself something of a paradox. Part of the explanation may lie in the extraordinary technological and economic development of a nation that has avoided war since 1812.

Private enterprise, which is at least 95 per cent of the economy, has pushed Sweden know-how and skills to remarkable lengths. Saab, one of the larger industries, makes a supersonic fighter plane as well as a motorcar. The plane, the Draken, is the backbone of the Swedish Air Force and is sold as well to Denmark.

The Swedes have consistently carried their weight in the United Nations, with 1,600 troops set aside as a U.N. standby force and a total of more than 12,000 serving over the years, mostly in the Middle East. Sweden's foreign aid, apart from private capital investment, is projected at 1 per cent of the gross national product.

The lot of a neutral is an unhappy one. The Nixon administration has not sent an Ambassador to Stockholm, which is one way of frowning. But it is also denying an authoritative voice that might help to explain

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

American policy and, in turn, come closer to understanding the feelings that run so deep here.

HENRY T. WASKOW: "THE SPIRIT OF '43"

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to call special attention on this day to a column in the Dallas Times Herald by Felix R. McKnight. He expresses, in very moving language of his own, and by publishing a letter from a Temple, Tex., soldier who gave his life in World War II, the spirit and courage which has made this country great. This soldier's expressions are especially apt today and I do sincerely agree with Mr. McKnight that we need more such feelings in these days. Captain Waskow was well known by me and following my own battle injuries, I was attended to by his sister who was an Army nurse on duty at the McCloskey General Hospital in Waco, Tex.

The column referred to follows:

HENRY T. WASKOW: THE SPIRIT OF '43

On the bad day of Dec. 14, 1943, a pack mule clopped its way through the slosh of a muddy trail that fingered down the slopes of Mt. Sammucro, Italy.

Lashed to its back was the body of a man—quite a man.

The dog tag identified him as Capt. Henry T. Waskow, Commanding Officer, Co. B, 143rd Inf., 36th Division.

A withered little man with a leathery face waited in the valley at the trail's end. And he cried when he saw the mule's burden.

Men all around Ernie Pyle cried and cursed a war that would take Henry Waskow.

Ernie hunched in the lamplight and wrote the finest of all the stories that made him supreme as a war correspondent. He wrote easily and eloquently of a man's bravery and devotion to his country. He wrote of the men who followed Capt. Waskow into combat; saw the heart that won their leader the highest awards of valor. Far above the call of duty was the life of Capt. Waskow.

It all came back the other day while trying to figure how we've lost the flaming spirit of the Henry Waskows in the wash of today's disrespect. It was something Capt. Waskow wrote before he led his company up those Nazi-infested Italian hillsides.

We got spiritual nourishment and a girding of our guts in those days from such words. It seems time to again try them for size—the last will and testament of Henry T. Waskow, sent home after death to his family near Temple, Tex.:

"Herewith my last will and testament:

"Greetings:

"If you get to read this, I will have died in defense of my country and all it stands for—the most honorable and distinguished death a man can die.

"It was not because I was willing to die for my country, however—I wanted to live for it—just as any other person wants to do. It is foolish and foolhardy to want to die for one's country, but to live for it is something else.

"To live for one's country is to my mind to live a life of service; to, in a small way, help a fellow man occasionally along the way, and generally to be useful and to serve. It also means to me to rise up in all our wrath and with overwhelming power to crush any oppressor of human rights.

"That is our job—all of us—as I write this.

November 13, 1969

And I pray to God that we are wholly successful.

"Yes, I would like to have lived—to live and share the many blessings and good fortunes that my grandparents bestowed upon me. A fellow never had a better family than mine; but since God has willed it otherwise, do not grieve too much, dear ones, for life in the other world must be beautiful. I have lived a life with that in mind all along. I was not afraid to die; you can be assured of that.

"All along I prayed that I and others could do our share to keep you safe until we returned . . . I made my choice. I volunteered in the Armed Forces because I felt it my duty to do so. I thought I might be able to do just a little bit to help this great country of ours in its hours of darkness and need—the country that means more to me than life itself.

" . . . Maybe when the lights go on again all over the world, free people can be happy and gay again. Through good fortune and the Grace of God, I was chosen a leader. If I failed as a leader, and I pray God that I didn't, it was not because I did not try. God alone knows how I worked and slaved to make myself a worthy leader of those magnificent men.

" . . . As I said a couple of times in my letters home, 'When you remember me in your prayers, remember to pray that I be given strength, character and courage to lead these magnificent Americans.' I hope I have proved worthy of their faith, trust and confidence.

"I guess I have always appeared as pretty much of a queer cuss to all of you. If I seemed strange at times, it was because I had weighty responsibilities that preyed on my mind and wouldn't let me slack up to be human like I wanted to be.

"I felt so unworthy, at times, of the great trust my country had put in me, that I simply had to keep plugging to satisfy my own self that I was worthy of that trust. I have not, at the time of this writing, done that and I suppose I never will.

"I do not try to set myself on a pedestal as a martyr. Every Joe Doe who shouldered a rifle made a similar sacrifice.

" . . . Try to live a life of service—to help someone wherever you are or whatever you may be. Take it from me, you can get happiness out of that—more than anything in life . . .

HENRY T. WASKOW."

No, Capt. Waskow, you weren't a queer cuss. You were one of the great Americans—the likes of which are needed pretty badly these days.—The Editor

DOCTOR SHORTAGE IN RURAL AMERICA

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, there is increasing concern throughout rural America regarding the chronic shortage of physicians. It is most distressing in this age of rapid technological progress and scientific development that we find in our rural areas only one physician to each 1,000 square miles.

This crying need has not gone unnoticed. Dr. Roger Egeberg, Assistant Secretary for Health, has specifically called for training of many more general practitioners. As Dr. Egeberg explained, there is an urgent need for family doctors who can treat most of the illnesses that afflict our population and which do not necessarily require attention of a

specialist. If the training of family doctors can be stepped up, relief could be provided to all specialities of the medical profession—freeing specialists for more research and intensive study of special cases.

Dr. George A. Wolf, Jr., M.D., dean and provost, University of Kansas Medical Center, is a progressive administrator who more than realizes the vital role the general practitioners play in providing adequate health service. His leadership is having a far-reaching effect.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that Dr. Wolf's proposals merit close study and consideration by medical school administrators and everyone who is interested in improving family health service. His views are spelled out in some detail in the following comments that he presented in a recent speech to the Kansas Academy of General Practice.

His remarks are must reading for all of us who are interested in revitalizing rural and small town America. His speech follows:

A TALK TO THE KANSAS ACADEMY OF GENERAL PRACTICE

(By Dr. George A. Wolf, Jr.)

I have been asked to speak to you about the American Board of Family Practice—its impact on the University of Kansas Medical School. I was on the Council of the Association of American Medical Colleges when the original committee was appointed under the direction of Bill Willard to get into the matter of Family Practice and Boards of Family Practice. I had many dinners and cups of coffee with Fred Richardson and other people involved with the American Academy Committee on Education. I note a great deal of effort which the American Academy of General Practice has put into this program to develop Family Practitioners. After I came to Kansas in 1966, one of the first things that I did was to meet Mac Cahill, and of course Jack Walker was sitting on my shoulder whispering Family Practice, Family Practice in my ear—like the Chinese water torture. But don't forget I had just as many characters perched on my other shoulder saying some negative things about Family Practice—its future and its role at our Medical Center. The fact is, in spite of considerable and strong opposition at the National level, the American Board of Family Practice was established last February and regardless of predictions that are made that the program will collapse in the future in the face of specialization, it is quite clear and our faculty has been told that we must decide what we are to do for those students of ours who request qualification for the Boards of Family Practice. The decision therefore, is to develop a program or not develop a program. Obviously it would be foolish not to do so considering our closeness to the American Academy. The fact that we have Jack Walker and Jesse Rising in prominent positions on our staff, and the fact that some of the distinguished leadership of the American Academy comes from the State of Kansas, would make it impossible for us not to participate in some fashion in the development of the program.

It should be pointed out, however, that the University of Kansas, in spite of inertia on the part of some of its staff members, has not ignored this situation. Our department of Medicine has been heavily oriented towards general internal medicine although it has assisted in the appropriate strengthening of specialist training programs. Dr. Delp is one of the few professors of Medicine in the country who was fit to spend the majority of his time working with ambulatory patients and not with the exotic patients in the beds, although he didn't neglect these

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

either. Furthermore, for the past 15 or so years, all of our students have been required to take an experience with a small town family practitioner. A recent study by Dr. Walker and our students showed that this experience apparently did not change the rate of going into Family Practice over our graduates as compared to the rate of decline on the national scene. (Kansas State Medical Journal, Walker, et al., 1967) Moreover, a grant was made available from the American Academy of General Practice Foundation which permitted us to search for a person to develop the Family Practice Program several years before the Boards went through, but no one was willing to accept this position. In retrospect, I am quite convinced that the reasons they did not accept this position was because the amount of money available for salary was insufficient, and the uncertainty about Family Practice Boards.

We have not attempted in any way to isolate ourselves from physicians in Family Practice, and I have encouraged and indeed taken upon myself, several maneuvers to bring selected Family Practitioners in closer contact with our students and faculty. However, I have been requested to say what we plan to do and this is what I am going to do, today.

My comments will be divided into several categories:

1. Student Considerations
2. Curriculum planning at the Medical Center
3. Recruitment of Physicians for Kansas
4. Recommendations to the faculty for implementation of a program in Family Practice.

So that we all understand what we are talking about the essentials for residency training in Family Practice—"The Family Physician is defined as one who:

1. Serves as the physician of first contact with the patient and provides the means of entry into the Health Care System.
2. Evaluates the patients total health care needs, provides personal medical care within one or more fields of medicine and refers the patient when indicated to appropriate sources of care while preserving the continuity of his care.
3. Develops a responsibility for the patient's comprehensive and continuous health care and when needed acts as a coordinator of the patient's health services.
4. Accepts responsibility for the patient's total health care including the use of consultants within the context of his environment including the community and the family or comparable social unit.

In short, the family physician must be prepared to fulfill the unique, specific and functional role in the delivery of modern comprehensive health services."

Now to be perfectly honest, I think all of you would agree that this definition says nothing about practicing in small towns in the state of Kansas or in small towns in other states. I think the record should be abundantly clear that the institution of the Family Practice Program will not solve the problem of physicians in solo practice in small communities. I think it would be dishonest if we were to claim credit for this, i.e., the relief of the problem of individual physicians services in the small communities by developing a Family Practice Program at the Medical Center. On the other hand, the concept of a family physician in a group of family physicians and specialists along with adequate help from Allied Health Professional people serving a region in an organized fashion is indeed a possible solution to some of the health care problems in the state. In any event, it is not our purpose to discuss this problem now, but we note with pleasure that a Kansas State Medical Society Committee has been appointed and is functioning to consider this latter matter.

Now what about students? In the first

place, there have been increasing feelings that the preceptorship program requiring a medical student to spend a month with a physician in a small town is unrealistic and limiting and indeed may encourage young people not to stay in Kansas if they feel that their only medical opportunities here are in very tiny rural towns. The faculty has repeatedly requested that this program be modified to meet the wishes of the individual students. In other words, if students request to go with a group of general physicians in a medium sized town, or if they wish to go with a group of specialists in a region, or to a small community hospital with multiple staff—these wishes should be acceded to. I have taken the position personally and so instructed the preceptorship committee that no changes in the original program should be made until the curriculum of the future is clear.

In the past two years, two curriculum committees have been working on what we should do about the various problems which beset medical education these days and which might be solved by curriculum change. It was only two weeks ago that the curriculum committee finally came up with what seems to be a reasonable recommendation. This will be presented the day after tomorrow to the Executive Faculty and a week from now to the faculty as a whole. If the recommendations pass they will be implemented as of July 1, 1970. The recommendations are complex but boil down to the following:

It will be possible to complete the medical course in 3 calendar years, at the end of which time the student will be awarded the M.D. degree. To do this the student normally will work 11 months out of the calendar year, but if he has academic or financial problems, or if he wants to combine this with a graduate degree program, he may be permitted to extend his educational program as long as four or five calendar years. In this way we will be avoiding the lock step curriculum where all students are required to work at the same speed. Students who might make excellent physicians will not suffer from competition with more sophisticated student-types who can study rapidly and perform well at examinations. This curriculum proposal will permit us to produce more physicians in a shorter period of time and will result in 1973 in the infusion of approximately 240 physicians into the Health Care system for that one year.

The second step which we are now in the process of proposing to the faculty and subsequently to the State, is an alternate to the often-proposed increase in the production of absolute numbers of physicians. There is evidence that is published by Eiskotten and Wiggins that students are more likely to settle in the area where they take their internship and residency, than in the area where they go to medical school. On the East coast the ratio of practicing physicians to approved internship and residency slots is about 4-1, whereas in the State of Kansas and the surrounding states the ratio is about 8-1. This suggests that we are short of internship and residency programs. If we increase the number of internship and residency programs in Kansas and make them adequate for accreditation and selection by students, we may increase that rate of physicians settling in Kansas. As a matter of fact, being an Easterner myself, I think many people have the wrong picture of the State of Kansas and that by bringing outsiders, as well as Kansans, into the scene through the internship and residency program they will find living is much better here than it is in a crowded metropolitan area on the East coast, Chicago, and on the far West coast. As far as cultural opportunities are concerned, the fact that "Hair" has not hit Great Bend yet doesn't dismay me at all. Therefore, the second step is a proposal to be worked out in some detail that would encourage

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

hospitals in Kansas City, in Wichita in collaboration with the University of Wichita, and in Topeka to extend and develop training programs in the post M.D. years. It is unlikely that these hospitals should develop initially sub-specialty training programs. Therefore, we are suggesting that the emphasis should be on internships and on preparation for Family Practice i.e., by 18 month rotating experiences and 18 month Family Practice residencies, with the understanding that if sub-specialty interests exist on the part of students they could then return to the University of Kansas Medical Center or elsewhere where such programs must be maintained because of the presence of a medical school. The emphasis on training would be in the post M.D. years. Some kind of financial incentive should be built into the program so that the hospitals would be anxious to get involved and to provide help in paying physicians to serve as teachers in these programs. The last 20 years have demonstrated pretty clearly that it is difficult to run a good program unless there is someone available to serve full time as educational coordinator such as a Director of Medical Education. Full time chiefs are better.

Thirdly, we are developing a proposal to the Legislature which would permit an increase in the size of our entering medical class at the University of Kansas. The new curriculum would permit students who have had training in college in some of the basic sciences to advance into clinical work sooner and not repeat basic science work which they have already had. To increase our number of entering students, several decisions would have to be made and several facts clarified. In the first place, we have had a rather dramatic increase the last two years in the number of qualified Kansans applying for medical school. They have gone from about 170 to 275 in a two year period. This in addition to five hundred or more out of state applicants. This year we will have virtually all Kansas residents in our class of 125. We must determine whether or not this increased level of application is indeed permanent or related somehow to the draft law. If it is permanent there is certainly justification for enlarging our class by 25 or 30% to take care of these additional applicants. We should know by January 1971. If the phenomenon is a temporary one and we go back to where only a smaller number of Kansans are applying, it is possible that a decision about admitting a greater number of out of state students would be made with the hope that they may be convinced to remain in Kansas to practice during the rest of their lives. The alternate is to keep the class size where it is.

Once this picture is clear, implementation of the increase requires funds! The first item to require funds, is to provide additional teaching space for students in the basic sciences. This could be accomplished by the use of temporary buildings which some medical schools are now doing with the understanding that a permanent structure increasing our basic science capacity would be planned and constructed during the next two to four years. An important consideration here relates to the Federal Government. After the present economy drive is over federal funds might be available for significant federal matching if student enrollment is increased by 25% or more. This cannot be predicted at the present time. Laws already passed by Congress permit such to happen but as I said, at the present, the economy approach is such that the Bureau of the Budget is not releasing many funds for this purpose. A second major requirement for funds relates to a new teaching hospital. Important for the future in relation to our educational role and our function as a referral center, it is becoming increasingly obvious that the hospital facilities which we have are outmoded and should be redesigned according to mod-

ern thinking. This is an expensive proposition that will probably require bonding by the state. And it is my strong recommendation to the Regents and to the people in the state, that immediate planning be started for a new medical center hospital, designed to give the most elaborate types of medical care required by our citizens and to permit us to develop the most sophisticated educational programs befitting the needs of the residents of our state who come to us for education.

A third requirement for funds is operating expenses for the additional number of students, including fully funded faculty positions for basic sciences and clinical departments.

Finally, we are recommending to the faculty that there be established a Department of Family Practice at the Medical Center and if approved by our faculty we will be requesting funds for the establishment of such a department. Several factors are important. Number one is, that I feel personally that we will be unable to get a family physician, qualified to run this department for less than \$35,000 a year in salary. The department would have to start with a minimum of three men with appropriate secretarial help and we are probably talking about a departmental budget of approximately \$200,000 to be derived primarily from state appropriations. It is possible that the annual budget of the department could be reduced as time goes on—through the granting procedure either through federal or private grants and through the earning of the individuals being turned over to the department for development of the department. In addition, funds will be needed to pay salaries of interns and residents in this area. The total budget has not been worked out in detail as I say, but a reasonable commitment to the program is necessary, if we are to be able to attract appropriate persons to run it. The exact nature of the department will depend, of course, upon the leadership we obtain for it. The new program would permit students to elect a considerable experience in that department. The members of the department would be involved in teaching from the first months of the undergraduate medical curriculum all through the residency program. The major argument that has developed has been whether or not such a clinical unit would be viable in our environment. It has been suggested that we purchase a nearby nursing home or construct beds nearby that would belong essentially to the Family Practice Department. Many feel that such an arrangement would be not viable because of the existence of specialty services in the immediate vicinity. It has thus been recommended that the leadership be stationed and housed in the medical center and that the clinical activities occur in a community hospital either in Kansas City or in a community hospital at some distance. The details of this have not yet been worked out.

The Family Practice Department of the University of Kansas Medical Center is supported financially by the state and becomes a reality, the selection of a head of such a department will be carried out in the method we have used for the last several years in selecting department heads. The Dean will appoint a committee of faculty members who will assemble names of candidates, recommendations, and so forth. They will request each candidate to visit the Medical Center and meet with the other department heads and selected faculty members, then they will make a recommendation to the Dean and the Executive Faculty. If agreement is reached the appointment will be recommended to the Chancellor and the Regents. It is my intention to appoint a family physician from the State of Kansas to the Selection Committee. To substantiate and support this contention it should be noted that I have appointed to the Selection Committee for a Professor of Medicine, an internist from Wichita; for a Professor of

November 13, 1969

Surgery, a surgeon from Topeka; for Professor of Community Medicine, a general internist from Emporia. Thus it is clear that my intent is to appoint a family physician along with faculty members to the committee to select the Chairman of the new Department of Family Practice if approved.

We have studied 14 other Family Practice programs and find we can be in the vanguard.

A TRIBUTE TO THOSE WHO SERVED

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, as the Nation tries to evaluate all the complex and controversial factors associated with this week's national confrontation over the President's policy to end the war in Vietnam, I believe we should reflect on where we, as people and as a nation, stand.

This is what I endeavored to do in a speech prepared for delivery at a Veterans Day event in Napa, Calif., on November 11. In it are some thoughts I would like to share with my colleagues and, perhaps, contribute in some way toward a better understanding of events transpiring across the Nation this week.

The speech follows:

A TRIBUTE TO THOSE WHO SERVED

(By Congressman DON H. CLAUSEN)

During the past 200 years, 38 million American men and women have responded to their nation's call—from the frozen fields of Valley Forge to the steaming jungles of South Vietnam.

As we pause once again to pay homage to these veterans, I cannot forget or resist this opportunity to read a letter written by a GI serving his third tour of duty in Vietnam to his parents. Regardless of how we, as individuals, feel about the war or the efforts for peace now being made, I believe this letter sums up better than anything I could possibly say, just where we, as people, find ourselves on this Veteran's Day, 1969.

Let me read from this letter:

"Dear Mom and Dad: I've been doing a lot of serious thinking about the state of world affairs, mostly about America and some of the news we hear. I've got a question I'd like to ask all the people back home . . .

"My God, how can it be?

"That one boy lies rotting from malnutrition and torture in a jungle prison camp in North Vietnam and another boy spits and tramples on the flag of his country on the steps of a university of learning.

"That one boy lies sightless in a U.S. naval hospital from communist-inflicted face wounds, and another boy uses a communist flag to drape himself in defiance of the laws of our country.

"That one man of medicine begins his 30th straight hour standing over an operating table in pursuit of life for a man serving his country, while another man of medicine implores crowds of young men to refuse to serve.

"That one Negro holds the face of his dead white buddy in his arms and cries without shame in a rice paddy of mud, and another Negro screams hate against his white brother on the street of an American city.

"That one boy lies in a coffin beneath the ground because he believed in duty to country, and another boy lies on a dingy cot giving blood to the enemies of his country.

"That one man of God shields a wounded boy from an enemy bayonet with his own body and dies, while another man of God

uses his cloth as a shield to preach hate, dissension and lawlessness.

"That one man spends his life in uniform serving his country, while another spends his life on drugs or in crime, hate and bigotry. "My God, how can it be? . . ."

The flames of bitterness, resentment and division burn brightly on this Veteran's Day as America desperately searches for the answer to this young soldier's question, because certainly, it is a question that is on the minds of millions of Americans.

It is ironic, I believe, and not too far removed from the theme of the soldier's letter, that we should honor America's servicemen and veterans on this day—only to be followed in a few more days by demonstrations against our government and our President who is trying desperately to end the war and secure peace, with genuine freedom, in Vietnam and to bring our troops home.

Let there be no doubt, I strongly support the right of citizens to peacefully assemble and/or express dissent against government policy. This is a basic right that I shall defend with all the vigor at my command. But, I question any demonstration against the war that criticizes *only* the President of the U.S.—that calls for the withdrawal of *only* U.S. troops—that calls on *only* the U.S. government to work harder for peace—or that condemns *only* one party to the conflict for the slow progress being made in negotiations at Paris. I also believe the American people are getting as tired of one-sided demonstrations in this country as they are of the war in Vietnam. However, isn't it about time these demonstrations start "Telling It to Hanoi?"

As most of you know, I was among the first—back in 1965, again in 1968 and 1969—to express my strong disapproval with the manner in which the war in Vietnam was being handled.

But, to express disapproval and criticism, by itself, is not enough. If one is not satisfied and disagrees with established policy, as responsible citizens, we have an obligation, in my judgment, to provide or offer a constructive alternative to that policy. Because, to me, the easiest thing in the world is to say, "I disagree." The real challenge is "What would you do differently or what course of action would you recommend?"—if you had the awesome responsibilities associated with the Presidency of these United States.

Those were the same basic questions I asked of myself. The results were, as most of you will recall, the development of our "Phase-In/Phase-Out Concept" through the creation of a Free Asian Security Organization.

This concept was presented as a "constructive alternative" to the policy in Vietnam that I submitted first in 1965 and then to President Johnson in early 1968, as well as to Presidential candidate Richard Nixon.

In describing the concept, it suggested: "Very briefly, it means redirecting the manpower emphasis in Vietnam whereby vastly more South Vietnamese and Free Asian Security forces would be injected into the ground war there and a like number of American fighting men withdrawn on a carefully conceived, methodical and realistic timetable basis.

"This could be done by creation of what I call a 'Free Asian Security Organization' composed of regular military units of the countries of Free Asia which are directly threatened by Communist expansion."

As many of you have told me, President Nixon's "Vietnamization" of the war and his November 3rd Nationwide, televised speech had a familiar ring and followed the basic concept of "Phase-In/Phase-Out" very closely.

This, of course, gives me a great sense of personal satisfaction because I firmly believe we are finally on the right course in Vietnam.

According to a recent poll, apparently 77%

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

of the American people agree, and only 6% disagree, with President Nixon's policy.

As a recent editorial in the Santa Rosa Press Democrat said,

"Public utterances by those participating in the October 15 'Vietnam Moratorium' demonstration fell largely into two divergent categories.

"Quite predictably, those who had spent months preparing and promoting the demonstration parroted, thought for thought, what the North Vietnamese have been saying at the Paris peace conferences—the United States must immediately withdraw all forces from South Vietnam, unconditionally and regardless of consequences.

"Some members of Congress and other public figures urged instead that a phased withdrawal of American troops be made.

"What these politicos are now saying, curiously enough, is exactly what the Nixon administration has publicly announced it is doing, and intends to keep on doing. This is an easy time to say it, and a popular time to say it—but they neglect to say where they were when President Kennedy turned a military advisorship into a small-sized war or when President Johnson turned it into a major conflict.

"Or even where they were when the Redwood Empire's Congressman, Don Clausen, advanced the concept of a planned, timetabled and orderly, phase-out of American participation. It was not the politically expedient thing to say at the time Mr. Clausen said it, and he received no support from some of his colleagues who more than a year later were advancing the same concept just as though it was not already underway, and just as though they had themselves just invented it in a sudden blinding flash of inspiration.

"Well, that's political expediency, we guess. Fortunately, it also happened to be responsible statesmanship, even if some of those came lately to the principle of phased withdrawal were a long time arriving."

I say the time has come for all Americans to demonstrate by deeds, not words, that we are one Nation, under God, indivisible, seeking peace, with freedom, justice and liberty for all mankind.

I say the time has come to re-unite these "Dis-United" States, by telling Hanoi and all Communist leaders in the world that the people of this Nation are still the leaders of the Free World—we are still the symbol of Freedom and Free Institution Building—offering that ray of hope to other peoples and countries who have a common desire and yearning for freedom.

One need only look to Czechoslovakia to realize the contrast between real freedom and the totalitarian Communist regimes imposed on people by the leadership from Moscow.

Remember, no country has chosen communism as a system through free elections—it has been thrust upon people and kept in control by outside forces.

One need only recall President Nixon's warm welcome by the people of Rumania to remind us of the respect people still have for our country and our people.

Veteran's Day, 1969, has many meanings to me.

It is a day, set aside, to honor, pay our respects and our appreciation to those Veterans of all wars for the extreme sacrifices they have made in defending our Nation and the cause of freedom throughout the world.

But, on this Veteran's Day, I believe we owe a special debt of gratitude to those veterans directly associated with the Vietnam conflict.

These men did not ask to be sent to fight this controversial, complex and very unpopular war—they went there because the then-elected Presidents and Commanders-in-Chief committed this Nation to that region.

To their everlasting and resounding credit,

I will never cease to be amazed at how well they've kept a high morale, demonstrated extraordinary courage, ability and leadership in what must be recognized as the "worst of all wars."

To me, these men have demonstrated something special; they've overcome great odds overseas, they've held their heads high above the internal dissension here at home and they've shown, once again, that an American fighting man is a man of character and courage that is accompanied by a benevolent and understanding attitude toward friend and foe alike.

They've shown an ability to adjust and adapt themselves to the most difficult of all threats to our security—guerrilla warfare.

They've demonstrated unusual skills and flexibility in handling very sophisticated and technical equipment, pacification, education, and training responsibilities, never before dreamed of during our time of military service.

Providing security for Free Nations in a Nuclear Age will require new dimensions, new security training and equipment, new and firmed-up alliances with our Free World friends.

It will require accelerated economic, diplomatic, and security integration among the free Nations—a merger of the Free Nations to advance the common interests, the social and economic progress of all people.

We must learn how to retain and improve our independence by maximizing our Free Nation inter-dependence.

There is no other choice in a Nuclear Age.

As we observe Veteran's Day, we, as veterans, have additional and continuing responsibilities; to keep up to date on all security matters.

In addition to "Telling It To Hanoi," we must communicate with all Americans—veterans and non-veterans alike—to tell them that all Americans need a broader understanding of the current day threats to our security—the complex problems associated with counter-guerrilla warfare techniques and the tremendously technical nuclear and space weapons systems.

We were trained to handle conventional military and warfare techniques.

This is one of the primary reasons the Vietnam and other guerrilla conflicts have been so difficult to understand. Honestly ask yourself, how many of you could explain guerrilla or nuclear warfare to your family or friends?

We must be able to explain that no Free Nation or system within that Nation can survive or endure without security.

Security is essential to political stability and political stability is essential to economic and social progress.

What we all seek is freedom of choice; fair, firm and factual free institutions through responsive and responsible government.

To me, that's what Vietnam and self-determination are all about.

We need to "tell it like it is," but we must also become better equipped to tell the whole story.

I hope Veterans' Day, 1969, will be a turning point in history.

I hope it will be a day of re-dedication to advancing the cause of peace with freedom in Vietnam and in all the world.

Recently, in our Nation's Capitol, I attended the funeral of one of our most colorful and greatest Americans, the one and only Senator Everett Dirksen.

There was, understandably, a second funeral ceremony in his home community in Illinois. I was told by colleagues that made the trip to Illinois that they observed, on that day, something exciting, heart-warming and rewarding.

They saw rows of people—children, parents, businesses and residences, all bedecked with American flags, holding them and waving them, unashamedly.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Somehow, I get the feeling that more and more Americans are becoming fed up with violence, militancy and wild, uncontrolled demonstrations.

I get the feeling they are tired of what some people are against and are searching desperately for something in the way of a cause they can all be for.

There is in the making, I believe, a resurgence of patriotism and pride in our country and what it stands for.

I sense a burning desire to put freedom on the move—recognizing full well that freedom isn't free—that we must all sacrifice and pay a price if we want to preserve our liberty.

I sense that the true spirit of America is coming alive, where patriotism and the pride of Old Glory will once again unite our people toward the common goal of peace on earth and good will toward man.

In the words of Douglas Jerrold: "We love peace—but not peace at any price! There is a peace more destructive of the manhood of living man than war is destructive of his material body. Chains are worse than bayonets."

And so I submit, that if the peace some seek in Vietnam only ends up chaining the people of South Vietnam, then I fear that 40,000 young American fighting men will have died in vain.

Of all the voices being heard on this vital question of war and peace, it is to those rather quiet voices of our men serving in Vietnam that I have also been listening. They believe there has been a major change in direction regarding the conduct of the war and the search for peace. They believe the level of the fighting has been drastically scaled down, and that American casualties have been substantially reduced. And, ladies and gentlemen, they believe the President is on the right track. I believe the American people should listen to these men too, because it is they who are risking their lives daily, and it is they who know better than anyone else what is actually taking place over there.

This is why I support the veterans who today, in response to those who offer only criticism and protest, are saying: "Tell it to Hanoi!"

And, they have earned the right to say it—the hard way.

Yes, Veteran's Day, 1969, is "Tell It To Hanoi Day," but let's make it "Tell It To The World Day" by walking up to a veteran or his family and saying, unashamedly, "I'm proud to be an American and everything America stands for, but, more importantly, "Thank you for your efforts to preserve our dignity, our purpose and our way of life."

Our veterans, both young and old, are the strength, the sinew, the heart, and the pulse of America. They fought, and many died, to make freedom endure, and I join millions throughout the world today in paying tribute to them—the men and women who have served in the uniform of this great country.

From the bottom of our hearts, we, your fellow Americans, thank you!!

BIG TRUCK BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my editorial for today is from the Nashua, N.H., Telegraph of August 8, 1969, in the State of New Hampshire. The editorial follows:

NEW ARGUMENT FOR LARGER TRUCKS

The trucking industry, engaged in a determined campaign for the last year or so to persuade the government to give even larger

trucks the run of the nation's roads, has lately come up with a new argument to bolster its case.

Industry spokesmen asserted in congressional hearings that the size and weight hikes desired would actually contribute to highway safety. Their reasoning is that by abandoning the present weight limit—73,280 pounds—for trucks on the interstate system and adopting instead an axle-spacing formula, weight distribution would be improved. Trucks might be heavier—up to 92,500 pounds—and wider, but also better balanced, and therefore less of a hazard to truckers, passenger car drivers, bridges and the roadways themselves.

There is no question that trucking is a vital element in the transport system of a consumption-happy society or that there are valid arguments for bringing existing regulations into line with changing needs of the industry and public, improved technology and highway facilities.

But this is one that is likely to be difficult to sell to drivers who have had white-knuckled experience maneuvering around and among present width and weight trucks, or struggled to keep a car on the road in the gale-force winds frequently created in passing or being passed by trucks.

AMERICAN INDIANS SPEAK OUT:
THE AMERICAN INDIAN TASK
FORCE STATEMENTS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, a group of us in the House met informally with members of the American Indian task force, an ad hoc committee of Indian leaders from 15 States. Many of the task force members are leaders of local, regional, and national Indian organizations. This loosely organized group makes no attempt to speak for all American Indians, however.

Prior to our meeting, task force representatives met with members of the Senate Indian Education Subcommittee and with Vice President AGNEW and administration officials at the White House.

At these meetings, task force members proposed new ways for Indian people to become more directly involved in shaping the Government programs that affect their lives so directly. The task force feels the need for new channels of communication to Government so that Indian voices are not lost in the maze of Federal agencies and congressional committees that are responsible for the development of Federal Indian policies.

Task force members share a deep sense of outrage at the injustices their people have suffered. They are understandably bitter about the deficiencies that they see in current Government efforts to aid Indians. While other Indians and concerned non-Indians may not agree with the task force point of view, this point of view certainly deserves to be heard.

I want to take this opportunity to insert the task force statements in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN INDIAN TASK FORCE'S STATEMENT PRESENTED TO VICE PRESIDENT SPIRO AGNEW AND WHITE HOUSE STAFF, NOVEMBER 10, 1969

We speak as Indians who care about what has happened to our people. We speak out

November 13, 1969

because every individual must and there must be some who are willing to start a process. We do not view ourselves as "chosen leaders" or an "Indian elite", though we come from various backgrounds and diverse tribes. But we do claim to be a cross-section of concerned non-establishment Indians.

We came together initially to assist in providing information for the book "Our Brother's Keeper" and to state whether, within our own personal knowledge, it spoke the truth.

The national concern aroused by "Our Brother's Keeper" cannot be allowed to dissipate. One of the main points made by this book is that, unlike most Americans, the Indians have little or no forum for redress of grievances and wrongs committed against them. The Task Force believes that there must be a direct channel of communication so that Indian voices are not lost in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Department of Interior, the Bureau of the Budget, Congressional Committees, or other parts of the bureaucratic and political maze in which Indians are now trapped. We are, therefore, proposing a process which could provide a way in which Indians could speak directly to the government of the United States, both to seek a redress of grievances and to initiate and shape Indian policy.

The Task Force has always and consistently been opposed to the idea of becoming another Indian organization. The membership has remained open and fluid. The length of time the Task Force will be in existence is limited in duration and consistent with this thought, that it views its objective to serve as a catalyst in beginning a process of dialogue for American Indians, and by American Indians, to have real input into the national decisions that affect our collective fates and national reality. We do not intend to supplant Indian organizations. We want this catalyst to be limited in scope of time to some definite period. We want the idea of an Indian controlled process to be one that transcends the limitations of various organizational agendas and is open to all. Today provides a forum to begin this process.

The Task Force proposes that a process of dialogue be initiated in all areas which shall coincide with the eleven area offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Each of these eleven areas is partially represented by individual members of the Task Force but it would be the responsibility of the entire Task Force, working with others, to expand in each area to insure that it included a broad spectrum of representation from numerous tribes, tribal chairmen, local organizations, individual spokesmen involved in issues, and representatives of urban Indians from cities within each area. Thus, the Task Force will establish separate and broadly representative Boards of Inquiry which would conduct hearings, receive grievances, and generate recommendations in the manner set forth below.

1. That a working meeting of the Task Force, with NCIO, be convened to determine the best way to present the idea of conferences and hearings.

2. That further area conferences be held to explain the need to begin the hearing process with each area's representatives to the Task Force and NCIO to discuss ways to expand the concept and lay groundwork for the hearings.

3. That there be hearings in each of the eleven areas—these hearings are to take testimony in open meetings from groups, tribes, and individuals about the needs and situations of the various people and to call for specific recommendations from the people. We urge federal agencies to attend the hearings as observers.

A. After the hearings, there will be continued input into the process through complaint and evaluation process by having a local center or person to take complaints in each local community. A "circuit rider" is

to be hired by the local Board of Inquiry who will take the complaints and make recommendations about solutions.

B. Red ribbon "grand juries," composed entirely of Indians, should be convened in order to investigate and report upon deprivations of rights, charges of inaction or unresponsiveness by officials, lack of effectiveness of educational, health and other services—and that where the facts appear to warrant it, the red ribbon "grand jury" shall not only come forward with findings of fact, but should also, by prior arrangement with the U.S. Attorney, present an "indictment" which the U.S. Attorney, or (in the event of conflict of interest) a lawyer provided by the government shall be called upon to investigate such charges and represent Indians in such a manner as to protect their rights and make government programs genuinely responsive to the desires and needs of Indians.

4. The Boards of Inquiry in the eleven areas are to meet again to evaluate the first round of hearings, include the continuing complaints, consider the circuit rider's findings, and take recommendation from another round of testimony to deal particularly with proposals and recommendations.

5. From each of the hearings and Boards of Inquiry, there is to be a National Board of Inquiry, composed of three members from each of the eleven areas to meet and make national recommendations. These members are to be chosen by an elective process by Indians. Finally, the entire process will result in the creation of a permanent ongoing local watchdog on bureaucratic programs.

We make this proposal because as Indians, we choose to go beyond talking about process and dialogue and consultation and to try to think through what would be a process that would be honest and would give Indians a genuine opportunity to be heard, to seek a redress of grievances and to take the initiative in shaping government policy.

We propose that the Task Force, supplemented by additional Indians from additional tribes and organizations, form a core of a group which would contract to implement this proposal. We believe that the time has come, not only for Indians to be consulted, but for them to design and implement a process of consultation whereby they can speak out their own grievances as they know them, articulate their problems, shape proposals, draft recommendations, circulate proposed legislative or administrative action for widespread discussion among Indian peoples. We believe that such functions should be performed by Indians—that there is no question here as to whether qualified Indians exist when this proposal has come from Indians—and we believe there is a clear statutory duty to contract this function to Indians under 36 Stat. L. 861. We submit that this is not only desirable—but that it would be a major symbolic break with the past practice where no Indians have been the ones paid to become Indian experts, while Indians served as volunteer educators for non-Indians.

We do not come here to blame this administration for the failures of the past—it is our hope that by implementing a listening process, that another group like this, in some future time, will not be needed because this administration failed to hear the Indian peoples.

THE STATEMENT TO CONGRESS MADE BY AMERICAN INDIAN TASK FORCE, NOVEMBER 12, 1969

I

We, the first Americans, come to the Congress of the United States that you give us the chance to try to solve what you call the Indian problem. You have had two hundred years and you have not succeeded by

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

your standards. It is clear that you have not succeeded in ours.

On Monday, we asked the Vice President of the United States to set into motion a process which would insure that our people could secure redress of grievances and could shape the government programs that affect and control their lives.

We know that a request to the Executive Branch—even if heeded—is not sufficient. We know that there are three branches—the Executive, the Legislative, and the Judiciary.

We come here today to ask you to do three things:

1. To serve as watchdog on the Executive Branch.
2. To facilitate—and certainly, not to bar—our access to the judicial branch; and,
3. To use your legislative powers to make it possible for Indians to shape their own lives and control their own destinies.

We have asked the Vice President of the United States for Indian boards of inquiries which would hold hearings throughout the areas where Indians live, for area conferences, for red ribbon grand juries, for circuit riders to take complaints and for a National Board of Inquiry to meet and make national recommendations based upon the complaints and recommendations received on the grass roots level.

And we ask you to help us see that the process we proposed to the Vice President somehow becomes a reality. We hope that he will be willing to do it on his own. But we ask you, as the representatives of the people of the United States to serve as our representatives too—to help us see that assurances do not become empty promises. And, if necessary, to enact legislation which will create such a process where Indians can really shape government policy and control their own lives and destinies if that is not done by the Executive Branch.

II

We come to you with a sense of impending betrayal at a moment when we wish to seek redress of grievances to ask you to broaden our access to the courts to protect the rights guaranteed us by your treaties and statutes. And we find, with a sense of horror, and impending doom, that instead, the Congress of the United States is on the verge of passing an Amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act which would effectively diminish the slight access to the courts we have gained in recent years through the advent of the OEO Legal Service Program. And, it is an even greater irony that we find this to be the case when the Governor's veto in at least one state has already killed a legal service program for Indians. What right do the Governors have to interfere with what goes on on the reservation. What right do state governors have to interfere with the solemn promises made to us by the federal government in statutes and treaties which can only be enforced by resort to the courts. What right do you, or any generation of Americans, have to rip up the solemn promises of the past—promises made to us both by the Constitution and by the President of a nation which still holds and enjoys the land received in exchange for those treaties. There are none among you who would suggest that rights—and above all the right to petition one's government—can have any meaning at all without lawyers and without access to the forum where the people traditionally petition their government.

