

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PRAISE FOR THE PEACE CORPS

HON. EDWARD W. BROOKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I recently came across a moving and perceptive article about the Peace Corps. Written by a doctor in New Haven, Conn., it describes one couple's encounters with Peace Corps volunteers in a number of African countries.

Prior to his mission for Crossroads Africa, Dr. Hans H. Neumann, like many other Americans, had entertained doubts about the character of the volunteers and the effectiveness of their work. His direct contact with these young people in the field dispelled all doubts and questions. The Corps is doing an exceptional job. Volunteers are well respected by the people among whom they live and work. And they are acquiring skills and a sense of purpose and responsibility which will always be of benefit to them and to this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Are You For or Against the Peace Corps?" by Dr. Neumann, be printed in the RECORD.

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

ARE YOU FOR OR AGAINST THE PEACE CORPS?

(By Hans H. Neumann, M.D.)

What would you say to a son or daughter or young patient thinking of volunteering for the Peace Corps? Do you suspect that most corps members are misfits, more intent on escaping reality than on ministering to needy foreigners? Is it a haven for draft-dodgers? Is it doing an effective, lasting job of improving the lives of people in its host countries, or just some Boy Scout good deeds?

I found answers to such questions recently when my wife and I combined a vacation with a mission for Operation Crossroads Africa. In the bush country of inland Africa we were frequently told about Peace Corps volunteers working in the villages, and we made a point of seeking them out. During our journey, we talked at some length with 36 of these volunteers. Sometimes we'd just spend an hour or so with them, perhaps meeting village chieftains and midwives, or visiting the local school and clinic. Occasionally, we met a volunteer who had a free afternoon or evening and was pleased to spend it with us.

Once we took a 10-hour train ride from southern Dahomey to the town of Parakou, near the border of Niger, and had as traveling companions—in addition to two dozen live guinea hens and a goat—six Peace Corps volunteers heading upcountry for new assignments. So by the time we left Africa we'd spent more than 100 hours with volunteers and had come to some definite conclusions about them and their work.

I'll take my last question first: What kind of job is the Peace Corps doing? The answer is indicated by certain facts. More and more nations are asking for Peace Corps volunteers. Many governments are asking for larger numbers of volunteers. And most of the handful of countries that had asked Peace Corps youths to leave have recently asked them to return.

Furthermore, praise for the performance of these young American men and women was uniformly high among the Africans with

whom we talked. Such support in the host countries isn't surprising when one actually sees these volunteers living and working under the worst possible conditions to bring knowledge and personal aid to victims of ignorance and hardship, including an overwhelming incidence of illness and injury.

For example, in most West African countries there's a 50 per cent mortality rate among children under the age of 5. Death among these children is the result of a variety of diseases and of malnutrition—which isn't due so much to a lack of food as to protein deficiency and to lack of knowledge about what foods a child should have. Consider also the high rate of deaths caused by malaria (still the leading cause in Ghana, where statistics are available). Consider that Africans don't become immune to amebic dysentery and other forms of enterocolitis; that many suffer from typhoid, hepatitis, and numerous parasitic infestations. Unaided, African villagers have no access to the modern methods of treating drinking water and creating sanitation facilities to reduce such diseases.

Imagine, then, the feelings of a 30-year-old African mother of eight (only four of whom have survived infancy), who knows that young Americans have come to teach her how to cook foods for her children that will help them live longer and be sick less often, and to teach her husband and brothers how to plant and cultivate a vegetable garden. Imagine what the northern Dahomeyan natives must think of the well-diggers of Natatingou. Americans laboring to bring good water to strangers.

What kind of people are the volunteers? I would say only that they're well-educated, articulate, sensitive, and dedicated boys and girls who, in doing so much for others, are also doing much to win friends for America. As to what the volunteers are getting out of their experience, I'll let some of the young Americans we talked with in West Africa speak for themselves.

One 22-year-old said to us: "For the first time in my life, I feel that I've made a difference in somebody else's life."

A young girl mused: "Every day I face challenges I never dreamed of before and I'm amazed at the abilities I find I have in overcoming them. I used to think if something wasn't solvable right away, it was the end of the world. Now, no matter how great the frustration, I know that tomorrow's another day."

Said a recent college graduate: "A lot of ego is involved in your first job. You feel you have to make your first mark. It may be a very tiny mark, but I'm leaving mine here."

One young man put it this way: "Teamwork? I used to think a word like that was garbage! That's what I thought until I taught 46 children to work together in a school garden. To them teamwork was a new concept, and teaching it to them made me see it in a new way."

And they said things like this:

"The Peace Corps helps you find yourself. You learn what you're capable of doing. Like I never knew what I wanted to do. Now I know. I'm going into urban redevelopment."

"Responsibility used to be something my father said I should have. Now I know what it really is."

"If you want to develop decisive-making power, the Peace Corps certainly gives it to you. You get into a village without a phone or any quick means of communicating with headquarters, and if there's a decision to be made, you make it—or else!"

"Everyone on campus said we have enough problems to solve at home and going someplace else was the coward's choice. Well, I just didn't see what I could do at home. I didn't know anything about my abilities, and I wouldn't have known where to start. Now

I think I can bring something back, both a knowledge of myself and some experience in problem-solving."

"I learned that there are other ways of doing things, that the American way isn't the only way. I've learned to make allowances for people who are different from us."

"I've learned that you must treat people with justice and sensitivity. If you have those two things, it doesn't matter how poorly you speak the dialect. People will understand you."

"You change your perspective. Looking at the U.S. from the outside makes you see it in a different way."

"It's a nice institutional way to have an adventure. You learn to live with hardship. And the way the world is going, that's not a bad thing to learn."

"It's a good way to step out of the middle class for a while. There are a lot of guys who are bored with their parents' house in the suburbs. They ought to try one of these for two years!"

Though the volunteers were willing to talk about their work and what it meant to them, there was one thing they wouldn't talk about: the physical discomfort. That seems to be part of their unwritten code. They wouldn't gripe about inconvenience, self-sacrifice, or deprivation—whether the deprivation was in terms of physical needs or Western companionship.

The general attitude was perhaps best summed up by a volunteer who said: "This has been the most frustrating, heartbreaking, teeth-gritting, eye-opening experience a person could have. I've suffered every minute of it, and I wouldn't have missed it for the world."

Until our trip, my wife and I had been somewhat skeptical about Peace Corps motives and effectiveness. Now I'm convinced that mature Americans who are fed to the teeth with hippies, addicts, cop-outs, drop-outs, and college rioters would stand a little straighter and speak a little more proudly of American youth if they could see and talk with some of these young volunteers as we did.

NO

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 19, 1969

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday Attorney General John Mitchell made a statement in which he seemed to indicate that the antiwar march in Washington this past weekend had the city in a state of near chaos and widespread violence.

In spite of the fact that only a few hundred undisciplined hotheads were involved in disruptions, out of the 250,000 "modestly" estimated to have been here, the Attorney General said he felt, overall, that the gathering in Washington could not be characterized as peaceful.

In this morning's Washington Post there is a story which reveals an incredible story of attempted extortion by the Weathermen of \$20,000 from the Vietnam Moratorium Committee.

Mr. Speaker, if this extortion story is true, Attorney General Mitchell should be praising these groups for not caving in to the extremists of the left and not chastising them as he did on Sunday.

As the editorial in the Washington Post said Tuesday morning:

What there is now is a split between the antiwar moderates and the extremists; it is a serious split, but if John Mitchell tries hard enough he can probably heal it. He is one of the few men in the country who can.

At this point I insert the complete editorial:

No

The effort by this administration to characterize the weekend demonstration as (a) small, (b) violent, and (c) treacherous will not succeed because it is demonstrably untrue. If citizens had had the opportunity to witness the weekend on television, they would know it to be untrue; as it is, they will have to ask those who were there—either kids or cops, no matter. For sheer balderdash it would be difficult to exceed Herbert G. Klein's estimate: "Had it not been for the highly effective work of the Washington police, of the National Guard . . . for the reserve forces of the Defense Department and the complete cooperation of all elements of the government . . . and the work of the Justice Department . . . the damage to Washington (Saturday night and the night before) would have been far greater than . . . the . . . riots after the death of Martin Luther King."

That statement is inaccurate on every count save the first—the enormously effective and professional performance of the Washington police department. Not necessarily in order of importance, thanks should be tendered to (a) the marchers, (b) the volunteer marshals, (c) the police and Chief Wilson, (d) the Mobe leaders, (e) Mayor Washington, and (f) the scores of organizations, churches and others, and individuals who went out of their way to exhibit what the mayor called "neighborliness."