III

We come to you today to ask that you set your own house in order. We say that until the congressional committees which control nearly all Indian legislation cease to be hostile to the interests of the Indian, then we have been deprived of one of the three branches of what we have been repeatedly told is our government as well as yours.

The present committees have pushed for termination, and have fostered on Congress seemingly neutral and technical legislation, under the guise of Indian expertise, which has taken away our land, our water rights, our mineral resources and handed them over to the white man.

You have been duped—as we have been duped. These committees have created a monstrous bureaucracy insensitive to Indians which trembles and cringes before them. The Indian suffers—and the nation pays the bill. Nothing will change so long as this unholy alliance exists between the BIA and these Congressional Committees.

On Monday we asked the Vice President to seek a new arrangement within the Executive Branch of Government—one which will bypass those channels which are hostile and insensitive to our interests. We asked him to set in motion a process by which our voices could be heard on our needs within the Executive Branch of Government.

Today, we come to seek a new arrangement with the Congress. We have come to seek a change in the committees that deal in Indian affairs. We ask that the committees of Congress not be dominated by interests which are hostile to our own survival. We ask that these committees act as a watchdog on federal programs which are passed especially for our benefit but which do not in fact benefit us because of the way the BIA runs them. And, we ask that these committees insure that we get our fair share of general legislation passed to help all citizens—highway legislation, health legislation, education legislation, economic development legislation. We do not get our fair share of these programs now. And we do not have any means to seek redress when the very programs that are passed to help us in fact are used as means to enslave and oppress us.

We come here today to remind you that you are not just the representatives of local districts or of states. You are members of the Congress of the United States. You have national obligations. We know you are highly conscious of your national obligations when you deliberate on such problems as the war in Viet Nam. We know that you have even taken those obligations seriously enough to go to Viet Nam in order to personally inform yourself on how the Executive carries out the commitments of the United States.

We ask that you do no less at home—for the United States has made older and more sacred national commitments to the people who have occupied these shores for twenty-five thousand years. The United States has made national commitments in the form of treaties, legislation and the Constitution itself, to our peoples. We ask you to come to our homes—in the cities and on the reservations. We ask that you seek with equal vigilance to determine whether national commitments have been kept to us. Guided tours by bureaucrats will only serve to hamper you in your search for truth.

You, the Congress of the United States, are being asked to come to see how we really live and to try to understand the values, the culture and the way of life we are fighting to preserve—an American way of life. A way of life which we believe is built upon respect for differences, a tolerance of diversity.

We cannot come to Washington. We are not rich. And we cannot afford the high price of democracy.

In essence, we ask the restoration of what you claimed at the founding of your nation—the inalienable right to pursue happiness. We cannot fall worse than the experts and the bureaucrats. We do not lack for knowledge—and we are not ashamed to hire experts and technicians. But our people do not lack for leaders, for sensitivity, for talent and ability. We ask for the right to pursue our dream—and we ask for you to respect that dream. That is the American way. We claim our birthright.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN TASK FORCE ATTENDING THE WASHINGTON, D.C., MEETINGS—NOVEMBER 10-12, 1969

John Belindo, Executive Director, National Congress of American Indians, Washington, D.C.

Clyde Bellicourt, Chairman, American Indian Movement, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

D. J. Banks, Director, American Indian Movement, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Mrs. Rose Crow Flies High, Three Affiliated Tribes, New Town, North Dakota.

George Groundhog, President, Original Cherokee Community Organization, Tahlequah, Oklahoma.

Simon Howard, Leech Lake Chippewas, Cass Lake, Minnesota.

Archie J. LaCoote, Passamaquoddy Tribe, Princeton, Maine.

Cipriano Manuel, Papago Tribe, Tempe, Arizona.

Miss Janet McCloud, Tulalip Tribe, Yelm, Washington.

Peter McDonald, Executive Director, Office of Navajo Economic Opportunity, Fort Defiance, New Mexico.

Bill Pensoneau, President, National Indian Youth Council, Ponca City, Oklahoma.

Jess Six Killer, Executive Director, American Indians-United, Chicago, Ill.

Ernie Stevens, Executive Director, California Inter-Tribal Council, Sacramento, California.

James Vidovich, Chairman, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, Nixon, Nevada.

Florence Josiah, Devils Lake Sioux Tribe, Devils Lake, North Dakota.

Mary Cornelius, Turtle Mountain Chippewas, Turtle Mountain, North Dakota.

John Borbridge, Vice President, Alaska Federation of Natives, Anchorage, Alaska.

ISAIAH AWARD TO BENJAMIN V. COHEN

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Ben Cohen, has written a very distinguished chapter in the history of America. As the confidante and able troubleshooter of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, he conceived and drafted many of the pieces of permanent legislation which are now the basis of American administrative law.

But, Mr. Speaker, this period in Ben Cohen's life was only one phase in a life of significant contributions he made for this Nation. Recently at a dinner he received the Isaiah Award of the American Jewish Committee marking his devoted service to his fellow man. I am pleased to attach to my remarks the eloquent address of Judge Harold Leventhal bestowing the award and the brilliant response of Mr. Cohen:

PRESENTATION OF ISAIAH AWARD TO THE HONORABLE BENJAMIN V. COHEN

(Remarks by Harold Leventhal)

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen: Tonight we gather together for the presentation to Benjamin V. Cohen of the Isaiah Award for human relations given by the American Jewish Committee of Washington.

This designation of the Isaiah Award is in recognition of Ben Cohen's contribution to the cause of justice, justice taken in the broadest sense, and contribution to the cause of peace. Joining Ben Cohen's name with that of the great prophet is uniquely fitting.

We need not carry the point to extremes.

Ben Cohen's characteristic diffidence in offering his wisdom is not in the same style as that of the impassioned public orator whose poetic cadences and images are recorded in the Bible.

The essential point, however, is that our guest of honor tonight has the same harmonious blend of intellectual gifts and fine qualities of heart as the Prophet; that both find the key that opens the door from man to man not in pomp but in unflinching devotion to justice and equity.

In the familiar quotation from chapter 1 verse 17 of Isaiah enshrined in the Award the Lord has cried out against those who trample his courts and bring vain oblations. "I cannot endure iniquity along with the solemn assembly." And then: "Cease to do evil. Learn to do good." I interject that this typically is set forth as it is in the program—Learn "to do well"—but I think the more faithful meaning, in terms of both Hebrew and English, is served by the wording: "Learn to do good."

The verse continues with the familiar injunction—"Seek justice, relieve the oppressed. Judge the fatherless, plead for the widow." In other words, protect those least able to protect themselves—and a close by passage teaches this includes protection against rulers. And then the next verse, the famous verse 18: "Come now and let us reason together."

In Ben Cohen these well springs of the heart prime a pump of rare intellectual power. Born in Muncie in 1894, 75 years ago, he emerged with highest legal honors first at Chicago and then at Harvard. He was law secretary to Judge Mack. By age 25 he had become counsel for the American Zionists at the Peace Conference in London and Paris, 1919-1921.

In eleven years of successful New York law practice he combined what someone termed an unworldly outward manner with a worldly understanding of the ways of corporations and securities markets. That he was able to make it for himself did not make him complacent, or untroubled by the plight of others.

He came to Washington in 1933 with the New Deal, and committed himself to one after another of Franklin Roosevelt's programs to provide the reforms needed to cope with social and economic ills, and in the ultimate to save constitutional government. The redoubtable team of Cohen and Corcoran, with its preparation, pep and persistence, was largely responsible for the emergence in three years of a trilogy of reform legislation on securities, exchanges, and utility holding companies. I hope Mr. Corcoran will include in his remarks tonight some reminiscences of that time, and perhaps of the campaign headquarters in the red brick house on R Street. Mr. Cohen then turned his attention to minimum wage legislation. He had become involved in minimum wage guarantees for the State of New York in the 1920's, and now he rededicated himself at a time when progress in this area was made more difficult by the heat of the Supreme Court plan.

Cohen and Corcoran and associates, including men like William Douglas and Robert Jackson, later elevated to the highest Court, sparked what Arthur Schlesinger has dubbed the Second New Deal. Not the sweeping plans of the NRA and kindred measures, that opened the way to all the dangers of industrial self-government, but limited and realistic programs, brilliantly drafted so as to anticipate problems and think enough through remedies, programs that have stood the test of time. In the words of the Alsops, it was Ben Cohen—"the most selfless, most brilliant . . . of the lot . . . whose inconspicuous signature is to be found on an actual majority of the truly fruitful great measure of the Roosevelt years."¹

¹ Joseph and Stuart Alsop, the Reporter's Trade, p. 22.

November 13, 1969

In the war years his "brain trust" resources were devoted to such causes as initiating the plan for lend-lease, and then to key, knotty and unglamorous assignments of the economic stabilization and war mobilization programs. James Byrnes wrote this of him:²

"Ben, in his quiet, shy way, has had a hand in important issues ever since the early days of the Roosevelt administration. He was with me through all my work at the White House. In addition to having a genuine affection for him, I regard his mind as one of the best I ever encountered. There is no more selfless and devoted public servant than Ben Cohen."

Then comes the culmination of his career in efforts to help build a durable system to further the goals of international peace and harmony. He served as adviser at Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods, and later on the U.S. delegation to the U.N.

From 1945 to 1947 he was counselor of the State Department. Dean Acheson's recent book refers to Ben's special "nature" as pointing that post toward contribution rather than difficulty, and recalls that Ben Cohen was importantly involved in the international aspects of atomic energy, and in the formulation of the Marshall Plan.

A special word is surely warranted for Ben's contribution to peace-making.

Isaiah's vision embraced the time when the nations "shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks," when "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." Ch. 2, v. 4. But Isaiah spoke out against treaty alliances for his time. While Ben Cohen was plunged in 1945 and 1946 into the exhausting and often heart-breaking meetings of the Council of Foreign Ministers and finally the Paris Peace Conference. Now he applied lessons learned 25 years before when he stayed on in London after the principal American Zionists withdrew and when, in Weizman's words, he devoted many months to "the battle of the Mandate," when "draft after draft was proposed, discussed and rejected."³

Now after World War II he was the exemplar of patience, exploring all possible paths for the ex-enemy states to reach agreement to join the United Nations and the international agencies trying to improve and stabilize living conditions. Byrnes recalls this memorably, and records that those times needed both firmness and patience. In our country counselors of firmness are in long supply and Secretary Byrnes properly records his debt to Ben Cohen's distinctive counseling of the unglamorous but indispensable patience and persistence.

In the Holmes lectures at Harvard a few years ago Mr. Cohen spoke on the Constitutional Crisis of the U.N. If there was keen disappointment over the residue of small envoys in great halls, there was continuation of his constructive, problem-solving spirit, of selfless devotion to the cause of international understanding.

In recent years he has continued the thread of service to his fellow Jews. His quiet counsel has been sought by those charged with guidance of the new State of Israel. Never does he thrust himself forward, but never is he unavailable when called.

That this man retains the commitment to Zionism he began with Judge Mack more than 50 years ago, though he of all men is devoid of narrow nationalism and is a profound internationalist, this is no anomaly. Nor is it an exception born out of the necessity of holocaust and terror and defined in those narrow limits. Ben Cohen's contributions reflect a philosophy that is of a piece, a passion for justice and serenity of inner conviction that distills the wisdom of pluralism, that different strands may intertwine

² Speaking Frankly, p. 67.

³ C. Weizman, Trial and Error, p. 279-280.

in harmony and strength, at home and abroad. His is not a romantic cosmopolitanism that forecasts all national differences will wither away. His is the internationalism of serious people, aware that national identities are cherished and strong, but aware too that strong links abroad are best forged by nations strong at home, strong not in chimerical pursuit of solutions through violence but in fostering the mutual striving of citizens for fraternity and justice.

No presentation of Ben Cohen today can ignore his views on Vietnam. From the start he was firmly against involvement. He held these views intensely when they were not widely shared, and though there was pain as ties of friendship frayed. He stood by his conviction though it exiled him from the councils of his once-intimate friend, Lyndon Johnson. He was ready then, as in other times, to stand by his devotion to highest principles though this isolated him from the company of those in highest office.

Today, as many join in the probing for disengagement, one never hears from him even a breath of, "I told you so." It always the constructive approach, to reason together, to consider what can be done now.

This has been the hallmark of this devoted, selfless servant of mankind throughout his life. His eyes are on the stars, his feet on the ground. He knows full well how many problems are not solved so much as reformulated. He is a pragmatist in human relations, understanding motivations, accepting foibles, sympathetic of frailty. Of himself, however, he is not sparing. Outwardly quiet and diffident, his inner spirit marks a totality of commitment and involvement. And in all the important things he has always been resolute and bold.

Our Award dinner is not parochial in outlook. We have honored men of other faiths, last year Carlo Christiansen, Cultural Attaché of the Danish Embassy and recently Cardinal O'Boyle. Our guest has been honored by men of other faiths, many here tonight. Tonight we glow not as a religious community, but as a broader community of men, honoring a selfless servant of his fellow men, a rare spirit who has been a source of deep and abiding inspiration.

It was said of Isaiah and it is apt for the man we honor tonight—He has "his heart in the things of eternity . . . his spirit in the eternal counsel of God, and his body in a very definite moment of history."⁴

It is with a joyous heart that I ask the Honorable Benjamin Cohen to step forward to receive the Isaiah Award of the American Jewish Committee.

REMARKS OF BENJAMIN V. COHEN

I am deeply moved by your presence here tonight, at the Isaiah award and Judge Levensthal's praises. Somehow I associate the Isaiah award not only with the prophet of Biblical times, but with Mr. Justice Brandeis, of more recent memory, the great exponent of social justice whom many of us, privileged to consult with him on Jewish matters, would reverently call Isaiah.

I must confess I feel some embarrassment in receiving your award because most of the things I have done and the movements and causes I have served have been carried through not alone but with others. Indeed it is my feeling that most of the things we accomplish are accomplished with the assistance of others. I would like, therefore, to feel that I accept your award not for myself alone, but for all those who have worked at various times in the vineyard with me, many who have done as much as I, some who did much more, some of them are here tonight and many who helped unseen and unknown to you and me.

Great changes have occurred since I came

⁴ Introduction p. x to The Book of Isaiah, the Soncino Books of the Bible.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

to Washington in the early Thirties with the Roosevelt administration. Still I find striking similarities with the present. There was then as now great frustration and discontent. The generation gap may not have been so striking, but many of our literary intellectuals were saying then that our economic institutions were obsolete, broken beyond repair and some even suggested we might have something to learn from Russia. There was also a crime problem then—those were the days of Al Capone and the rackets, of bootleggers and hi-jackers. There was peaceful, and not so peaceful, resistance to law. Farmers in Iowa resisted with pitch forks and rifles efforts to foreclose on their farm mortgages. Sit-in strikers in Michigan refused to leave their employer's plants. There was no black or white back-lash, but there were militant demagogues—Father Coughlin demanding radical monetary reforms, Huey Long and Gerald Smith preaching share the wealth. Rational arguments were as important then as now to quiet irrational demands.

But Roosevelt deflated these divisive movements by gaining the confidence of, and winning away, their supporters—not by arguments but by action. He did this not by meeting their impossible demands, but by rehabilitating the banking system, providing aid to industry and agriculture and relief and work for the unemployed. Some of these programs were inadequate by present standards, but they were sufficient to show that he cared not for a chosen few, but for all of our people. Many Southerners then had some doubts about his attitude on the race issue, but he did so much for their people, their poor white people, that they gave him their support.

The times are equally challenging now. The frustration of our youth and the militancy of some of our disadvantaged groups should alert us to the causes of their discontent. President Nixon in a speech shortly after his election called upon us to meet our urgent problems in the spirit of togetherness. I believe that if the President does develop programs for us in the spirit of togetherness, which must embrace all of us—the unrepentant sinners as well as the silent majority, the country will respond as it responded to Franklin Roosevelt in the 1930's.

The rapid urbanization of our country has created terribly serious social and environmental problems which must be given first rank in the determination of our national priorities. Upon the meeting of these problems depend the continued health, moral strength, and vitality of our people which is the source of our national security.

But we are not likely to be able to give first priority to the growing crisis at home unless we take steps without delay to bring to an end our tragic involvement in Vietnam and, what may be more important for the future, unless we are able to guard against the presently threatened acceleration of the nuclear arms race.

Our withdrawal from Vietnam is not a retreat to isolationism. It is not an abandonment of any treaty or charter obligation. It is a retreat from what the wisdom of hindsight if not foresight we should recognize as an unfortunate misadventure in the internal affairs of another country. It is a retreat from an outmoded colonial foreign policy which we stumbled into when in the course of the cold war we supported the French return to Indo-China. Our withdrawal is not only in our own interest, but in the interest of the people of South Vietnam and of world peace. Our principal concern should be to obtain from all concerned and for all concerned guarantees of amnesty and protected asylums for those whose lives are in danger.

I have grave doubts about our supporting the vietnamization of the war without clearer evidence that that is the wish not only of the Saigon government but of the

great majority of the people of South Vietnam. I hope we may help all the war-weary people of that land to find peace and to work together in peace.

Let me add that what our government does or does not do in South Vietnam should not affect what it does or does not do for Israel. The two situations are markedly different. In South Vietnam we intervened in a bitter civil war to support one side. We not only supplied aid, but with our armed forces took over the fighting and made the war our war. The State of Israel is fighting to defend its right to exist against the combined forces of neighboring Arab States. Israel is not asking for combat troops or the logistic or air support of our armed forces, but only for arms and economic aid to defend itself.

The important thing is that our government take our people into its confidence before the takeoff and not just before the crash landing.

Before the Tonkin Bay incidents, there was very little public debate on, or public knowledge of, what we were really doing in Vietnam. The activist operations of the CIA in Laos and Vietnam were top secret. Our people were not aware of the seriousness of our involvement in South Vietnam or of the unavoidable effect of that involvement on the determination of our national priorities.

I do not think our people are now aware that the success or failure of the disarmament talks starting this week in Helsinki may be the most decisive factor in determining our national priorities in the coming decade. Unfortunately we do not know what our government's position in these talks will be. We do not know what those who have labored in the disarmament agency are thinking. I fear, I hope I am mistaken, that they are still waiting instructions from the Pentagon.

The nuclear arms race between us and the Soviet Union has clearly got out of control. Neither our government nor the Soviet seems content with the approximate balance in deterrent power which each of us now possesses. Common sense suggests that we stop while we are in a situation where each is not likely to risk nuclear war with the other. Instead, however, each fears the other is going to get ahead in a race for a technological breakthrough and tries to get there first. Not only with the ABMs, but more importantly with the MIRVs and FOBS and other multiple-head missiles, we are about to engage in an alarmingly accelerated and incalculably costly arms race which if not promptly arrested, will gravely jeopardize any hope of a negotiated cessation or slowing down of the race in the foreseeable future. If these new weapons become a part of our arsenal, it will be extremely difficult for us and the Soviet to agree on the ground inspections we will consider necessary to check observance.

If the nuclear arms race continues, each of us will fear that the other may have acquired a first-strike potential, and in a crisis each may be tempted to strike first to knock out the other's ability to respond for fear that the other is planning a first strike. Consequently the accelerated arms race far from deterring, may actually precipitate, a nuclear holocaust. If we seek an illusory security in an accelerated arms race, we will be obliged to defer domestic programs vital to the domestic peace, well-being and genuine security of our country.

Many who have followed past disarmament talks are convinced that there are those on the Soviet side as well as on our side who believe that our countries have a common interest in the cessation of the arms race which drains away our resources and in the avoidance of nuclear war which threatens our common destruction. But there are also those on both sides who act otherwise. If we really want to stop the arms race, why as a prelude to arms control talks, should both

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

countries continue to add new and more sophisticated weapons to their already overkill operational armaments, and why should each impugn the good faith of the other by ascribing to the other a possible first-strike intention? When we rightly condemn some of the younger generation's irrational and self-defeating conduct—their extravagant demands, violence, and obscenities—in opposition to our defense programs, let us remember that some of our actions appear equally irrational and self-defeating to them.

We have strayed from our old traditions, our disdain of power politics and power alliances. We fought two world wars to oppose the lawless exercise of power and at the end of each sought to establish the rule of law in place of the rule of power. We re-armed after World War II to defend the law of the Charter. We entered into defensive regional organizations to give collective support to the Charter. But then came the cold war and Korea and disillusionment. And we strayed into the field of power politics and power alliances.

But now the Congress and the American people are troubled and are having second thoughts about our arms, our alliances and wars. They want no more Vietnams. There is talk of reducing our over-extended commitments.

There is the suggestion that we limit our commitments to certain pre-determined areas of vital interest and not be concerned with the rest. But we live in an interdependent and changing world, and our interest and involvement are far-reaching and world wide. We may limit our treaty commitments, but not our interests. It is impossible to foresee where and when our interests may be significantly and vitally affected by future events. It would be highly dangerous for us to foreswear any concern with what may happen in any part of the world. Dean Acheson, you may recall, was unfairly accused of inviting the attack on Korea by doing just that shortly before the attack on Korea. On the other hand if we do make treaty commitments we should guard against their being completely open end. One generation has not the right or the power to tie the hands of the next generation. We should reserve leeway to ourselves to determine the nature and extent of our response. Resort to war is not the only means of meeting a commitment or fulfilling our responsibilities or protecting our interests in the absence of commitment. The credibility of our commitments may be shaken quite as much by stretching as by narrowing them contrary to their intent and purpose.

The most unfortunate result of our preoccupation with arms and military alliances has been our failure to develop adequate procedures in the United Nations or elsewhere to aid in the peaceful settlement of international disputes. In this nuclear age, war is no longer a practical method of settling international disputes. Yet because of the frustrations of the cold war, we have almost abandoned "our last best hope of peace on earth."

It is frequently said that the United Nations is impotent to promote peaceful settlements because it lacks power to enforce settlements. But it is not so much the lack of power in the United Nations which stands in the way of peaceful settlement as the lack of effort or will on the part of member states, particularly the great powers, to develop fair and objective processes and procedures for peaceful settlement. It is putting the cart before the horse to worry how the United Nations is going to muster power to enforce peaceful settlement before it has developed processes and procedures for peaceful settlement which can command the respect of states whose national interests and possibly very existence is at stake. There is no reason why the United Nations cannot be equipped to be as effective in assisting

in the settlement of disputes among nations without compulsory powers as our government is in assisting in the settlement of labor disputes which affect our national welfare without compulsory powers.

It is not surprising that intemperate inventive and cold war debate in the Security Council do not create an environment conducive to peaceful settlement, particularly when the debate is hastily followed by the counting of partisan, political votes—in many instances, pledged in advance and uninformed and unaffected by the facts or merits of the controversy.

Many of us would like to see Israel work more closely with the United Nations, but we can understand Israel's bitterness in having to plead its case before the Security Council where the Soviet Union and the Arab states can always control the votes of a majority. Israel may not always exercise due restraint in its reprisals, but the Council almost invariably condemns Israel's reprisals, but never the terrorists raids which provokes them. Finally last summer the United States announced that it would not support a one-sided resolution condemning Israel's reprisals, but not the raids which provoked them. Yet when it came to the vote, our government abstained, being unwilling to be counted because its negative vote would have been a veto. It stood by while the one-sided resolution was carried with the votes of Pakistan, Hungary and Algeria. I do not favor the arbitrary use of the veto, but I think it is the duty our government to exercise the veto to prevent the abusive exercise of powers by others.

The situation certainly reveals the urgent need of improved non-political procedures in aid of peaceful settlement.

What is needed is a corps of professional diplomats, of worldwide repute, whose experience and training qualify them to serve as a mediation and conciliation service. The service should be empowered to intervene whenever there is a breach of peace or sooner if there is an imminent threat to peace so that meaningful efforts can be made to limit the issues and bring the parties together before the fighting starts, and positions and passions hardened. The service should provide the Security Council and General Assembly with reports as objective as possible of the essential facts and issues. Every precaution should be taken to relieve the Security Council and General Assembly from having to act on the uncorroborated statements of the disputants and their partisans.

If the United Nations is to develop effective procedures for peaceful settlement, there must be a down-grading of political voting, an avoidance of broad moralistic judgments, an upgrading of efforts to create processes of conciliation and mediation to bridge and narrow differences, to find acceptable accommodations and compromises, and to devise *ad hoc* or provisional arrangements which leave to the solvent of time and the wisdom of a future generation seemingly irreconcilable conflicts.

It is now almost eight years since a delegation of the American Association for the United Nations consisting of Mrs. Roosevelt, Norman Cousins, Arthur Larson, Clark Eichelberger, Herman Steinkraus, Oscar de Lima and myself went to the White House to urge that we take the Vietnam question to the United Nations instead of beginning to participate in the fighting as the Taylor-Rostow Report had recommended. We were referred to the State Department and there we were told that they had considered that, but after talking with Dag Hammarskjold they did not think they could get the action there they wanted. They decided they could handle the situation better alone. Had they gone to the United Nations I am sure they would not have gotten what they wanted. But the American people might have had time and opportunity to learn into what

November 13, 1969

a tragic pit they were being asked to leap. They might have learned it is sometimes better to endure patiently the ordeal of peaceful settlement than to put our trust in trial by battle even with our superior arms.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUB WEEK

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, recently we have recognized the celebration of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Club Week. I would like to pay my respects to them at this time for I feel they are one of the outstanding organizations of my State.

The national federation was founded in 1919 as the result of a call issued by the Secretary of War, Newton D. Baker, for coordinated womanpower.

The purposes of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, as set forth in the articles of incorporation, include the improvement of conditions in all business and professions; the extension of opportunities to better the business and professional status of women; the preparation of women for leadership in their communities, their States and the Nation; and the advancement of women in their respective fields of work so that they may make their greatest contribution to the common good.

Health and safety are major concerns of the business and professional woman, and they are basic to all her other pursuits. In programming, our major emphasis is on the positive and preventative approach.

Another objective is a better understanding of a cooperation with the people of other nations. Through their understanding and interpretation of the work of the various agencies of the United Nations, they help to crystallize public opinion. By the support of legislative measures designed to create the necessary authority to enforce action of the United Nations, they render service to make this great experiment succeed.

An example of the work they do is a nursing home constructed in the Republic of Nationalist China in 1960. Mr. Speaker, these ladies have established an outstanding record of service to our country and I commend them on the fine work they have done and on the exciting plans they have laid for the future. At this time I would like to mention the names of a few of those persons who have helped to make the BPW an outstanding organization in Kentucky:

Mrs. Ledean B. Hamilton, State president.

A few of the outstanding club presidents are: Mrs. Bonnie Kitchens, Mrs. Francis P. Brockman, Mrs. Louise Hutchison, Mrs. Alma Henderlight, Mrs. Prentice Collier, Mrs. Bobby Carol Noland, Mrs. Evelyn Cornett, Mrs. Evelyn Burnette, Mrs. Hilda Keller, Mrs. Leone

Prater, Miss Vada Chumley, Miss Donna E. Miracle, Mrs. Irene Vertees, Mrs. Enola Wheat, Mrs. Elsie C. Matheny, Mrs. Helen Vaughn, Mrs. Mildred Bedford, Mrs. Mable Hutton, and Mrs. Sue Steely.

Some of the outstanding district directors are: Miss Kate H. Woods, district 8 director; Mrs. Mary Nell Neff, district 9 director; Mrs. Olive Davis, district 10 director; and Mrs. Martha Wirtz, district 11 director.

Two outstanding assistant district directors are: Mrs. Ruth Murphy, assistant director, district 9; and Miss Florence King, assistant director, district 10.

RURAL HOUSING NEEDS

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, recently the House of Representatives passed H.R. 13827, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969.

Within this legislation was an increase in authority for the Farmers Home Administration, thereby allowing more housing in rural America. As I indicated on the floor of the House of Representatives during debate of H.R. 13827, there is a crying need for adequate housing facilities not only in urban America but also in rural America.

Mr. Speaker, while we have passed H.R. 13827, this is, in my opinion, only a step in the right direction. An example of the housing problems in rural America is expressed in a letter from one of my constituents, Mr. Leonard J. Meyer, of Belgrade, Minn. So that my colleagues may know there is much to be done in this area I hereby submit for the RECORD Mr. Meyer's letter:

BELGRADE, MINN.,
October 28, 1969.

Hon. JOHN ZWACH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Being a Committeeman for the FHA of this county, and a citizen of a good small community of Belgrade, I feel obligated to write you about a few problems small communities face unless some kind of action is taken to improve things.

As you are probably aware of we have here in Belgrade a housing shortage as in most small communities, and in order for a small community to grow and prosper we must have available housing for the low income families, as well as for our higher income bracket. We have two four-plex and one duplex apartments here at Belgrade and they are all filled and more people are waiting for housing. One thing that many people as well as myself think, is that the maximum income of \$6,000 to be eligible for low income housing, should be raised to probably around \$8,000 so we would have more people eligible. As you probably know many young people just can't get financing to build their own home if their income is below \$8,000 or so. Most people have car payments, insurance to pay, and many other bills as well as the high cost of living, there-by cannot afford payments on a house. With housing available

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

for them we could keep more people in the home area instead of leaving for the overpopulated larger cities. Our education program also suffers when we can't give teachers a place to live so they move on to a different locality and we have to take the teachers that are left. We must keep our small communities for without them the country would suffer greatly. We are as you always say the "Grass Roots" so we should keep it that way.

Our "Bel-Plex" apartments also pay local taxes derived from real estate taxes paid by them. This also gives our community a boost.

Any help you may be able to give us in this matter would be greatly appreciated. I judge by your reports etc. that you have been kept quite busy and I know you are fighting for the right things, so if you could help low-income housing we will all be grateful to you. Keep up the good work.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

LEONARD J. MEYER,
Crow River Twp.

VIETNAM RESOLUTION

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, on November 3, 1969, the President picked up a fallen standard, and proclaimed "Nixon's war." On a closer look, the war he proposes to continue is dismally close to Johnson's war: a commitment to the pursuit in Vietnam of unattainable ends, open ended in time, cost, and the use of American firepower against Vietnamese.

The fundamental flaw is in the narrowing of the choice to two positions: "precipitate" withdrawal or an indefinite commitment to prop up militarily the present government in Saigon—with the pious hope of transferring the ground war ultimately to the South Vietnamese forces. We do not propose either, and we find the President's Vietnam policy tragically ill conceived for three principal reasons:

First. Short of destroying the entire country and its people, we cannot eliminate the enemy forces in Vietnam by military means, which even President Nixon concedes; "military victory" is no longer the U.S. objective. What the President fails to recognize is that the opposing leadership cannot be coerced by any U.S. strategy into making the kinds of concessions currently demanded.

Second. Past U.S. promises to the Vietnamese people are not served by prolonging our inconclusive and highly destructive military activity in Vietnam. It must not be prolonged merely on demand of the Saigon government, whose interest in preserving its status and power is served only by continuing the war with American support, not by settling it, and whose capacity to survive on its own must finally be tested, regardless of outcome.

Third. The importance to the U.S. national interest of the future political complexion of South Vietnam does not

justify the human, political, and material cost: a war which divides our people, brutalizes our minds, confounds our economy, and brings untold tragedy to hundreds of thousands of American families.

It is for these reasons that we conclude that U.S. forces in South Vietnam should be systematically withdrawn on an orderly and fixed schedule—neither precipitate nor contingent on factors beyond our control—to extend only over such period of time as shall be necessary to provide for the safety of U.S. forces, secure the release of American prisoners of war, assist any Vietnamese desiring asylum, and enable the United States to make an orderly disposition of its facilities in South Vietnam.

The President worries, as did his predecessors, about a domestic political "hang-over" from withdrawal: after immediate relief, "inevitable remorse and decisive recrimination would scar our spirit as a people" as "we saw the consequences of what we had done." His solution remains that of his predecessors: to postpone such painful "withdrawal symptoms" simply by continuing the war, with its cost in American and Vietnamese lives. That is the course of the addict; it may be the major hidden basis for our Government's addiction to this war over so many years and so many disappointments. It is not, as he presents it, the hard, courageous way to address this real problem, but the politically easy way, for the short run: easier than admitting past mistakes and facing painful consequences. It is not "the right way."

It seems clear that the President believes this to be a just war, one he would feel dishonored to disown. In his speech, he discusses the consequences of disengagement in emotional words—"defeat, betrayal, humiliation"—that warn of years' more war. He implies a sense of U.S. responsibility for political developments in South Vietnam that can be discharged only by indefinite combat engagement. His plan for "winning a just peace" is a plan for continuing U.S. involvement indefinitely, not at all a plan for ending it.

It is a policy that must goad the Hanoi leadership to challenge it by increasing the pressure of U.S. casualties; to which the President promises to respond by escalation, against all past evidence—and consistent, reliable intelligence predictions—that this would neither deter nor end such pressure. In fact, we have heard a plan not only for continuing the war but for returning it to levels—in firepower, commitment of prestige, destruction inflicted—recently abandoned. It is a plan and a speech we might have heard, without surprise, from Johnson, Rusk, or Rostow: indeed, we have, many times.

The text of our resolution reads as follows:

H. RES. 704

Resolved, That it is the sense of Congress that United States forces in South Vietnam should be systematically withdrawn on an orderly and fixed schedule—neither precipitate nor contingent on factors beyond our control—to extend only over such period of time as shall be necessary to (a) provide for the safety of United States forces, (b) secure

the release of American prisoners of war, (c) assist any Vietnamese desiring asylum, and (d) enable the United States to make an orderly disposition of its facilities in South Vietnam.

The cosponsors of the resolution are:
JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, of New York.
GEORGE E. BROWN, of California.
PHILLIP BURTON, of California.
HUGH L. CAREY, of New York.
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, of New York.
WILLIAM B. CLAY, of Missouri.
JEFFERY COHELAN, of California.
JOHN CONYERS, JR., of Michigan.
BOB ECKHARDT, of Texas.
DON EDWARDS, of California.
LEONARD FARBSTEIN, of New York.
DONALD M. FRASER, of Minnesota.
KEN HECHLER, of West Virginia.
HENRY HELSTOSKI, of New Jersey.
ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, of Wisconsin.
EDWARD I. KOCH, of New York.
ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN, of New York.
ABNER J. MIKVA, of Illinois.
PATSY T. MINK, of Hawaii.
WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania.
BERTRAM L. PODELL, of New York.
HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin.
BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, of New York.
WILLIAM F. RYAN, of New York.
JAMES H. SCHEUER, of New York.
LOUIS STOKES, of Ohio.
JEROME R. WALDIE, of California.
LESTER L. WOLFF, of New York.

ONE OF CONNECTICUT'S MOST DISTINGUISHED CITIZENS

HON. LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Speaker, one of Connecticut's most distinguished citizens was in Washington recently for a most important meeting. Mr. Ralph A. Hart, chairman of the board of the food and beverage firm of Heublein, Inc., based in Hartford, participated in the 2-day meeting of the newly designated National Public Advisory Council of the General Services Administration. The panel of 16 outstanding Americans was named by Administrator Robert L. Kunzig to bring about greater public involvement in the affairs of GSA.

The appointment of this Council represents another forward step in President Nixon's program of making the Federal Government more responsive to the needs of the public. I am proud that a Connecticut man is serving on this important panel. That a man of Mr. Hart's stature should be chosen to serve on this Council is indicative of the importance Mr. Kunzig attaches to the mission of the panel. Mr. Hart brings a wealth of experience to the GSA Advisory Council—experience gained in his 37-year career in business and in service to his fellow man and to his country. I want to commend Mr. Kunzig for his foresight in choosing such distinguished men to serve on the Advisory Council.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

POLITICAL PERSPECTIVE: CHOOSING THE PRESIDENT

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a continuing effort of the nonpartisan League of Women Voters has been to interest citizens not only in getting out to vote on election day but to take part in the nominating process. The taped recording "Political Perspective: Choosing the President" helps the citizen understand the nominating process and where he fits in. Dr. Arthur L. Peterson and Dr. Daniel M. Ogden agree that "to have a voice in the party of your choice" the citizen must start early.

A transcription of the League of Women Voters' program on this subject follows:

POLITICAL PERSPECTIVE: CHOOSING THE PRESIDENT

Participants in the order of their appearance:

Torrey Baker, former broadcaster, Voice of America.

Dr. Arthur L. Peterson, former Executive Director of the National Republican Committee, Chief of Staff of the Republican National Conventions Temporary Committee on Resolutions, and President of the American Institute for Foreign Trade. Co-author of Electing the President.

Dr. Daniel M. Ogden, former professor of political science, Washington State University, former Special Consultant to the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, former Budget Director for the United States Department of Interior and presently Dean of the College of Humanities and Social Science, Colorado State College, Fort Collins, Colorado.

BAKER. Politics is the number one sport in the United States, and probably no aspect of the game is more exciting—or meaningful—(fade in sound) than a national convention.

(Sound: National Convention. Up for 10 seconds then under and fade out.)

BAKER. Buttons, banners, bumper-stickers, pledges, handshakes, hurrahs, these are the familiar sights and sounds of our national political conventions. (Sound out.) But amid all the hoop-tee-doo, decisions are made that deeply affect the lives of all of us in this country, and the world around us as well.

(Theme. Establish. Then fade under and out.)

BAKER. The name of this program is Political Perspective: Choosing the President, and this is Torrey Baker speaking to you from Washington on behalf of the League of Women Voters.

What is the citizen's role in nominating the President of the United States? We elect him, to be sure; but do we have a voice in the nominating process?

PETERSON. In my opinion, the American people participate as directly and as fully in nominating the President as they desire. Since the nomination of presidential candidates in America is a party function, it is a function, then, of the number of people who wish to participate in that function; and in my opinion the ten or fifteen percent of the American electorate who now participate could be greatly expanded. But they do have the opportunity and from time to time they exercise this in great number.

BAKER. This is the view of Dr. Arthur Peterson, a former Executive Director of the

November 13, 1969

National Republican Committee and now President of the American Institute for Foreign Trade. He is co-author of a book "Electing the President." Dr. Peterson's co-author is a Democrat, Dr. Daniel M. Ogden, formerly professor of political science at Washington State University, Special Consultant to the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and now budget director for the United States Department of Interior.

OGDEN. Both of the political parties are wide open. They are available for people who want to participate.

BAKER. One type of participation is being a delegate to a national convention. We all know the actual nominations of presidential candidates take place at national political conventions where the delegates from the various states gather to make their nominations and to adopt a platform. Dr. Peterson tells us how they are chosen.

PETERSON. There are actually two kinds of delegates to our national conventions. First the "at large" or state delegates and secondly, the district delegates who are selected on the basis of congressional districts ordinarily. There is some confusion about some of these delegates because they, in turn, are selected through three different means. Most are selected by a state convention. In fact, in 29 states this is done. In some 18 states the delegates are selected both at large and/or in districts by primary, and in four states by the state central committee.

BAKER. Does the average citizen have a chance to attend a convention or even influence the choice of delegates? What should a citizen do in the convention states, for example?

OGDEN. Well, the best advice is to be active in your political party beginning immediately. You go to the precinct caucus, and the precinct caucus which has a broad base, you see, will elect a few delegates to a county convention. The county convention, then, may have several hundred people who will elect a few delegates to the state convention; and then the state convention, which may have as many as a thousand people, will elect a handful of people to go to the national convention.

Those who want to be able to affect the selection of delegates to a caucus or a county convention and to be welcome at a precinct to do so need to be active.

BAKER. Primary elections are intended to assure popular control of the political parties, and they offer the candidates a chance to test their strength at the state and local level. No two states have exactly the same system of primaries. Dr. Ogden outlines some of them.

OGDEN. First of all, there is one kind of presidential preference primary in which the voters simply elect delegates and there is no designation of candidates. . . . They simply vote for delegates' names. Now if the delegates' names do not have any designation of candidate preference, and this is often the case—New York and Pennsylvania are examples of this—the voter really doesn't have much guidance in what he is going to do, and I understand that it is quite common for the delegates to be unopposed so that it is simply a process of ratifying a slate which the party organizations have already picked.

A second type of presidential preference primary is one in which . . . the candidates assemble slates of delegates and they run a slate under their name of people who will vote for them if they become delegates to the national convention.