What this administration, and the Attorney General in particular, does not seem capable of grasping is the simple truth that if the demonstrators had wanted serious violence they had the numbers to create it. Does anyone seriously believe that Washington's undermanned police force could contain 5,000 or 50,000 or 150,000 demonstrators bent on violence? The answer is No, and the demonstrators didn't want trouble. The fringe groups—Weatherman, crazies—did want trouble, and got it. To the Attorney General, this is evidence that the Mobe lost control and broke its nonviolent pledges. Is it reasonable to hold the Mobe leaders (and, by implication, all those thousands who marched) responsible for the actions of 50 or 200 or 500 people? No, it is not. The Mobe does not control Weatherman—and that is not an apology, it is a fact. There is evidence now that Weatherman demanded \$20,000 from the Mobe as the price for peace; the Mobe refused, and the wild ones marched on the Saigon embassy. What there is now is a split between the antiwar moderates and the extremists; it is a serious split, but if John Mitchell tries hard enough he can probably heal it. He is one of the few men in the country who can.

"I do not believe that—over-all—the gathering here can be characterized as peaceful," was the way the Attorney General put it. He places in evidence the fact that at the "major confrontation" at Dupont Circle "20 persons were arrested." If the arrest of 20 people then, less than 300 people overall out of a crowd of a quarter of a million, constitutes a "major confrontation" engineered by the leaders of that crowd—then, what we may have here is a failure of communication.

These men—Mitchell, Klein and others who have had a hand in making policy in this matter—are not dumb or weak but small, men who somehow naturally see themselves as beleaguered adversaries. It seems clear from their statements, and from the accounts of participants at the command post in the

Municipal Center over the weekend, that the Nixon administration was less interested in trying to keep the march peaceful than in trying to make it seem less large and more violent than it really was, and in trying to scare the daylight out of that putative Silent Majority at the same time.

So yesterday, as is the fashion with this administration, we had the qualifying statement from the White House press secretary, Ron Ziegler. Yes, it was a pretty large crowd; yes, it was, when you think about it, fairly peaceful. More moderate, more generous, more truthful than the other statements—but there is no reason to think that what Ziegler says is what the President thinks. On Saturday and Sunday, the President by his own account was preoccupied with the football games. It was a fine afternoon for watching football, he is quoted as saying on Saturday, and for sheer piquancy, we have not heard the likes of that since Marie Antoinette.

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I call my colleagues' attention to the position of the Policemen's Association of the District of Columbia on the report of the Mayor's Ad Hoc Committee on Public Safety. Their communication to me follows:

POLICEMEN'S ASSOCIATION OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,

Washington, D.C., November 14, 1969.

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HUNGATE: The Mayor's Ad Hoc Committee on Public Safety has published its report which has now become available to the Policemen's Association. We oppose this report and the proposals contained therein for the following reasons.

First, the Committee proposes to act in an investigative capacity, a judicial capacity and a prosecutive capacity. As stated in the report there will be appointed an Investigations Committee which shall (1) gather the facts; (2) determine if and when an officer is restored to duty; (3) have the option of sponsoring, presenting and prosecuting a complaint if the Metropolitan Police Department does not bring a Departmental complaint. It is a violation of the most basic constitutional rights to have a single body act in all of these capacities.

Second, there is great questionable legality of the committee deriving its authority from the Mayor. We seriously question this delegation of power and contend that these functions may not be delegated.

Third, the committee seeks to make judgments in purely internal affairs of the Metropolitan Police Department. To permit an outside group to decide recruitment, assignment, promotion and disciplinary matters is to invite chaos, inspire anarchy and effectively destroy the professionalism of the Department. As an adjunct to these aims, the Committee would vest itself with the power to invade files of the Metropolitan Police Department thereby obtaining information not necessarily available to it.

Fourth, the Committee would intervene in grievance procedures. This is an unwarranted interference in purely internal matters for which adequate procedures exist. Indeed, this Committee's function in this area may run counter to the functions of other groups.

In summary, we submit that this Committee does not purport, by its own report, to

be advisory. It talks of "dealing" with certain problems; of being an "open advocate" for the complainant; of "initiating" action. These words mean what they say; we urge that this Committee be abolished or restrained within legal or common-sense bounds. At the very least, we urge that the Committee, its report and aims be carefully scrutinized by the Congress.

Respectfully,

CARL W. BEATTY,
President.

RUBBER FOOTWEAR PRODUCTION

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I should like to submit for the RECORD part of a recent statement issued by B. F. Goodrich Co. outlining the problems facing rubber footwear production in the United States. As I have stated repeatedly, the impact of foreign rubber imports on our domestic industry is a devastating one.

The B. F. Goodrich statement in part follows:

The situation surrounding imports that started in 1956, and the impact of growing imports on a product with a very high employment factor. Over 60% of our sales dollar goes to labor, and with our high labor rates at Goodrich—or even the lowest wages paid rubber workers in the United States—it is difficult if not impossible to compete with merchandise made in the low cost labor areas of the world. Much of the waterproof footwear today is being imported from Taiwan and Korea, where wages for an 8 hour day, 6 days a week average approximately \$25 (American dollars) per month including benefits which are negligible. An American worker in our industry earns this in less than a day.

The flood of imported rubber footwear, which amounted to less than 400,000 pairs in 1956, has reached almost 13,000,000 pair in 1968. This is more than one out of every three pairs sold in the U.S., or 36% of total shipments, leaving approximately 64% to the American manufacturer . . . and selling at prices that are severely depressed because of the import competition.

The tide of imports has not stopped. In 1968 in spite of substantial tariff protection the imports were larger than any other year in the history of our country. So clearly the end is not in sight. I might also point out that Goodrich is not the first casualty, but the 4th in our industry.

We have had an area of our activity devoted to development of all types of footwear for the Armed Services. We are at the present time working on two contracts for sealed insulation boots, the type that was developed by this Company for the Korean War to prevent frostbite and other foot injuries. We were the sole bidder on the last two contracts. We will no longer be able to furnish the Government with this kind of footwear or development service. We will close out this part of our operation on October 15, 1969.

Our experience must be considered as a harbinger of things to come in all American labor intensive industries where the impact of imports is not fully understood by those in power to effectively control these low labor cost imports.

The following charts illustrate the tremendous increase in rubber footwear imports into the United States. In 10 years, from 1958 to 1968 rubber-soled canvas-

upper footwear imports into the United States rose from 3,248,000 pairs to 49,200,000 pairs, representing an increase from 4.4 to 24.5 percent of imports to consumption.

The situation facing waterproof foot-

wear is likewise critical. Over a period of 10 years, from 1958 to 1968, imports rose from 2,365,000 pairs to 12,946,000 pairs, representing an increase from 7.4 to 36.3 percent of imports to consumption.

The charts follow:

RUBBER-SOLED CANVAS—UPPER FOOTWEAR

SHIPMENTS, IMPORTS, EXPORTS, APPARENT CONSUMPTION AND RATIOS, 1958-68

[In thousands-pairs]

Year	Shipments	Imports	Exports	Apparent consumption	Percent imports to consumption
1958	70,000	3,248	122	73,126	4.4
1959	75,000	12,614	98	87,516	14.4
1960	84,000	30,435	69	114,366	26.6
1961	103,000	28,476	84	131,392	21.7
1962	136,000	29,225	82	165,143	17.7
1963	147,813	28,676	130	176,359	16.3
1964	162,151	29,063	225	190,989	15.2
1965	165,741	33,363	195	198,909	16.8
1966	157,491	35,060	167	192,384	18.2
1967	153,656	44,659	211	198,104	22.5
1968	152,257	49,200	239	201,218	24.5

WATERPROOF FOOTWEAR

SHIPMENTS, IMPORTS, EXPORTS, APPARENT CONSUMPTION AND RATIOS, 1958-68

[In thousands pairs]

Year	Shipments	Imports	Exports	Apparent consumption	Percent imports to consumption
1958	29,492	2,365	50	31,807	7.4
1959	30,036	7,875	53	37,858	20.8
1960	27,511	12,015	33	39,493	30.4
1961	28,597	8,352	32	36,917	22.6
1962	27,463	12,510	35	39,938	31.3
1963	23,200	12,819	32	35,987	35.6
1964	23,282	11,326	34	34,574	32.8
1965	23,393	12,448	25	35,816	34.8
1966	22,522	8,582	36	31,068	27.6
1967	22,093	10,541	32	32,602	32.3
1968	22,730	12,946	23	35,653	36.3

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit for the RECORD a recent letter from Mr. J. Anastasio of Uniroyal to Mr. Mitchell J. Cooper, again pointing out the worsening plight of the rubber footwear industry.