BAKER. Even in places where a delegate is presumably pledged to a particular candidate he may not have to vote for him when he actually gets to the convention. Some states such as Oregon and California require the delegates to vote for the candidate to whom

they are pledged at least on the first ballot, but delegates from West Virginia, for example, or New Hampshire, need do no such thing. Dr. Ogden comments—

OGDEN. Now this is really quite practical as a matter of fact because if at the primary election the issue had happened to lie between two noncandidates when you get to the convention people who have been knocked out for one reason or another, the delegates may not wish at all to be simply the victims of the circumstances and have to vote for a candidate who is no longer in the ball game.

BAKER. Any politics-watcher worth his salt observes with keen interest the way the would-be presidential candidates pick the states in which they will test their political mettle. This is a science.

PETERSON. You have to go where the votes are . . . as in the election. You select those states which have winning combinations and numbers and go after them. . . . It is a simple matter of adding up the numbers you need to win the nomination.

OGDEN. Candidates are careful not to enter primaries which are going to create disaster for them. There is no point in going into a state where the cards are so heavily stacked in favor of an alternative candidate that you will look bad. You can't afford to be a "loser" and so the candidates generally stay out of a state with this kind of situation.

BAKER. There are five states which, according to Dr. Ogden and Dr. Peterson, are critical to winning the nomination. They are New York, California, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois. These are the so-called swing states, and a candidate must have a majority of them or he's out of the running. Dr. Ogden points out that the big winners—Roosevelt, Eisenhower, and Johnson—carried them all.

OGDEN. Getting these states in your pocket at the convention is a very important strategy. If you could carry all of these, and have some others in your hands, it would be virtually impossible to stop you. That is why the selection of delegates in New York, in Ohio where the delegates are elected in a primary, in Illinois where they are elected in a primary, and in California where there is a primary—become very important party affairs. And in California where the delegates are committed to the candidate who wins, and the selection process comes in early June—which is fairly late in the selection process, this can be critical because this can wrap it up for the candidate, and that of course is exactly what Goldwater did in 1964.

BAKER. Thus what happens before the Convention is all important.

PETERSON. Some candidates assume that by sheer force of persuasion they can turn the heads of delegates at the national convention. This is really a very naive position to take. Once the delegates have arrived, no amount of eloquence ordinarily will turn their heads. They are committed and they are going to support the person for whom they are committed. There are exceptions of course in the Wilkie case in which the so-called "galleries" did influence the selection but that's the exception that proves the rule.

BAKER. And Dr. Ogden recalled the 1960 democratic convention as a case in point.

OGDEN. There are a lot of people there who had been stalwart Stevenson people in 1952 and '56 and they still "loved Adlai madly" and . . . Senator McCarthy from Minnesota gave one of the most stirring and eloquent nominating speeches that any of us have ever heard in nominating Mr. Stevenson and it was, it was a real tremendous ovation that followed. But everyone knew that he didn't have a chance.

BAKER. Dr. Peterson stresses the need for organization to line up delegates sympathetic to your candidacy.

PETERSON. First of all you have to go into the hustings early. . . . If a candidate is serious as Mr. Kennedy was in '57 and as Mr. Goldwater was, the first thing he does

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

is to go out and get effective organizational leaders.

Secondly . . . I suppose it is important also that the specific tactics are developed—how exactly are you going to organize the caucuses to your advantage, how specifically are you going to make certain those caucuses are going to turn out in your favor.

OGDEN. That's exactly the situation. It is hard work at the precinct level early in the game that gets delegates lined up for your candidates. There's no substitute for it. It means having someone from your staff go out to the state and get a state individual who will carry the ball for you and who has contacts with the state organization, who is willing to operate for your candidates—someone who has been prominent, active, and knows his way around, who can put his finger on people in the various counties who will become the organizer for your candidate and then the county organizer's job is to make sure that each precinct caucus is loaded with your friends, go to the meeting and choose delegates at the county convention.

Mr. BAKER. Dr. Peterson points out that it takes more than just attendance-at-a-meeting to get delegates favorable to your candidates selected.

PETERSON. It seems to me that often those who wish to be effective forget the little problems of parliamentary procedure; not only does one have the commitment and the concern over a candidate but before one enters the political caucus it's well, I think, to know all of the devices that one needs to know to be effective. Now to enter dilatory motions, how to delay meetings, how to speed up meetings, how to do the thousand and one things that are perfectly legitimate to do and if the citizen really wants to be effective, you have got to know how to handle parliamentary procedure.

BAKER. Eventually delegates to the national convention are chosen, and the American public is witness to two gigantic political spectacles. There are some who say that there must be a more efficient and less flamboyant way to choose a candidate for the highest office in the land. Dr. Ogden does not agree.

OGDEN. The national convention is a place and area of compromise where the party organizations leader from several states can assemble for the purpose of choosing a candidate . . .

Now a second great advantage is it enables them to get a lot of the party people to identify with the cause. They can share emotionally in the selection process and identify with the candidate.

The third advantage is that it presents a great spectacle to the American people.

The national convention also gives the party itself a chance to work out the kind of broad direction in which it wants to go.

PETERSON. This vast nation with its many, many interests comes together as a variety of peoples and comes out of the convention with at least a central thrust—with a series of statements, even though they are really not policy pledges but a set of statements which have in every possible sense tried to tie the party together. It is a somewhat ephemeral thing but a very important and crucial thing to us. We develop unity out of diversity, and this is one of the important reasons for our national party conventions.

BAKER. As the convention proceeds—after all the conferences, political maneuvers, promises and compromises, the roll call of the states finally begins and the candidates names are placed in nomination. Tension mounts as the balloting proceeds (sneak in sound)—until the great moment when a particular state declares for a candidate and this vote carries him over the finish line.

(Sound: Convention climax up for "X" seconds then under and out.)

BAKER. This is the great climax of the national convention, and pandemonium reigns

as the delegates cheer "the next President of the United States." To all intents and purposes the Convention is over and the campaign for electing the President is underway. But the first job is to nominate.

This is Torrey Baker in Washington speaking for the League of Women Voters. Our thanks to Dr. Daniel M. Ogden and Dr. Arthur L. Peterson for joining us in political perspective; choosing the President.

MIDDLE EAST BOILS AGAIN

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, fully appreciating the preoccupation with our problem in Vietnam, I believe it is essential that we keep a close look at continued Soviet involvement in the Middle East.

Therefore, an editorial in the Wednesday, October 29 Chicago Daily News remains extremely appropriate and I insert it into the RECORD as a profound commentary on this major crisis:

MIDDLE EAST BOILS AGAIN

"Our simple demand is to be free to operate in any Arab land."

The words are those of an Arab commando, interviewed by Georgie Anne Geyer of The Daily News Foreign Service somewhere inside Lebanon. Miss Geyer, with her usual enterprise, had managed to make contact with the guerrilla forces that have brought Lebanon to the brink of civil war.

A "simple demand" it may appear to the fanatical Palestinians bent on warring against Israel from any point on Israel's borders. But this concept of a guerrilla force roaming at will across the Arab lands, superseding the established Arab governments and their armies, has now dimmed even further the vague hopes for peace in the Middle East.

The Arab guerrilla movement has grown largely under the protection of President Nasser of the United Arab Republic. The volatile, hate-ridden regime in Syria also gave it shelter. King Hussein, whose throne is precarious at best, was not strong enough to oppose the commandos when they set up camps in Jordan.

Lebanon has tried a different tack. Alone of Israel's neighbors, half-Christian, half-Moslem Lebanon has managed to maintain relative calm on its border. It opposed the move-in of the guerrillas, correctly believing that they would inflame the border and invite retaliation from Israel.

But Lebanon's attempt to drive out the guerrillas—though apparently a failure—has brought down the wrath of the other Arab states on the Lebanese government and threatens its very foundation. A "compromise" with the guerrillas, which probably means allowing them nearly free access, is in the air.

Israel can doubtless handle this expansion of the continuing border war, in the military sense. But the repercussions of Lebanon's difficulties go far beyond the border.

The United States' relations with Lebanon have remained good—until now—in the deteriorating situation in the Arab lands. Beyond expressing a pious concern about "any threat to Lebanese integrity from any source," the United States has scrupulously refrained from any move that would smack of intervention.

The Russians, however, have exhibited less restraint. Even while warning the United States to keep its hands off, the Soviets have busied themselves with diplomatic activity

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

that could spell further Russian influence in the Middle East, at the expense of the United States.

It may be, as the shah of Iran suggested the other day, that nothing short of big-power pressure can avert a new explosion in the Middle East. But even that prospect is remote as long as Russia seems more intent on stirring trouble than in trying to calm it down.

LEGAL AID—FOR LAWYERS

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a recent New York Times editorial commenting on the Senate-passed amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act which would allow a Governor to have an absolute veto over a legal services program. The Times points out that this amendment could place "legal representation for the poor at the mercy of State and local political machines."

Of equal concern to me is the fact that this amendment might discourage young lawyers from entering the field of poverty law. Presently there are more than 2,000 lawyers serving in the OEO program. One out of every 17 June law graduates applied to VISTA in 1969, and there are now 700 lawyers in VISTA, clearly indicating a tremendous interest on the part of young lawyers to give legal assistance to the poor.

This resource should not be discouraged by any amendment which would limit the rights of the legal services attorneys. They would be reluctant to handle controversial cases because of the possible retaliation of a Governor's veto. They would hesitate to sue a public agency that is not performing its job properly because of the possibility that the Governor would discontinue the whole program. In effect, this amendment would prevent these lawyers from offering every legal right to their clients in accordance with the canon of ethics.

As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I have watched this program grow from 12 legal services projects in 1965 to a point where last year 1,800 lawyers in 265 projects handled over a million cases.

The bill ordered reported by the Education and Labor Committee last week does not contain the so-called Murphy amendment and I hope that the House will stand firm behind the efforts of these dedicated attorneys to provide equal justice for all.

The editorial follows:

LEGAL AID—FOR LAWYERS

One of the most effective programs in the Office of Economic Opportunity is legal services, under which 1,800 attorneys in 800 neighborhood offices in forty-nine states represent impoverished clients. Federal funds administered through the O.E.O. enable hundreds of thousands of indigent persons every year to obtain equal justice under law.

The program will perish in the areas where it is most needed if proposed Senate amendment to this year's antipoverty

bill goes through. By giving Governors veto powers over O.E.O. storefront law projects, it would place effective legal representation at the mercy of state and local political machines. It would, in many cases, prevent the disadvantaged from getting an even break before politically appointed judges. It would discourage some of the most dedicated young lawyers in the country from entering the new field of antipoverty law.

This amendment should be called the Reagan amendment because the California Governor is really the man behind it. The board of governors of the American Bar Association has described the amendment as "oppressive interference with the freedom of the lawyer and the citizen" which would "discourage actions that are politically unpopular." The conference in New York this week of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association clearly shows the deep concern of the bar all over the country for representing clients who cannot afford to pay. Their rights will be seriously infringed if the Reagan amendment is adopted.

SPEECH ON POW'S

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, this past Tuesday, November 11, Mrs. Rita Hauser, our able representative to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, delivered a major policy statement to all 126 member nations. The context of her statement was human rights—an appeal for humanitarian treatment of Americans who are prisoners of war in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, it was coincidence, but I might add, very appropriate that Ambassador Hauser's speech came on Veterans' Day. To most Americans, Veterans' Day is a day to reconfirm our loyalty and faith in the United States, its Government, and its people. Our servicemen who are missing and captured in Vietnam must not be forgotten. They are patriotic, brave fighting men. World opinion must be brought to bear on the North Vietnamese Communists to provide for humane treatment of our men who are POW's.

I am certainly gratified that our United Nations delegation has brought this matter to the attention of all member countries. If all the governments represented in this international body use their utmost influence, enough pressure can be brought on North Vietnam so that they will at least adhere to the tenets of the Geneva Convention.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mrs. Hauser for her statements. She is an able spokesman. I pray that her remarks will be heard in Hanoi and that positive action can be accomplished toward our goal for the freedom of all American POW's.

A number of wives of our prisoners were present in the galleries of the General Assembly's Social Committee when the speech was delivered. They added their mute support to a cause that cannot, in good conscience, be denied.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I am inserting the text of Mrs. Hauser's speech. I

November 13, 1969

urge everyone to read it in its entirety. We must not allow these Americans to be forgotten.

SPEECH ON POW'S

(Delivered by Mrs. Rita Hauser)

I would like to turn now to a specific situation involving prisoners which, I am sure you will understand, is of very particular concern to my country. United States forces are engaged in combat in Vietnam. It is our earnest hope that this conflict will soon be terminated so that the task of rebuilding can be begun. But many hundreds of American soldiers, airmen, and naval personnel are presently missing or captured in Southeast Asia. How many of these men, and which ones, are in Communist captivity is a secret closely guarded by the authorities. For each of these men there is a wife, a child, a parent, who is concerned with his fate. They are subjected to grave uncertainty and despair which grows as each day passes.

Our concern in this matter is humanitarian, not political. It was succinctly but urgently expressed in the agonizing question asked by the many wives who have gone to Paris to ask the North Vietnamese delegation at the Paris talks: please tell me if I am a wife or a widow.

There exists a solemn convention, legally binding upon all parties concerned—the Convention on protection of Prisoners of War, concluded at Geneva in 1949. This Convention applies to "all cases of declared war or of any other armed conflict which may arise between two or more of the High Contracting Parties, even if the state of war is not recognized by one of them." It thus binds the United States, which ratified it in 1955, the Republic of Vietnam, which acceded to it in 1953, and North Vietnam, which acceded in 1957.

This Convention, to which, I may add, 125 nations are parties, including more than 100 members of the United Nations, contains provisions which, if implemented, would tell children if their fathers were alive, parents if their sons were well-treated. It requires that—and I quote—"immediately upon capture, or not more than one week after arrival at a camp, even if it is a transit camp, likewise in case of sickness or transfer to hospital or to another camp, every prisoner of war shall be enabled to write directly to his family." The Convention assures prisoners of the right to remain in communication with their loved ones and with an international or state organization which has assumed the obligation of safeguarding his rights.

In addition to the right to receive mail and packages, and to send a minimum of two letters and four cards each month, the Geneva Convention specifies minimum humane standards of detention, of hygiene, diet, recreation, and employment. It requires that seriously wounded or ill prisoners be repatriated as soon as they are able to travel. It specifies that the Detaining Power shall accept a neutral party to the conflict or a respected international organization such as the International Committee of the Red Cross as a Protecting Power for the prisoners. It requires that the Detaining Power provide the names of the prisoners it holds to their families, as well as to the Protecting Power, or to the International Committee of the Red Cross, to pass on to their country of origin. It requires that the Detaining Party permit on the scene inspection of its detention facilities.

Madam Chairman, my fellow delegates, this Convention is not meant to create a life of privilege for captured military personnel. It is meant to insure minimum standards of human decency to helpless men who are in the power of their military enemy and can no longer pose a threat to that enemy, and to provide minimum solace to families who are far from the front lines. In wartime, when

passions are inflamed, this Convention seeks to preserve those frail links of compassion and decency which are so urgently needed. Nurtured, these links may in turn help move enemies toward a realization of their common stake in finding the path to peace.

My country places the highest priority upon implementation of this Convention. There are now some 30,000 North Vietnamese and Viet Cong prisoners of war in South Vietnam who have been accorded the status and the rights of prisoners of war under the Geneva Convention, even though many of them fail to meet the requirements for prisoner of war treatment set forth in the Convention. The United States has striven again and again to persuade Hanoi to apply the basic minimum standards guaranteed by the Convention—identification of prisoners, the right to send and receive mail, and a Protecting Power to inspect detention conditions. We remain grateful to the governments which have cooperated in these regrettably unsuccessful efforts.

In contrast, the Government of the Republic of Vietnam, with the cooperation of its allies, opened all detention camps to inspection by the International Committee of the Red Cross. The names of POW's have been made available to the ICRC. Prisoners of war detained by the Republic of Vietnam have the right to send and receive mail and packages. They are interned in six camps which are administered by the Republic of Vietnam and which, as regular international inspection has shown, conform to the requirements of the Geneva Convention.

Let me be clear that we are not claiming a perfect record on this subject. War is ugly and brutal by nature, and violations by individuals have occurred. The point is, however, that the allied command has made every effort to ensure that the Convention is applied. This includes the issuance of clear and explicit orders, and, even more importantly, thorough investigation of alleged violations and punishment of those found guilty. This policy is confirmed and supported by the continuous review, both official and unofficial, which results from free access to POW's by delegates and doctors of the ICRC.

The United States neither seeks nor deserves praise for its efforts to implement the Convention. They are our duty—our legal duty and our moral duty. The tragic fact is, however, that North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front refuse to acknowledge their legal and moral duties to apply similar standards of treatment to the helpless prisoners in their power—Vietnamese as well as American.

The record is indeed sad. The Communist authorities have refused to identify the prisoners they hold. Only a limited minority of those men known by the United States Government to have been captured have been allowed to communicate with the outside world. Mail even from this small minority has been infrequent and irregular. The sick and the wounded have not been repatriated nor have they been identified. Prisoners have been utilized by North Vietnam for propaganda purposes. Even the minimum protection that would be afforded by inspection of POW facilities by an impartial international body has been denied. The ICRC's repeated requests to be allowed to visit the prisoners at their places of detention have been repeatedly denied; nor has any other accepted intermediary been given access to the prisoners.

From the reports of the nine men actually released by North Vietnam and from other sources has come disturbing evidence that prisoners are being deprived of adequate medical care and diets, and that, in many instances, they have been subjected to physical and mental torture. For example, Lt. Robert Frishman, one of the recently released American prisoners in a pub-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

lic statement of September 2, 1969, shortly after his release, said American prisoners are subject to "solitary confinement, forced statements, living in a cage for three years, being put in straps, not being allowed to sleep or eat, removal of finger nails, being hung from a ceiling, having an infected arm which was almost lost, not receiving medical care, and being dragged along the ground with a broken leg . . ." Recounting the treatment of Lieutenant Commander Stratton, Lt. Frishman said—and I quote—

"The North Vietnamese tried to get Lieutenant Commander Stratton to appear before a press delegation and say that he had received humane and lenient treatment. He refused because his treatment hadn't been humane. He'd been tied up with ropes to such a degree that he still has large scars on his arms from rope burns which became infected. He was deprived of sleep, beaten, had his finger nails removed and put in solitary, but the North Vietnamese insisted that he make the false humane treatment statements and threw him into a dark cell for 38 days to think about it."

This record is indeed chilling. It has been noted and deplored by a great many international observers. For example, Jacques Freymond of the International Committee of the Red Cross, reporting on the work of the Committee on Prisoners of War, highlighted the contrasts between North and South Vietnam as follows:

"In Vietnam it [the ICRC] has so far had limited success. In fact, in spite of repeated representations, it has not been able to obtain the agreement of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam to the installation of a Delegation in Hanoi nor even to the visiting or prisoners of war.

" . . . On the other hand, the ICRC is represented in Saigon and the delegates are able to visit all prisoner of war camps. They also receive nominal rolls of these prisoners."

In the face of such international criticism there have been few breaks in the silence of Hanoi. We have, however, been told—though in the shrill phrases of propaganda rather than in the measured tones of statesmanship or humanitarianism—that the Geneva Convention does not apply because there has not been a formal declaration of war and that the American prisoners are "war criminals" and therefore not entitled to the rights conferred upon prisoners of war by the Geneva Convention. Despite this, Hanoi says, it treats the prisoners "humanely."

Madam Chairman, my government cannot accept these assertions. The Geneva Convention provides a detailed international standard of humane treatment against which the treatment of prisoners of war can be measured. Hanoi's mere assertion of "humane" treatment, which has never been verified by impartial inspection, is no substitute. Further, North Vietnam's denial that the Convention is applicable, and its assertion that it therefore cannot be the standard to measure their conduct, have no basis in international law. Hanoi says that the Convention applies only where there has been a declaration of war. But it is clear from the language of the Convention that the absence of such a declaration has no relationship to the Convention's applicability and does not justify a refusal to apply it.

Hanoi has also asserted that our men whom it holds are war criminals, apparently on the theory that any attacks against North Vietnam or Viet-Cong forces or facilities are criminal acts and that all military personnel involved in such attacks are criminals. Such assertions are patently absurd. Our men are not war criminals. Moreover, the Geneva Conventions and modern international humanitarian law reject any suggestion that the protection of individual war victims,

whether soldiers or civilians, is dependent upon moral or legal judgments about the cause for which their government is fighting. The law is there to protect all the victims of war on both sides. All countries have an interest in seeing that it is respected.

The Geneva Convention—in addition to representing a binding international treaty obligation—represents an international consensus on what is "humane" with regard to captured military personnel. North Vietnam, even by the terms of its own arguments, cannot escape its obligations. The United States understands that every country believes that it is right and its enemy wrong. North Vietnam has said that it is inconceivable that the captured military personnel of the so-called "wrong" side should be given status equal to its own soldiers. But, Madam Chairman, the Geneva Convention was designed specifically to meet this problem. It imposes upon all combatant powers the obligation to treat military personnel made helpless by their captivity in accordance with a single objective and verifiable standard.

The 21st International Conference of the Red Cross held at Istanbul in September cut through any possible quibbles that could be made by a party to the Vietnam conflict. It adopted without dissent a resolution which obtained the support of 114 governments and national Red Cross organizations. That resolution called upon all parties—and I quote—"to abide by the obligations set forth in the Convention and upon all authorities involved in an armed conflict to ensure that all uniformed members of the regular armed forces of another party to the conflict and all other persons entitled to prisoner of war status are treated humanely and given the fullest measure of protection prescribed by the Convention." It also recognized—and again I repeat the exact words of this resolution—"that, even apart from the Convention, the International community has consistently demanded humane treatment for prisoners of war, including identification and accounting for all prisoners, provision of an adequate diet and medical care, that prisoners be permitted to communicate with each other and with the exterior, that seriously sick or wounded prisoners be promptly repatriated, and that at all times prisoners be protected from physical and mental torture, abuse and reprisal." We hope that the committee will take note this session of the resolution passed without dissent by the International Committee of the Red Cross in Istanbul, and that it will in a similar fashion reaffirm the obligations of all parties to the Geneva Convention.

Madam Chairman, two weeks ago—on October 30th—the Secretary General made the following statement:

"It is the view of the Secretary General that the Government of North Vietnam ought to give an international humanitarian organization such as the League of Red Cross Societies access to the Americans detained in North Vietnam."

We join in this appeal, and we urge all the governments represented here today to use their utmost influence so that at least this single step forward can be accomplished. We would welcome the intervention of any organization or group of concerned people who may be able to reduce the anguish of the prisoners and their families. But the Secretary General has made a concrete, limited proposal; its immediate implementation would bring closer the day when the observance of the humanitarian principles of the Geneva Conventions by all parties is complete.

I have spoken at length on this topic, Madam Chairman. It is of the most vital importance to the United States. What I have said here today—what my government has said—is meant most sincerely. We hope that these words will lead to deeds.

I thank you, Madam Chairman.

THE ROLE OF THE ARTS IN
20TH-CENTURY AMERICA

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, sometime during the coming weeks, the Select Education Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor will undertake hearings, in cooperation with our colleagues in the other body, on legislation to extend the life of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

I believe that Members who are interested in this legislation and in the role of the arts generally in 20th-century America will read with interest a recent address by Dr. H. Beresford Menagh, executive director of the American Education Theater Association.

Although Dr. Menagh's particular emphasis is on the theater, he makes a persuasive case for support of all the arts.

His address, which was delivered to the 1969 convention of the Tennessee Theater Association, on September 13, 1969, follows:

ADDRESS OF DR. H. BERESFORD MENAGH

I am delighted to have this chance to bring you official greetings and good wishes from the American Educational Theatre Association. The formation of a state theatre organization is an important and needed step in Tennessee and will be, I hope, an example to the many other states which have not yet awakened to the needs of the last third of the twentieth century. I wish you good luck not only at this your state meeting but throughout the year as you meet needs in the cities, in the counties, in the hamlets from Memphis to Mountain City. I promise you the full cooperation of the national association and trust we may quickly establish a formal working relationship between the state organization and the national one. We need each other, but what is more important our work needs us both.

I am grateful to your officers for giving me this chance to share some thoughts with you on our work; to look with you at some problems; and to see if we might together come up with some directions we might take as we close out the sixties and move into the seventies.

THE ARTS IN THE SIXTIES

The sixties have not produced for the arts a very happy environment. If anything, the world we live in has become increasingly hostile to the arts. The arts are concerned with those uniquely human characteristics of man: individuality, dignity, controlled emotions, feelings, and, if I may use the word, the "sanctity" of man. But the world is increasingly emphasizing technology as a way of life and is almost insisting on behavior that is dehumanizing or at best dignity-limiting. Pressures have been developing in our society that will stop us right in our tracks unless we recognize them and work desperately hard to overcome them.

We can no longer afford to engage in socialized ego-inflation in community theatre and pretend we are improving the cultural level of the community. We can no longer afford to sentimentally re-hash 19th century fairy-tales with 20th century children in the name of children's theatre and think we have done something in sensitivity training. We cannot afford to place students in the lock-step of credit hours and a sequence of courses and think this will produce creativity, appreciation, or even understanding of the arts. We cannot afford to bask in the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

sweet sound of the much-touted cultural boom, because the cultural boom you have read about is a bust. Increased attendance at and increased money spent on the arts result directly from increased population and increased affluence of that population. Indeed the 20th Century Fund report shows that the percentage of per capita disposable income spent on the arts is unchanged in the past 20 years and is actually down from what it was 30 years ago.

The world does not seem to have been kind to the arts yet it is a wonderful world. We look at the marvels man has created and we look at the creature, man, who has created these marvels, and innocently, like Miranda in the *Tempest* we say, "Oh Wonder!"

How many goodly creatures are there here!
How beauteous mankind is! Oh brave new
world
That has such people in't.

TECHNOLOGY AND THE ARTS

We have created mechanical brains that are faster and more accurate than any human being's brain. We have medicine and drugs that remove not only sickness and pain but also anxiety and worry. We have transportation to the ends of the earth and beyond in a matter of hours. We have instantaneous communications that bounce pictures off satellites. We have exploration under the sea, on the moon, and space probes beyond. We have entertainment through TV and motion pictures of extreme technical excellence and frequency and finally we have energy of unimaginable power in the atom bomb, the hydrogen bomb and the cobalt bomb.

Oh brave new world that has such people in't.

But there has been a price to pay and not just in money. Bit by bit and generally willingly, we have been paying the price of fragments of human individuality, human worth, and human freedom.

We have been giving up these bits of freedom to gain other freedom. We are demanding more than just freedom from want. We crave freedom from care, freedom from worry, freedom from loneliness, freedom from being different, freedom from insecurity, freedom from decision-making, and above all, freedom from boredom. We are rushing headlong into a society that gives these freedoms, cooperating willy-nilly with certain enemy pressures or forces which are steadily dissolving away the basic human attributes of individual dignity and individual worth. I'm not talking about such enemies as communists or segregationists or Nazis or other such bigots, but specifically described and statistically proved forces that we cooperate with and live with as a matter of course.

POPULATION GROWTH AND OVER-ORGANIZATION

I am talking about population growth, for one. In the 16 centuries from the first Christmas day to the landing of the Pilgrims, the world's population merely doubled from 250 million to 500 million. Today as we enter the last $\frac{1}{3}$ of the 20th century, the world's population is 3 billion and at its present rate of increase will double again in only 50 years. Our basic concern with overpopulation is that it puts a terrible strain on a country's economy, and therefore, especially in underdeveloped countries, creates a demand for the central government to assume greater responsibility and greater power and, unless there has been a strong tradition of constitutional government, totalitarianism and the negation of individualism is the result. Ten years ago economists estimated that 20 years from then the majority of overpopulated, underdeveloped countries would be under totalitarian rule. They missed by about 10 years for as we meet here this has almost come to pass. India alone is the hold-out and the elections a few months ago in that country show it to be approaching perilously close to the brink.

November 13, 1969

Another enemy force destroying individuality and dignity is over-organization. Modern, complex, expensive mass production and mass distribution has concentrated power in the organization; the corporation, and has forced the little man to become a cog in a machine, undermining as Erich Fromm points out, "the individual's inner security, happiness, reason, and his capacity for love. The individual is turned into an automaton who pay for his human failure with increasing mental sickness, and with despair hidden under a frantic drive for work and so-called pleasure." The normal person becomes one who is adjusted to an abnormal society—living without fuss in a society to which, if he were fully a human being, he ought not to be adjusted. Conformity becomes uniformity and the human individual in our society becomes standardized. Yet nature has made every individual unlike every other individual and I submit that any society which, in the interest of efficiency or in the name of some political, economic or religious dogma seeks to standardize the human individual commits an outrage against man's biological nature. In addition, the current social phenomenon of a concentration of population in the city emphasizes the organization of man, further destroying his individuality. We have William Whyte's concept of the Organization Man, with emphasis on group loyalty, group living, group thinking, group creativity, group dynamics. We teach in our schools and actually give marks on report cards for "acquisition of social skills," "Adjustment," "socially oriented behavior."

PROPAGANDA AND DRUGS

In addition to population growth and over-organization, there is yet a third enemy force operating to destroy human individuality and dignity and that's propaganda.

Formerly propaganda consisted of 2 kinds: the true or the false. But today, especially in Western democracies, there is propaganda that is neither true nor false, but simply unreal—the more or less totally irrelevant. All of us have the power to respond to reason and truth or to unreason and falsehood, but we also appear to have an infinite appetite for distractions. Games were one thing; radio another; movies yet another; but now we have constant television in our homes that provides us with an instantaneous wall of irrelevancy to insulate us against the realities of our social, political and personal situation. This is a propaganda that does not destroy by misleading, but by merely numbing. Nor does it stop there, for riding on the constant distraction of daily TV programming is the most powerful propaganda civilized man has ever invented for himself—the commercial. We are all susceptible to it, but most especially are our young people. They are TV fodder. As one TV actor frankly stated it, "Children are living, talking records of what we tell them every day." I fear that all too often young people, who we like to think are products of our schools, are in reality products of advertised products.

And this brings us to the last enemy force I'd like to mention and that's mind control. Brain washing became a frightening reality during the Korean war. We don't like to admit it, but it is a fact, and the Chinese Communists proved it, that every man has his breaking point and can be brought under absolute control. We don't have brain washing of that kind here but we have other forms of brain control in chemicals and drugs we call stimulants and depressants which do everything from calming frayed nerves to producing dreams in technicolor. We have alcohol, Benzedrine, cocaine, heroin, marihuana, peyote, Miltown, meserpine, chlorpromazine, Iproniazid, LSD, and Deaner. A dream in a pill is no exaggeration and the statistics are that annually we are buying dreams by the billion. We also have subconscious persuasion. In 1957 experiments with subliminal pro-

ection were picked up by the purveyors of distractions for it was discovered that fleeting images on a screen influenced an individual unconsciously. The possibilities were frightening, so frightening that the government forbade it. But we do have both conscious and unconscious persuasion by association, as in the use of sex appeal to sell cigarettes, and we have it in so-called sleep-learning, or hypnopaedia.

THE NEED TO HUMANIZE

These, then, are some of the forces operating in our society which have somehow to be counteracted by those who work in the arts. We want people to develop as fully as possible their unique, individual, human qualities, but our efforts are directly opposed by the de-humanizing forces of population growth, over-organization, special kinds of propaganda and increasingly popular mind control.

Riding on and through these forces is a strong technological orientation that begins in babyhood, is reinforced daily from the time a child enters school and permeates every aspect of adult life. The drive from babyhood onward is to prepare for, to hold, and finally successfully retire from a job. Anything that does not contribute directly to that drive is, in the minds of most people a non-essential addendum. If it is not utilitarian it is not necessary.

Ask anyone why he should get an education. Three out of four will answer, according to a Harris survey, that an education is necessary for getting a job. 74% of parents believe the primary purpose of going to college is to get a good job.

Newspapers contain items about the problems of young men and women who fail to complete high school and consequently fail to obtain employment. Government on various levels exhibit concern about apparent relationship between unemployment and lack of education. Programs are proposed and instituted in which people are helped not only to complete high school but to obtain a higher education and in some cases even to engage in graduate work. It is taken as almost axiomatic that the more education a person has the greater are his job opportunities. Thus it appears to many that the function of education is to prepare people for making a living.

Because of this common conception of the function of education, students may complain about spending time, even "wasting" time on a course of study not directly related to their particular job-goals. Students preparing to teach are perhaps less prone than others to complain about such courses because they generally accept the idea that the more they know about themselves, their relationship to others and their relationship to their universe, the better equipped they are for teaching growing human beings. But there is hardly a student who has not heard another student complain, "What do I need with botany in mechanical engineering?" or, "What do I need with physics when I'm going to be a teacher of American literature?" or, "What good is a course in speech for an agronomist?" For these students, the criterion of merit in any educational pursuit seems to be utility.

Utilitarianism received a strong impetus following the successful launching of Sputnik in 1957. Clamors were heard in Western countries for greater emphasis on mathematics and science in education. One respected scientist became better known in some circles for his view on technological education than for his achievements in physical science. A well-known U.S. military officer became a regular writer in newspaper columns about a no-nonsense approach to education. A superintendent of public instruction in one of the large states was elected with a platform that emphasized the "3-R's" and no "frills." A dramatic result of this upheaval in educational thought was

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

seen in California where in early 1962 the State Legislature passed the "Fisher Bill" which called for a major revision of credential requirements and empowered the State Board of Education to draw up the regulations necessary to implement the bill. Had the legislative measure been implemented as originally intended by the State Board, the various arts would have been eliminated as subjects for a teaching credential in California.

In spite of the utilitarian tendency in educational thought; that is, the tendency to assume human education has the practical function of preparing for making a living, making a home and raising a family in a technologically oriented society, one ancient world-wide truth still holds. Any animal makes a living, gives birth to and rears its offspring, obtains shelter, and even explores its universe. It is true that human beings have made some remarkable refinements in these basic pursuits but the unknown man who died in his cave 5,000 years ago after making a living with spear and ax made no less or no greater an impression on human progress than the man who passed away this year after making his living with an electronic computer—or the gray wolf who perished alone in the snows of the Yukon after a successful life with fang and claw. All three received educations that were practical for their societies and all three may have had a proportionately narrow or broad understanding of themselves, their relationship to their fellow-creatures and their relationship to their universe. Education for making a living, for making a home and raising a family is a part, but only a part of the story; the part which may be called animal, which is carried on in every lair, den, cave and burrow on every hill and in every valley on the fact of the earth. Education that is concerned with what a young person needs as he grows, that enables him to continue his growth after he reaches physical maturity, that helps him achieve an appreciable degree of human worth; this kind of education is the other part of the story. Meeting these needs is a function of education with which we must be concerned whether we work directly in education or not.

THE NEED WHICH THEATRE CAN MEET

Whether we are in or out of education we have many needs we must meet. Those of you who have heard me speak before have heard me recite some of these needs. Everywhere I go around the country I keep repeating that we need work with young children. We need to find out what theatre should mean to children and to find their capability for assimilating this meaning. The mathematicians have painstakingly investigated these matters in their field as have the physical scientists, have come up with content and methodologies based on their investigations and have instituted them in the schools. The arts, on the other hand, provide virgin territory for this kind of work. It is as if it were beneath the dignity of professed sordom so far to be concerned with little children.

Needed is work with high school students who are actually worse off than children in elementary school. At least in elementary school little is done with theatre so little damage to the child occurs. But high school theater in our country is a national scandal. At this age the adolescents are still highly suggestible and impressionable and yet they are fed garbage, thrown at them by people untrained and unqualified, who are paid, naturally, with garbage man's wages. Yet it is here, in high school, the greatest mass of our population gets its impression of what theatre is really all about. It is unfortunate that too many university theatre departments consider the education-bound students beneath consideration. The instructor wants to direct or train only those students bound for a commercial career in theater.

So we graduate 4,000 theatre majors in a year with a degree in theatre into a market glutted by 14,000 actors, mostly unemployed, in New York, and 20,000 in Los Angeles, all holders of Equity or Guild cards. And it makes me heartsick when, every few years, by accident, one of our students appears on T.V. and someone points with pride and says, "Ah, a student of mine!" as if this were the purpose of his teaching, as if this were proof positive of the success of his thousands of contact hours with an unknown number of students and as if this justified the tens of thousands of dollars paid him in salary.

Needed is basic research in theatre as a dynamic event, research done in collaboration with social scientists, psychologists and other arts researchers and practitioners.

Needed is training in the art of salesmanship. We have a tremendous product—a valuable and an exciting one—but the only people we talk to about it are ourselves, just as we are doing right now. We must take the time and expend the effort to learn how to market our beliefs, our art, our job to the people who can do us some good—our state and national representatives, our local mayors, principals, and superintendents, and the business community and labor.

Needed is a massive effort to change theatre from a toy of the privileged few to an essential ingredient in the lives of the many. Desperately needed are training institutes for teachers in the inner cities for direct work with the young people in the slums. Here is a huge laboratory that is almost untouched. Theatre may be a social art but not in our generation has it been very sociable.

Needed is a new pride by theatre people in the profession, the vocation, the art, the discipline and the institution of theatre. We can no longer afford the dilettante, the hanger-on, the self-expressor, or the social climber in theatre, especially in community theatre. Theatre seems to be the only activity in which amateurs feel they are excused from being any good and expect people to pay to see them being shabby. No amateur golfer thinks its good fun to never do better than a triple bogey on any hole. And he certainly does not want anyone watching him make an ass of himself. Even the week-end painter goes off quietly by himself and mercifully shows his work to only a few close friends. The theatre dilettante gives our work a bad name and we've been living with that bad name for so long that we have an inferiority complex about it. We need to be proud of what we are doing but of course we need to know what we are doing and be good at it.

GOVERNMENT SUPPORT OF THE ARTS

All these and many more are great needs, so great, that it seems almost discouraging when one thinks where we are, where we have to go, and the pressures in our world that tend to push us back. But starts have been made. There are some tremendously important programs being undertaken by people like Brustein, Hoffman, Schechner, Langham, Ballet and others. The nation's lawmakers have made historically important decisions in the arts with NDEA, ESEA and EPDA. Research teams are at work and some of their findings are already available with more coming up with implications which are at the same time shattering to our complacency and challenging to our imaginations. But these are only beginnings and meanwhile the needs of our people and of our children scream for fulfillment.

While it is true that the money voted by Congress to support the arts is not great, still if wisely used in each state it can exert a great influence. But this wise use and possible influence in theatre depends on the knowledge and the effort of people in the arts; it depends on you. When President

Johnson signed into law the bill establishing a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, he pointed out, "It is in the neighborhoods of each community that a nation's art is born. In countless towns there live thousands of obscure and unknown talents. What this bill really does is to bring active support to this national asset . . . The arts and humanities belong to the people, for it is the people who create them." "We in America," said Mr. Johnson, "have not always been kind to the artists and the scholars. Somehow the scientists always seem to get the penthouse, while the arts and humanities get the basement."

Whether the arts move upstairs, whether they ascend on foot or by elevator, or how high, will depend on us, wherever we live. What happens with theatre in Tennessee now depends on you, the Tennessee Theatre Association.

What happens across America depends on you also, and on other people like you across the country working together with you, each depending on the other, banding together to achieve capability and power.

It depends on us, all of us in theatre, whether or not we can some day say, not out of innocence like Shakespeare's *Miranda*, but with knowledge, with conviction and with pride.

Oh wonder!

How many goodly creatures are there here!
How beauteous mankind is! Oh brave new world.

That has such people in't.

DELAWARE MORATORIUM COMMITTEE

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, no problem today is on the minds of Americans more than our quest for peace. In my State, the Delaware Moratorium Committee is holding a number of meetings today and tomorrow. I was invited to attend these meetings, but respectfully declined to do so for the reasons set forth in a letter. I would like to include the body of that letter in the RECORD:

As you undoubtedly know, it has always been my policy to meet with constituents whenever possible to discuss any issue. Under ordinary circumstances, I would be happy to meet with Delaware groups to discuss our common goal of peace in Vietnam. Despite this general policy, I have, however, respectfully declined your invitation to attend the meetings being sponsored by the Delaware Moratorium Committee, as I am deeply concerned that meetings of this type tragically do not promote the lasting type of peace we all desire in Vietnam.

I served as an intelligence officer during World War II in the Pacific and we were constantly monitoring all activities in the Japanese homeland to detect any division as evidence of their willingness to surrender. Similarly, I am concerned that North Vietnam finds the moratorium activities as one reason for delaying meaningful negotiations in Paris. If the situation were reversed and the moratorium activities were taking place in North Vietnam today, I believe that most Americans would judge such events as evidence of their willingness to surrender.