The letter follows:

UNIROYAL CONSUMER PRODUCTS,
New York, N.Y., September 4, 1969.
Mr. MITCHELL J. COOPER,
1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MITCH: I am sure you have read about our tentative decision to close the Woonsocket Plant. This comes as a particularly devastating blow to us since we have been operating that plant as far back as 1897. Not only that, we have 800 employees involved which I understand comprises about 10% of the Woonsocket labor force. As you know, we do not take these things lightly but unfortunately, our business has dwindled to the point where we have a great deal of excess capacity. We simply can find no way to keep Woonsocket in business. As you know, the labor content of our canvas footwear products amounts to about 50% of the total cost. Since our wages including supplementary benefits in the Woonsocket plant amount to about \$4.50 an hour while our foreign competition ranges from \$.30 to \$1.00 a day (I am thinking mainly of Far East competition which is where most of our imports come from), you do not have to be a financial genius to learn what has been and is happening to the domestic canvas footwear business. With a product as heavily oriented toward labor as our canvas footwear product, we find it more and more difficult to compete and it is this kind of a situation that has led us to the disastrous Woonsocket decision. It is interesting to note that we are forced to shut down plants while imports continue to grow.

We, of course, will absorb as much as the Woonsocket business in our existing domestic

facilities as we can, but because of the decline in business, I am sure much of the Woonsocket production will disappear. We are strongly considering offshore production in an attempt to hold on to our domestic business. I am afraid this is just the start of things as far as domestic production is concerned, but as the situation continues to develop, I will keep you informed. In the meantime, if you have any questions please feel free to write or phone me.

J. ANASTASIO.

REMARKS OF FORMER GOVERNOR OF FLORIDA, MILLARD S. CALDWELL

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

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

ADDRESS BY FORMER GOVERNOR OF FLORIDA, MILLARD S. CALDWELL, TO LOUISIANA JUDICIARY, MONDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1969, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

I had some difficulty in deciding the subject of this discussion. Judges can look you straight in the eye, appear to be sympathetic to your views, and, at the same time, be sound asleep. As a practicing lawyer I learned I could not tell the judge one thing he didn't already know. As a Justice of the Supreme Court of Florida I found my brethren of the Bench better informed than I, so full of knowledge, most of which wasn't so, that I gave up trying to enlighten them. I resolved my dilemma for this evening by selecting as the subject matter of this address a problem about which you as the audience and I as your speaker are completely ignorant. For a brief period of time,

therefore, we'll both be lost in abstraction, a rare experience for the Judiciary.

There is a definite relationship between public confidence in the courts and the stability of national government. In the so-called democracies the degree of public respect for law has infallibly measured the Nation's life span.

The historians think the demise of governments is, more often than not, linked to paternalism or, as we call it, welfare statism. It is strange but apparently true that paternalism and a sound jurisprudence are incompatible.

The Bar Associations, conscious of these cold facts, observing a growing disrespect for law, are endeavoring to stem the tide by the use of such devices as subtle advertising, free clinics, Law Day, et cetera.

I discussed this general problem recently with an able observer whose view was the trouble was deep-seated—that a substantial minority of Bench and Bar has been indoctrinated with alien philosophies and, being active in the professional organizations, will continue to militate against public confidence.

This man tells me the Soviet Union, with great foresight and greater patience, started the infiltration of the American Schools of Law, journalism, the ministry and education a half century ago, putting their people of learning and influence on the faculty, enrolling likely young converts in the student bodies and that communism is just now reaping the harvest. Whether his assignment of cause and effect is valid I can't say but, it must be admitted, those schools have graduated an inordinate number of queer people who have, in the courts, the press, the pulpit and the school rooms, expounded a queer philosophy. Some of them sit in the Congress, on the courts, and in the American Bar Association. Others make the headlines as ministers and priests and teachers and still others are established in the field of news dissemination. They have created distrust in the law, dissension in the churches, unrest in the cities. But, and this is significant, their philosophy is not yet that of the great majority of the American people who still believe in the Constitution, in legal precedent and in decent observance of the law.

Americans have been taken to the mountaintop too many times and they have become skeptical, they're prone to ask questions. For instance, when the American Bar asks the people to observe Law Day, when it seeks to foster respect for the law, when it seeks to persuade the public the law and the courts are worthy of respect, the response is not warm. The people ask, what kind of law are they called upon to respect? Are the lawyers talking about the law as represented by the Federal and State Constitutions and the Statutes enacted by the Legislative bodies of the Nation or are they talking about something else? Are the people called upon to respect judicial legislation enacted by the courts without reference to or regard for the Constitution and legal precedent? Are they called upon to respect such judicial revelations as the Schwere, Konigsberg and the more recent Keyishian decisions which admit Communists to the legal and teaching professions and authorize them to advocate the overthrow of the government by force? Is the public expected to exhibit confidence in the decisions which turned Mallory and his criminal ilk loose to prey on other victims?