I, like all loyal Americans, share your concern for peace. In seeking peace, however, I

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

believe we must consider the safety of our allies as well as the safety of our own troops, including missing American servicemen and prisoners of war. We must act in such a manner that will serve both the short and long range interests of international peace, and must by our actions invite no further aggression.

I also believe that our success in negotiating an end to the arms race, as well as the success of our initiatives in other areas of foreign affairs, depends in large measure upon our steadfastness of purpose.

I hope, therefore, that every man who can in good conscience, will unite behind the President's peace efforts at this critical juncture. I believe our chances for an early and meaningful end to the war can best be aided by supporting the only man in a position to negotiate a lasting peace.

I recognize, of course, the important right for each American to act according to his conscience, and this includes the most important right to dissent. Although you may or may not agree with my views, I am sure you will appreciate why under these circumstances I do not want to participate in activities that I reluctantly believe may delay a lasting peace. I would, of course, be happy to meet with you or other individuals as I have in the past.

With warmest personal regards.

RESENTMENT EXPRESSED AGAINST USE OF NAMES OF VICTIMS OF VIETNAM WAR

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the news media recently carried announcements to the effect that in connection with the current antiwar demonstrations in Washington it was planned for marchers to carry individual names of Americans killed in action in Vietnam, and then display and deposit those names in some receptacle.

Such a practice, particularly without the consent of the next of kin, is most reprehensible. In fact, it is known that this stunt was announced over Radio Hanoi more than a week before the plan was disclosed by those in charge of the demonstrations.

In behalf of the surviving relatives I condemn such despicable actions. It is a shame and disgrace that these loyal Americans should be subjected to such desecration of their fallen sons and husbands.

Today, I have received communications from survivors of two servicemen who lost their lives in Vietnam while gallantly performing their military duties. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the full text of a telegram and letter.

The two communications follow:

UNIVERSAL CITY, TEX.,

November 13, 1969.

Hon. O. C. FISHER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I vigorously object to the reading of the name of my son PFC Gary E. Young in the program sponsored by the San Antonio Moratorium Committee on November 15, 1969.

November 13, 1969

Such an act would dishonor him. Further I feel that it is repulsive arrogance and an illegal act on the part of the sponsoring organization to require that relatives appear in person to object to the reading of the name of their loved one. Also I feel that the federal government should take necessary action to allow in or near a national cemetery only those who go there to honor the service men who gave their lives for their country. National cemeteries are not political forums.

Mrs. ANNA B. CONNOLLY.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.,
November 10, 1969.

Hon. O. C. FISHER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have learned with great personal concern that the 13-15 November "March of the Dead" will involve participants carrying the name of each of our brave Americans who have died in Vietnam.

My husband 1st Lt. John H. Farley was killed in action in Vietnam on June 2, 1969, just 30 days prior to completion of his tour there. I am not bitter but broken-hearted and proud. My husband was killed doing what he believed was best for this great nation and I have no desire to see his name paraded along the streets by anyone of questionable motives.

In behalf of my husband and all members of the family, I appeal to you, and all Members of Congress, to do whatever you can to prevent such a grotesque display which is not in the National interest.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JOHN H. FARLEY.

POTATO RESEARCH AND PROMOTION ACT

HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 2777, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES). Essentially this legislation would enable potato growers to finance a nationally coordinated research and promotion program aimed at expanding their markets and further improving the quality of their product.

My own State of North Dakota is among the principal potato-producing areas in the Nation. Our growers are rightfully proud of the high quality of their product and the strong demand for it in marketplaces throughout the country.

Cost of the potato promotion program would be borne by producers themselves. It would help the entire potato industry in solving its own problems.

Contemplated under the program are expanded export markets for U.S. potatoes, development of new potato products for use both at home and abroad and general quality improvement. It would include advertising and promotion plans to bring the attention of consumers to the nutritional value of potatoes.

The program has the support of potato growers generally and of their organizations. I believe we would do well here today to help the potato growers of America to embark on this self-help program.

A LESSON TO LEARN

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

MR. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Julian Richards of New Orleans, a constituent of mine, has brought to my attention an article which appeared in the October 27 issue of the *National Observer*.

Written by Mr. John Kay Adams, it describes what happened in Athens, Greece, when so-called peaceful protesters were given too much leeway. It might be well for those Members of Congress who condone all actions of the antiwar demonstrators to read this article.

In my opinion, it is worthy of everyone's attention, and I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

[From the *National Observer*, Oct. 27, 1969]

A LESSON FROM THE BLUE SHIRTS: HOW POPULAR PROTEST CAN LEAD TO DISASTER

(By John Kay Adams)

In the streets of Athens five summers ago, my teen-age son and I watched throngs of the good-hearted young people of Greece protest against the actions of their government.

In the streets of Washington on Oct. 15, my teen-age daughter and I watched throngs of the good-hearted young people of the United States protest against the actions of their Government.

We were onlookers in Greece, outsiders, emotionally not involved and obliged to watch it all with Olympian detachment. In Washington, we—or at least my 14-year-old daughter—were emotionally involved. She led a school discussion on Moratorium Day. She has strong feelings about the wickedness of war in general and the Vietnam War in particular.

She feels, as thousands do, that she helped the cause of peace by marching in front of the White House. She can see nothing wrong—noting potentially dangerous—in such a good-hearted demonstration for a cause she feels is noble.

THE LESSONS OF ATHENS

Had she been old enough at the time to join her older brother and me at the demonstrations in Athens, she might now be more aware of how such things start and where they sometimes lead.

On summer evenings in 1965, the streets of Athens were alive with people who came downtown in the evening to shop, go to the movies, visit the *tavernas* and candy stores, or just to stroll around. They wandered through Omonias, the people's square; Syntagma, the tourists' square; and Kalonaki, the fashionable square. Young mothers pushed perambulators and fathers held the hands of their small sons.

The main excitement, if it could be called that, was down around the University of Athens, where there was an occasional bit of shouting on Venizelou Street. The students often demonstrated in front of the university about something or other. Frequently, it was for *Enosis*—the union of Greece and Cyprus. Villains changed from time to time. On one occasion they shouted against Dean Acheson. On another they stormed with equal fervor against Andrei Gromyko. The students seemed to be the only ones who cared very much. They stayed on the university grounds, where the police did not bother them, and the demonstrations were without rancor.

The first giant demonstration—it surely must have been the largest in the long history of the Athenian cradle of democracy—

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

came in July after Prime Minister George Papandreu had been dismissed by King Constantine.

Perhaps he had resigned. The published accounts never were completely clear. But the people believed he had been dismissed, and one thing soon became quite clear. They had tremendous affection for Mr. Papandreu, who was then nearly 80.

TRIUMPHANT PROCESSION

A few days after he was out of office, the old man drove downtown to deliver an address from the balcony of his Center Union Party headquarters. The event became a triumphant procession. Tens of thousands of good-hearted people jammed the street to honor the old man.

From a vantage point on the roof of a building overlooking the party offices, I had an unobstructed view for a mile or so down Stadiou Street to Omonias Square. The street and square were packed with people. Rhythmic chanting shook the buildings: "Pop-on-dray-you! Pop-on-dray-you! Pop-on-dray-you!"

Here and there in the throng were little groups of muscular young men wearing blue short-sleeved shirts and dark slacks. I learned later that they were the activists, mostly dock workers and laborers from Piraeus. Without being obvious about it, the Blue Shirts seemed to start and lead the cheers. When the cheers died out, they started them again. But no one was really manipulating the crowd that night. The demonstration was spontaneous—a massive outpouring of good feeling and affection for the old leader. The half-hidden activities of the Blue Shirts could be seen clearly only from above. They are scarcely visible at street level. Down in the crowd, the people were in good spirits.

After the good people of Athens had shown Mr. Papandreu how much they loved him, the demonstrations did not stop. On the nights that followed, the focus changed to other causes. Labor-union members appeared in the streets to shout their grievances. A regular routine developed.

The demonstrators usually assembled at the university. After speeches and cheering, the marchers went down Venizelou Street to Omonias Square, around the fountain, and back up parallel Stadiou Street to Klafthmonos Square. Then they turned left one block to the university, where they broke up after a total distance of about three miles.

Usually there was no attempt to break the routine. There was no violence. Uniformed police massed discreetly in the side streets, watching, but not interfering. Demonstrations were held on week nights—not week ends, when Athenians went to the beaches. The character of the crowds remained the same, and the Blue Shirts were seldom seen. It became so unexciting that an ice-cream vendor working among the demonstrators declared business so bad that he would return to the beaches, where there were more customers.

Then things began to change. More police lined up in the shadowy side streets. Students were less in evidence, there were more Blue Shirts than before, and the shouting seemed to be uglier.

My son was with me watching a crowd form at the university one evening. For the first time that summer, one of the demonstrators had an unkind word for us. A woman remarked, "Why don't you Americans go home?" But she mumbled it in Greek, and she did not think we understood her words.

As the demonstrators set out that evening on their usual route to Omonias Square, we walked through to Stadiou to see the leaders as they came back.

They were expected to make the customary turn and return to the university. To be sure they did so, the police had blocked the way on Stadiou which led to the Parlia-

ment building. Rows of gray-uniformed men were backed up by turreted water-cannon trucks parked fender to fender and sealing the street.

As the leaders of the march, with reporters and photographers as outriders, approached the corner, a bus driver, whether by accident or design, moved his bus through the police lines. They parted to let the bus through. Suddenly, Blue Shirts materialized, surged through behind the bus, and charged the water cannons. It happened so quickly that the long following line of peaceful demonstrators and the reporters had no advance warning. All were caught in the crush.

TEAR-GAS ATTACK

By reflex my 14-year-old son started toward the action. But I hurried him into a hasty retreat across the park in Klafthmonos Square. As we paused to look back, the tear-gas canisters, smoking like miniature rockets, arched out over the crowd and into the park. Gas spread quickly, and moments later we were fleeing with the rest with burning eyes and tears streaming.

As we ran past him, an aged Athenian screamed at us in English: "Did you see that? Did you see that? They gassed us, the beasts. They gassed us. They are monsters."

As the demonstrations got rougher, some were even held in the heat of the day. We stayed off the streets in the evenings. Now the Greek children were left at home, and there were no more ice-cream vendors. Police used tear gas more often, but they continued to exercise restraint to avoid creating martyrs.

Accidentally, probably inevitably, a demonstrator was killed. A Blue Shirt died with a fractured skull. Published accounts stated that a tear-gas shell fell near the victim. He stumbled and was trampled in the rush of his companions to escape.

An elaborate funeral followed. Thousands gathered at the cathedral. I watched from a high window on Syntagmatos Square, enabling me to see the Blue Shirts pushing the mourners into formation. They herded people like sheep into tight blocks of humanity so that a huge throng appeared to fill the street from curb to curb. Though this maneuver left gaps in the procession and shortened it, the people watching thought the crowd was enormous.

The casket was carried by Blue Shirts with arms raised in defiance. As it moved along, screams of rage broke from the bystanders. These were led by strategically placed knots of Blue Shirts performing as macabre cheerleaders.

THE COLONELS MOVE IN

Trouble continued month after month. Several Greek governments were formed. All tried in vain to win public confidence and to stop the disorders. In April 1967, a few months after we had come home, the colonels seized Greece and ended parliamentary government. That result was something almost no one wanted.

It would be outrageous, perhaps, to suggest direct parallels between events in the streets of Athens and events in the streets of Washington.

In Greece the turmoil lasted so long that people came to regard their government as unrepresentative of their wishes and weak enough to be altered or overthrown by demonstrations in the streets. Greece's own politicians, including some members of Parliament, supported the demonstrators to advance personal causes and ambitions. The product, almost the by-product, of all that maneuvering was the eventual loss of confidence and loss of parliamentary government.

Most of us here regard our Government as fundamentally representative and stable enough not to be changed very much by demonstrations in the streets. Yet I saw and felt some haunting similarities between the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

atmospheres of Athens in the summer of 1965 and of Washington on Oct. 15.

The innocent Greek students and casual evening strollers lent their good-hearted, unquestioning support to the initial Athenian political demonstrations for the beloved old man.

The well-dressed, attractive young American political demonstrators were a lot like them in their innocence and in their quiet determination to support a war moratorium their feelings told them was just.

Certainly there were no American equivalents of the Athenian Blue Shirts. But then, the Blue Shirts did not appear in Greece until the emotional ground had been thoroughly prepared. One can scarcely predict the course of future demonstrations, or whether an American form of the Blue Shirts will appear.

TRIBUNE BANS X, R FILM ADS

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, many Americans are finding it most difficult to locate movies suitable for the family.

I am receiving considerable mail complaining about the low caliber of movies and the immoral aspect of life they portray.

There is little doubt that our young people are being deluged by an unbelievable avalanche of filth from Hollywood, poorly disguised as "entertainment."

The Peru Tribune of Peru, Ind., recognizes this problem and is doing something about it; namely, refusing to accept advertising for these objectionable movies.

The Tribune says it will not be part of anything that pulls young America down. I congratulate the Tribune and offer the following editorial from that paper concerning its decision to ban advertising of harmful movies.

The editorial follows:

TRIBUNE BANS X, R FILM ADS

Effective with this issue, the Peru Tribune will no longer publish advertising for X or R rated motion pictures.

Why are we doing this?

We've been contemplating the action for some time, but a recent editorial in *Editor & Publisher*, the news industry's trade journal, provided the deciding impetus.

The editorial concerned a speech by Jenkins Lloyd Jones, editor and publisher of the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune and president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Jones charged in his speech that the press is being used by those advocating a revolt against self-discipline and a reaction against civilization.

The editorial mentioned another speech by Jones back in 1962 in which he suggested the nation's moral climate had "reached the stomach-turning point" and asked the nation's newspapers, "How about raising a little hell?"

"Not too many people were listening," the E&P editorial said. "If more editors had followed his advice the downward plunge of moral climate since then might not have been so pronounced."

There will be those who will scream "censorship" at us for the action we are taking, and they're right. We are exercising censorship. But we aren't censoring the trash and pornography that can be seen on the nation's movie screens daily. It will still be there as

long as people are willing to lay down good money to watch it.

What we are censoring is the content of our newspaper, and we have a responsibility to do it. Regardless of what the Supreme Court has said, we believe most of today's X and R movies have no redeeming social value and do appeal to the prurient interests of those who watch them. In other words, they're dirty for the sake of being dirty and making their producers a few bucks.

There is a good deal of truth in what Jones said seven years ago and again just recently. The press is being used by many to gain their own ends. Too often it helps pull sales figures up by pulling young America down.

The Peru Tribune is not going to be used that way any longer.

IMPROVING THE OEO

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appeared in the Richmond News Leader, a daily newspaper serving my congressional district. It related to the proposed extension of authorization for the anti-poverty program and brings out the views of our colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE), who unsuccessfully sought to have witnesses appear before the Education and Labor Committee, who were not a part of the program under consideration. Certainly a matter as controversial as this needs to be fully examined before a decision is reached as to its merits. Therefore, I am inserting the editorial below, in full, for the consideration of the membership:

IMPROVING THE OEO

Late last week, the House Education and Labor Committee approved a bill calling for an extension of the anti-poverty program. In the process, the committee added \$295 million to President Nixon's request of \$2.05 billion, for a total of \$2.3 billion. The bill now goes to the floor of the House, where it is predicted that bitter partisan conflict will be staged in an effort to obtain a complete rewriting of the bill.

The prospect of dissension over the bill brings a heartening note. The measure stayed in committee for five full months, while hearings were being held. Witnesses at those hearings, however, were mostly staff members from the Office of Economic Opportunity, who hardly could be expected to give impartial testimony about the many shortcomings of the OEO. Critics of the program hardly could get a word in edgewise.

Congressman William Scherle of Iowa persistently sought open hearings on the measure, to no avail. He had plenty of support for his position, including a letter from Kentucky Governor Louie Nunn, who asked that approval of the anti-poverty bill be held up until his office could supply documentation of numerous abuses in the program in his State.

Congressman Carl Perkins, chairman of the House committee, agreed that additional witnesses could be heard on the bill, but only after the marking-up of the bill had been completed. Mr. Scherle recognized this as an exercise in futility, because there would be insufficient time to print the testimony of critical witnesses before the bill came up for debate. It is significant that the committee vote split along party lines, 21 to 12, with the Democrats in the majority.

November 13, 1969

Floor debate will give Mr. Scherle a chance to air some facts indicating the need for amending the bill to make the anti-poverty program more efficient and less subject to criticism. He knows of instances in one State where convicted felons have received high-paying jobs in community action programs. One of these felons is being paid \$21,000 a year. In a Midwestern State, the \$15,000 a year head of a community action program defaulted on a Federal loan in 1967, saying that he was bankrupt. Other Congressmen may have similar facts to report to their colleagues.

There is little doubt that the much-criticized anti-poverty program badly needs a complete overhauling to prevent future abuses. President Nixon had asked for no changes in the program, but those who have followed it since its inception five years ago know that many tightening-up procedures would be in order. It is up to the House to get down to brass tacks, and to stop vacillating on a program that has wasted more money than it has spent on helping the poor.

STATEMENT ON WAR PROTEST

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, during the next few days millions of Americans are going to participate in a matter of conscience. The events, and the movement they make up, are in a tradition consistent with our traditions and with our laws, but even so they are little understood, and often misrepresented.

Colman McCarthy, a member of the editorial page staff of the Washington Post, today outlined one of the principles of the peace movement, and some of its motivations. I recommend the article to all Members of this House, and I would hope our reading of it, will increase our understanding of the events to come:

ROLE OF CONSCIENCE IN THE WAR PROTEST

(By Colman McCarthy)

Many in this week's passion play for peace are finding it more and more difficult to keep a clear personal conscience while collectively the country wages war. Not all of those who will march, assuredly, are conscience stricken; some will come merely because they feel good in crowds, others from senseless hatred of the President, others will be easy riders of midnight cowboys. But among the many thousands converging on Washington these next days, a large number are people whose consciences will no longer be still. They do not want to be like those Germans of the early '40s who said later they never knew what their government was doing.

Too many Americans believe they know exactly what their government is doing. They see the futile war on television, they hear the generals saying since 1965 that victory is just around the corner, they know it is not the coast of California the Marines are defending, they know that few of our soldiers understand the Vietnam culture, and that much of what our army destroys in the name of protecting will never be the same again.

Unlike Germany, which waged war in the name of conquest, the United States fights in Vietnam in the name of peace. The latest presidential speech on the war used the word 39 times.

This habit of waging war in pursuit of peace may dismay many of this week's activists, but it is nothing new. In 1941, writer Henry Miller, a pacifist then and a pacifist now, described the irony: "There have always been two kinds of people in the world: those who want peace and those who want war. Logic dictates that the peaceable ones must extinguish the war-like ones. That is, in order to be peaceful you must be a better fighter than the warrior... The more peaceful we get, the better we fight. If we were just fighting to fight we might grow slack, because even fighting can grow dull and monotonous if you think only of fighting. But to fight for peace—that's marvelous. That puts iron in you."

Shifting style from obvious sarcasm to obvious realism, Miller warns: "In our zeal to destroy the enemies of peace we forget that war brings about the death and destruction of all that is human and sacred... The only peace we seem capable of understanding is the peace of the grave."

Down through history, men who oppose war and violence have rarely been understood, and even less followed. When St. Francis of Assisi founded the Third Order, which he meant for non-clericals, a basic rule was that the members "not take up lethal weapons or bear them against anybody." The appeal of St. Francis and his thinking was immediate and wide; literally thousands joined him. Expectedly, the government of the day—the feudal lords—quickly tried to suppress it. St. Francis was depriving them of serfs who were needed to fight the feudal wars.

Today, the image of St. Francis is not of a morally brave man who opposed the government's militarism; rather he is a harmless dreamer who talked to animals and flowers. The Church, instead of championing his antiwar philosophy—which was taken directly from Jesus—has mostly ignored it. Today, court theologians busily argue the "just war" theory, which fits in fine with the state's thinking. What state would admit fighting an unjust war?

The Swiss psychologist, Carl Jung, who saw doubt about Western culture and its values as the neurosis of this era, frequently wrote about the senselessness of war. His observation on the first world war is largely what many this week feel about Vietnam: "When fate, for four whole years, played out a war of monumental frightfulness on the stage of Europe—a war that nobody wanted—nobody dreamed of asking exactly who or what had caused the war and its continuation. Nobody realized that European man was possessed by something that robbed him of all free will. And this state of unconscious possession will continue undeterred until we Europeans become scared of our 'god almighty'."

This is the feeling of the conscience-minded this week: they are scared of the government's might. Jung: "This ghastly power is mostly explained by fear of the neighboring nation, which is supposed to be possessed by a malevolent devil. As nobody is capable of recognizing where and how much he himself is possessed and unconscious, one simply projects one's own condition upon the neighbor, and thus it becomes a sacred duty to have the biggest guns and the most poisonous gas."

Ultimately, governments, said Jung, will stop waging war when individuals begin leading lives of peace. But the trouble is, governments can make it hard on anyone who takes the peace vocation seriously. One of the most heroic stories of World War II pacifism concerned an Austrian farmer, Franz Jaggerstatter. Little is known between his birth in 1907 and his marriage in 1936, except that he had scant education but frequently read the Bible.

When Austria's Cardinal Innitzer endorsed

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the Nazis in 1938, Jaggerstatter balked; two years later, he refused to join the German army. His family, friends, parish priest and bishop urged him to "defend the fatherland." The uneducated peasant refused, because he said his instinct was opposed to war. He was beheaded in a Berlin prison in August 1943, for "undermining the military power."

Most likely, in the excitement of this week, few will be thinking the ideas of Henry Miller or Jung, or recalling the lives of saints. They will have their own ideas and lives. But basic to both will be the thought that motivated all men in history who opposed war: a nation can't begin to do what is right until it stops doing what is wrong.

NICK MILLER AND TRACY COKER

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days I have received many communications concerning this country's position in Vietnam. Throughout all the debates I have heard countless arguments. Recently, I received two letters which clearly illustrate how differing points of view may be expressed in a free society without disruption and chaos. At this point, I include the full text of the remarks of Mr. Nick Miller and Mr. Tracy Coker in the RECORD:

OCTOBER 20, 1969.

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: What was the purpose of the Vietnam Moratorium Day?

The stated purpose of many proponents was to end the war in Vietnam.

It is well known, however, that the primary purpose of some originators of this idea was to bring about the defeat of our Republic and our allies in the struggle against Communist terrorism and aggression in Vietnam.

These two are related ideas, but obviously they are not exactly the same.

Every decent-minded person should be for peace with justice, security and freedom.

But is not the effort on the part of any American citizen to bring about our defeat simply treason?

Is this not an old Communist trick—to entwine the honest hopes of good people with their evil purposes? Peace to them does not mean justice and freedom to anybody. It simply means Communist rule.

There are many ways to end the war in Vietnam. One is by complete victory for our side. Many people do not understand why we have never really tried that.

The simplest would be for the Communists to just stop their terrorism and aggression to South Vietnam. Short of their defeat, we can not expect them to do that. Fifty years of Communist history must convince anyone that this brand of Communism exists only as a continued war and aggression against the rights and liberties of mankind. Even within the countries they control, they have never ceased their oppression of the masses.

Another way for the war to end would be for an armistice to be signed, like the one that supposedly stopped the shooting in Korea. Unsatisfactory as the Korean Armistice was and is, it has saved lives—for the time being. The main reason that it has been otherwise unsatisfactory is that Communists over the past half-century have proved themselves incapable of good faith.

In Vietnam, as elsewhere, they will agree to an armistice only if they think there is no other way to do better in accomplishing their evil ends of enslavement and oppression. The many months of Paris negotiations must convince anyone who has not previously bothered to learn about the Communist pattern of thought, that a Moratorium Day, or any other demonstration of our lack of determination to oppose Communist oppression or aggression, will only harden the North Vietnam Communists' unwillingness to end the war by armistice.

Another way the war could end would be for both sides to just stop shooting. But this can hardly occur either unless the North Vietnamese withdraw and stop supporting the Viet Cong in their effort to destroy the South Vietnam government. Aggression is defined as the violation by force of the rights of another state. When North Vietnam became a nation by the Geneva Treaty of 1954, their government, which has not changed its basic structure or personnel except for the death of Ho, agreed in solemn treaty to the separateness and independence of South Vietnam. But ever since, they have continually interfered with the independence of that country and the rights and liberties of its people.

What other name than "aggression" can be given to these actions? In the name of justice they must stop this aggression, or if they will not, then they must be stopped.

Another way to bring about so-called peace would be to bring about the defeat of the United States and its Allies. This kind of Communist peace would be no peace, but continual slaughter, torture and war against all individuals who fall under their power. Immediate withdrawal of our forces would likely mean total defeat. This is the clear purpose of the originators of the Vietnam Moratorium, whatever may be the motives of the misguided persons who have joined and supported the movement.

Is the defeat of the United States what you really want? Sad as we all must be for the death and maiming of our boys, do you really want that it should all have been for nothing? If you go along with these movements, has the thought occurred to you that all these defeatist movements encourage the enemy, extend the war, get more Americans, and others, killed and maimed?

Are you going to be proud to have some of this blood guilt on your hands?

It can be supposed that most of those who took part in this movement somehow rationalized their motives and kid themselves that the results will be some happier thing than the inevitable, ugly, evil results.

All kinds of motives, or excuses, have been mentioned—some innocent, some even good.

Some say they want to hasten the Vietnamese, we all wish that. But this takes time. It takes years to train technicians for the mechanics of modern war. Pressure that might cause this to be done overhastely can well be disastrous, causing more bloodshed and perhaps defeat. Is this what the protesters want?

Some have said they wished to honor our dead and wounded, and to commemorate their sacrifice. That in itself, and to honor the cause of freedom, is a good thing to do every day.

But does it belong in this particular context?

Our government has set aside an official day to do this every year—Memorial Day. Every year in Nampa we have little ceremonies on that day. Every year attendance grows smaller. Those of you who are so eager to honor our dead and their sacrifice—where were you on Memorial Day? There is a right time and a right way for everything. Disruption of society and betrayal of the cause for which they fought is hardly the way to honor our Vietnam war dead.

As to any comfort the promoters of the moratorium take from the support of some young people and students, it can be largely discounted and ascribed to the almost universal urge to be out of school now and then. Any of us can remember our joy to have a school vacation, no matter what the cause. Much contact with Nampa students convinces me that the vast majority are very sound citizens and regard the moratorium as the brainchild of "kooks."

On the eve of the Moratorium, the Communist premier of North Vietnam sent an open telegram to all Americans to join this movement to defeat our own government and the cause of freedom and democracy. If you went along with it, whatever YOUR motives were, HIS and the hidden sponsors of this movement have only the motive to bring about our military and political defeat and thus aid Communist enslavement of people. If you participated on the 15th and helped them, are you proud of your accomplishment?

Remember that all we have been told by some of our officials and others about the mellowing of Communism has always proved to be nonsense. Remember that the facts are the facts, whatever your wishful thinking may be. Wake up and decide which side you are on. It is easier than you think to become guilty of unconscious treason to the causes of truth, freedom, true democracy. And remember, that if Communism finally wins in the worldwide struggle, it will be your rights and liberties that will be lost along with everyone else's.

Vietnam is only a part of the struggle. Don't give our enemies any help.

TRACY COKER.

STANFORD, CALIF.,
October 15, 1969.

Rep. JAMES A. MCCLURE,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCCLURE: I am a sophomore at Stanford but my family lives in Caldwell. I am taking a few minutes out of this day, Vietnam Moratorium day, to write a letter to you informing you of my beliefs on the war, for I believe that citizen input into the governmental process in this form is far more important and democratic than mass protests where an individual only becomes part of a group and its feeling rather than his own. I spent this morning calling on people in the Palo Alto area urging them to do the same.

I base my objection to the war on two things: both would be argued as untrue by some, presumably yourself not the least among them, but I do think they have merit. First, that the United States should not become involved in the internal affairs of another country, jumping in on one side simply because it is "fighting communism," when the side we are defending is a corrupt, undemocratic, dictatorship of another abstraction. Secondly, that the "domino theory" is not a realistic analysis of SE Asia. It would seem that we think all communism is like the monolithic communism of post-World War II Russia (which indeed it was), and accordingly we apply the same remedies—"we must stop them somewhere before it spreads." I don't think that was the case with Ho's type of Communism.

No discussion of the war is complete without comment on its domestic implications. It is a source of frustration and doubt to all, of economic hardship to the poor and the elderly, and of sorrow to those who lose loved ones. Any long war will breed massive social change; sometimes that change is too great and comes too fast for a nation to assimilate it without considerable hardship. Witness World War I.

I realize that much discussion of the war goes beyond the realm of political reality. (Though discussion is necessary in seeking

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

to prevent similar mistakes in the future.) It is certainly difficult to propose policy that will end the war and accomplish the goals we specify. In this area I won't have much to suggest, but then that is not my function. I'm not the Congressman—you are! To those to whom much is given much is expected.

You know my father and can, of course, guess that our politics are much the same. Nonetheless, please regard this a sincere, respectful letter written with an open mind. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

NICK MILLER.

THE HONORABLE FRED B. ROONEY CONDUCTS A ONE-MAN CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, for the last 8 months, our colleague, FRED B. ROONEY, of Pennsylvania, has been conducting a one-man congressional investigation in the general area of the selling of magazine subscriptions. The results of his diligent work have recently been brought to light in a series of excellent articles in the Washington Evening Star. These articles were written by Star staff writer and Pulitzer Prize winner Miriam Ottenberg. Both our colleague and the author of these articles should be congratulated for exposing some of the fraudulent practices of unethical magazine salesmen who yearly exploit the public for thousands of dollars in the form of unwanted subscriptions.

I urge my colleagues to give their most careful attention to the following articles:

THE HARD, HARD SELL—I: MAGAZINE RACKETS PROBED
(By Miriam Ottenberg)

(Note.—There's a new public outcry against unscrupulous magazine salesmen who are trapping the unwary into costly, often unwanted subscriptions. Here is the first of a series of four articles about the problem and what you can do about it.)

Widespread charges of deception, fraud and even terror tactics in the sale of magazine subscriptions have now prompted two federal investigations and demands for reform through Congress.

A stream of complaints across the country deals with both telephone solicitors and door-to-door sales crews.

People claim they have been tricked or trapped into signing up for long-term subscriptions to as many as eight magazines with "something-for-nothing" promises from telephone solicitors.

Housewives protest they have been intimidated into paying for magazine subscriptions they don't want through thinly veiled threats from door-to-door crews.

A survey of state attorneys general shows a renewed concern about magazine sales abuses, court action against both subscription agencies and salesmen and a concerted drive toward consumer fraud laws aimed particularly at fraudulent magazine subscription selling.

On the federal level, Federal Trade Commission task forces have been ordered to make a "highest priority" investigation with a view to recommending formal complaints

November 13, 1969

against those responsible for fraudulent operation.

The Postal Inspection Service is pursuing allegations of possible mail fraud involving several subscription agencies.

Meanwhile, the Internal Revenue Service is reported interested in possible tax evasion.

Both federal and state actions come at a time when the Magazine Publishers Association is trying through its Central Registry of Magazine Subscription Solicitors to enforce a stern code of ethics and rid a burgeoning industry of its unscrupulous fringe.

There's no question that the industry is growing. "We sell 168 magazines for every 100 persons 15 years of age and older compared with 130 magazines 20 years ago," an association official said.

To boost sales, an estimated 86 million calls are now being made annually by magazine solicitors. Out of those calls, 6.5 million long-term subscriptions are sold annually on an installment plan known in the trade as Paid During Service.

Another 2.6 million subscriptions are sold through door-to-door cash sales.

REGULATION WEIGHED

Much of the federal agencies' interest centers on determining whether the complaints come from an isolated few among millions of satisfied customers or whether the industry does need more regulation.

Firmly on the side of tighter control is Rep. Fred B. Rooney, D-Pa., whose eight-month solo investigation has complaints from all over the country and allegations from ex-magazine dealers who claim they were forced to use deceptive tactics.

Equally firm for self-regulation is the Magazine Publishers Association and its Central Registry, whose aim is "to serve the public interest by maintaining ethical standards among door-to-door magazine subscription salesmen and to protect the public against fraud and loss in magazine solicitations."

Central Registry claims complaints have decreased substantially since the FTC-endorsed selling code for magazine subscription agencies went into effect in January, 1968.

COMPLAINTS CUT 38 PERCENT

Cited were figures compiled by the National Better Business Bureau showing a 38 percent decrease in the number of formal written complaints in the first half of 1969 compared with the same period last year.

Rooney disputes the figures. He asserts that thousands of complaints are not being channeled to Central Registry and that many examples of consumer deception are so neatly concealed that the consumer may never realize he was victimized.

Central Registry protests that the FTC gave the industry three years to prove its self-regulating code could clean up subscription sales, but that its had only 18 months.

The publishers contend that their magazines can be sold on their merits and their service, without fraud or deception.

TACTICS CITED

But Rooney says they're not all being sold on their merits—and displays a thick file of complaints alleging a dozen varieties of deceptive and misleading tactics as well as forgery, altered contracts and outright fraud.

Virtually every magazine subscription company is named in the complaints. Three different types of subscription selling are involved:

The cash crews—the door-to-door salesmen who collect the total amount for the subscription on the spot.

The two-pay plan where the subscriber makes one cash payment at the door and mails the balance to the sales company or publisher.

The Paid During Service plan—by far the largest—which usually starts with a phone solicitation followed quickly by a visit by a salesman to get a contract signed.

Most of the complaints about the cash crews are from women who said they paid because they were afraid of what would happen to them if they didn't.

POLICE OFFICER REPORTS

One complaint came from a police inspector in Lancaster, Pa. Reporting on the activities of three groups of magazine salesmen for Interstate Publishers Service, Inc., he said four or five salesmen would enter a business place en masse and mill around while one of the group was trying to make a sale.

In upper middle-class residential areas, he went on, five or six would stand in front of a house while one went to the door. He cited one case where the salesman became "quite nasty" and another where a crew leader was arrested for disorderly conduct when he refused to leave a hospital nurses home.

A Paxton, Mass., woman collapsed and died minutes after two salesmen for Subscription Bureau, Ltd., in nearby Virginia, asked her how she would like her house to be burned down.

Charged with assault and threatening to commit a crime, one of the pair told the judge he was only joking.

An 80-year-old man said two girls came to his door and told him to pick two numbers from a card and sign his name. As soon as he signed, the girls told him he owed \$53 for several 10-year magazine subscriptions.

FULL PRICE IMPRESSION

In the two-pay scheme, the cash payment to the salesman often is represented as the full price of the subscription. It's only later that the unhappy subscriber reads the receipt and discovers that no magazines will be forthcoming until additional money is sent to the publisher.

The paid-during-service contracts usually are for long-term subscriptions, four or five years or even more. Payment is spread over 24 to 30 months after the downpayment and covers four to eight or more different magazines.

Theoretically, the principal advantage of the PDS plan is that it can be paid on the installment plan rather than in one lump sum, but that pitch isn't usually considered enough of a door-opener.

That's where the trouble starts. Subscribers are led to believe they're getting something for nothing, that the magazines are free and they only have to pay postage or handling charges, although that's banned by the PDS code.

\$125 PACKAGE

A Mexican-American mother of three who told the salesman she couldn't read English was sold a \$125 package of subscriptions. She was promised if she signed a piece of paper she would receive a gift. The paper was a contract and she never got the gift.

Another widely used door-opener frowned on by the PDS code is the phony quiz. One woman said she was called and asked where she got the most news. When she kiddingly said the Bible, the caller told her she had won—but didn't say what.

In a matter of minutes, a salesman from the International Magazine Service of the Mid Atlantic Inc., a Hearst organization, was at her door telling her that what she had won was a group of magazine subscriptions. All she had to pay was a small "handling" charge. She told the salesman she didn't want any magazines but he said she'd won them and had to pay. She was stuck with a bill for \$112.

FREE MAGAZINES

The gimmick that caught a newcomer to a New Jersey town was a "welcome" phone call. No sooner had she said hello than the caller said someone would be stopping by to welcome her further.

Her visitor told her if she subscribed to Life magazine through Family Publications Service, Inc., she would receive four other

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

magazines free. When she finally figured it out—long after she had signed the contract—she discovered that instead of paying about \$23 for the magazine package, as she had figured it, she now must pay \$108 and couldn't cancel.

Rooney contended in a House statement that the "root cause" of a deceptive practices in magazine subscriptions selling is corporate pressure for high volume sales.

He singled out magazine sales companies which are subsidiaries of Cowles Communications because of the "large volume of complaints they have generated and the substantial number of individuals familiar with Cowles' operations who have assisted in my investigation." But many of the same circumstances apply to other magazine sales organizations, he said.

"With relatively few exceptions," he said, "men who entered into contractual agreements to operate subscription sales franchises for any of a number of Cowles subsidiaries which have been in operation at one time or another since 1955 have seen their entire business seized by Cowles."

TRAPPED BY DEBTS

"Virtually all—at some point before their downfall—found themselves trapped by debts. They could accept the demise of their business and lose their shirts financially. Or they could bow to the pressures applied by corporate agents to attain higher sales production 'by whatever means possible' meant trickery, deception and fraud."

"Inevitably, 'by whatever means possible' meant trickery, deception and fraud."

Rooney said some ex-dealers had given him copies of deceptive and fraudulent sales talks which they claimed had come from regional directors and other corporate officials with specific instructions to use the misleading spiel to boost sales.

He contended that dealer loans, borrowing rights and interest charges have been "manipulated by corporate officials to force dealers to use trickery to increase sales."

And he concluded that a company which "certainly exercised an overwhelming degree of control over every other aspect of its franchise operations" should also be held responsible for the sales practices of its dealers.

Speaking for Cowles, J. S. Kelly of the legal department said he had never known of a dealer "terminated" for not meeting his sales quota as long as he keeps his financial affairs in order and solicits a reasonable amount of business.

Kelly emphasized that the top management of Cowles' subscription agencies is determined to proceed at all costs—even at the expense of circulation—to improve sales and collection methods.

The Cowles subsidiaries, he reported, are being consolidated in order to police the operations of the dealers more efficiently. In the consolidation, several higher-ranking officials have left.

NAMES SOUGHT

Answering Rooney's allegation that regional directors are furnishing bad sales spuels to dealers, Kelly said he had tried without success to get the name of any officials who may have done this. Nevertheless, he said studies are now underway to make the volume of sales less important in figuring the compensation of regional directors.

Kelly reported that a field auditing force is now checking on the sales and collecting activities of franchised dealers and calling on new subscribers to see if they're satisfied and to find out what was said to them by the salesman.

A principal target for Rooney has been the practice of including gift subscriptions in the total cost of the subscriber's contract. Under this procedure, a subscriber designates a friend or relative to be given a subscription to Look magazine as a gift from him.

GIFT TO STRANGERS

Rooney charges that some subscribers have been billed for one or more gift subscriptions to people whose names were plucked from telephone directories. The unwitting donors, according to Rooney, were short-changed on the length of their own subscriptions to pay for the gift and earn bonuses for salesmen.

Using ledger sheets supplied by ex-dealers, Rooney wrote to 50 subscribers picked at random and asked if they knew they had paid for gift subscriptions and if they knew the person listed as the recipient of the gift Look.

None of those who responded was aware he was paying for a gift subscription and only one identified the recipient as a relative she had designated. As one woman put it, when asked if she knew the recipient, "I don't know he or she from Adam and Eve."

Kelly said Cowles is now reviewing the gift subscription practice. Meanwhile, he reported the company is telling dealers to make sure the subscribers know they are paying for the gifts and that the recipients get cards saying who is sending the gift.

The ledger sheets Rooney used to track down gift subscriptions date back to 1963, but a current case of a misused gift subscription turned up in a complaint to The Star's Action Line.

A railroad conductor complained of being dunned for \$152.93 on a magazine contract he had never signed.

"They are threatening to sue me," he wrote. "I received a long distance call from them a couple of weeks ago threatening to attach my check."

Investigation developed that the contract was allegedly signed on a day when the conductor wasn't even in town and a gift subscription was included for a man whose name and APO address number meant nothing to him.

Cowles said the dealer who handled that obviously forged contract has been "terminated."

THE HARD, HARD SELL—II: "FREE" SUBSCRIPTIONS TO MAGAZINES COSTLY

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

"We have received a gift certificate today in your name and it entitles you to . . ."

"We are going to send you, entirely at our expense . . ." "For answering my questions, I am going to send you . . ."

Do any of those sound familiar?

They're all telephone openers to sell packages of magazine subscriptions. And they're all phony and prohibited by the self-regulating code of the magazine industry as something-for-nothing gimmicks.

The industry is trying to rid itself of deceptive and misleading sales pitches at a time when several federal agencies are investigating magazine subscription selling and Rep. Fred B. Rooney, D-Pa., is spearheading moves for more protection of unwary buyers.

The telephone spuels are cited frequently by complainants as the reason they signed contracts for magazines they didn't want at prices they couldn't afford to pay.

Victims writing to newspapers, Better Business Bureaus and Rooney range from the easily confused elderly to the inexperienced young, from busy housewives who didn't stop to count to servicemen who thought they were getting something free.

Although the self-regulating code has been in effect for 18 months, spuels implying something for nothing are still being used.

A typical spuel promises to send the lucky recipient five magazines "entirely at our expense" for the next 60 months.

"I know this is kind of hard to believe," the caller acknowledges, "but we make our money on the increased circulation. All we ask you to do in return is merely cover our editorial and sales costs."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

That cost, the prospect is told, is just 49 cents a week. Nowhere in the spiel is the total cost mentioned—the tidy sum of \$127.40.

The industry's code doesn't require the entire cost of the contract to be mentioned—figuring, possibly erroneously, that people can multiply—but it specifically forbids solicitors to represent that the cost is simply to cover postage and handling charges and that the magazines are free.

The sellers got around that prohibition so fast that the code's administrator issued a bulletin citing all the forbidden variations of the sales pitch.

Thus, solicitors are not supposed to say subscribers only have to pay "the cost of postage and wrapping" or "the cost of mailing and handling" or make any of these statements:

"Due to postal regulations, you must pay X cents per week." Or "There is a mailing charge required by federal law (or interstate commerce)." Or "Since postage costs cannot be controlled by publishers, you must pay them." Or "You pay a few cents a week which just covers what it costs the girls in the office to handle the magazines." Or "Just return to us a printing and editorial cost."

Then there's the reverse twist which also has been outlawed: "We are not asking you to pay the postage and handling charges and your payment will be only X amount a week." Or "you will pay X amount a week, we will pay the postage and see that these magazines are delivered to you."

SPURIOUS QUIZZES

The code also forbids the spurious "quiz" which winds up with the caller promising to send magazine subscriptions as a reward "for answering my questions."

It doesn't seem to be much of a come-on, but it can confuse, as this New Jersey woman complained:

"I was called on the telephone and told my name was chosen for the lucky one. I was supposed to get five different magazines if I'd answer a question: Where do you get the most ads from? I said the paper. Then she named the magazines I'd be getting and also a free subscription to anyone I chose to give it to."

"I told her I did not want any magazines. But she said I'd get them regardless. Then she said, Only 58 cents . . . not saying at first a week. But she meant a week and I thought a month."

ORDER TELEGRAPHED

"In a very short time, a man appeared at my door. . . . I told him I did not want the magazines. He said, 'It's too late now. They already telegraphed the order to Baltimore.'

"He said, 'Sign your name.' I didn't want to but he said 'You have to sign.'"

He was using a gambit frequently used by unscrupulous salesmen to give the impression that a contract that hasn't been signed yet is a binding document. In a variation of this, another woman wrote: "He insisted that my name had already been put in a computer and I must take the magazines."

Even more deceptive are the tricks salesmen use to get signatures on contracts.

In one of a number of complaint letters Rooney has received about salesmen for the International Magazine Service of the Mid-Atlantic, Inc. in Baltimore, a woman wrote:

"I thought I was signing to enter a sweepstakes and as it ended up I had signed a contract at almost \$7 a month. If I were to pay the contract in full, it would add up to over \$200."

"I am receiving threat letters in the mail and it is beginning to be a nuisance. I must be receiving every magazine there is and I think anyone who would knowingly sign a contract such as this would be crazy."

A widow on Social Security told of being roused out of a sick bed to answer the door, where a young man told her she had won

subscriptions to several magazines. He asked for her signature on a piece of paper. When she told him she couldn't read without her glasses, he read to her. So she signed and found herself committed to pay \$180.

SIGNATURE NON-CANCELABLE

Another woman thought she was signing a receipt for some "gift books." She, too, signed without reading and it turned out to be a non-cancellable magazine contract.

Actually from the time the magazine code became effective, contracts could be canceled either at the time of verification of the contract or in writing within 72 hours, which ever was later.

The trouble was that salesmen didn't want to lose commissions and some dealers didn't want to give up sales so they made a secret of the 72-hour provision. Even a year after the code was approved, contracts still bore the clause: "This contract cannot be canceled or "This contract is not subject to cancellation."

Finally, in April 1969, all agencies participating in the Paid-During-Service Code were reminded of the 72-hour provision and asked to review their contract forms to be sure they complied.

PRACTICE CONTINUES

Even so, complaints about the old contract with its noncancelable clause were still trickling in months later.

The bitterest of all the protests center on the efforts of the subscription agencies to collect what's due them under the contract.

Sometimes subscribers stop paying because they're not getting the magazines and see no reason to pay for nothing. Other times, their circumstances have changed and they feel they can't afford a luxury when they're having difficulty paying for necessities.

On occasion, they want out before the first magazine arrives. They try to return the "gifts" and refuse the magazines but they can't escape the bill collector. Garnishment, court action and ruined credit are threatened in progressively harsher terms.

The mother of a 22-year-old serviceman told this anguished story:

In February 1969, while her son was an officer candidate at Ft. Benning, he and his wife were sold subscriptions to eight magazines by the Franklin Readers Service, Inc., of Washington, D.C.

They paid a deposit of \$4.98. Then for the next 29 months, they were to pay \$14.95 a month for a total of \$438.53.

The week after they signed up, the mother wrote, the boy was dropped from OCS and later ordered to Vietnam.

On April 9, before leaving for Vietnam, he wrote the subscription agency and its payment department telling of his change of status, saying he couldn't pay for the magazines and was returning the gifts which had accompanied his subscription.

DEMOTION THREATENED

A week later, after he had left the country, his wife received a long-distance call at her Ohio home from a man in Washington who threatened to have the soldier demoted if she didn't make the payments.

And a week after that, the mother was called by a Washington attorney who said "that my son would face legal proceedings that would affect his standing in the Army, that he would be reduced in rank, that the contract was unbreakable and they would have to pay."

The mother complained to Rooney, who called it to the attention of Robert M. Goshorn, administrator of the Central Registry's paid-during-service section. A week later, Franklin Readers Service notified the young wife that the contract had been canceled.

The boy may never have learned that the magazine problem was resolved. He was killed June 22.

November 13, 1969

There are other abuses which show up repeatedly in complaint letters. Here are some of the most flagrant:

1. Failing to complete key portions of the magazine contract, particularly the payment terms and the period of time each subscription is to run, expressed in years, months or numbers of issues.

This makes it possible for the unscrupulous salesman to alter it to reduce the number of months a subscription is to run and include one or more hidden "gift subscriptions" on which he gets a cash bonus.

The practice is known as "shaving" the contract and the subscriber doesn't know he's been short-changed until the magazines stop arriving.

2. Substantially overcharging the subscriber for the magazines he ordered, thereby "watering" the contract.

3. Feigning handicaps of using similar sympathy appeals to promote sales and using abusive language to housewives who refuse to buy.

4. Misrepresenting the size of the monthly payment or the fact that payment of the five-year subscriptions must be completed in 24 to 29 months.

THE HARD, HARD SELL—III: PUSHY MAGAZINE SALES MEN MUST BE HANDLED CAUTIOUSLY

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

How can you get the magazines you want without being prodded, tricked or trapped into subscriptions you don't want or can't afford?

The magazine industry is trying to rout out the salesmen and the bosses who prey on the unwary. Several federal agencies are looking into possible violations. And an increasing number of states are establishing consumer fraud offices and passing ordinances aimed especially at door-to-door magazine selling.

But when a magazine subscription salesman comes into your life via a ringing telephone or a knock on the door, you're on your own. It's up to you to stay out of the ranks of unwilling, unwitting unhappy subscribers.

The first line of defense, of course, is your common sense, an operative sales resistance and a flat refusal to be rushed into signing anything.

TWO-WAY SOPHISTICATION

As a study of magazine complaints reveals, however, when consumers become more sophisticated so do the schemes to separate them from their money.

These do's and don'ts should help you avoid falling for magazine selling schemes prohibited by the industry but practiced by some of its salesmen:

Watch out for the magazine salesman who asks you to sign his "route book" to show he called at your home, or the one who wants you to sign a "receipt" for a gift of green stamps or some other bonus offering. Read before you sign. It may be a trick to get your signature on a magazine contract.

Be skeptical of the young man who says he's earning points toward a college scholarship by selling magazine subscriptions. Too often, the only points he's earning are commissions and the only time he goes near a college campus is to sell subscriptions.

And don't be misled by the salesman with a real or feigned handicap. Sympathy appeals are frowned on by reputable subscription agencies who believe magazines should be sold on their merits, not out of frequently misplaced sympathy. If your visitor turns nasty when you refuse him, slam the door and call the police. They'll want to know about him.

If you're going to subscribe, make sure your carbon copy of the contract is filled out completely before you sign the original. Insist that the contract include not only the names

of the magazines you want, but also the number of issues of each, the down payment, the payment per month, the number of months over which you make payments, the number of months thereafter during which you continue to receive magazines and the total price.

If the contract has any incomplete sections, you're inviting "shaving"—a trick by which the number of issues of some magazines you ordered is cut down and the salesman makes himself an extra bonus at your expense. Either he inserts in your contract "gift subscriptions" to complete strangers or he includes a subscription to a magazine you didn't order. You may think it's free but you're paying for it.

When the opening pitch is made in a telephone call, take the time to ask questions and do some multiplying before you agree to let a salesman visit you to clinch the deal. If the salesman says you'll get all those magazines for just pennies a day or so much a week, don't settle for that. Ask how much you will be expected to pay each month because that's the figure that counts. Don't divide your cost over the entire length of the contract because you have to be paid up halfway through the life of your subscription.

Don't sign any contract until you've read and understood all of it. Remember that the unscrupulous salesman will head for the busiest person in the office to make his pitch because the busy man is least likely to read the fine print. And on home visits, that kind of salesman will reach the housewife while she's rushing to fix dinner and signs fast to get rid of him.

Too often, complainants say they didn't bother to read the contract until their payment book arrived and they found out how much they had to pay. By that time, the 72-hour cancellation period is long past and they're stuck.

Make sure to read the "receipt" given you by the door-to-door salesman in exchange for your cash. He may have tucked it away in an envelope but open and read it before he leaves. It may and often does—say that you must send the balance of your payment to the sales agency before the magazines start coming. He may have represented the cash you gave him as payment in full but what he handed you was not a receipt at all but a mail-in coupon.

If you've signed a paid-during-service contract, talk over your contract in detail with the person from the subscription agency who calls to verify it. Make sure you understand the terms. If you don't want it, that's the time to say so.

The verifier may tell you it's too late to cancel but don't you believe it. And don't believe verbal assurance that you can change the terms or cancel any time you want. It can't be done, as the collection agency will be the first to tell you.

When your payment book arrives, make sure the number of coupons coincides with your contract. One East Coast subscription agency is known to have inserted one or two extra coupons in many payment books over the past two years.

If yours is a 25-payment plan, your coupon book should contain 24 coupons. Your down payment was or should have been deducted.

Keep a detailed record of how many issues of how many magazines you're supposed to receive; the dates you started receiving them and how much you have paid.

Before you do business with a magazine salesman in your home, ask to see his Central Registry identification card as well as his license to sell door to door in your community. If he doesn't have either, refuse to deal with him.

If the salesman tells you your subscription will help buy wheelchairs for a veterans hospital or benefit a local scholarship fund or

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

charitable cause, check it out with the Better Business Bureau or the organization being "benefitted." It may be all news to them.

If you believe you have been duped into signing a contract for magazines you don't want, ask the Better Business Bureau for a magazine complaint form. If the BBB considers your complaint justified, it will be forwarded to the subscription agency involved, the Central Registry of Magazine Subscription Solicitors and the National Better Business Bureau.

Right now, the most frequent complaints reaching The Star's Action Line come from people who have paid for their magazine subscription, gotten their canceled checks back, waited more than three months, written to the publishers and still have heard nothing—no response, no magazines.

Some complainants are shouting "fraud," but a more likely explanation is that the increase in subscribers is breaking down the creaky machinery for processing subscriptions. Because the magazine publishers can't get enough competent manpower, they're moving into computerized systems and they say it takes time to get the bugs out.

If you've written the publisher without success, try writing to the Central Registry of Magazine Subscription Solicitors, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022. You may get only a card acknowledging receipt of your complaint, but that's more than you got from the publisher.

FASTER DELIVERY

And sooner rather than much later, you'll get your magazines.

But what about the ones who don't get their magazines because of fraud in the selling or didn't want them in the first place?

Rep. Fred B. Rooney, D-Pa., was asked what answers he has for all the complaints he has gotten.

He believes policing of the magazine industry could be done either by the Federal Trade Commission or a proposed Department of Consumer Affairs if either were given the tools for effective enforcement.

Meanwhile, he intends to cosponsor a deceptive practices act which would provide authority for a federal regulatory agency to get temporary injunctions to halt practices which the agency believes are deceptive or fraudulent.

Rooney said he also will introduce, with slight revision, a bill sponsored by Sen. Philip Hart, D-Mich., known as the Fairness in Franchising Act. Since Rooney contends that some franchised magazine dealers are forced to resort to deceptive practices to keep their franchises, he proposes to add a provision prohibiting the parent organization from disavowing its responsibility for the use of lawful business practices.

REVISED BILL PLANNED

In addition, he will introduce a revised version of the Door-to-Door Sales Act which passed the Senate in the last Congress but failed to win House consideration.

The measure, authored by Sen. Warren Magnuson, D-Wash., carries several provisions which Rooney believes would offer protection against deceptive practices of some magazine salesmen. A key feature of the bill is the establishment of a 72-hour cooling-off period during which the consumer can cancel a contract for goods or services sold door-to-door.

A similar provision is carried in the magazine code under which the major subscription agencies now operate, but confused customers don't always know this. The Magnuson bill requires that the right to cancel be printed clearly on the sales contract.

EXPIRATION DATES

Rooney plans to ask the publishers themselves to act to reduce the likelihood that consumers can be misled when buying maga-

zine subscriptions. If voluntary action isn't forthcoming, he will introduce legislation to accomplish these objectives:

First, to clearly identify on each address label the exact month and year when a subscription will expire.

Secondly, to imprint clearly on any mail solicitation of subscription renewals the exact month and year the subscriber's current subscription is to expire.

"While I have serious reservations about licensing of door-to-door salesmen at the local level," Rooney added, "a local solicitor licensing law often is a community's only available defense against unscrupulous sellers.

"Further, it is the only means by which a local community can determine whether persons invading the community as members of traveling sales crews have serious criminal records."

THE HARD, HARD SELL—IV: MODEL CODE WOULD CUT DECEPTION

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

A magazine solicitor with a long criminal record can be refused a permit to sell subscriptions in Arlington County Va., but can cross the line into Fairfax County and get a permit the same day.

Alexandria had an ordinance to weed out criminals among door-to-door salesmen, but a judge called the key sections unconstitutional and now Alexandria police aren't sure just how far they can go.

In Falls Church, on the other hand police make certain a salesman has a clear record before giving him a permit to solicit from door to door.

Nearby Maryland's protection against criminal or fraudminded magazine solicitors also depends on where you live.

Montgomery County strengthened its solicitation ordinance in August 1968, and complaints have dwindled.

ONLY A CLEARANCE

But next door in Prince Georges County, all a solicitor needs to get a permit to solicit is a clearance from District police and some identification.

And in the District, License Superintendent C. T. Nottingham says flatly, "Washington residents are not really covered against unscrupulous magazine solicitors. The law is almost unworkable and unenforceable."

Informed of the Washington area's split protection against door-to-door magazine salesmen with criminal records as well as the gaps and loopholes in present law, Francis B. Francois, chairman of the board of directors of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, said he will recommend a model code for the entire area to cover door-to-door solicitation.

"To me it sounds like an excellent idea," he said, "and I think it should certainly be explored. I'm going to ask the staff to do the preliminary work and bring it up at the next meeting."

A TWO-EDGED SWORD

"A model ordinance would not only be a protection to householders and an aid to law enforcement, but would be a help to legitimate solicitors. At least they would know what requirements they must meet throughout the area."

On the state level, more protection also is being sought against solicitors who make their sales through deception or outright fraud.

The Virginia Retail Merchants Association recommended to the Virginia General Assembly at its last session a door-to-door sales act similar to laws recently adopted in several states. The bill failed to pass but will be introduced again at the next session.

Maryland has a consumer protection law which has been used by Assistant Attorney General Norman Polovoy, chief of the con-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

sumer protection division, to set aside a number of magazine contracts where the consumer has been misled.

PAYMENT REALITIES

Polovoy considers it a "serious misrepresentation" when a solicitor tells a prospect she has to pay only 59 cents a week for five years' worth of magazines when she actually will have to pay by the month and her payments must be completed in two years or 30 months, not five years. This is a procedure followed by many magazine subscription agencies.

To help consumers who buy now and regret later, Polovoy said the No. 1 legislation sought by the Maryland attorney general is a measure to allow a 72-hour cooling-off period. He acknowledged that the code which magazine subscription agencies are supposed to follow allows customers 72 hours in which to cancel their magazine contract, but he contended the subscription companies don't always live up to the code.

Throughout the Washington area, even in the communities where door-to-door salesmen must be investigated and licensed, there's this one big gap in protection:

If the salesman comes to the house by "appointment" after a telephone solicitation, he doesn't have to be licensed—although this might be the most misleading pitch and the contract he gets may be much more costly than the one sold by the door-to-door salesman.

APPOINTMENT MISLEADING

Even the idea of an "appointment" may be misleading. The householder for instance may just agree to be home to receive a gift of 200 green trading stamps for answering a phony quiz, but she's a captive audience for a magazine spiel.

In the District, officials say that for several years, because of a lower court decision, they haven't required licenses for salesmen who come by prior appointment. The corporation counsel's office now says a test case will be made.

Rep. Fred B. Rooney, D-Pa., who has been crusading for tighter control over magazine solicitation has told District officials that if they feel new law is needed to control sales abuses, he would be glad to sponsor it.

Rooney also brought up the question of licensing salesmen, including those who make prior appointments, when he sent Fairfax County officials a statement supporting a proposed Fairfax County solicitation ordinance.

TRICKERY INVITED

He said failure to consider door-to-door sales which result from prior appointments, "has been the downfall of other communities' attempts to stamp out trickery by door-to-door salesmen."

He urged that the proposed ordinance be extended to cover all door-to-door salesmen "whether or not such individuals are responding to appointments with householders or other individuals pre-arranged by telephone, telegraph, correspondence other means of communication."

Rooney noted that in the District, because prior appointments are excluded only six salesmen have registered out of the hundreds working the city every year.

While none of the communities in the area require licensing of salesmen who come by prior appointment, no matter how flimsy is their excuse for an appointment, most jurisdictions are better off than Fairfax County when it comes to protection against criminals masquerading as magazine salesmen.

RECORD CHECKED

In most nearby counties, some check—sometimes a very detailed one is made of a solicitor's record before a license is issued.

In Fairfax, however, a solicitor gets fingerprinted, but then is able to go out soliciting without any waiting period to determine if he has a record.

By the time his fingerprint record comes back from the FBI he has already done whatever he came to do and has left the area. He may have used his time to case the area for a housebreaking gang or may have used his solicitor's license to gain entry to homes where he could filch whatever wasn't locked up.

Fairfax police who know the kind of people they are now required to license have been pleading for an ordinance that allows them enough time to complete a record check on applicants for licenses.

They believe there should be a 15-day waiting period before a license is issued, a bond such as is required in other jurisdictions and the right to refuse a license to any one with a criminal record.

HAD 74 RECORDS LISTED

At Rooney's request, Fairfax County Police Chief William L. Durrer listed 74 criminal records, selected at random from those who registered with county police to solicit magazine subscriptions from March, 1968, to March, 1969.

One solicitor operating in Fairfax County had a record of unauthorized use of a car; four counts of robbery, fugitive from justice, grand larceny and escape from custody; four counts of possession of narcotics and four counts of bank robbery.

Another had four counts of grand larceny, theft of an automobile, two counts of petty larceny, four counts of possession of heroin and armed robbery.

And a third had a record of three counts of burglary, felonious assault, manslaughter by motor vehicle and two counts of carrying a concealed weapon.

Others had been charged with rape, assault with intent to murder, receiving stolen property and "investigation of swindle."

FOES SHOW UP

"They have records like fugitives from San Quentin and here they are running around our county," commented a Fairfax police official.

"But when the County Board of Supervisors held a hearing on adoption of a solicitor's ordinance, the only people who showed up were the ones against it. The housewives who want protection from the criminals don't show up."

Officials throughout the area acknowledge that even the better ordinances don't assure that residents won't be taken in by a fast-talking, magazine solicitor. Nor is there any guarantee that a salesman won't persist to the point of harassment.

These pointers should help:

Always ask to see a magazine solicitor's Central Registry identification and local permit before doing business with him. If he doesn't have it, slam the door but get his automobile license number and call police.

CALL THE POLICE

Also call police in a hurry if a magazine salesman becomes abusive or threatening.

If you feel you were misled or deceived into signing a magazine contract, but don't discover the deception until after the 72-hour cancellation period, you can ask the Washington Better Business Bureau for a complaint form. If the BBB considers the complaint justified, it will be forwarded to the subscription agency and the Central Registry. Chances are you'll get back your down payment and relief from the contract.

Maryland residents with a justified complaint can write to Norman Polovoy, chief of the consumer protection division, Attorney General's Office, 1207 Charles Center, Baltimore, Md. 21201. Include a photocopy of the contract and a letter setting forth as fully as possible what was said to you before you signed the contract.

November 13, 1969

As always, your eyes are your best protection. Use them to read every word of a contract before you sign it.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE DENIED VETERANS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, apparently our veterans returning from Vietnam can expect to have freedom of choice denied them in seeking to pursue higher education under the GI bill of rights.

The Supreme Court of the United States has already indicated pitiful lack of understanding of the Constitution—or outright dishonesty—by favoring executive orders and illegal bureaucratic guidelines over the precise laws enacted by Congress.

Although the GI bill provides that an eligible veteran is entitled to receive money for his education in "any public or private secondary school or other institution if it furnishes education at the secondary level or above," the Veterans' Administration to prohibit their attending the college of their choice unless it signs a "voluntary" compliance to admit Negroes to the standards illegally set by HEW.

Veterans who risked their lives fighting for freedom in South Vietnam will find they have lost their own freedom at home—to bureaucrats who operate in open defiance of the law of the land.

I include David Lawrence's column of November 12:

RACIAL SCHOOL HURDLE FOR VETERANS

Veterans returning from Vietnam may be surprised to learn that if they wish to enter a private school or college and get the benefit of tuition furnished under the GI Bill of Rights, they may not be permitted to attend the educational institution of their choice. For federal government agencies now have assumed the privilege of denying the right of choice by the veteran. He will not be given the funds unless he agrees to go only to the school or college which has "voluntarily" complied with certain regulations as to the admission of Negroes.

This correspondent wrote a dispatch in September which said that there have been no attempts to bar the use of "tuition money for attendance in schools or colleges that may be wholly or partially segregated by race or religion." It now turns out the Veterans Administration had earlier moved into at least one case with a threat not to permit white veterans receiving federal financial assistance to attend the college in question unless it signed a "voluntary" compliance declaration on the admission of Negroes. The college decided to comply. The incident was not widely publicized.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964, in its section dealing with "nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs," states that rules and regulations may be issued on the subject of racial discrimination and the withholding of federal funds, but it says specifically that "no such rule, regulation or order shall become effective unless and until approved by the President."

There has never been any such regulation signed by either President Johnson or President Nixon authorizing interference in the admission practices of private schools or col-

leges. Yet, whenever a returning veteran applies for tuition grants and names the school of his choice, the Veterans Administration requires from the institution an "agreement of voluntary compliance" with the "regulations" issued by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

If the agreement is not approved by the authorities of the school or college, the veteran who has made application at that particular institution either will lose his right to choose the college he wants to attend or will have to give up the financial assistance to which he is eligible under the GI Bill.

Veterans' benefits are described in various statutes, the latest of which was enacted in March 1966. No mention is made therein of the necessity for conformity by the educational institutions to any rules concerning the admission of applicants.

The law says that an eligible veteran is entitled to receive money for his education in "any public or private secondary school, vocational school, correspondence school, business school, junior college, teachers' college, college, normal school, professional school, university, or scientific or technical institution, or any other institution if it furnishes education at the secondary level or above."

But now, through some administrative action inside the government, the Veterans Administration has apparently been ordered to intervene. The theory that the veteran is to receive financial aid for his own education has been superseded by the idea that a private school or college of his choice must agree to handle the racial, discrimination question in accordance with government dictation.

Educational institutions which are attended by students of one race or religion may decide to enroll veterans who apply and find some other means of helping them financially to get an education rather than change their longstanding customs and traditions.

While the Civil Rights Act of 1964 specifically declares that governmental action to correct "racial imbalance" is prohibited, this is being disregarded. Apparently the move to deny funds to private schools or colleges unless they conform to the rules laid down by the federal government was begun under the previous administration but is continuing under the Nixon administration.

The real question is how far a government bureau may go in dictating to a citizen where he shall get his education even though he may have risked his life in military service and earned the right to financial assistance as he seeks to attend the college of his choice.

E. S. KOCH DIES IN VIET WAR

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp4c. Edward S. Koch, a fine young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to honor his memory and to commend his courage by including the following article in the RECORD:

E. S. KOCH DIES IN VIET WAR

Army Spec. 4 E. Stephen Koch, a native of Cumberland was killed in a helicopter accident in South Vietnam October 19, the Department of Defense reported yesterday.

Specialist Koch, who was 20, died after he was struck by the tall rotor blade of a helicopter near Binh Long province 50 miles south of Saigon.

He was a helicopter crew chief assigned to C Troop, 7th Squadron, 1st Air Cavalry.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A native of Cumberland, he was graduated in 1967 from the Fort Hill High School there and received the Hazelwood Award in Industrial Arts.

After graduation he had worked as a clerk-cashier in a food market before being inducted March 17.

PARENTS SURVIVE

He was the son of Mr. and Mrs. Edward W. Koch, Jr.

Survivors include his parents; a brother, Army Pvt. Ronald W. Koch stationed at Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., and a sister, Brenda Koch, of Cumberland.

LOOKING TO THE SOUTH

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I previously called attention to the excellent editorial comment which the President has received in a number of Florida's outstanding newspapers, with respect to the "new directions" he has advocated in our Latin American policy.

I am sure we are all aware of our desire for friendship with our Latin American neighbors. I cannot help but feel that the President is heading on the right course with his new direction of policy in this great area of the world.

It is for this reason that I would like to again commend the attention of my colleagues to another excellent editorial, which appeared in the November 3, 1969, edition of the Tampa Tribune. This editorial, like the many others, gives full support to the President's efforts to establish a new policy toward Latin America.

The editorial illustrates the foresight displayed by the President in providing a new, simple, and practical course for our Nation to follow in order to achieve progress among the Latin American nations. The President's policy would do so in a manner which, in my opinion, will reflect favorably on our Nation and be welcomed by our good neighbors to the south.

I, therefore, commend this fine editorial, which appeared in the Tampa Tribune, to my colleagues for their perusal and study.

The editorial reads as follows:

TO THE SOUTH, STABILITY WITH RESPONSIBILITY

President Nixon's new Latin American policy is a low key, soft sell approach for dealing with our restless friends to the south. It places more emphasis on pragmatic approaches and less on the social engineering concepts of the last 15 years.

The President proposes a working partnership with all Latin American nations glued to the premise, in his own words, that "give-and-take is better than take-it-or-leave-it." The Latins now will have more to say how U.S. aid funds are spent and a bigger voice in solving mutual problems.

He also applied the surgeon's knife to grievances which have gnawed on the Latins for years. Latin Americans have groused that they were buying more and more goods from the United States while selling us less. In other words, they have been stricken with trade sickness. The Latins also have com-

plained the United States has been too involved in the internal affairs on their land and also calls all the shots on administration of U.S. aid funds.

To eradicate these sources of friction, the President decreed this nation no longer will require that loan dollars be spent solely in the United States. They may be spent anywhere in Latin America.

He proposed that the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress be the agency to permit Latins more decision making and responsibility for administering economic assistance monies.

Mr. Nixon said this nation also will pursue a course for funneling more U.S. assistance funds into private business channels already operating in Latin countries. He also encouraged more U.S. investments while at the same time warning that recent expropriation of oil properties in Peru and Bolivia could sour investor confidence.

He will ask Congress to upgrade the Office of Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs to Under Secretary. This will provide a single office through which all Latin business can be transacted, something the Latins have wanted for a long time.

Of all Americans, President Nixon should be aware of the temper of Latin Americans. He was stoned in Venezuela and abused by other mobs in 1958. Eleven years later, his own personal representative, Nelson Rockefeller, faced angry mobs while on a fact-finding mission.

The stoning of Richard Nixon, then the Vice President, created such a shock in the United States that the Eisenhower Administration took the first positive step toward the Latins since the "Good Neighbor" days of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Under Eisenhower the Inter-American Bank was established to make low interest loans for development and \$500 million was appropriated to finance projects with a strong social flavor.

President John F. Kennedy was swept along by this momentum of helping Latin nations by creating the Alliance for Progress. Washington poured a lot of money into the Alliance for such social projects as land reform and improved schooling.

Not all in the Alliance has been bad, as President Nixon recognizes, and it has made some accomplishments. However, the distrust of Latins for the rich Yankees continues. So President Nixon wisely stressed that social reforms are needed and this nation supports them but the initiative for them must come from the Latin nations themselves. This is significant because it marks the end of American activism in Latin nations.

The President also discarded the long standing policy of loudly proclaiming we oppose military rules and dictatorships and the overthrow of existing legitimate governments in the face of which we always wind up recognizing such dictatorships and dealing with them. The Nixon approach recognizes the political status quo in Latin America, including military and dictatorial governments.

Mr. Nixon logically asked for no additional Federal funds to carry out his new policy. Logical, because such a request likely would be treated roughly in Congress, which last year halved Latin American aid requests to \$336 million.

There is nothing grandiose about the new partnership approach with Latin America. Its net effect is that the United States and all Latin nations will be on a 50-50 footing, sharing both decisions and responsibility.

We have a big stake in the stability of Latin America and a responsibility to promote progress among the underprivileged. Mr. Nixon, the businessman and the diplomatic surgeon, has provided a simple, practical course for us to achieve both.

THE SILENT MAJORITY

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and said in the past several weeks concerning the "silent majority" who have failed to speak out against antiwar demonstrations and so-called moratoriums on the Vietnam war. I, for one, am very pleased that the American people, by the thousands, are beginning to respond to the challenge presented to them. However, we tend to overlook the fact that there still remain so many Americans who have little or no opportunity to be heard when they do speak: our fighting men overseas and those others whose voices will never again be heard. For this reason, I would like to share with the American people the contents of a letter which I have just received from one of our Vietnam soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, in order to give equal opportunity for Capt. Coleman J. McDevitt's voice to be heard in protest to the antiwar demonstrators, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD his letter to me:

NOVEMBER 7, 1969.

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STUBBLEFIELD: For the past year I have watched the tide of opinion against the war in Vietnam swell. Now we have come to a moratorium conceived by some young people who have but a slight, if any, idea what the whole thing is all about. Since my first tour of duty in Vietnam I have remained a part of the silent majority. Since I am a career military man I do not feel that I have the right to actively display my true feeling, however I feel that it is my duty to let my elected representative know just where I stand on such important issues.

You have been to war and so have I. I have served two years in Vietnam and will serve a third or possibly more. I do not like the family separation. I do not want to be killed. I can think of more pleasant things to do than fight a war. However, the world being what it is, there is a time that we must fight. Did we not fight WW I and WW II to stop all future wars? It does not seem to have helped very much.

Being a free society, each and every citizen has a right to protest whatever he or she is against. This is one of the things that we as soldiers fight for. I do feel that when this protest infringes on the rights of others that it is time for competent authorities to put a stop to it. Today it seems that discipline and authority are words that would be responsible people are afraid of. Having been in the military you must realize that the longer an undisciplined situation is allowed to go on, the harder in the end it will be to bring it under control. The silent majority is in need of some leaders to follow. I suggest the place to look for these leaders and spokesmen is in the halls of Congress. It is the duty of these leaders to speak out against the actions of the administration if they disagree with it. It is bordering on criminal to continue to voice this disagreement as well as actively support dissident groups whose actions are giving moral as well as material support to the enemy. Hanoi has publicly stated that this sort of demonstration in the United States is one of the things that gives them the spirit to fight on. It takes very little common sense and no education to see that this

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

will cost more American lives. The irony of it all is that the people involved claim that they believe their action will shorten the war.

Having been involved in the war for two years I can tell you from experience that the communists are not the "good guys" that some of the people seem to think they are. A short review of history will show you that the communists have never bargained unless they were sure they were going to get what they wanted out of it. They are past masters at making it appear that it is a give and take proposition when in reality nothing could be further from the truth. Do people not realize that they will keep trying by any means available from open war to subversion to gain their intended goal of world control? If we pull into our isolationist shell today it will only mean that we will have to face them at a later date on another field of struggle. Our leaders, from the lowest echelon of civil government to the presidency, have a history of looking for a solution that will solve the problem right now. It is time we started looking into the future to see what today's decisions will do in times to come. What will the effect be two, five, or ten years from now. Ignoring the problem will not make it go away no matter how badly we wish it would. X number of years from now people will realize that the communists have nearly realized their goal of world conquest. The hue and cry will then be raised to stop them. No doubt the leadership at that time will agree (providing it is the "popular" thing to do) and loving scapegoats like we do will lash out at the leadership of times past for their blindness and ineptitude at handling problems.

Let there be no mistake in your mind. We could win the war, and without the use of nuclear weapons, very easily. But of course we don't fight wars to win anymore. How would you feel if you were in the shoes of today's young soldier being sent out to find and engage the enemy. You wouldn't like it in the first place. Add to this the fact that your country is near the stage of complete riot over the war. Add to this that many of our leaders both local and national do nothing but protest and say pull out. It matters little that these people for the most part have no alternate solution or if they do it does not take into consideration the long term effect of their proposal. This man wonders why he should go out and risk being killed for nothing. I think the same thing about my third tour. Are we as a country getting so callous that we can throw away 40,000 lives for nothing? Call it a mistake and quit? I do not mind protest if people know what they are talking about. A little knowledge is a dangerous thing. People protest the brutality of the American soldier toward the poor south Vietnamese villager. Have they been there? No! I have. Have they seen what the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong soldiers do to innocent civilians? No! I have. Again let me assure you that they are not nice fellows.

Why isn't this side of the war given broad coverage in the press? Is it because it wouldn't be the "popular" thing to print. It might not sell enough papers. My question is where will all this end. Why don't you drop by the G2 shop in the Pentagon and take a look at all the other locations in the world where the communists are actively engaged in the over-thrown of the government. I think you will be shocked. Mr. Congressman, the communist understand but one thing and that is force. Who is the strongest. Who will stand up and fight. If you don't believe that, ask for a briefing by people who have devoted their lives to the study of the communist movement and the means it uses to attain its goals.

It is time that we as a people force ourselves to face up to the truth. People want a strong army to protect them but they don't

November 13, 1969

want to serve themselves. They want us to be ahead of any would be enemy in nuclear and CBR weapons but they do not want any testing to be done in their state or locale. They want big government spending, only in their area though, all the while seeking every means known to get out of paying taxes. Unless our leaders face facts and force the people to do likewise things will never get any better.

Sincerely,

COLEMAN J. McDEVITT,
Captain, Armor,
U.S. Army.

HIJACKING OF A COMMERCIAL AIRPLANE

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, on September 16, I joined with 49 other Members of Congress in sponsoring a House concurrent resolution condemning the hijacking of the Trans World Airlines Boeing 707 to Syria by Arab guerrillas on August 26, 1969. To compound this felony the Syrian Government illegally detained two Israeli nationals.

Under date of September 9, I wrote to Mr. Gerhard Hoeltje, president of the International Air Transport Association, urging that drastic counteraction be taken, by immediately suspending all international flights to any nation which violates the provisions of the 1963 Tokyo convention which calls for all nations to promptly release hijacked airliners, passengers, and crew members.

On that same day, I wrote to the Honorable William P. Rogers, the Secretary of State, regarding the growing menace of air piracy, and urged that he request Ambassador Yost, our representative to the United Nations, to call on Secretary-General U Thant to use his good offices to encourage support of such an international compact.

The American Jewish Congress on October 26, issued a statement passed by their policymaking national executive board, calling on the U.S. Government and the United Nations to "intensify their efforts to bring about the immediate release of two Israeli citizens imprisoned since late Summer in Syria following the hijacking of a Trans World Airlines airliner."

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point the text of the communications I have referred to above and the press release by the American Jewish Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 9, 1969.
Hon. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am enclosing a copy of my recent letter to Mr. Gerhard Hoeltje, President of the International Air Transport Association, requesting that the I.A.T.A. join in the effort to bring an end to the growing menace of air piracy.

Considering the serious implications for American air travelers inherent in the circumstances surrounding one of the most recent incidents which resulted in the detention of a group of Israeli nationals in Syria,

I believe it appropriate to ask that you request Ambassador Yost to call on Secretary General U Thant to use his good offices to encourage support for such an international compact.

I also believe that our government should undertake immediate consideration of entering into bilateral agreement with all nations to provide for the mandatory extradition of hijackers, including those who request political asylum, to the flag country of the hijacked aircraft.

With my sincere appreciation for your consideration of these requests, I am

SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 9, 1969.

Mr. GERHARD HOELTJE,
President, International Air Transport Association, Montreal 2 P.Q., Canada.

DEAR MR. HOELTJE: The menace of international air piracy has reached proportions which demand the most drastic counter measures.

The members of the International Air Transport Association can make a significant contribution by voluntarily agreeing to immediately suspending all international flights to any nation which violates the provisions of the 1963 Tokyo Convention which calls for all nations to promptly release hijacked airliners, passengers and crew members.

The recent action of the Syrian government in illegally detaining Israeli nationals following the recent hijacking of one of TWA's international flights by Arab guerrilla terrorists should be condemned in the strongest terms.

I urge that your Association make clear its resolve to react to any such act of air piracy or the condoning or overt support of any such act by the immediate cessation of international air flights to and from the offending nation and further that such suspension shall continue until all passengers and crew members shall be released and the hijacked airliner returned to its country of origin.

I am sponsoring a Resolution in the United States House of Representatives calling on the U.S. government to act immediately to enter into bilateral agreements with all nations to provide for the mandatory extradition of a hijacker, including a hijacker who requests political asylum, to the flag country of the hijacked aircraft.

The hijacking of commercial airplanes will cease only when an international agreement is reached that recognizes hijacking as a vicious international crime and provides that the hijacker shall be punished.

Your Association's cooperation in meeting this grave challenge will be most deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,
Member of Congress.

STATEMENT OF AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS

The American Jewish Committee applauds the efforts of the United States government, of Trans World Airlines, and of various international agencies concerned with civil aviation, to secure the release of the two Israeli civilian passengers still being imprisoned in Damascus, nearly two months after they were the innocent victims of an Arab terrorist hijacking.

We call on our government and the United Nations to intensify their efforts to bring about the immediate and unconditional release of these prisoners. By freeing the hijackers and detaining their innocent victims, the Syrian authorities have compounded their own guilt and openly flouted international law and basic human decency. It is high time, therefore, that the international community make it crystal clear to

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the Syrian regime that air piracy will not be tolerated and that unless Syria releases these prisoners and is prepared to assure the safety of commercial passengers in the future, appropriate sanctions will be imposed, including the denial of aviation links and service.

Syria's recent election to serve on the Security Council of the United Nations, the organ assigned the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, makes action by Damascus in this matter imperative. It demands that Syria promptly release the two detained Israelis and thus give concrete evidence that it is prepared to live up to its signature on the Charter of the United Nations, under which the Syrian people reaffirmed faith in "fundamental human rights," pledged to establish conditions under which justice and respect for international law are maintained, and promised "to practice tolerance and live together in peace" with all others "as good neighbors."

Founded in 1906, the American Jewish Committee is this country's pioneer human relations agency. It combats bigotry, protects the civil and religious rights of Jews at home and abroad, and seeks improved human relations for all people everywhere.

LIBERALS CAPITULATE TO EXTREMISTS, REDS DOMINATE PEACE MOVEMENT

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I recommend that my colleagues read this article which I am placing in the RECORD, by the noted columnists Evans and Novak in the Washington Post of November 12, 1969.

I believe that these writers have presented a very perceptive analysis of the so-called peace movement. They have given us pause for thought and for alarm. They have pointed out those dangerous and hidden forces which have not only planned the moratorium march, but which have, in the process, duped sincere liberals who have become involved by virtue of their convictions.

Any reading of history, both American and European, clearly demonstrates that parallels do exist. For, if anything is evident from any such readings, it is the fact that mass movements are led and are not spontaneous. In most cases they are calculated to achieve an ostensibly legitimate purpose, but, as history shows with tragedy, the ultimate end of many such movements is known only to those who plan and manipulate them much to the regret, when it is too late, of those who have been used as pawns.

Sincere liberals, in their eagerness to embrace a cause in consonance with their convictions, have not questioned the sinister designs of the professional revolutionaries whatever their Red hue. Perhaps, they have merely overlooked any ulterior motives, swept along as they are in the exhilaration of a new found voice to express their opinions. But, while the throngs go forth to demonstrate, those Communists who are behind the march know that it does not represent honest dissent.

The editorial referred to, follows:

LIBERALS CAPITULATE TO EXTREMISTS, REDS DOMINATE "PEACE" MOVEMENT

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The tens of thousands of well-meaning war protesters set to converge on Washington Saturday will be joining a demonstration planned since summer by advocates of violent revolution in the U.S. who openly support Communist forces in Vietnam.

Accordingly, whatever happens here Saturday, the Nov. 15 march on Washington will mark a postwar highwater mark for the American far left. Responsible liberals have been enlisted as foot soldiers in an operation mapped out mainly by extremists—testimony to the present ineffectiveness of non-violent, liberal elements in the peace movement.

Moreover, heavy-handed Nixon administration reaction by Deputy Attorney General Richard G. Kleindienst assures that any violence on Saturday will be blamed by liberals on the government, and the avoidance of violence will be credited by these same liberals to the self-restraint of the far left.

Although liberals belatedly spend this week in frantic eleventh-hour efforts to co-opt Saturday's march, they had plenty of advance warning. The New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam (New Mobe) sponsors of the march, was formed last July in Cleveland with an executive committee dominated by supporters of the Vietcong.

The executive committee is moderate when compared with the 60-member steering committee, studied with past and present Communist Party members (including veteran party functionary Arnold Johnson). Far more important than representation by the largely mordant American Communist Party, however, is inclusion on the steering committee of leaders in its newly invigorated Trotskyite movement.

The steering committee began eclipsing the executive committee in recent weeks under the leadership of the Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party and its fast growing youth arm, the Young Socialist Alliance. Fred Halstead of the Socialist Workers Party took over planning for a march calculated to end in violent confrontation.

Participating in planning sessions were elements even more violence-prone than the Trotskyites: extreme SDS factions calling themselves the revolutionary brigade. Wild scenarios for storming the White House, the Justice Department, and the South Vietnamese Embassy were prepared.

Furthermore, the New Mobe was in closer contact with Communist Vietnamese official circles than is generally realized. Ron Young, a member of the New Mobe steering committee, journeyed to Stockholm Oct. 11-12 for a meeting attended by representatives of the North Vietnam government and the Vietcong. Reporting on plans for Nov. 15, Young urged a worldwide propaganda campaign to boost the demonstration.

The link between Hanoi and elements of the New Mobe was again demonstrated Oct. 14 when Premier Pham Van Dong of North Vietnam sent greetings to American antiwar demonstrators. Halstead, the Trotskyite leader, drafted a friendly reply to Hanoi approved by a majority of the New Mobe's steering committee. Its transmission was blocked only by the intervention of Stewart Meachem of the American Friends Service Committee, one of the New Mobe's moderates.

Thus far-left orientation of the New Mobe for weeks has worried liberal doves, including the youthful leaders of the peaceful Oct. 15 Moratorium. Sen. Charles Goodell of New York, emerging as a leading congressional foe of the war, attempted—without success—to reduce extremist influence inside the New Mobe and argued against including far leftists on the steering committee.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

But the liberals, having forgotten the fate of popular front movements a generation ago and unwilling to repudiate any antiwar forces, would not actually break with the New Mobe. Any chance of that was eliminated by President Nixon's relatively hardline speech Nov. 3 and government strategy laid down at the Justice Department by Kleindienst.

Goodell and Sen. George McGovern of South Dakota, after much deliberation, accepted invitations to address the demonstration in hopes of moderating it. Similarly, moratorium leaders this week have tried to insinuate themselves into control of the march. But the march remains essentially a project of the far left, constituting a tragic failure of leadership by liberal foes of the war.

LEGACY OF JOE FINE

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 6, 1969

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, every so often our communities are blessed with dedicated individuals of rare talent and a zest for public service. Such a man was Joe Fine of Marquette, Mich. Joe Fine was a close friend of my father's and a particularly valued friend and counsellor of mine. I commend to your attention a recent editorial in the Marquette Mining Journal which captures the spirit of a loyal American who fervently loved his country and served his community:

LEGACY OF JOE FINE

Joseph Fine of Marquette, who died Saturday, was a man of great character, and will be remembered for his many actions and services.

Mr. Fine served as mayor of Marquette and was on the Marquette City Commission for two terms. He was the first chairman and later (and still at the time of his death) a member of the Marquette Board of Light and Power. Actually, creation of the utility board was an idea largely conceived by him.

For many years he had served in various committees and behind the scenes on civic projects. He didn't care for the spotlight, preferring, instead, to share in the satisfaction of knowing something worthwhile succeeded.

Mr. Fine was active throughout his lifetime. For many years he rose early to take long walks, and then walked to work anyway. He had operated a grocery store in Marquette for a decade, after immigrating here from Lithuania, via Boston.

Then Mr. Fine operated a tavern. It was an unusual place, open mainly in the daytime hours. He paid his employees well, yet restricted the serving of persons who had had enough. His operation was such a success, despite the bargain prices, that it became the subject of a feature story in a metropolitan newspaper.

After passing retirement age he disposed of his tavern. But he couldn't remain inactive long, and soon after opened a newsstand, then a cigar store. Later he went back into the tavern business. Inactivity was not for Joe Fine.

When he ran for office it was always for an ideal and with a view to service, not for a personal gain. He never accepted open support from groups or individuals. "If I can't win on my own I don't want to," he'd say. Yet Joe Fine always won any election he entered. In fact, he always ran first in the field.

In office, whatever he did he did because he sincerely believed it was in the best in-

terests of the community. He had no selfish desires in his actions as a municipal official.

He was proud of his service to the country during the first World War. He later became active in the American Legion and was a commander of the Marquette Post. He also was active in the Masons, Elks, Odd Fellows, UCT and Kiwanis Club.

What, then should we remember most about Joe Fine? (No one referred to him as Joseph Fine.)

Perhaps this story will suffice: Mr. Fine was known as a "soft touch" for any charitable drive or cause. Once, after he had made contributions to some Christian church projects, he was asked by an acquaintance: "But, Joe, why do you want to give to those Catholic and Protestant church building projects; you are Jewish."

This was Mr. Fine's reply: "I figure that as long as I am able to give something to help build a church—any kind of a church—it must be a good cause and this must be a good country."

This, we believe, is the legacy of Joe Fine—popular businessman, patriot and public servant.

MORATORIUM AND THE SILENT MAJORITY

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, soon after the October 15 moratorium, I received a petition from numerous students of Union College in Barbourville, Ky. I have withheld my remarks in an effort to find the right time and the right things to say as an expression of my views in relation to their activities on moratorium day.

I was impressed by the way they participated in the nationwide moratorium. They not only involved students and faculty but alumni who have received post-graduate degrees and others who have served in Vietnam as members of our armed services. They had a full day of debate which involved discussions that entertained all views on this war. They have approached this in a mature, constructive manner and I know that they have learned from this experience and will make their own independent contributions to the future developments of our country.

They came together with one common goal—the ending of the Vietnam war as quickly as possible. That is a goal which no true American can oppose, but one often forgets this goal while striving to enforce his own private plan on how this can be achieved. Debating issues is a valuable tool which we possess in this country as a means to decide upon a course of action. It is a part of our democratic way of life, but equally so it is our obligation to join in support of the commonly agreed upon course to try and make it effective regardless of the previous views we held. We have been debating issues surrounding our involvement in Vietnam for many years. Some answers have evolved from this, and while we are making progress toward peace, and I believe President Nixon will be successful in his efforts, there is not enough hard evidence to convince everyone that our goal for immediate peace will be forthcoming.

November 13, 1969

The most common criticism one hears of the moratorium demonstrations is that it is embraced by our enemies as a sign of good faith toward them and that it is subsequently anti-American. I do not agree with this position, and I believe that recent surveys by major news media bear me out on my views. The great numbers who participated in the October moratorium stated nothing more than they desire a speedy end to the war in Vietnam. Their concern is for their country, the United States, and they have not loaned their conscience and efforts to those who would kill or maim their brothers, friends, and former classmates.

We must not allow the statements of the North Vietnamese to force us into opposing things which we would otherwise heartily approve. While Congress is united in its goal for peace, they are divided upon the ways in which it can be achieved. The citizens of our country, including those who participated in the moratorium, are also united in the goal of peace and are equally divided on the ways in which it can be achieved. We must not allow our dissatisfaction of the many things that are said by our enemies or the social appearances of the participants actively opposing the war to force us into polarizing ourselves and making opponents of those who are in truth our echoes.

When President Nixon speaks of the "silent majority," I know that he is correct, for there can be no doubt that he has the support of the vast majority of our citizens including myself and many of my colleagues. And on this eve of November's moratorium, I ask each of you to look at our Government and the participants in the moratorium and the "silent majority," and I am confident that you will conclude that all of us are united in our search for an early peace in Vietnam. The only conceivable difference is in the way that it can be achieved.

On this latter point, the differences are even smaller than one might think for our points of debate are not whether President Nixon should continue his withdrawals but whether he should inform us in advance of his planned procedure for withdrawal.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission I should like to include a petition by students of Union College in which 234 signatures gathered in support of immediate peace. They have continued their debates since the 15th of October and I do not perceive of this as being in opposition to President Nixon or their Government. I respect and commend them on their concern for their Government and on the constructive way they have elected to let their feelings be known.

It is my hope that we as elected Representatives can continue our debates with an open mind so as to allow our acts to be free and responsive to the people rather than be reactions to a social element which we do not like or statements from enemies of our country.

The petition follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CARTER: We the undersigned students and faculty of Union College, Barbourville, Ky. do feel that the war in Vietnam must stop. We demand that you do everything in your power to end this senseless war.

SIGNERS

Karen Jackson.
Emily Feeley.
Sornchai Serovinlin.
Christopher Kord.
Timothy Feeley.
Rochelle Furtah.
Al Tailous.
Sue Boyer.
Alice Smalley.
Doug Werley.
Bob Barhdoll.
Orlinda E. Reid.
Christina Williams.
Nika Stallard.
Brian Sullivan.
Russell F. Silver.
Alice Woodward.
Richard Poshay.
Robert Wildrick.
Tom Burns.
Barbara Thorpe.
William R. Schad.
Robert J. Clement.
William A. Longacre.
Richard Reed, Jr.
Virginia Anne Myers.
Bob Stevens.
Juanita Bain.
Margaret Hammond.
Celleta Knuckles.
B. J. Hisk.
Jerry Yellin.
Diane Hughes.
Karl T. Merchant.
Janie Ann Nelson.
Steven Goodman.
Bill Isbister.
Lisa Long.
Linda J. Smith.
John J. Schamp.
David W. Whitcomb.
Judy Peaco.
Rick Illes.
Carol Francis.
Jim Habercan.
Dennis Hamilton.
Douglas P. Schellinskeet.
Mary Lee Wood.
Suzanne Gilliam.
Timothy Cleary.
H. Doyle Mills.
Ken Mackay.
Edward Busser.
Donald Parker.
Joe Collins.
Bruce Ricardo.
Len Dufresne.
Robert E. Jordan.
Jody Cloud.
Margo Jackson.
Vicki Wilburn.
Rev. Tyrrell Keller.
Pauline Spicer.
Doreen Johns.
Charles W. Kipp.
Ed Black.
Michael Prusina.
Owen Skaggs.
Larry Curd.
Fred Gross.
Celeste Wilson.
Ruth Ann Lakeman.
Clevis O. Carter.
Nicholas Poulos.
Barbara Lane.
Tom Hodgkins.
James L. York.
Ray King Smith.
Diane Logan.
Patricia Connor.
Debby Ward.
Vicki Caswell.
Molly Kemmer.
Edward Barber.
Nancy Blair.
Quentin Yeager.
William Phipps.
Dave J. Urich.
G. Glassman.

John R. Podlackowich.
Deborah Minard.
Bob Kimble.
Steve Gerb.
Thomas J. Flynn.
Brenda Jones.
Steve Trumble.
Billie Jean Morris.
Peggy M. Wallace.
L. H. McPherson.
Thurman Faxin.
Robin Garslauser.
Stephen B. Fowler.
Richard Child.
Cynthia Lee Merrill.
Gerry Brigante.
Haustost von deBurg-Vista.
Stephen F. Belle.
Stephen Chrisos.
Andy Savarese.
Tom R. Digell.
Douglas V. Smith.
David E. Hey.
Paul F. Kirby.
Ken Mubers.
Gregg Turner.
Emily Willis.
Martin Kumor.
Tom Richardson.
Chris Brozyno.
Pete Miller.
Demer A. Carrimita.
Denis Volpe.
William Darnell.
Tom Buddenhagen.
Eric Krebs.
Peter Quimby.
Herbert R. Harmsen Jr.
Janie Parkey.
Bob Blis.
R. Terry Bolen.
Sherry Moore.
Sandi Schnitz.
Sandra Grubb.
Doug Hinderer.
Fred Baldwin.
Herman B. Gonzalez.
Paul Rudolph.
Bob McCullough.
Ralph Sherman.
Christopher Columbus.
Peter Chin.
Charles C. McDowell.
John Entchisan.
David Bandelin.
Roger Hamilton.
Kenneth Semtyader.
Steven S. Roto.
Scott M. Elliott.
Wm. A. D. Nionia.
Eric Small.
Gary Kennedy.
Mr. & Mrs. Cantrell.
Walter Yotka.
David R. Ganary.
Robert E. Bodenlos.
Bruce Aldele.
Forrest M. Wilkinson.
Bob Maguire.
Mrs. Ruth Hampton.
Randy Parmett.
Robert Henshall.
Ella Sue Logan.
David Bird.
Thomas Floy.
Jeff Guile.
Bill Pierce.
Ed Lillie.
George Fisher.
Bob Sciolte.
Paul Andrews.
Scott Anderson.
Judith Mays.
Regina Bean.
Edward R. Schneider.
Nancy L. Perry.
Elaine F. Abbot.
Neal A. Bender.
Greg L. Klinedensts.
Bruce M. Freedman.
Douglas Bownjack.

Michelle Palmer.
Kala J. Moore.
Thomas N. Cady.
Mike Esposito.
Marc Goodhart.
Ann Consiglio.
David West.
Bill Beebe.
Bruce E. Barnes.
Michael E. Carlson.
Pat Ragona.
James E. De Rocco.
Beth Ballard.
Lindsey Davis.
Stephen B. Roberts.
Rickey Pack.
Arthur Comocho.
Douglas W. Jones, Jr.
Debbie De Luca.
Marvin Miller.
Jane Doner.
Bruce Burdett.
Pam Foley.
Joseph W. Stone, Jr.
Catherine Bradbury.
Linda Gudner.
Helen Hammon.
Sallie Dodd.
Grant P. Wallace.
Greig Ferguson.
Thomas J. Stanton.
Chester R. Lyons.
Betty Valentine.
Ruth Ann Payne.
Mary Moore.
Charlene Valentine.
John P. Graham.
Glenn E. Marston.
Clark Taylor.
Paul F. Whittaker.
Clayton W. Gove.
Janice M. Prunier.

A NOSTALGIC EVENING AT THE
GRAND OLD DRISKILL: FUND
RAISING FOR A LIVING MUSEUM

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would take this opportunity to reminisce about a bygone era—but it is nostalgia with a purpose.

Last month, I was privileged to participate in an activity which I will explain in detail, but first I would call your attention to what was once the grandest old lady west of St. Louis. I refer to the magnificent, although faded, Driskill Hotel in Austin, Tex. Just to walk into the wide lobby on the main floor immediately invokes memories of a life style that used to be. This hotel has been the meeting place of Presidents, of Governors, of State officials of varying importance—and of the common man.

There are a few of us die-hards remaining who recall the gaiety and grandeur of the era.

The opening of the Driskill was heralded in the Austin Daily Statesman on Friday morning, December 17, 1886, in headlines as "What a Bonanza Austin Possesses in Its New Caravansary." The subhead continued the description, "A Blessing to the City and State Which Cannot Be Overestimated."

From that gala beginning, the Driskill grew in purpose and in legend. In its time, this grand old lady has been hostess

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

to a President, scores of Governors, even more legislators and throngs of lobbyists, reporters, and the socialites of eight decades.

Walter Long, an Austin historian of considerable note, describes the early Driskill as—

Originally, there were sixty rooms, very large, some later were partitioned, a few added, making a total of one hundred and fourteen. Square nails were used throughout all the woodwork and it was the most comfortable, spacious hotel south of St. Louis... The hotel was gas lighted and steam heated. Warm mineral water from the artesian well was available to every customer.

Today, the Driskill is undergoing another of several traumatic changes. Several times in its history, the hotel has been closed. Just this year, it narrowly avoided the wrecking ball and bulldozer when some stalwarts came forth to save a portion of the grand old building.

Mr. Speaker, I realize this is quite a preamble, but I wanted to attempt the proper setting for a night that was billed as "A nostalgic Evening at the Grand Old Driskill" which was the initial fund-raising effort of the newly formed Austin Natural Science Guild. The purpose—the planning and construction of one of the most exciting educational resources dreamed of for Austin: a living museum of Texas flora and fauna.

The living museum will be a part of Zilker Park in Austin. The joint project of the Austin Natural Science Association and the ANSA will be, in effect, a native Texas zoo composed of several ecological communities representing the major regions of the State.

No better locale could have been selected for this fund raising effort than the Driskill Hotel—a museum of yesterday.

Thus, it was the perfect setting for the rather nostalgic evening. While the old stories of the Driskill's legend circulated about the room, the crowd assumed a good, warmhearted mood. And rightfully so. For the evening, a mock hotel staff was assembled including former Gov. Allan Shivers as "hotel manager" and Mayor Travis LaRue as "bell captain." The list of notables is too long to reprint here, but I would mention the "bartenders"—namely, State Senator Charles Herring, local business leader John R. Kingsberg, and the Congressman from the 10th District, myself.

In October 1946, an official historical marker was erected for the Driskill Hotel and Mr. Walter E. Long, one of the most tremendous civic and historical men our city has ever known, made some remarks that are worthy of remembrance, and I want to include them at this time:

A PAGE FROM THE HISTORY OF THE DRISKILL
(By Walter E. Long)

On October 25, 1966, Central Texas friends of Austin's Driskill Hotel gathered in its Brazos Street entranceway to see and hear its dedication as an official historic site of Texas. Governor John Connally, Austin's Mayor Lester Palmer, Judge J. M. Watson, and other dignitaries paid tribute; relatives of the hotel's first owner, Colonel Jesse Driskill, were introduced and a general historic occasion was enjoyed under the direction of Mrs. Jessie McIlroy Smith and Mrs. Alfred W. Negley. The moving moment, however, came just before the plaques were un-

covered. Mr. Walter E. Long, read the following remarks.

My Friends,

In this day of fading gratitude I shall not bore you Faithful, who are conscious of your heritage, with too many words about the history of this living moment of Austin's past, and present.

Perhaps its tomorrow will be a parking lot!

I am "much obliged" to Jessie McIlroy Smith, Mrs. Jim Hart, and their fellow workers, who hold their tireless hands in the leaking dikes of a great nation's civilization. The only fundamental teacher is history.

Col. Jesse L. Driskill bought three lots from Sir William J. Oliphant, a Scotsman from Dimfirmallum, Scotland, early in the 1880's, and on six lots began construction of the Driskill in 1885 which opened December 20th, 1886. It cost \$400,000 with a large debt against it.

The bust of Col. Driskill faces South, that of his son "Tobe" faces West, and "Bud" faces East.

The grandfather of Ed St. John, a noted stone mason of the 70's and 80's, directed all the stone work in this building of Romanesque architecture.

One horn was broken from the steer's head beneath the bust of "Tobe," but was dowelled back so securely by Mr. St. John, that his assurance that he could "fit it," stands good for eighty years.

Originally there were sixty rooms, very large, some later were partitioned, a few added, making a total of one hundred and fourteen. Square nails were used throughout all woodwork. "It was the most comfortable, spacious, luxurious, hotel south of St. Louis."

The tragic story of Mr. Driskill's fortunes was given me by some of the old-timers of the 80's. He and his sons, with numerous drovers, left his ranches in South Texas in the early spring of 1888 with some 3,000 head of cattle for his northern pastures in the Dakotas. On the way they were caught by one of the most severe blizzards in history and nearly every head was frozen—many of them standing. His debts on the Driskill could not be met.

The hotel changed hands several times. One of the owners being Major George W. Littlefield in 1897.

The hotel was closed several times between 1886 and 1906, about which date it was acquired by Dr. E. P. Wilmet. During these periods a negro man and his wife were the trusted custodians.

Traveling men looked forward to their stay in the Driskill in the early days of the Southern Pacific and the International and Great Northern railroads.

The hotel was gas lighted and steam heated. Warm mineral water from the artesian well was available to all customers. Salt ate out the casing every few years.

Today's inner dining room has the most beautiful wainscoting to be found in any hotel of the nation. It was fitted from the matched mahogany headboards of the first beds which Mr. W. L. Stark and Mrs. Sully Roberdeau saved half a century ago.

Mr. Stark was manager from 1906 until June 1944. He was one of the most genial and accommodating business men I have ever known.

Call bells, not telephones, connected the office with every room. Reverse calls got service.

The bar was one of the handsomest in the nation and now graces the reception desk.

The corner stone inscription on the East side Reads—"The Driskill—Erected 1885-1886—J. N. Preston and Son, Architects"; and on the South side—"This Stone Presented by the Business Men of Austin."

And the walls of this old romantic structure—if they could talk—I would cease my ramblings and listen—

November 13, 1969

LISTEN—to the sobs of the heartbroken Carlotta as I look for her beautiful face in her mirrors of 1863.

LISTEN—to the stories of my old friend, Pete Lawless, who made the Driskill his home from the day it opened until 1928.

LISTEN—to the orchestras of University Final Balls and Governors' Inaugurals as "After the Ball" fades away at the break of dawn at the Crystal Ball Room.

LISTEN—Yes, as I listen I come alert with a jolt as the bullets of a six-shooter of a noted lawyer glance from the sturdy cast-iron columns in the broad hallways and imbed themselves in these old walls as he misses his target—the other lawyer!

ONCE MORE—I listen for the tantalizing sound that comes to me over eight decades—Head Waiter Old Sam is calling, "Dinnah is now served in de Crystal Ball Room. Roast Ham, Fried Chicken, O'Possum an Sweet Potatoes, Virginia Style, thirty-five cents . . ." and the sounds from the old walls fade away.

Mr. Speaker, since the days of Jim Hogg and earlier, this great old hotel has been the center of nearly all the historical entertainments that our city has enjoyed. The walls of this old hotel hold some of the greatest secrets of Texas history. Every inaugural reception for many years was held here. An entire book could be written about the events and episodes covered with the service of Judge Ruben Gaines who served on our supreme court. Our late beloved Col. Ernest Thompson has recorded many delightful stories about this hotel and particularly about Judge Gaines for whom he served as secretary in the early 1900's.

On election night in 1964, Lyndon B. Johnson was elected the 36th President of the United States. He received the election returns from around the Nation from the Jim Hogg suite in the Driskill Hotel. Not only were we proud to have the eyes of the Nation turned to this native Texas son and his gracious wife and family—but in a smaller way, we were proud for the Nation to view the charm of this grand old hotel which has been at the pulse beat of virtually every historical event in Texas since its opening.

That was indeed a great night to remember.

RURAL AMERICA LOSES A GREAT FRIEND

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow last week that I learned of the death of my good friend, Howard Bertsch, formerly the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration.

During his term as Administrator, it was my pleasure to have Mr. Bertsch on more than one occasion as a visitor in my district, and though his background was in Oregon, many of us in Oklahoma considered him one of us. He was an outstanding public servant with a deep understanding of the needs of our rural areas and our rural people.

When Mr. Bertsch left Government service, he did not slow down in his efforts to help these rural people. At the

time of his death he was director of program development of the Rural Housing Alliance, a nonprofit organization dedicated to providing adequate housing in rural areas.

Rural America is going to miss Mr. Bertsch.

TRUCK WHEEL INCIDENT SHOWS WHY TOUGHER AUTO SAFETY LAWS ARE NEEDED

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Commerce Committee this week began considering making major changes in current automobile safety legislation. I am glad to note that many proposals up before the committee will significantly strengthen this important law.

Although the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has not yet slated action in this area, hopefully auto safety law revision will be on the committee's agenda in the near future.

One key amendment appears to be forcing a massive showdown between safety exponents and car makers. If passed, the amendment would require manufacturers to correct safety-related defects at their own expense. Since the auto industry has always been more interested in profits rather than in safety, pressure from them opposing this change has been extremely heavy.

I believe that this amendment must be passed by the Congress so that mandatory recalls and corrections are imposed upon manufacturers. As a rationale for the amendment, I need only point out an ongoing controversy in which the manufacturers exhibit what I term an extraordinary callous disregard for health and safety—all for the sake of saving a few dollars.

On May 28, 1969, General Motors notified owners of around 200,000 Chevrolet and GMC trucks that wheels supplied with their vehicles were defective, prone to sudden collapse under heavy-loading conditions. But, instead of offering to replace the defective wheels, GM told truck owners they would have to bear the cost and out-of-service time themselves.

In its letter to truck owners, General Motors admits that the wheels are a safety hazard, but then seeks to shift the burden onto the owners using the theory—one already disputed by a number of safety and engineering experts—that the trucks were not meant to be loaded with heavy equipment, such as cab-over campers. However, when the trucks were originally sold, advertisements by Chevrolet and GMC emphasized their capability for such cab-over use.

Under current auto safety legislation, the Department of Transportation is powerless to order recall. In addition, the Department's procedures for notification require that only the manufacturer—thus excluding injured parties—can appear before it.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The pending amendment to the law would correct this type problem by requiring that whenever such a defect does occur that manufacturers would recall vehicles and absorb all remedial costs.

The truck-wheel incident might have gone unchallenged had not a group of California truck owners filed a class action suit against General Motors in August. Until then, the situation marked the first time when acknowledged failure of a part in an automobile required recall, and when the manufacturer circulated notice to owners that recall was necessary, but told the owners that they had to pay for the failure caused by improper manufacture.

This class-action suit was made in the name of all owners of the specific $\frac{3}{4}$ -ton truck. On their behalf, it asks \$97.5 million in specific and general damages, \$180 million in treble damages on price discrimination—resulting from General Motors' early free replacement of these wheels to certain fleet owners, an action denied to individual owners—plus \$150 million in punitive damages.

Filing of the suit has brought about some changes. The National Highway Safety Board reopened its investigation of the incident; initial investigation and administrative proceedings had ended in May when the first letter to the truck owners was sent. Then, nearly 8 weeks after the complaint was charged, General Motors issued another letter reversing part of its previous position.

The new letter went to owners of around 40,000 of the trucks, but only to those who bought trucks with camper attachments. In the letter, GM offers free replacement of the wheels.

GM's partial capitulation still leaves the owners of approximately 160,000 trucks with the necessity of paying for replacement themselves. All the wheels are potentially dangerous, and General Motors will not escape from liability—or from the law suit—by this maneuver.

The faulty wheels represent a tremendous hazard to all drivers, not only to the truck owners, and it is well within the public interest that all the wheels be replaced. But, according to the existing auto safety law, nothing can be done to force GM into replacing the wheels on all 200,000 vehicles.

Hopefully, Congress will soon amend the law so that this situation will never arise again. But until that time, judicial action seems to be the only means of providing pressure upon the manufacturers to comply with strict safety standards.

I support this class action suit, and I now place in the RECORD two articles from the Wall Street Journal describing in further details the history of the truck wheel incident:

[From the Wall Street Journal, August 14, 1969]

GM, KELSEY-HAYES SUED FOR \$427.5 MILLION OVER POSSIBLY DEFECTIVE TRUCK WHEELS

General Motors Corp. was served with a class action suit in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County for failing to pay for the replacement of possibly defective wheels on about 150,000 of its trucks.

In Detroit, neither GM nor Kelsey-Hayes Co. which was also named in the suit, had any

immediate comment. Kelsey-Hayes manufactured the wheels for GM.

The class action, believed to be the first of its kind in the automotive industry, involves eight specific charges and asks for compensation totaling \$427.5 million.

A class action means the grievance is brought on behalf of the plaintiff and all others with the same grievance. According to Ralph Nader, auto industry critic, such actions have been successfully brought in other fields in recent years.

In this instance, it revolved around a GM "advisory" made last May 28. At the time, GM sent out letters to owners of certain 1960-1965 trucks advising them that if the trucks were overloaded, they ran the danger of the wheels disintegrating. But unlike other recalls, GM did not offer to pay for the replacement of the tires or wheels. Instead, GM suggested the owners of the vehicles do so at their own expense.

At the time, Mr. Nader sharply objected to the tactic. He said that most of the trucks were three-quarter-ton vehicles that had been advertised as vacation camper carriers. He suggested that GM had misled the public by advertising the vehicles as camper carriers, when in fact the wheels were not strong enough for the added weight of a camper, which usually is a metal cabin placed on the truck bed.

The present lawsuit, filed under California laws, is on behalf of G. W. Anthony and Herbert Lockerbie, and all others who received GM's letter.

According to attorney Steve Zetterberg, replacement for each of the trucks would run about \$250. However, the suit asks for \$97.5 million in specific and general damages, \$180 million in treble damages on price discrimination, plus \$100 million in punitive damages from GM and another \$50 million from Kelsey-Hayes.

Although the sums are large, Mr. Zetterberg feels that "basically we're asking that GM immediately repair, at their own expense, the failures they set forth in their advisory letter."

Mr. Nader sees the action as far more significant. He says that grievances of this kind, involving only several hundred dollars per buyer, have frequently had no recourse in the courts. Because of the relatively small amount of money involved, neither the people with the grievance nor the courts have been willing to take legal action. A class action suit, however, forces the issue on behalf of all those similarly involved and thus represents a "mass consumer remedy against the mass producers," Mr. Nader says.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 10, 1969]

GM WILL RECALL 200,000 TRUCKS; IT REFUSED IN MAY

DETROIT.—General Motors Corp., under pressure from a multimillion-dollar class-action suit and the Federal Highway Administration, said it will notify owners of about 200,000 of its Chevrolet and GMC trucks that it will replace wheels on any with camper attachments. GM estimates that there are about 40,000 of the 1960-to-1965 models with such attachments.

In May, the company sent an "advisory" to owners of the vehicles advising them that if the trucks were overloaded there was a danger of the wheels disintegrating. But GM didn't offer to pay for the replacement of the wheels, as is common, but suggested the owners of the vehicles replace them at their own expense.

The class-action suit against GM was filed in August in superior court of Los Angeles. It asked, on behalf of all owners of such trucks, \$97.5 million in specific and general damages and \$180 million in treble damages on price discrimination, plus \$100 million in punitive damages from GM and another \$50

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

November 13, 1969

million from Kelsey-Hayes Co., which manufactured the wheels for GM.

GM said it still considers itself under no obligation to replace the wheels but is offering to do so "in the interest of reducing the safety hazard resulting from overloading" and as a basis for terminating an investigation by the Federal Highway Administration.

After the suit was filed, the National Highway Safety Bureau asked GM to explain why it hadn't recalled all the trucks. GM in its statement yesterday disclosed that the Federal Highway Administrator made a preliminary finding of the existence of a defect, but GM "presented test data and other evidence demonstrating that in fact these wheels are not defective."

Attorney Steve Zetterberg, who filed the class action suit, said GM's decision "is the main guts about what we have asked for." He declared that GM took the action more as "a reaction to our suit" than in response to the Federal Government's investigation. However, he cautioned that the suit might continue if some truck owners "still aren't helped by it."

The company said about 200 wheel failures were reported, almost all on trucks with campers.

While emphasizing that its offer to replace the wheels applies only to pickup trucks on which campers or special bodies have been installed, GM said it is informing other owners that the company will replace their wheels should they decide to put such bodies on their trucks in the future. GM also said it will reimburse any owner who bought wheels because of the earlier warning.

General Motors said it informed owners that wheels on trucks without special bodies or campers are adequate "as long as you do not exceed the maximum load capacity" at specified tire inflation pressures.

INVESTMENT COMPANY AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1969

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I have devoted a great deal of time and thought to the proposed Investment Company Amendments Act of 1969, pending before our committee as H.R. 11995. This bill stems from the 1966 report by the Securities and Exchange Commission of its study of investment company growth. Legislative proposals to implement recommendations made by the SEC in the 1966 report were introduced in 1967 and were passed by the Senate in 1968. However, various interested groups became very concerned with some aspects of the proposals, and the House took no action on the bill.

In early 1969 similar bills were again introduced in the Senate and after extensive hearings a "clean bill"—S. 2224—was reported in the Senate on May 21, 1969, and passed on May 26. That bill is H.R. 11995 which, together with other related bills, will be the subject of hearings by our Subcommittee commencing November 12.

I have in the past expressed reservations and doubt as to the need for this

legislation since neither the Securities and Exchange Commission nor anyone else has up to this time come forward with any substantial evidence of mismanagement, wrongdoing, excessive profitability, excessive compensation for salesmen, or excessive compensation for the management of investment companies. The recommendations of the SEC seem to be based more upon the need for updating some provisions of the Investment Company Act of 1940 and related statutes, and simply because the staff apparently thinks investment companies having now grown to where total assets approach \$50 billion that they are too large.

This seems strange in view of the fact that savings and loan associations have assets of \$150 billion, bank trust departments manage assets approaching \$200 billion, and insurance companies have policies in force approaching \$1 trillion. Against this background, the size of the mutual fund industry would not seem to be alarming. Moreover, the Investment Company Act of 1940, under which mutual funds are regulated, gives to the SEC enormous authority to regulate the industry, much of which has never been used.

During the time this legislation has been pending, I have endeavored to learn as much as possible about the operations of the industry, the protection of investors, the level of compensation for salesmen and management, and other matters of similar importance. A great many persons and groups have discussed this legislation with me and many have suggested changes in the SEC proposals. Many others have serious misgivings as to whether such legislation is not premature, in view of the fact that Congress has authorized the Securities and Exchange Commission to conduct a study of the impact of institutional trading on the securities markets and report to Congress by September 1970. Still others think it is unwise to enact such far-reaching legislation at a time when our Government is taking drastic steps to stop inflation, which in turn has caused considerable disruption in the Nation's securities markets. Trading on the New York Stock Exchange has diminished nearly 50 percent during the past 6 months, and the sales of mutual fund shares have suffered similar diminution. There has been a certain erosion of investor confidence due to excessive and unjustified criticism of the mutual fund industry. There are over 5 million mutual fund shareholders in the United States, and they have a keen interest in not having Congress take any precipitous action which will cause a "selling panic" or otherwise affect the soundness of their investment.

The success of the mutual fund industry, like other businesses, depends upon adequate compensation for managers and for salesmen. Without this incentive, mutual funds are unable to market the shares necessary to bring in new money to replace redemptions, or to provide the management so necessary to achieve successful investment performance. Nonetheless, the Congress has a responsibility to exercise oversight and

consider very carefully any recommendations made by the Securities and Exchange Commission. Our November 12 hearings are one element of meeting that responsibility. However, my study of the pending legislation persuades me that as of this time I cannot vote for the bill passed by the Senate unless it is amended in several significant particulars.

In order to provide the industry, its management and salesmen, and mutual fund investors with a vehicle for further consideration of pending proposals, I am today introducing another bill, H.R. 14737, which incorporates the various suggestions, objections, and modifications people have asked me to consider in connection with the pending legislation. I am asking various interested groups to let me have their comments prior to the hearings on November 12 so that we will have a more complete record on which to base any action respecting these far-reaching legislative proposals.

The bill I am introducing today varies from the bill passed by the Senate in the following ways:

First. It adds certified public accountants and former personnel of the Securities and Exchange Commission in addition to legal counsel as "interested persons."

Second. It restricts the Securities and Exchange Commission to administrative actions only after notice and opportunity for hearing in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act.

Third. It provides for reasonable profitability of brokers and dealers selling mutual fund shares, as a protection for small businesses and their salesmen.

Fourth. It authorizes the Commission to allow higher sales loads for smaller companies subjected to relatively higher operating costs.

Fifth. It reduces the redemption period for persons investing in front-end load contractual plans to 1 year from the 3-year period in the bill, so small investors can participate in equity investment along with more well-to-do citizens.

Sixth. It requires the Securities and Exchange Commission to accord defendants a fair opportunity to comply before instituting actions for breach of fiduciary duty respecting management compensation.

Seventh. It limits legal action by private parties to plaintiffs acting in good faith and with justifiable cause.

Eighth. It prohibits former Securities and Exchange Commission personnel from participating in lawsuits against mutual funds for a period of 2 years after the end of their employment.

Ninth. It leaves the question of common trust funds operated by commercial banks and savings and loan associations to existing rules, regulations and judicial decisions.

Tenth. It amends the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to recognize the legitimacy of minimum commission rates on national securities exchanges, provided such commissions are reasonable and they have reasonable access for non-members to such exchanges.

Eleventh. It preserves the existing requirement that oil and gas drilling programs register their securities with the

Securities and Exchange Commission under the Securities Act of 1933 and file reports under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. It also preserves the existing exemption from registration under the Investment Company Act of 1940, so as not to destroy these programs or deny to small- and middle-income investors a right to participate in mineral exploration heretofore reserved only for the wealthy or to impair the national security by stifling oil and gas exploration and development.

Twelfth. It provides criminal penalties for persons who foment unjustified litigation against mutual funds.

Thirteenth. It gives mutual funds a chance to avoid having the SEC or NASD establish management and sales compensation, if they obtain approval of management and distribution agreements by 100 percent of the unaffiliated directors and a two-thirds vote of outstanding shares within 1 year.

I hope to have this bill considered along with other legislative proposals. In any event, I will offer as amendments to whatever bill our committee considers the substantive proposals I have introduced today. Too many of the provisions of the Senate bill are anti-small business and anti-small investor. I do not subscribe to any proposal that tends to deny to small business or to small investors the opportunity to participate in our country's economic growth.

NATIONAL BLOOD DONOR MONTH

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced a resolution to annually proclaim January as "National Blood Donor Month." This resolution has gained the interest of many people across the Nation and I am enclosing for the perusal of my colleagues an editorial by the Kansas City Times:

FOR A NATIONAL BLOOD DONOR MONTH

While one of the joint resolutions pending before both branches of Congress would hardly attract world notice, it is important to Americans. The resolution would authorize the President to declare January National Blood Donor month. The purpose would be to encourage more persons to donate blood.

Certainly the national publicity that would surround such a presidential proclamation should increase the number of volunteers. Of course many of the new recruits might prove to be one-time donors, but even that would be a great help. January is traditionally a month of shortages in the nation's blood banks, which supply blood for about 6.5 million transfusions a year. Bad weather and the Christmas holidays combine to discourage would-be donors. The demand for blood, which has a usable life span of only 21 days, does not drop accordingly. If anything, demand goes up in January. In addition to the accident victims hurt on the highways during the holidays, persons who have a choice in setting the date for surgery on themselves usually wait until after New Year's to undergo operations.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Thus the resolution, suggested by the American Association of Blood Banks, could do much to help make this coming January different. It is to be hoped that Congress acts on the matter soon enough to give President Nixon time to prepare and issue the proclamation that just might help save lives.

A BILL TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF DROPOUT YEARS AVAILABLE IN DETERMINING SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am preparing legislation to correct a major injustice in the social security laws. Under present law, a worker's social security benefits are determined on the basis of his average social security taxable income between 1951 and the year he is eligible for benefits—65 years of age for full benefits and 62 for reduced benefits. Each worker is able to delete his 5 lowest income years before figuring his average—the average which determines the size of his benefits during his years of retirement. Most workers, of course, delete the years between 1951 and 1956 when the social security tax base was only \$3,600 and their wages were much lower than present.

But this dropout provision which removes these early very low income years, is restrictive and is most unfair for those hundreds of thousands of workers who may be laid off before the age they are eligible for social security. If a man is laid off because his plant closes or he is "merged" out of a job at the age of 60, it is almost impossible for him to find new employment at his previous, often highly skilled, rate of pay.

In addition, the present dropout of low years of earning provisions conflict with an increasing number of private pension plans. For example, if a worker is able to receive the benefits of his company pension plan after 30 years of service, and decides to retire at age 55, by the time he is eligible to receive the social security benefits he has earned in 30 years of covered work and 30 years of paying into the fund, he will have to average in 10 years of zero income—thus substantially reducing his monthly social security benefits. This conflict between the provisions of the Social Security Act and private pension plans is placing beneficiaries in a difficult dilemma, reducing mobility in the working force, and causing workers to sacrifice benefit payments they have earned.

The amendment I am preparing today will provide 1 additional dropout year for every 10 years that a person has worked in an occupation covered by social security. Thus a person who has worked 30 years could drop 3 years in addition to the five now allowed him. In addition, the amendment changes the basis upon which benefits are computed from age 65 to 62. In effect, this will give an additional 3 dropout years to male employees, allowing them to compute their retire-

ment benefits on the same basis that women do.

The amendment will remove the penalties from which a worker suffers when he is laid off before age 65 and cannot get commensurate employment because of his age, or because he elects to participate in his company pension plan.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment can receive consideration in the current review of the Social Security Act being made by the House Ways and Means Committee.

HAWAII'S CONCERN OVER POLLUTION AND ENVIRONMENT AMAZES EXPERTS

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the magnitude of the problem of pollution of our natural resources is so awesome, it is incomprehensible that it has taken so long for a national sense of urgency to develop in taking concerted action to protect the quality of our environment.

The awakening concern of the public and of the Congress has been evidenced in recent years by the passage of landmark legislation in the fields of air and water pollution. Nowhere is this concern more evident than in the Island State, where prevails among its citizens a sense of responsibility to preserve that unique natural beauty which is Hawaii's heritage.

The deep involvement of Hawaii residents in the preservation of the island environment was immediately noticed by a recent distinguished visitor, Mr. Sheldon Samuels, chief of the field services in the Office of Education and Information of the National Air Pollution Control Administration. Mr. Samuels was in Hawaii last month to meet with local conservationists and others interested in participating in the planned hearings to set air quality standards for Hawaii.

He observed:

I've been here for 36 hours, and it's fantastic! . . . There's more concern about the environment and pollution in Hawaii than in most troubled spots on the Mainland.

Honolulu Advertiser planning writer, Harold Hostetler, has written a most informative article about the yoeman work being done by Mr. Samuels, and I think Mr. Samuels' stimulating and perceptive remarks should be read by all who are concerned with what could be and should be done to clean up our environment.

I am therefore pleased to submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article, "Isles' Interest in Pollution Amazes Control Official," from the October 29, 1969, issue of the Honolulu Advertiser:

ISLES' INTEREST IN POLLUTION AMAZES CONTROL OFFICIAL

(By Harold Hostetler)

A Federal air pollution control official has been floored, figuratively speaking, by the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

intense interest in Hawaii on matters involving pollution and the environment.

He is Sheldon Samuels, chief of field services in the Office of Education and Information of the National Air Pollution Control Administration (NAPCA).

"I've been here for 36 hours, and it's fantastic!" Samuels told The Advertiser Monday. "There's more concern about the environment and pollution in Hawaii than in the most troubled spots on the Mainland."

Samuels is in Hawaii for two days of meetings with local conservationists and others interested in participating in the planned hearings to set air quality standards for Hawaii.

If Samuels was surprised by the keen interest among Island residents in the environment, he was quick, however, to come up with a theory.

"I think it stems particularly from the haole who've come here, many of them trying to find a place where the urban ills of the Mainland don't exist," he said. "And they resist when they see changes taking place that seem to be bringing those ills to Hawaii."

Samuels' own specialty is aiding citizen participation in the establishment of air quality standards as specified by the Federal Clean Air Act.

"In the 10 years I've been in this business, no city or state has ever begun to tackle the problem (of air pollution) unless action was instituted by the citizens of the community," he said.

"The non-expert traditionally leads the way in the fight to control pollution," he explained, although he pointed out that "technical" persons such as doctors and scientists have always been involved in supplying factual information.

"But those who are most affected by pollution are those who are most apt to want to do something about it," Samuels said.

"It's a gut feeling type of thing when you know there's filth in the air, and you know it isn't good for the plants or for your own health."

"This is one thing that everyone agrees on—blue collar worker, student, no matter who he is. When you exclude such things as the Vietnam War or race problems from a conversation, you can find everybody agreeing at least on this one thing."

"And the interesting thing is that there has been a tremendous increase in interest in areas not yet polluted to the extent cities such as Los Angeles are," Samuels said.

"People in Denver get upset because they wake up in the morning and can't see the mountains any more."

Samuels said he sees a revolution in values taking place in the United States, a revolution which demands that we clean up our environment before it affects us seriously—or even kills us.

"The most important change I've seen is the involvement of organized labor," Samuels said. "At one time, labor leaders would go to hearings and ask that no pollution controls be enacted, because they feared that economic constraints would eliminate jobs."

"Now, they go and say they are no longer going to subsidize the cost of production with the health of their workers."

As an example, he cited hearings last month in Pittsburgh, where an unusual alliance was struck up between conservationists and the United Steelworkers of America. Some 500 people showed up for a hearing on proposed air quality standards for Pennsylvania.

Samuels said that the weight of citizen testimony in Pittsburgh, combined with similar concern voiced by citizens of Philadelphia, prompted Pennsylvania Gov. Raymond P. Shafer to demand even tougher air quality standards than those originally proposed.

"The Pennsylvania hearings proved some-

thing about states," Samuels said. "It proved the Governor can be sensitive to what the people want."

"Pollution standards for Pennsylvania's air as now proposed put the allowable level just slightly above the normal background level of pollution. That's really cleaning up the air!"

Samuels also pointed out that 1967 amendments to the Clean Air Act provided the vehicle for citizen participation in the adoption of air quality standards. The law provides also that a transcript of all public hearings be included when the proposed standards are forwarded to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for approval.

Hawaii probably will begin its efforts to set air quality standards next year. The first item is to have Hawaii declared an air quality region, probably in the spring.

After that, the Governor will have 90 days to file a letter of intent to set the standards. Following that will be 180 days for public hearings and another 180 days for completing the standards and submitting them to the Federal Government.

Samuels summed up his philosophy about the environment this way:

"If you really want to do something about air pollution, you have to do something about automobiles and transportation, about solid waste disposal and industrialization.

"There are all kinds of pollution, but if you cut air pollution, you've cut the Gordian knot. When you've solved one pollution problem, you've forced a solution to the others."

POLLUTION CONTROL: WHY HAS IT FAILED?

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned about how to best improve the quality of our environment. We have wrestled with anti pollution legislation and continue to seek answers on the solution to pollution problems. The October issue of the American Bar Association Journal contained a very interesting article entitled "Pollution Control: Why Has It Failed?" I offer this article to be entered in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

POLLUTION CONTROL: WHY HAS IT FAILED?

(By Arnold W. Reitze, Jr.)

In recent years nearly every literate person has become cognizant of the "quality" deterioration of our environment.¹ However, this knowledge has not been translated into the meaningful societal actions necessary to halt the fouling of our habitat. At one time the destruction of our environment was merely an aesthetic problem. Now it threatens the survival of mankind as a species.²

When compared to the age of the earth, the period of man's occupation of our planet has been very short. While man has been destroying his environment throughout his recorded history,³ his ability extensively to alter his surroundings to the point of complete destruction has developed during the last century. It is therefore imperative that man's myopic view should not obscure the insignificance of this span of time.⁴ Assuming he survives his radiological, biological and chemical war toys,⁵ he still must face the

Footnotes at end of article.

November 13, 1969

long-term effects of pesticides,⁶ air pollution,⁷ destruction of the soil⁸ and the many other effects of abusing his habitat. War is a danger, but peace too may be deadly. Man should not be sanguine. Why then is he acting against his long-term interests?

The most obvious reasons are the ubiquitous nature of the problem, its complexity and the concomitant cost of combating it. Professor Kenneth Galbraith put it this way: "Pollution may well be the nation's most broadly based and democratic effort."⁹

Today, virtually every identifiable social or economic interest group is actively engaged in the destruction of our environment. The average citizen functioning as the operator of an automobile and as a waste-producing machine is the most significant source of air and water pollution. Industry is a large user of water and a contributor of vast quantities of pollutants. Whether it is the air and thermal pollution of the power industry, the acid pollution of the steel industry or the organic wastes that the food processors discharge, nearly every industry is a significant contributor to the pollution problem.¹⁰ So too is agriculture, with its pesticide residuals, chemical fertilizers, organic wastes and silt.¹¹ The mining industry is responsible for much of the destruction of Appalachia,¹² while the construction and road-building industries follow practices inimical to soil conservation, adding to our silt pollution problem.¹³ The Federal Government is a major polluter from its military installations,¹⁴ ships,¹⁵ and through the activities of agencies charged with other aspects of resource development.¹⁶ With everyone contributing to the pollution problem, it is difficult to assign responsibility.

While the universality of polluters complicates abatement procedures, it would be simplistic to attribute the failure of control efforts solely to the size and diversity of the body to be regulated. Restraints on "aggressive activities" that result in limitation of individual freedom for the benefit of society are common. Traffic laws are an example. As population density increases, these limits on individual freedom continue to become more totally encompassing. The furor over firearm control legislation is an excellent example of the conflict between the necessity for group control in areas of dense population and the individual freedom that could more readily be maintained in a bucolic society.¹⁷

SPENDING A FORTUNE TO DEFEND WHAT WE WON'T PAY TO CONSERVE

The argument that the high cost of pollution abatement precludes adoption of controls is also unconvincing when one realizes that what is at stake is the livability of our environment. The expenditures from the public sector of our economy for defense and agricultural price supports are examples of the high fiscal commitment to policy goals for needs deemed sufficiently great. But if we consider the vast fiscal resources of the private sector of the economy, the handling of our environmental problem is certainly within our capabilities. The problem is getting the money allocated to the task.

In our society, the traditional controls have been unable to cope with the continued deterioration of our environment basically because of our failure to recognize pollution for what it is: a form of aggression against society as a whole and our neighbors in particular. Existing or possible control methods are of three types: informal (our mores), formal or legal and economic. The informal controls are those most capable of producing a high general level of conformity to the demands of society, while legal controls operate primarily to establish a minimum standard of acceptable conduct. Economic controls hardly exist. The informal controls are the most effective, as the regulated individual conforms as a result of his ingrained

socialization. Ultimately, in a democratic society, all control should be based upon this societal consensus of what is permissible conduct. The strength of such mores is aptly expressed in the ditty about

"The young lady named Wilde
Who kept herself quite undefiled
Through thinking of Jesus
And social diseases
And the dangers of having a child."¹⁸

IF WE WOULD VIEW POLLUTION AS VICTORIANS
VIEWED SEX

If pollution could be regarded as "dirty" in the Victorian sense, then our environmental problems would soon be solved. But this is not likely to happen. In general, polluting is socially acceptable conduct. Many of the wealthiest suburban communities inflict their inadequately treated wastes on their downstream neighbors. Eleemosynary institutions such as hospitals and universities are often major air polluters. The names of the major industrial polluters read like a who's who of industry.¹⁹ Yet the corporate directors and officers who are responsible for these chemical and biological attacks on the rest of us are often considered the leading citizens of their communities.

This acceptance of pollution is deeply embedded in our societal psyche. The Judeo-Christian tradition is a most anthropocentric influence. The man and nature unity of ancient paganism and primitive animism has had no part in our historical tradition. As a society we still believe that man can exploit nature interminably. Our technology and our predominant social institutions have evolved in this tradition, and it is this outlook that is held today by nearly all Americans. Despite Copernicus, our relationship to the environment is still based on a man-centered universe. We reject the Darwinian notion that we are part of nature.²⁰

This rejection may have been useful in creating the mental framework necessary for settling the wilderness and developing a nation from a relatively unpopulated frontier.²¹ But today, in our densely populated, interdependent, twentieth-century nation, this attitude can lead to our destruction. Man cannot persist in creating an environment hostile to his continued existence.

Economic controls to protect our environment do not exist. The reason is simple: Pollution increases profits to individuals and corporations. Conversely, pollution control is expensive. When the environment is defiled by a business, the cost of production includes a harm inflicted on society for which no payment need be made. Air and water are treated as elements of production that are essentially free and are, therefore, abused or wasted with impunity. Pollution controls, when avoided, do not become a cost of production. Although the cost to society of pollution, even in economic terms, may exceed the costs of abatement, the individual polluter making the decision of how to operate his business must decide whether he will abate pollution with his own financial resources or pass the costs and harm on to the public as negative externalities of his business operation. Even if the businessman possesses a highly developed social conscience, his competition is unlikely to be similarly constrained. In a competitive world the lowest level of morality, if consistent with the desire for maximizing profits, tends to become the norm.²²

IF PRODUCTION DOESN'T POLLUTE, THE
PRODUCT DOES

Even if the production of the goods does not cause pollution, the product itself can be designed so as to become a pollution problem. Polaroid film, aluminum beverage cans, detergents and chemical pesticides are some of these. The responsibility of a man-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

facturer for the environmental problems caused by the use of his product is a subject that must become of increasing concern if we are to protect our water and air. The requirements for controls on automobile emissions are but a beginning.²³

Pollution abatement is hampered, of course, by the often astronomic costs of control. The capital investment necessary to control industrial wastes can represent a substantial portion of total capital investment. Many businesses, particularly those that are small or inefficient, just do not have access to such capital. It is usually difficult to make pollution abatement financially attractive. Even if a profitable by-product can be obtained through pollution control, the economic return is rarely equal to the return which could be obtained from investing the necessary capital in more traditional investments or else in other polluting industries.²⁴

Not only are capital requirements substantial, but operating costs for pollution control are significant. For most communities, proper waste treatment would engender a substantial increase in operating costs as well as a vast increase in capital expenditures. For the Lake Erie Basin, proper phosphate removal alone would double present waste treatment expenses.²⁵ The costs to industry for abatement programs would have to be passed on to the consumers in the form of increased costs for nearly every item purchased. The cost to municipal government would be reflected in higher water and sewage rates.

The economic cost of environmental protection is so high that a commitment of the citizenry similar to that created by war is necessary if this problem is to be successfully resolved. Environmental protection is an expense that only wealthy nations can afford, but today it is an expense we cannot afford to avoid. The capital accumulation necessary for a modern economy is obtained by exploiting natural resources. But the limits of exploitation for developed economies have been reached.²⁶ We no longer can afford to allow this exploitation process to continue. Rather, the process must be reversed. Continued expansion of the gross national product, if achieved at the expense of our environment, is irrational. For example, producing gas masks and distilled water for city dwellers will increase the gross national product, but it is difficult to understand how the required use of these products improves our well-being. As the production of goods of dubious value and planned obsolescence continues, it is often at the expense of our environment.

ERODE ENVIRONMENT OR PERSONAL FREEDOM?

Since economic considerations provide an incentive to pollute our air and water, only strong formal constraints have any chance of success, and these can only be considered temporary expedients. If the mental attitude necessary for developing the informal constraints is not developed, the formal regulation in the long run will not be successful. While the continued expansion of governmental powers and the erosion of personal freedom that this implies cannot be welcomed, the penalty for increased population density must be paid. The choice is either *laissez faire* treatment of the environment, followed by its destruction, or governmental regulation sufficient to prevent such destruction. The polluted condition of our air and water makes it clear that efficacious regulatory powers do not exist.²⁷

The concept of governmental regulation of our waters is nothing new. From the beginning of our nation, the Federal Government has been concerned with our water resources. Most of its activity, however, was to encourage development and exploitation of these resources. Not until the end of the nineteenth century did the concept of governmental protection of resources enter our

political philosophy.²⁸ Yet this long history of involvement in the various aspects of resource management is significant, for it helps explain the lack of a unified, coherent government policy toward our water resources or toward the larger problem of the management of all our natural resources.

DOZENS OF FEDERAL AGENCIES MOSTLY AT CROSS PURPOSES

Today water resource regulation and development is carried on by dozens of federal agencies. Many of these agencies work at cross purposes: The Department of Agriculture has paid North Dakota farmers to drain land, while the Department of the Interior spends money to create and protect such wet lands for wild fowl breeding; the Department of Agriculture pays to remove lands from agricultural production, while the Bureau of Reclamation spends large sums to create agricultural lands; the Army Corps of Engineers dredges harbors in such a manner as to increase the pollution problem the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration is attempting to abate. Examples of these inconsistent government activities are legion, and they are largely the result of numerous agencies that represent specialized economic interests.²⁹

Today, most progress toward pollution control is carried out by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (FWPCA) of the Department of the Interior. This is one agency dealing with water resources that does not represent an economic bloc. It has been active for but four years. Its power is limited, and it has a small budget. But considering the limitations imposed on it, it has done an excellent job. Some progress finally is being made, but this progress is inadequate. As the Queen said to Alice: "[I]t takes all the running you can do, to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that."³⁰ Our growing population and increasing rate of urbanization require an estimated expenditure of \$22 billion for municipal sewage systems by 1975 and an additional \$10 billion for industrial waste treatment.³¹

We must run to stand still, yet we are barely crawling. The estimated expenditures and net lending for 1968 by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration are \$190 million. Of this a little over \$6 million will be allocated to Ohio.³² The ten largest agricultural subsidies exceed Ohio's allotment.³³ With this sense of priorities, little progress can be expected. Reductions in federal outlays can be anticipated to be taken from natural resource programs out of proportion to their percentage of the total budget.³⁴ Few economic blocs lobby to protect water pollution control funds. Even without reduction, the present federal expenditure for water pollution is only approximately equal to the interest that could be earned on the interest that would be paid on the defense budget if invested at 5 percent.

The state governments' attitude toward pollution control parallels that of the Federal Government. A profusion of conflicting state agencies dealing with these problems is common. Even more common are the lack of effective power and minuscule budgets.³⁵ Under present law the responsibility for enforcing most laws dealing with water pollution is with the states. In Ohio the Water Pollution Control Board operates with a budget of less than \$500,000.³⁶ Though there is danger in making comparisons between systems that are not identical, it is interesting to note that the budget for the German Ruhr District Authority—the district is a fraction of the size of Ohio—is about \$50 million.³⁷ Air pollution control in Ohio is expected to advance with a budget of \$150,000. State grants to local governments in Ohio for pollution control have not mate-

Footnotes at end of article.

rialized,³⁸ and this in turn denies local governments federal matching funds. Expenditures of this nature predetermine the result.

SOCIETY MUST KEEP SCIENCE'S PACE

The failure of our environmental protection program is obvious. The ability of our social organizations to deal with today's problems has lagged substantially behind our science and technology. But the reason for this failure is due largely to the lack of any consensus to effectuate the necessary change. The political pressures that encourage a high level of expenditure by the Department of Defense tend to minimize environmental controls. The general public has had but minimum concern; when its concern grows to the point where it manifests itself in a willingness to approve expenditures commensurate with the task before us, then, and only then, will there be a chance for reversing the deterioration of our environment.

Recent voter approval of bond issues for pollution control is a hopeful sign, but after two centuries of neglect and exploitation, the challenge is so substantial that these sums, while welcome, are but a beginning.³⁹ We can only hope meaningful recognition develops throughout the nation while the problem is capable of being solved.⁴⁰ A danger is that society will adjust to levels of pollution that apparently have only a minor nuisance value, but that this apparent adaptation will eventually cause much pathological damage.⁴¹ Further, the ability of man to adapt to the continuing qualitative deterioration of his environment creates a political climate that makes reversal of this deterioration difficult. After a period of time citizens seem to accept as normal a long journey to areas where fish still live and swimming is safe.

It is the belated recognition that time may not be on our side that is most ominous. The air we breathe is the same as that utilized by Neanderthal man, only now 65 million tons of deadly carbon monoxide are discharged each year by automobiles in this country.⁴² The long-term effects of this pollution on man's physical, neurological and even genetic make-up cannot be determined. What will the 133 million tons of pollutants that are sent into the atmosphere each year in the United States do to weather patterns and eventually to the temperature of this planet?⁴³ No one can be sure. Water pollution may also become irreversible. The present deterioration of Lake Erie from phosphate—mostly from detergents—that encourages vast algae growth and greatly speeds eutrophication may continue even if additional nutrient inputs are curtailed.⁴⁴

ABILITY TO DESTROY WHAT WE CAN'T CREATE REQUIRES HUMILITY

Our technology is allowing man to upset ecological balances without having developed the degree of technological expertise necessary for a new artificial ecological balance to be created that can be predicted and controlled so as to assure that a place remains in our man-defiled environment for man. Until this can be achieved, we must humble ourselves to reinstate a man-nature unity. We must begin to live in harmony with our environment.⁴⁵ When this concept is accepted, the necessary money will be forthcoming and social institutions will rapidly provide the means for carrying out the mandate of the citizens. In a democratic society these attitudes can only be created through education and persuasion. Until the consensus of our citizens is that an environment undefined by man is highly desirable, the reckless abuse of natural resources will continue. The law, particularly when large sums of money must be appropriated, can move only a short distance beyond the desires of the governed. Unless those who are led become convinced of the wisdom of the course of action, even limited leadership will have an

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ephemeral existence. Until Americans decide they want a livable environment, we cannot have one. Our survival may depend on their decision.

(NOTE.—Arnold W. Reitze, Jr., is an associate professor of law at Case Western Reserve University School of Law where he offers courses on natural resource law and water law. He is a graduate of Fairleigh Dickinson University (B.A. 1960) and Rutgers University School of Law (J.D. 1962).)

FOOTNOTES

¹ Numerous publications lamenting the destruction of our environment have been written in the past several years. Two general books of value are S. UDALL, *THE QUIET CRISIS* (1963) and RIENOW & RIENOW, *MOMENT IN THE SUN* (1966).

² In 1952 the London smog killed 4,000 people, more than the number killed in the attack on Pearl Harbor. In late October of 1963, a stagnant air mass over the Northeastern United States caused toxic gases to increase to more than five times the normal level. Only a change in wind direction prevented disaster. LEWIS, *WITH EVERY BREATH YOU TAKE* viii, xvii (1965).

³ The decline of numerous ancient civilizations, for example, is attributed to poor irrigation practices. See generally CARR, *DEATH OF THE SWEET WATERS* (1966).

⁴ Estimates of the age of the earth vary between 5 and 6 billion years. LEET & JUDSON, *PHYSICAL GEOLOGY* 29 (3d ed. 1965). Human evolution began only 1 million years ago, and all of recorded history encompasses but 7,000 years. STORER, *GENERAL ZOOLOGY* 195 (1943).

⁵ Weapons can, of course, effect the environment without being used in war. Contamination from nuclear testing is a well-known danger. A more dramatic example of the danger posed by modern weapons is the death of 6,500 sheep caused by the Army's nerve gas experiments in Utah. NEWSWEEK, April 1, 1968, at 53; Hersh, *Chemical and Biological Weapons—The Secret Arsenal*, The New York Times, August 25, 1968, § 6 (Magazine), at 25.

⁶ See generally CARSON, *SILENT SPRING* (1962); HEADLEY, *THE PESTICIDE PROBLEM: AN ECONOMIC APPROACH TO PUBLIC POLICY* (1967).

⁷ See generally U.S. DEPT. OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, *AIR POLLUTION PUBLICATIONS, A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 1963-1966* (1966).

⁸ See generally MORGAN, *GOVERNING SOIL CONSERVATION* (1965).

⁹ Galbraith, *The Pollopulationists*, ATLANTIC, January, 1967, at 52, 54.

¹⁰ See generally JACOBSTEIN & MERSKY, *WATER LAW BIBLIOGRAPHY 1847-1965* (1966); NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL COMM., NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, *WASTE MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL*, No. 1400 (1966).

¹¹ See generally UDALL, *supra* note 1; HERFINDAHL & KNEESE, *QUALITY OF THE ENVIRONMENT* 35, 65 (1965); STILL, *THE DIRTY ANIMAL* 239 (1967).

¹² See CAUDILL, *NIGHT COMES TO THE CUMBERLANDS* (1962); LIFE, January 12, 1968, at 54.

¹³ See W. DOUGLAS, *A WILDERNESS BILL OF RIGHTS* 147 (1965).

¹⁴ Nationally, in 1966, at least 237 federal installations were still improperly discharging wastes into United States waterways. The New York Times, January 3, 1968, at 96.

¹⁵ U.S. DEPT. OF INTERIOR, *WASTES FROM WATERCRAFT*, S. Doc. No. 48, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. 3 (1967).

¹⁶ See generally DOUGLAS, *supra* note 13.

¹⁷ Here the conflict over regulation as a responsibility of government should be distinguished from the merits of any specific regulatory proposal.

¹⁸ Lewis, *The High Court: Final . . . But Fallible*, 19 CASE W. RES. L. REV. 528, 568 (1968), quoting from *A Symposium on Morality*, 34 AM. SCHOLAR 347, 360 (1965).

November 13, 1969

¹⁹ See generally U.S. DEPT. OF INTERIOR (*FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADMINISTRATION*), *LAKE ERIE REPORT* (1968).

²⁰ See White, *Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis*, 52 SIERRA CLUB BULL. 123 (1967); White, *What Hath Man wrought?*, SCIENCE, March, 1967, at 11; NASH, *WILDERNESS AND THE AMERICAN MIND* (1967).

²¹ MANAGING THE ENVIRONMENT, REPORT OF THE SUBCOMM. ON SCIENCE, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT TO THE HOUSE COMM. ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS 13 (1968).

²² See generally CONTROLLING POLLUTION, THE ECONOMICS OF A CLEANER AMERICA (Goldman ed. 1967).

²³ Clean Air Act of 1963, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 1857.

²⁴ For detailed information concerning industrial pollution abatement costs see 3 U.S. DEPT. OF INTERIOR (FWPCA), *THE COST OF CLEAN WATER* (1967).

²⁵ Statement of George Eagle, Conference on Pollution of Lake Erie and its Tributaries (June 4, 1968). Perhaps these additional costs may be subject to considerable reduction. See MICH. DEPT. OF PUBLIC HEALTH, WASTEWATER SECTION DIVISION ENGINEERING, & DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY, *STUDIES ON REMOVAL OF SUSPENDED MATTER AND BIOCHEMICAL OXYGEN DEMAND* (1967).

²⁶ This does not mean that underdeveloped nations do not have pollution problems, but only that their economies are less capable of absorbing abatement costs.

²⁷ Present government control over pollution is much better than it was prior to 1965, and we are beginning to develop a body of law capable of dealing with some of our environmental problems. However, the law has just begun to function. See Reitze, *Wastes, Water and Wishful Thinking: The Battle of Lake Erie*, 20 CASE W. RES. L. REV. 5 (1968).

²⁸ *Id.* at 49.

²⁹ See generally MOSS, *THE WATER CRISIS* (1967).

³⁰ CARROLL, *THROUGH THE LOOKING GLASS*, quoted in Lewis, *supra* note 18, at 566.

³¹ Figures for pollution abatement costs vary substantially. There are some estimates from COHN, *SEWERS FOR A GROWING AMERICA* (1966).

³² BUDGET OF THE UNITED STATES 108 (Fiscal 1969).

³³ Moore, *Slaves for Rent*, ATLANTIC, May, 1965, at 109, 118.

³⁴ BUDGET OF THE UNITED STATES 109 (Fiscal 1969).

³⁵ This is only a generalization. Los Angeles County has an effective air pollution control, though not effective enough to solve the problem. New Jersey has begun a vigorous abatement program.

³⁶ Reitze, *supra* note 27, at 80.

³⁷ Fair, *Pollution Abatement in the Ruhr District*, in *COMPARISONS IN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT* 143, at 171 (Jarrett ed. 1961).

³⁸ Reitze, *supra* note 27, at 79.

³⁹ Bond issues for water pollution control were approved in Ohio, Michigan and Washington. The \$1 billion bond proposal in Illinois was rejected. BUSINESS WEEK, November 9, 1968, at 104.

⁴⁰ A number of environmental pollution problems include a possible irrevocable destruction. A wilderness destroyed by man-created drought cannot be restored. Pennekamp, *Disaster in Everglades National Park*, 50 SIERRA CLUB BULL. 4 (1965). Air pollution may change world weather patterns. Cole, *Can this World Be Saved?*, The New York Times, March 31, 1968, § 6 (magazine), at 35.

⁴¹ Dubos, *Adapting to Pollution*, SCIENTIST & CITIZEN, January–February, 1968, at 1, 3.

⁴² PROGRESS IN THE PREVENTION AND CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION, FIRST REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE TO THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS, June 28, 1968, at 16.

⁴³ Faltermayer, *We Can Afford Clean Air*, FORTUNE, November, 1965, at 159. See gen-

erally U.S. DEPT. OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, POWER SYSTEMS FOR ELECTRIC VEHICLES (1967); CARR, THE BREATH OF LIFE (1965); 1 AIR POLLUTION (2d ed. 1968); Iglauser, *The Ambient Air, THE NEW YORKER*, April 13, 1968, at 51.

^{**} Reitz, *supra* note 27, at 19; see also *supra* note 39.

^{**} For further discussion, see generally MURPHY, GOVERNING NATURE (1967).

WILLIAM L. JOHNSON, COMMUNITY LEADER

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, as soon as the House adjourns for the week, I shall travel to Ironwood, Mich., to help pay tribute to an American who has devoted his life to community responsibility and service. This exemplary American is Mr. William L. Johnson, whom the community of Ironwood is honoring Saturday for his 28 years as a businessman, radio broadcaster, and active civic and community leader.

The list of his accomplishments and efforts for his community is entirely too long to be included in these remarks, but I would like to point out some of the highlights which mark this man as an exemplary community leader. "Bill" has always pursued one endeavor after another of communitywide significance. First, I refer to the Ironwood Airport, which he tenaciously sought as chairman of the airport development committee. Ironwood's fine airport facility has long since been put to good use. His leadership in the development of new hospital facilities led to equal success. And more recently, Bill spearheaded a drive to develop the Copper Peak Ski Flying Hill near Ironwood. This structure is unique in the Western Hemisphere, making Ironwood the American center of a great international sport. This project was termed a "far-out dream" by some, and there were many who said it simply could not be done. But Bill would have none of it. Certainly, more than any other single factor, Bill Johnson's persistent efforts to raise the needed capital and ramrod the project led to the completion of this landmark in northern Michigan.

As if these nonstop community efforts were not enough to consume his considerable energies, Bill has been a member of the board of two colleges in northern Michigan. He has also served as a member of the board of directors of the Michigan Chamber of Commerce, and the advisory council of the Michigan Department of Economic Expansion. In this capacity, Bill did more than merely advise, for his accomplishments in the Ironwood area have contributed significantly to the improvement of economic conditions since the end of the iron mining era in the Gogebic Range.

In addition, Bill has found time to become especially active in the political arena. In 1952, he was a candidate for the office of State treasurer, receiving over 1,300,000 votes. In 1958, he was an

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

unsuccessful primary candidate for Governor against the incumbent Gov. G. Mennion Williams. Later, in 1962, Bill was a member of the State board of directors for the Romney volunteers, and he has since served as Republican finance chairman for his county.

Ironwood has long recognized the magnitude of his accomplishments for the community. He has been chosen "Man of the Year," "Citizen of the Year," and even "Boss of the Year," by the local chapter of the Jaycees. He has obviously set a fine example for the young business leaders of the area.

These are but a few of Bill's endeavors and accomplishments. This week, the grateful citizens of Ironwood will turn out to again pay tribute to the man who played such an important role in the business, civic, and educational development of the area, and who was a generating force behind the economic resurgence of his community. The occasion does not mark Bill's retirement, for a man of his stamina and energy could never really retire. While he is divesting himself of his broadcasting business, those of us who know him are convinced that he is merely "clearing the desk" for a new personal challenge.

NONE SO BLIND

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is appropriate while many naive and misguided young Americans innocently participate in demonstrations which feed the Communist propaganda mill that attention be directed to the attitude of people who have suffered under Communist rule.

This point is very effectively demonstrated in an article by the distinguished international columnist of the Copley Press, Dumitru Danielopol, in the Tuesday, October 28, Joliet, Ill., Herald News:

NONE SO BLIND

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—"At home everyone—even top party leaders—knows that communism is a fiasco, that it just doesn't work," said the elderly woman who came from eastern Europe.

"Some of the leaders still pay lip service to it, with an eye on Moscow, but in the bottom of their hearts they have given up."

What happened in Czechoslovakia is symptomatic of the atmosphere in all Eastern European countries. Had the Russians not interfered the whole system would have been swept away.

"We in eastern Europe see the decay. We think we see the end of communism. Its collapse. We began to hope that eventually it would pass away, like a long nightmare."

The woman has been shattered by her brief experience in the West.

"We found more communists in the free world than there are at home," she said.

For one who emerges from behind the Iron Curtain, it is impossible to understand how intelligent and supposedly learned people, in politics, in the arts, in the teaching profession and students can fall prey to communist propaganda.

"It's incredible and it is pathetic," she said. "Don't these people have eyes to see? Don't they read?"

The evidence of the communist fiasco is overwhelming. So is that of the hatred of the people living behind the Iron Curtain of the regime.

The Berlin Wall is witness for anyone who wants to see.

It is a monument to communism's failure, a tombstone, if you will.

Now Czechoslovakia has clamped shut its borders to citizens who would travel abroad. The "summer" of liberalization has turned into a winter of new oppression.

When the Russians invaded in August 1968, Czechs fled by the thousands. The Russians hesitated to close the border immediately, perhaps fearing world opinion, perhaps content to let the most volatile Czechs leave.

The exodus continued for more than a year. Tens of thousands of young skilled workers arrived in Vienna as "tourists," sought asylum, moved on to new lives in Australia, Canada and South Africa.

Now this has ended. The "brain drain" of young talent is more than the Communists can tolerate.

Why are the young leaving every Iron Curtain country, the ones supposedly indoctrinated with communism?

Because they have no future. Many must feel they have escaped into a free world populated by the blind.

As the saying goes, there is none so blind as he who doesn't want to see.

FERDINAND EBERSTADT

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, the death of Ferdinand Eberstadt is a significant loss to the United States which he served for over four decades. His deep faith in our country, his unique powers of analysis, and the character of his vision for the future were only matched by the warmth of his friendships and the respect for him by men and women in all walks of life.

His public service began in 1929 when he served as an assistant to Owen D. Young at the Reparations Conference in Europe.

He worked closely in subsequent years with James Forrestal and Bernard Baruch. In 1941, Under Secretary of the Navy Forrestal asked him to study the machine-tool industry in terms of preparation for war and this resulted in his being named Chairman of the Army-Navy Munitions Board. In 4 months, he increased machine-tool production by some 30 percent, thereby relieving a major bottleneck, and, in 1942, he was named Vice Chairman of the War Production Board.

Subsequently, he was asked to help draft a plan for the reorganization of the armed services which ultimately resulted in the National Security Act of 1947. In a sense, Ferd Eberstadt was the author and certainly a principal architect of the present Department of Defense and the consolidation of the services.

Bernard Baruch considered Mr. Eberstadt one of his ablest associates on the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

American delegation to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, and he did much of the actual drafting of the Baruch plan for the control of atomic weapons and energy production which was later submitted to the United Nations. The vision of that plan is more relevant and imperative today and would that it had been adopted.

Mr. Eberstadt also headed the national security organization subcommittee of the first Hoover Commission. I had the privilege of serving as a staff assistant on this committee and I will long remember hearings at which the witness frequently was seated between Mr. Baruch on one side and Mr. Eberstadt on the other. Mr. Eberstadt's questions were brilliant in their thrust and simplicity and any recalcitrant witness whose answers were rambling and not to the point soon found that he had Mr. Baruch's hearing aid shoved in front of his face on the left and a cloud of smoke from Mr. Eberstadt's cigar on the right.

In private life, Mr. Eberstadt was one of the creative minds of Wall Street who understood the dynamics of our free enterprise system. He contributed to countless underwritings, public offerings, and mergers and his firm—F. Eberstadt & Co.—pioneered in the mutual fund field with the establishment in 1938 of the Chemical Fund, Inc.

His family has been a joy and strength to him throughout a long and wonderful life wherein he was active to the last. His initial attack occurred as he was en route to testify before a congressional committee.

I know that Mrs. Reid and I join with his many friends in the House in expressing our deepest sympathy to his lovely wife, Mary Eberstadt; his son, Frederick; his three daughters, Mrs. Ann Cannell, Mrs. Mary Harper, and Mrs. Mary Unnerstall; and his 14 grandchildren.

His life will stand as a constant inspiration to all who knew him and his contributions remain a permanent and lasting part of the country he loved.

NATIONAL WEEK OF UNITY

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, while many of us differ on individual policies or programs of the National Government, all of us agree that such differences are secondary to our primary allegiance to the United States of America, its Constitution, and the principles of government they represent.

At this time in our national life when Americans are sorely divided on the single issue of Vietnam policy, I think it extremely important that this body demonstrate to the world our unshakable underlying firmness of commitment to these principles despite our differences on the conduct of the war.

As the first Member of Congress to accept a national cochairmanship of the Committee for National Unity Week with

Chairman Bob Hope and Cochairmen Art Linkletter and Mrs. Ivy Baker Priest, I feel a special responsibility to express this commitment.

I consider it an honor to introduce this resolution proclaiming this week as a national week of unity and to commend it to my distinguished colleagues as worthy of unanimous adoption.

DON'T BE MISLED

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a thought-provoking editorial which appeared in the Thursday, November 6, 1969, issue of the Catholic Standard published here in the Nation's Capital. Those sincere critics of the President's Vietnam policy should think twice about lending their support to the November 15 demonstration when one considers those who are planning it.

The editorial follows:

DON'T BE MISLED

Responsible officials, including those directly concerned with the preservation of law and order in the nation's capital, are deeply concerned about the strong probability of serious civil disorders during the three-day peace demonstrations scheduled in Washington next week. It is apparent that the organizers hope to attract between 250,000 and 500,000 persons from outside the city.

While it is impossible to predict how many will respond to the call for the massive demonstrations, it is no secret that the promoters are leaving no stone unturned in their concerted efforts to draw the crowd. Certainly there will be enough demonstrators to tax the resources of the police and other law enforcement agencies. Crowd control alone will be a real problem. But that isn't the whole story.

The promoter of what is in fact a massive march on Washington is the so-called New Mobilization Committee to End the War. Its steering committee, the controlling body, is a mixed bag of mature, experienced organizers and activists drawn together in a coalition for resistance against any meaningful search for peace, other than on their own terms.

The steering committee of this coalition has made it absolutely clear that their demands, which parallel the positions of the North Vietnamese and the National Liberation Front (Vietcong) in Paris, do not support our efforts for a negotiated peace in Vietnam. They call for the immediate and unilateral withdrawal of all American and allied troops and logistical support from South Vietnam. It is their position that there is only one issue to be negotiated at Paris: reparations to the Vietnamese people for damage done to that country by the United States.

And who makes up the steering committee of this unholy alliance? It runs the gamut. Beginning with hard-core professional Communist Party leaders, passing through the traditional Communist front organizations and special interest groups, it also includes a few of the altruistically minded peace organizations. However, it is heavily weighted in favor of the hard core professional and militant left wing activists.

November 13, 1969

Included on the membership of the steering committee are 12 Communist Party members or persons closely associated with its activities, eight or ten participants in the demonstrations at the Pentagon and five members of the SDS. It also includes representatives of the Trotskyites (Socialist Workers Party) and its youth group, the Young Socialist Alliance, as well as other, but less publicly identified, left wing activist groups.

It is a matter of public record that several members of the steering committee have met with the North Vietnamese and Vietcong in Peking, Paris, Hanoi and Stockholm. Unquestionably there have been other contacts and meetings to coordinate the efforts of the "peace movement" in the United States with plans of the North Vietnamese and Vietcong in Paris and Hanoi.

The New Mobilization Committee also has opened the door for participation in the demonstrations by violence-prone elements of the New Left. The Weatherman faction of the SDS, a violently activist group, has announced its intention to participate. This, in turn, undoubtedly will stir up a reaction from some of the militantly active right wing groups. One or more of these groups can be expected to appear on the scene.

All the elements for violence and disorder will come together in Washington next week. The presence of a large crowd with divergent ideologies and interests, sprinkled with experienced and dedicated left wing activists and combined with the catalyst provided by the presence of extremist groups from both sides could easily create very serious disorders.

We realize that many, if not the majority, of the participants will have no desire for violence. But their intentions cannot control the actions of those who will want to react violently. When violence begins, in any form, those responsible for the maintenance of peace and order will be hard put to distinguish between the good and the bad. The innocent will be indistinguishable from the guilty.

We strongly urge our readers to avoid whatever crowds may appear in Washington for the demonstrations next week. The situation could be extremely critical. The more people there are on the streets, for whatever reason, the more dangerous the situation. The best way to avoid creating a danger for yourself and others is to stay away.

THE SEARCH FOR TRUTH—ANOTHER PUTNAM LETTER

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Carlton Putnam—scientist, attorney, scholar, and renowned author—"The Putnam Letters," "Race and Reason," and "Race and Reality"—has written another compelling appeal to reason, calling for sound judgment and leadership in dealing with ills besetting our country today. Mr. Putnam advocates policies based on truth—scientifically established fact and genuine human compassion.

Recognizing that solutions to problems can only be begun and developed after the true causes have been identified, Mr. Putnam's analysis—unmuddled by emotionalism and free of political power motivations—is grounded on the solid foundation of a clear understanding of the

basic causes of our most serious domestic problem. His remedy ignores the fearful taboos and needless misconceptions of prevailing, and discredited, theories which are being forced into practice.

In a letter addressed to President Nixon, the author of the "Putnam Letters" offers an incisive evaluation of the problem and suggests constructive action to correct it.

The letter follows my remarks:

MCLEAN, VA.,
October 18, 1969.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Often in recent months, as I watch the conduct of opportunists in public life, I find myself recalling a remark Theodore Roosevelt made over fifty years ago: "People always used to say of me that I was an astonishingly good politician and divined what the people were going to think. This really was not an accurate way of stating the case. I did not divine how the people were going to think; I simply made up my mind what they ought to think and then did my best to get them to think it."

Looking back across half a century and observing the areas in which our national unity has declined, I am increasingly dismayed at the preponderance of poll-taking over leadership as regards public opinion today, and the growing confusion which results. It seems to me it would be hard to find a more complete vindication of the view that in a representative republic conceived as ours originally was, and through which we grew to maturity as a nation, public servants should hold office on the strength of having explored the issues, and then submitted their findings and recommendations to the electorate, not on the basis of a guessing game by candidates as to what bewildered and conflicting groups among our people might at the moment prefer to hear.

The man in the street is occupied with earning a living. He has neither the time nor the background for the research and analysis required for the wise evaluation of modern political and social problems. But he can evaluate the presentation of candidates who have done such research and analysis. At least I believe our own American majority still can, although no majority has ever been under such purposeful pressure for so long from determined minorities with so great a control over the opinion forming agencies of their society.

I am sure what I say applies to many fields of public policy, but as you may know, my own concern for the last ten years has been with one particular, but very basic, area. I refer to the subject of inborn human differences, especially as these find expression in the field of race. It is no exaggeration to report that in our American society at the moment there is a more prevalent and dangerous misunderstanding of this problem than of any other, that this misunderstanding has been carefully and assiduously cultivated by those who stand to benefit from it, that the deception extends from our schools and campuses to our churches, courts and legislatures, and that it saturates our mass media in all its aspects.

The core of the deceit has been in teaching that the greater part of the differences in status of individuals and groups among us is due to social injustice, whereas the scientific fact remains that, frequent as injustice is, these differences are primarily attributable to innate differences in capacity. The net result of course is to create imaginary grounds for revenge among some groups, and imaginary grounds for guilt among others. One need look no further for the causes of tension between races, of rising crime, of attitudes of appeasement

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

among those in authority, and of the consequent decline in respect for law and civilized behavior everywhere.

I can conceive of no more fundamental truth, no truth the recognition of which is more essential to an understanding of world conditions, than the all-embracing importance of race in human affairs. It defines the protoplasmic substance of life. From race differences spring cultural differences with their variations in ideals, traditions, and standards. The contrasts between substocks of the major races are of course less than those between the major races themselves but they are nonetheless significant. Race is basic. To assume that all races can be merged in a harmonious national symphony without maintaining the controlling theme of a culturally dominant race is the greatest folly since the story of Babel was first recorded. To the cry of racism and racist the answer is obvious: Every intelligent person who is accurately informed is a racist in the correct sense of the term, namely, one who appreciates the axiomatic relation of race to all human problems.

It is needless nowadays to review the evidence on this subject. On balance the cumulative and converging testimony from every relevant field of science and historical experience is overwhelming. You are certainly familiar with the disclosures of William Shockley, Nobel laureate and discoverer of the transistor, and with his efforts to stir the National Academy of Sciences to action. You must be aware of the research of Arthur Jensen and of all the men before him who have labored to break the stranglehold of a scientific hierarchy which for forty years has stifled the truth wherever possible. From the Boas-Herskovits-Klineberg axis of the nineteen thirties to the present minority-group control of our leading mass media, the primary motive was and is transparently self-serving. I do not hesitate to assure you that as a practical matter there is no more doubt about the facts on race differences than there is as to whether the world is flat. I am sure that if as many people today had a vested personal interest in the doctrine of a flat world as there are who have such an interest in the dogma of genetic racial equality, most of us would still be taught and still believe in a flatness dogma.

Nor need I emphasize the speciousness of the arguments used to justify the deceit. Primarily they revolve around the notion that it is harmful to remind human beings of their limitations. But as all men have limitations of varying degrees, and as the first step to happiness of any sort is to recognize this and to address ourselves to making the most of what we are, the reasoning is clearly fallacious. A quarter of a century ago the noted liberal clergyman Harry Emerson Fosdick wrote his book *On Being a Real Person*, one chapter of which was entitled "The Principle of Self-Acceptance". In it Fosdick remarked: "No well integrated life is possible without an initial act of self-acceptance, as though to say: 'I, John Smith, hereby accept myself, with my inherited endowments and handicaps . . . , and, so accepting myself, I will now see what I can do with this John Smith.'" To put it more succinctly one may cite the time-honored adage: "Life's not in holding a good hand but in playing a poor one well." The concept of character contained in this principle is so fundamental to our original American way of life that only a dangerous dilution of our native traditions can account for its being so readily forgotten now.

But I fear the consequences of the equalitarian dogma go far beyond such dilutions as this. The constantly increasing taxation of success to support failure which in the end can mean only the punishment of excellence to reward its opposite; the disappearance of the word *earn* and *deserve* from the lexicon of sociology; the universal climate of dis-

obedience of parental and other properly constituted authority in defiance of the accumulated experience and wisdom of the past; the violence and lawlessness; a mass media which often inspires and always over-publicizes and exacerbates the agitation it pretends to deplore; the growing hostility between White and Negro now spreading into our police departments as well as into the armed forces; the flaunting of the one-man-one-vote principle which is totally alien to the original concept of our representative, constitutional republic; and finally the accelerating sexual morality of the barnyard and the pornography which stimulates it—all these are but a few examples of the doctrine's influence. One cannot erect a misconceived image of the underdog and fawn before it for decades in penitent self-abasement without gradually accepting many of the standards the underdog represents, as well as forfeiting all respect and obedience from those from whom respect and obedience are due.

Let me at this point clarify one essential matter. Nothing I have said is intended to disparage the great contributions made to our civilization by numerous minorities, individually and collectively. They have enriched us in countless ways. But there is one area in which our North European, English-speaking peoples have themselves excelled and that is in the establishment and maintenance of stable, free societies. The combination of intelligence and character, of even-tempered judgment and dependability, of honor and good sportsmanship, which forms the core of our native American prototype, constitutes a distinctive racial heritage, a heritage which until recent years has undergirded our entire history. Moreover, studies which are now in progress and which will be published in due course leave little question that our North European stocks are still in the numerical majority in the United States, albeit in disarray and doubtful of their own existence.

It is their heritage which, in the name of minority rights, is being challenged and diluted. I would deny no right to any minority but I would claim one right for the majority and that is the right to hear the truth on the most fundamental issue of our time—a right which for two generations has been flagrantly and consistently violated. Nor do I intend to suggest that our minorities alone have been responsible for this. They have provided the leadership, but they have been ably assisted by certain majority elements in our population who, either for political or other advancement, or through misguided sentimentality, are obsessed with the leveling instinct and the socialist ideology. They are blind to their own inheritance, ignoring of their debt to it, and hence willing tools of minorities who themselves are unable to see that they are destroying the fabric of a society to which more often than not they fled for survival and a new life.

The alliance between our minority groups and these majority "liberal" elements has been most noticeable in the fields of science and education where it has been reinforced in many cases by an understandable timidity. Persecution and a conformist environment have taken their toll. I might add that there is some substance to a comment made years ago by an English lecturer upon returning from an American tour. "In America," he remarked, "there are three sexes—men, women and college professors."

Such is the fundamental issue I would bring to your attention. Next to the population explosion, there is no subject of more importance. The Vietnam war and conditions in the Middle East are related to it, not to mention Africa south of the Sahara. But it is on our domestic front that the problem has its source. If it were solved here, it could readily be solved elsewhere. And no man is in a better position than yourself as leader of

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the republic to begin telling our people the facts.

Indeed I believe it will someday seem incomprehensible to historians that during the past 15 years of increasing racial turmoil following the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown vs. Topeka* not one President of the United States, at least to my knowledge, invited one truth-oriented scientist to the White House for consultation. Administration after Administration, with an inexcusable lack of intellectual initiative or even curiosity, blindly refused to examine the cause of our difficulties. Even today when the Jensen material has made it abundantly clear that the decision in *Brown vs. Topeka* was based upon a record from which all the essential evidence had been omitted, the Court still refuses to reopen this case in the face of repeated requests to do so. Certainly this should be a matter of some interest to a President who is himself an able lawyer.

You will note that I do not in this letter take any position for or against racial integration or for or against any civil rights or other laws or social policies. I simply point to the fundamental matter, to the erroneous assumptions upon which every court decision handed down and every law passed in this field in the last 15 years has been based. When the balance of the anthropological data today indicates that one race in the United States is on the average over 100,000 years behind another in evolutionary grade,* and when this point is ignored entirely by every branch of our government in all its actions, we are in the grip of a disruptive mania about which it is difficult to speak with patience.

My plea is that the American public, their courts and legislatures, be told the truth as to the nature of inborn human differences between and within races. Naturally it would be my opinion that, having unmasked the deception, it would be both your prerogative and your duty, in Theodore Roosevelt's words, to make up your mind what the people ought to think and then do your best to get them to think it. And it would thereafter be up to the public to accept or reject your views at the polls. But this is not the immediate problem. A minority-liberal alliance, as heretofore defined, has saturated our American majority in a colossal misconception. This error must first be corrected. What should be done next will become apparent as the process proceeds.

Finally let me repeat that however many valuable members of minority groups you may have in your Administration and however brilliant their contributions in other respects may be, you cannot *on the average* expect disinterested advice or information from them in the racial field. This caveat is especially necessary since the nation's three most influential newspapers are minority controlled, as are the three leading radio and television networks. Consciously or unconsciously their group identification with the Negro, while totally illogical scientifically, is almost complete. It is essential to remember that what you read and hear from all these sources is minority thinking, seasoned slightly at times by other views (set in a negative

*Dr. Carleton S. Coon, Viking Medal winner, member of the National Academy of Sciences, former president of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists, and a graduate *magna cum laude* of Harvard, estimates in his definitive *The Origin of Races* that the White race crossed the *erectus-sapiens* threshold at least 250,000 years ahead of the African Negro. I have cut his time span by over one-half to allow for the approximately one-third infusion of White genes in the Negro race in the United States. However, this infusion has not been evenly distributed throughout the country. It is considerably less, for example, in the rural South than in the North.

context) to give an impression of impartiality. The former are not the views of the American majority, who have no voice on this subject save as it reaches you as a conditioned reflex through minority channels.

Our American majority today are leaderless and confused on the paramount issue. They are as kindhearted and anxious to be fair as you are. But they are hopelessly ignorant and misled. Some may be restless over the downgrading of so much in our early history which is occurring in new school textbooks, but they scarcely know where to turn for a remedy.

In this respect the 1968 election suggests an instinctive trend. It puts you in a position which may not recur. The time available for the decontamination of our national ideals and purposes, as well as of our air and water, is not unlimited. Regardless of how slowly and tactfully it may be advisable to move, I would give this matter as high a priority as any.

Sincerely,

CARLETON PUTNAM.

ALONG THE RED FRONT

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the Communist organization and sponsorship of the demonstrations against the elected Government of the United States here this weekend has been well documented.

Undoubtedly many innocent and sincere people will be involved and their participation stems from a desire to assist in any activity that will hasten the end of the war.

But, nevertheless, they are pawns in a struggle the Communists have been waging for more than 50 years—the destruction of free nations and the triumph of world socialism under Soviet domination.

The Communist strategy is to seize upon any area of agitation or controversy, fan the flames, and work toward a holocaust of revolution that will destroy the United States.

Mr. Donald L. Miller, of the All American Conference, writes a regular column entitled "Along the Red Front" for the Veterans of Foreign Wars magazine.

In the current issue of the VFW magazine, Mr. Miller describes how campus unrest and street mob strategy is being utilized to Communist ends.

The article follows:

ALONG THE RED FRONT
(By Donald L. Miller)

The main conflict of the Vietnam war has shifted from the hills of Vietnam and the halls of Paris to the streets and campuses of America.

How our domestic struggle between anti-war youth and the President comes out will affect the fate of 17 million South Vietnamese and the position of the United States in Asia.

American student radicals who met with North Vietnamese military officials in Havana this summer, without doubt, are well aware Hanoi and their Soviet backers are counting on an anti-war victory in the U.S.

Five years of war have taken their toll of North Vietnamese, Viet Cong and the revolutionary infrastructure in South Vietnam. Equipping, supplying and training of South Vietnamese (ARVN) forces also is starting

November 13, 1969

to show results. Thanat Khoman, Foreign Minister of Thailand, said on Oct. 1 that the military forces of South Vietnam and some other Asian countries can now take over the active defense of South Vietnam's independence.

The proviso is that Asians themselves can take up the slack if withdrawal of American forces is not too rapid. That's why Hanoi and Moscow favor an effort to stampede our government into immediate and complete withdrawal of forces.

The spearheads of the "Bring the Boys Home" movement are student radicals. We've already had the Oct. 15 Vietnam moratorium. The second round escalation will come with mass demonstrations and marches in a number of major cities of the United States.

The primary demonstration slated for Washington, D.C., is planned to include "tens of thousands" of clergymen, pacifists, anti-war demonstrators and student radicals who want not only to end the war in Vietnam but to close down the institutions of our free society.

Agitate the discontented, merge the destructive emotions of the mob with the calculating destructiveness of the intelligent vanguard. That was Lenin's formula for insurrection and revolution. Will it work in America? Will it overheat and stampede public opinion? Will people then demand an act that will both destroy our credibility and our power in the world and bring closer a direct conflict between the major powers?

You, and millions of veterans like you, will provide the answer.

Don't waste time looking for Communists among the demonstrators. By the time the marches start, the intelligent vanguard will be back in their plotting rooms far from the scene watching it on TV, making notes for improving the next round of demonstrations.

Your greatest weapon is to create first, a groundswell of public opinion supporting America's ideals and our commitments to defend independence of peoples. Their continued independence is a guarantee of our security.

Second is to have a groundswell of opinion condemning the "totalitarian Left," the "radical disruptors," "the Typhoid Marys" who want to infect the entire nation with their sickness by "the use of mass intimidation in the name of legitimate dissent and protest."

What better time to start making these points than Veterans Day, Nov. 11?

BIG TRUCK BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News today carried a story by Mr. William Steif on the truck bill. The story relates to the action taken yesterday by the House Roads Subcommittee, and I insert it in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

VETO OF BIG TRUCK BILL HINTED
(By William Steif)

Secretary John A. Volpe of the Department of Transportation (DOT) has indicated in a letter to Rep. Fred Schwengel, R-Iowa, that President Nixon would veto a bill permitting heavier, wider and longer trucks and buses on the Interstate Highway System.

The letter was made part of the record yesterday as the House Public Roads Subcommittee, in closed session, referred such a bill to the full Public Works Committee without

following the usual practice of recommending approval or disapproval.

Rep. Richard D. McCarthy, D-N.Y., a sub-committee member and an opponent of the bill, said today that he demanded that sub-committee Chairman John C. Kluczynski, D-Ill., conduct a vote, "but Kluczynski just banged down his gavel and jammed it thru without a record vote."

Rep. McCarthy said, however, that Mr. Volpe's letter to Rep. Schwengel showed "the Nixon Administration has stiffened its resistance to the bill."

70 FEET LONG

Under the measure sponsored by Rep. Kluczynski, states could permit trucks as long as 70 feet and as heavy as 108,500 pounds on interstate roads. The bill also would permit buses and trucks to be widened from eight to eight and a half feet. The present weight limit is 73,280 pounds, which effectively limits truck lengths to no more than 60 feet in most states.

SECRETARY FINCH'S MOVE TO BAN DDT

HON. TIM LEE CARTER OF KENTUCKY IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1969

MR. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Finch has recently moved to ban DDT sales in the United States within the next 2 years.

After reading the literature on this chemical pesticide which has been extremely helpful, I must voice my support of the Secretary's intention.

At the present time, fish are not marketed if they have DDT content of 5 parts to 1 million. It is further my understanding that beef is not marketed if it has DDT content of 7 parts per million.

Since DDT is a hard pesticide it lasts as long as 10 years without change. Accumulations over the years present a grave danger not only to our fish and wildlife, but also to human beings. There is no question but that DDT affects fish embryos, fingerlings, and it also affects the calcium metabolism in birds so that the shells are so soft that the embryos often die, or the shells break and the embryos are exposed and later die.

It is a known fact that DDT does affect hormone synthesis. And if the concentration becomes great enough, it could well affect the offspring of the present generation adversely.

The content of DDT in the average human being in the United States is from 12 to 14 parts per million. Concentration of DDT in 140 parts per million has produced tumors in 50 percent of the experimental animals tested.

So that more of the Members of the House may have a better understanding of the dangers, the long-range effects of DDT, I include an article from the Washington Post of November 12, 1969, and a recent article from Sports Afield:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 12, 1969]
HISTORY OF DDT GOES BACK TO FIRST USE BY SWISS IN 1939

(By Hedley Burrell)

DDT — dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane — was first widely used 30 years ago.

Initially, the Swiss dumped it on their

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Colorado potato beetles. The insecticide was dusted on GI's in World War II to protect them from malaria, typhus and other insect-borne diseases.

After that, while some continued to sing the unqualified praises of DDT, other scientists began to have their doubts.

Botanist Barry Commoner, now director of Washington University's Center for Biology of Natural Systems in St. Louis, served as project officer in the Navy's development of aircraft dispersal of DDT during World War II.

In "Science and Survival," published in 1966, he wrote:

"Toward the end of our work, when the system was ready for fleet operations, we received a request for help from an experimental rocket station on a strip of island beach off the New Jersey coast.

"Flies were so numerous on the beach that important military developments were being held up. We sprayed the island and, inevitably, some of the surrounding waters, with DDT. Within a few hours, the flies were dead, and rocketeers went about their work with renewed vigor.

"But a week later they were on the telephone again. A mysterious epidemic had littered the beach with tons of decaying fish — which had attracted vast swarms of flies from the mainland.

"This is how we learned that DDT killed fish . . ."

ALSO KILLED CATS

Telling of an incident in Latin America, Commoner writes: "In one Bolivian town, DDT sprayed to control malaria mosquitoes also killed most of the local cats. With the cats gone, the village was invaded by a wild, mouse-like animal that carried black typhus. Before new cats were brought to restore the balance, several hundred villagers were killed by the disease."

DDT, of course, has not always had such obviously disastrous side effects. Survivors of Nazi concentration camps, for example, were often found to be suffering from typhus. Dusting of the released prisoners with DDT stopped the disease from spreading and possibly averted a serious epidemic.

And during the liberation of Italy in 1944, the Allies sprayed buildings in the Tiber delta.

"As a result," says Dr. Thomas H. Jukes, a biochemist, "primary malaria disappeared from the region and in 1945 it was reported that the health of the population was better than it had been for 2,000 years."

Jukes, professor of medical physics and associate director of the Space Sciences Laboratory of the University of California at Berkeley, writing in the Washington Post last May, said of DDT:

". . . DDT is safe, and has been studied more than any other pesticide for its effects on human beings. Without pesticides, there wouldn't be enough food to go around. Next, the campaign against DDT is emotional and unsound, and I object to this. Most important of all, DDT is needed by the millions of 'Third World' people because it is a cheap, safe residual pesticide."

Dr. Charles F. Wurster, also writing in the Washington Post, stated the case for the critics.

Wurster, a Ph.D. in organic chemistry and an assistant professor of biological sciences at the State University of New York at Stony Brook, played an active role in efforts to restrict the use of DDT as chairman of the scientists' advisory committee of the Environmental Defense Fund.

CONSIDERABLE HARM

Massive spraying of vast areas of North America with DDT to kill insects, he wrote, had done considerable harm.

"The root of the problem," he wrote, "lies with the DDT molecule itself, for it combines four properties that are responsible for its behavior in the environment:

1. Toxicity to almost all animal life rather than simply the insect pest.

2. Persistence, so that it remains in its original toxic form for at least a decade and perhaps much longer.

3. Mobility, so that it doesn't remain where applied, but is carried about the earth by currents of water and air.

4. Solubility properties that cause it to be accumulated by living organisms, instead of getting 'lost' in the oceans, in soils or in other inorganic parts of the environment."

Wurster added:

"We now know that DDT is a hepatic enzyme inducer. This means that DDT causes the liver to increase greatly its concentration of certain enzymes. These induced enzymes modify steroid sex hormones, i.e. estrogen, progesterone and testosterone, thereby changing their biological action. In birds, estrogen influences calcium metabolism."

"Since female birds of prey accumulate DDT residues from their contaminated food, induced liver enzymes destroy the birds' own estrogen supplies, thus causing them to lay inadequately calcified, thin-shelled eggs. Such eggs usually break in the nest or lose too much water through the thin shell, resulting in dehydration and death of the embryo."

"Populations therefore collapse from low reproductive success. Extinction of a species can occur from such sublethal effects without the killing of a single individual."

WORSE PROBLEM

Botanist Commoner said DDT illustrates how a new, synthetic substance can produce "a wholly unanticipated development" that "sometimes creates a problem worse than the original one."

[From Sports Afield, November 1969]

DDT: WILL IT KILL FISHING?

(By Jack Van Coevering)

On March 22, 1969, the roof fell in on Marvin Blackport, a rotund, red-faced, black-haired, pipe-smoking meat packer in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Only 11 months before, he had bid on and won a contract to buy all the coho salmon that escaped being caught on sportsmen's hooks as they made their way upstream to spawn. The terms of his contract with the state of Michigan specified that he must take all surplus salmon and pay for them at the rate of 15.6 cents a pound.

He installed expensive modern machinery in his plant, bought trucks to transport the cohos from stream to cannery, instituted a marketing campaign. Pictures of the new Michigan salmon appeared everywhere. Prospects were glowing. The coho run did not follow the schedule of the year before and fishermen sometimes complained about the fishing, but by years end there were so many cohos that Blackport resorted to freezing the fish.

Then, when his warehouses were still full, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration made a routine check. It discovered residues of DDT in the cohos far in excess of the amount allowed in beef fat. It impounded over 14 tons of the salmon which had been shipped to Minnesota and Wisconsin from Michigan. That was March 22 — when the roof fell in on Marvin Blackport.

The roof also fell in on the coho salmon itself. The miracle fish of the Great Lakes had caused a rebirth of fishing sport in waters that had been as nonproductive of sport fishing as a desert. Now, was the roof falling in on the future of fish and fishing in the Great Lakes, or was it only a wan prediction of a bigger catastrophe? At the very least, it was a warning to men everywhere that their profligate use of hard pesticides is approaching the day of reckoning.

Since the FDA has jurisdiction only over food shipped out of state, the Michigan De-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

partment of Agriculture, in obedience to a 1968 law, also made a check. It found canned cohos with residues of DDT from 13.67 to 19.48 parts per million. The FDA had by this time come up with an interim guideline allowing only five parts of DDT in fish for human consumption. (This is still in effect.) Conforming to the guideline, Michigan barred 146 cases of cohos from sale.

Blackport is an honest man, all 275 pounds of him. He had no intention of selling dangerous fish. That is why people felt sorry for him, including Lyle Littlefield of the Food Inspection Division in the Michigan Bureau of Consumer Protection who had to lower the boom.

"I am surprised that Blackport will even speak to me," he said before the Michigan Association of Conservation Ecologists last spring. "If anyone had told me a year ago that I would be in this position, I would not have believed it."

The news of DDT-drenched cohos slammed across the nation with a deadening thud. Newspapers and news magazines which headlined the disappointing development were read with astonishment and even disbelief. Few people could say: "I told you so." The coho miracle of 1967 and 1968 was about to become the coho debacle of 1969. How could all this happen and with such suddenness?

For a decade there had been warnings of the danger of pesticides. Bird lovers had been making a brave fight against DDT used for control of Dutch elm disease, but they were laughed at for seeing "burglars under the bed." Only a few scientists in the fisheries field suspected that fish were picking up DDT.

Ralph A. MacMullan, director of the Michigan Department of Conservation (now renamed the Department of Natural Resources), cautioned against the use of hard pesticides in the March 1960 issue of *Michigan Conservation*. That was after Dr. George Wallace of Michigan State University discovered dead robins on the college campus and pointed to DDT as the culprit. Also in 1961, in the *Detroit Free Press*, in my "Woods and Waters" column, I commented on the dangers of DDT. These voices may have been heard, but they were not heeded.

It was not until 1966 that the Department of Conservation itself adopted a stringent policy on the use of DDT on its public lands. The following year, this same agency went to court to stop the use of 600 pounds of dieldrin by the Michigan Department of Agriculture for Japanese beetle control in Benzie County—and lost.

That same year, Dr. MacMullan published his five-point program on pesticide use. One of his points called for a complete ban on hard pesticides in Michigan. He got little support except from such scientific groups as the Michigan Association of Conservation Ecologists.

Time, however, would not stand still. On March 17, 1968, young cohos began dying in Michigan state hatcheries. DDT was believed to be the probable cause, but even this was not immediately deemed a warning of what was happening to the rapidly maturing salmon in Lake Michigan. Those fast-growing salmon looked healthy, and they were healthy. The bigger they grew the more DDT they absorbed, but nobody knew this at the time.

The cohos thrived in Lake Michigan. They grew fat on alewives, little fish that had come in from the Atlantic Ocean to fill in the vacuum caused by the disappearance of lake trout from overnetting by commercial fishermen and ravages of sea lampreys. Success of the cohos fired up every member of the fishing fraternity to the extent that every rod-toting angler began to think that he had never been really fishing until he had caught a coho. (See my stories "In Michigan . . . They're Coho Crazy," SPORTS APFIELD, January 1968 and "Coho—The Second Year," SPORTS APFIELD, March 1969.)

During these years of coho discovery, an obscure University of Michigan student named Robert Reinert was working on his Ph.D. thesis in the School of Natural Resources. His problem was to determine the presence of hard pesticides in fish and how they got there. I got to know him well because his laboratory was next to my office. (By this time, I had been appointed a Research Associate in Natural Resources at the University of Michigan.) Since Reinert, a tall, blond fellow, liked fishing too, we had plenty to talk about.

I used to watch him grinding up fish flesh, shaking up the particles in vials for analysis in a gas chromatograph. I called this his "gas machine" and was always fascinated by the squiggle of the pens as they recorded pesticide contents of the fish fat in solution much like pens record temperatures on a barograph at the Weather Bureau.

Reinert made 1313 analyses on 29 species of fish from the Great Lakes. He discovered that fish can absorb insecticides from water which passes through their gills as well as from food, even though water may contain as little as one part per million of DDT. At the time, he considered this of minor importance. Now this has become very significant.

Insecticide levels, Reinert found, are highest in Lake Michigan, less in lakes Huron, Ontario, Erie and Superior, in that order. Fish in Lake Michigan have two to seven times as much DDT and dieldrin as fish in the other lakes. In April and May, young cohos in the southern end of Lake Michigan average 3.51 parts per million of DDT and .11 parts per million of dieldrin. By the time the salmon mature and arrive at the northern end of the lake to swim up the rivers for spawning, they may have as much as 12.28 ppm of DDT and as much as .42 ppm of dieldrin.

If the terms "parts per million" or "parts per trillion" puzzle you, let me put it this way: Dump one teaspoonful of chocolate into one million tank cars and you will have a dilution of one part per million. Now, dump one teaspoonful of chocolate into one trillion tank cars and you will have dilution of one part per trillion. This is terrific dilution and requires extremely sensitive instruments to detect it, not to mention highly trained scientists. In neither case will you be able to detect the presence of the added ingredient by appearance, smell or taste. So it is with DDT, dieldrin or any other pesticide.

The poison will be there. No one will ever know it until a beastie drinks or eats it and suffers its effects. If it happens to be a fish embryo, it will die almost immediately when it absorbs the poisonous DDT in its fatty yolk sac. (This explains the death of young cohos in the hatchery in 1968.) If it is a bird, it will cause the liver to produce enzymes which break down female sex hormones and thereby inhibit calcium metabolism, thus producing thin-shelled eggs which crack or break easily. Result: few or no young.

If it is a woman who is breast-feeding her baby, two or three times as much DDT will be in her milk as is allowed in cow's milk by the FDA. If it is a man, be he fisherman or not, he probably has too much DDT in him already to make him fit for human consumption under FDA standards. Cannibals beware!

I have previously referred to "hard" pesticides, a term which includes DDT and its relatives dieldrin, aldrin, endrin, heptachlor, chlordane and lindane. All are chlorinated hydrocarbons. Without going into their chemistry, I need only say that these "hard" pesticides are compounds which do not disintegrate or break down quickly. While other pesticides may lose their lethal powers in a year, the chlorinated hydrocarbons are very stable chemicals.

"DDT persists in the environment for ten years or more," testified Charles F. Worster Jr. of the State University in Stony Brook, New York, at a hearing in Wisconsin. "It is

November 13, 1969

extremely soluble in fatty tissue. It builds up in the fat of fish, wildlife and livestock. It is highly mobile. It is a vagabond, for it tends to hitch rides on particles suspended in flowing water. It attaches itself to soil particles easily swept aloft by wind. It evaporates with water into the atmosphere."

The storing up of DDT in the fatty tissues of fish was graphically described by Dr. Joseph J. Hickey, of the University of Wisconsin, who experimented with crustaceans in Door County, Wisconsin, and found that these have about one-quarter of one part per million of DDT. Crustaceans are at the bottom of the biological food ladder. Fish eat them and the DDT contained in crustaceans concentrates in the fat of fish. One fish eats another and in turn builds up the DDT content. When a gull, which is at the top of the biological food ladder, eats a fish, it may get a real dose of DDT. In fact, Dr. Hickey found that gulls may have as much as 80 ppm of DDT in their muscle tissues and up to 1975 ppm of DDT in their fat tissues. This also helps explain why fish-eating birds become the ultimate victims of DDT and why ospreys, peregrine falcons and bald eagles are on the list of endangered birds.

Now, is the fisherman also a "threatened and vanishing bird?" What is he to do? Throw away his catch? Stop eating fish? Hang up his rods, store his tackle and give up his sport altogether? None of these alternatives, of course, is acceptable. Therefore, I suggest a better procedure, soundly based on what is currently known about hard pesticides.

Go ahead and catch all the cohos, lake trout and other fatty fish you can and keep what the law allows. Then, when you dress them, trim off all the fat. The remaining muscle meat should be well within the level of tolerance for consumption as set by the FDA.

Cut off the fish's head because it contains a lot of fat. Trim off all the black areas shown in the cross-section; in short, fillet your fish, remove the skin and cut off the fins including the fact that surrounds the fin bones.

Big fish are likely to have more pesticides in them than small, younger fish. For example, cohos caught before August will have much less DDT than those taken later at river mouths or in their spawning streams.

Smoking, frying or broiling ~~heads~~ reduce the amount of DDT in the fish you eat. Dr. Reinert found that chubs (which have a high oil content) lose from 60 to 70 percent of their oil during cooking and about 60 to 70 percent of their DDT at the same time.

Catching fish from water with low concentrations of insecticides will help. Lake Michigan, for example, has from 2 to 17 times more dieldrin than the other Great Lakes.

Bass, bluegills, crappies, perch, walleyes and pike are not on the list of "fatty fish." Their pesticide content, therefore, will be lower than that of trout, salmon or whitefish. If you fillet nonfatty fish such as perch or walleyes, you should run little danger of getting too much DDT.

Although most of the data on pesticide contents of fish comes from coho salmon taken in Lake Michigan, this does not mean that our inland lakes and even our rivers are immune. Technical Bulletin 41, 1968, of the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources states that "every sample of fish taken in Wisconsin or its boundary waters contained DDT or its analogs." Concentrations ranged from .021 to 16.20 parts per million and averaged .845 parts per million on a "whole fish" basis. On a "fat basis" the concentration ranged from .222 parts per million to 534.6 ppm., with an average of 27.15 ppm.

It is significant that the lowest DDT residues were found in fish from forested northern Wisconsin where samples showed less than 1 ppm of the DDT complex. That leads me to conclude that, generally speaking, lakes in farming areas may be expected to

contain more pesticides than those of forested areas.

A two-year pesticide study by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, recently released by Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin, reveals that Lake Michigan is not alone with its contents of DDT. The bureau study found DDT in 584 of 590 samples of fish taken from 45 rivers and lakes across the United States. DDT ranged up to 45.7 ppm in whole fish, a count more than twice as high as that found in Lake Michigan.

The study found that in 12 of the 44 lakes and rivers DDT in some or all of the fish samples reached levels higher than the five parts per million guideline limit of the FDA. Highest DDT counts were found in white perch taken from the Delaware River in the heavily populated northeastern United States.

Nelson reported that rivers and lakes where DDT counts reached levels in fish higher than the 5 ppm level include the Hudson River in New York, the Delaware River, the Cooper River in South Carolina, the St. Lucie Canal and Apalachicola River in Florida, the Tombigbee River in Alabama, the Rio Grande River, Lake Ontario, Lake Huron, Illinois River in Illinois, Arkansas, White, and Red rivers in Minnesota, San Joaquin River in California and Rogue River in Oregon. Species frequently used for sampling were carp, buffalo, black bass, channel catfish, sunfish, yellow perch and trout.

In Massachusetts, however, the Division of Fisheries and Game in 1967 monitored pesticide residues in nine species of fish in its major rivers and tributaries and found DDT levels ranging from .17 to 11.64 ppm. Within the next few years, data will become available from other states, including California, which manufactures, sells and uses more DDT than any other state. Coastal areas, with their production of shellfish, must still be heard from.

You may wonder: Why all this concern about the amount of DDT we get into our systems? Already the average American has 12 to 16 ppm of DDT in his body. This information was obtained from a study of cadavers and also from chunks of human fat taken in surgery. Perhaps a little more won't hurt. After all, there is no conclusive evidence, on the long-term effects of DDT on people.

Yet, the boys in the Food and Drug Administration are disturbed. They are charged by law to protect the public against food adulteration and contamination. DDT which may build up in a man without harm for 25 years,

could exceed man's tolerance the very next year. Who knows? That is why Victor J. Yanaccone of Patchogue, New York, representing the Environmental Defense Fund at the Wisconsin hearing on DDT asked: "Is man an unwilling guinea pig for an uncontrolled experiment with DDT?"

It is impossible to give an answer all done up neatly and tied with a red, white and blue ribbon. A group of professors at Stanford University, all members of the Department of Biological Sciences, said: "The evidence is overwhelming that persistent pesticide substances threaten the ecological systems upon which human life depends. Recent studies suggest that chlorinated hydrocarbons which are now being stored in human tissues may have direct harmful effects on man himself."

This may paint a gloomy picture; yet I do not believe I am an alarmist when I suggest that despite all its past achievements as an inexpensive miracle chemical which has done wonders for public health and for farmers, DDT now hangs over not only Lake Michigan and its fish, but also over the whole race of man like a sword of Damocles. This conclusion is not mine alone. The state of Michigan put its concern into action this year when it outlawed the sale of DDT except for a few special uses. Arizona has banned DDT spraying. Stricter controls are under consideration in Massachusetts, Wisconsin and New York.

Time magazine reported last July that Europeans have taken even more decisive action. Sweden ordered a two-year ban on DDT as well as related pesticides: lindane, aldrin and dieldrin when DDT was found in herring there. The Netherlands and Denmark have decided to stop using DDT. West Germany limits spraying so severely that only 192 tons of DDT were used there last year. France and Britain also are watching pesticides closely and the Soviet Union is much concerned.

A host of unanswered questions remain. The most immediate one is: What will happen to the coho salmon this year? Undoubtedly, thousands of fishermen will pay no heed to DDT in salmon. This was evidenced during the past summer when anglers fished Lake Michigan like never before. All they asked was:

"Where are the fish?" But will they be as eager to catch cohos in the fall when DDT levels will be at their peak?

More disturbing is the question of what to do with the tons of surplus cohos that went into commercial outlets last year. This has Michigan's Department of Natural Resources in a quandary.

It is unlikely that the FDA will change its tolerance level for DDT in fish for human consumption. What then will happen to the giant surplus of uncaught cohos which will surge upstream? They cannot be left to pollute the streams with their dying and dead carcasses.

Will a way be found to fillet the fish economically and in such a way that the product will pass FDA limits for DDT? Will it be possible to extract oil from salmon at a profit? Already coho eggs are used and sold for fish bait and bring about 50 cents a pound wholesale. Will a market be developed for cohos destined for nonhuman consumption? Will scientists discover a way to neutralize the effects of DDT?

If there is no commercial outlet for surplus fish, will licensed anglers be allowed to take them willy-nilly in the streams, perhaps developing a kind of pitchfork fishery, a far cry from sport fishing? Will the Department of Natural Resources net these fish at the weirs and make them available to anglers, perhaps at nominal cost? But could the Michigan Department of Health permit this, since it already bans commercial sale, DDT tolerances being what they are?

A second series of questions concerns the vested-interest aspects of the coho miracle. How about Michigan's lakeshore communities which have expanded facilities in anticipation of more and more coho anglers. Will there be a drop in the sale of boats, tackle, lodgings and lunches? What about manufacturers who launched hundreds of products tied to the coho boom?

The third consideration stretches far into the future. What will DDT do to the fish population? At present, fish seem to be getting along all right. Despite DDT, they are growing and multiplying. But is the death of young cohos in Michigan's hatcheries a prophecy of things to come? Will fish be able to reproduce as DDT keeps concentrating in their eggs?

To carry the case just a bit further: Will there be increasing numbers of fishermen who fear DDT enough to stop eating fish until they are safe? And if these fears are general enough, will they put a brake on fishing for food and encourage fishing for fun—much as sailfish are caught more for fun than for food? If this idea spreads, will it usher in a new chapter for fishing in America when fishing for fun will become the rule rather than the exception? Should this happen, will we enter a new era when piscatorial prowess will attain new meaning and the ideal of sport-only fishing will attract a new and even more devoted coterie of anglers? Only time will tell.

SENATE—Friday, November 14, 1969

The Senate met in executive session at 10 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord of all history and of this single day, we pray not that Thou shouldst reveal Thyself by outward signs of mighty works, but in the quiet solitude of our inmost heart; not by wind and fire, but by the still small voice.

Set before us, O Lord, the vision of one who found joy in doing the will of Him that sent Him, and in finishing His work. When many are coming and going, and there is little quiet, give us grace to remember Him who knew neither impatience of spirit nor confusion in His work, but in the midst of all His labors, kept a tranquil heart at peace with itself. Give

us steady spirits and brave hearts that we may play our part in bringing to all mankind the new world of liberty and justice for all.

In Thy holy name, we pray. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read a communication to the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U. S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., November 14, 1969.
To the Senate:
Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)