We must remember the American public is fairly well informed and is inclined to understand and accept the necessity for otherwise unpopular decisions so long as they believe the Court is earnestly striving to construe the Constitution as it was written and intended. But one gets an altogether different reaction when the Courts abandon judicial restraint, attempt to rewrite the Constitution and impose personal, social predilections on the law. The people simply

cannot understand how it is five members of the Supreme Court, elected by no one, responsible to no one and there for life, can usurp the prerogatives of the Congress and establish the policies which govern two hundred million otherwise free people. And that is so notwithstanding the assumed divine endowment of omnipotence which graces that Court.

In my view, a vital question for the Nation is whether we can re-establish in the public mind a belief in the judicial integrity of the Federal court system—not an easy task because virtue once lost seems to have a way of remaining questionable. Assuming even the most favorable of developments such as several more retirements and the best of appointments to fill the vacancies, it will take long years to undo the damage wrought in the fields of education and criminal justice. Millions of parents are seething in anger over the disruption of orderly education, amounting, in some instances, to worse than no education. In other millions there is a revulsion against a judicial preference for the criminal as against the public. Don't expect the people, in the light of the chaos in the schools and on the streets, to shrug it all away along with Shakespeare's Puck and his observation of "Lord, what fools these mortals be" because those people know the Lord did not intend us to be fools nor did He intend that we content ourselves with fatalism or resignation.

I point my finger at the Federal side of the court system for two reasons: First, because the Federal courts have been the greater offenders and, second, because my hosts are Judges and Justices of the State court system and I would not like to be so ungracious as unnecessarily to offend them. But, in all candor, it is fair to say the public generally respects the State courts and at the same time, recognizes the need for improvement at all levels.

As we contemplate the future of mankind and appraise the astounding progress made in recent years in material endeavors, it is disconcerting to have to acknowledge the human mind is basically unchanged from the days of Plato and Aristotle. We all know war is destructive, unnecessary and futile, but none can say why the human race refuses to live in peace; we all know there is no such phenomenon as "something for nothing" but we tolerate and often accept the giveaway nostrums of the demagogue; transportation has moved from the sled to the jet, warfare from the club to nuclear fission, communications from the smoke signal to the airways, but our minds continue to walk on foot.

Our friends on the Bench in Washington have never in all their circumlocutions approached the wisdom of Hammurabi's "Judgments of Righteousness," promulgated four thousand years ago; the preachings of today's ministry are no improvement upon the sermons of John and Paul; the politicians of today show no more originality of thought, no more nor less integrity, than did the demagogues of ancient Rome. Does all this mean that we can go just so far toward the goal of true civilization and no further? Do you suppose it's humanly impossible to solve the problems of peace, racial and religious tranquility and the common cold?

It must intrigue you as it does me that Nations, like humans, have a way of dying; in youth or old age, but dying. Countless hundreds of governments, monarchies, kingdoms, tyrannies, dictatorships and republics have come and gone—none have been nor, in the light of history, is any likely to be everlasting. Do you suppose mankind is not given the capacity to ascertain the cause of the high death rate of Nations and at the same time the ability to devise a government which will avoid those dangers which will avoid those dangers which have proven so destructive?

The scholars tell us that since the dawn of time there have been twenty civilizations on earth, twenty periods of time when populations enjoyed peaceful progress in the arts and letters and science. Nineteen of those twenty civilizations have bloomed and faded and this Twentieth Civilization, roughly dating from the Eighteenth Century, is now on trial.

Those same scholars have reveled in a morass of speculation as to why the human race, having nineteen times striven with a measure of success to attain a civilized state, has faltered and fallen back and why more than a thousand national governments have prospered and, after a short or long period, died on the vine. Is it possible the Architect of the Universe planned it that way?

It does seem true that mankind and human governmental structures have built-in urges for self-destruction. The point was proven over and over again by the Chinese, the Persians, the Egyptians, the Greeks, the Romans and nations of more recent times. The historians tell us there are many reasons for the national suicides; some because of internal dissension, inflation, famines, plagues, and overwhelming outside forces. But, apparently, a vast majority of the governmental fatalities may be attributed to ambitious leaderships motivated by greed and lust for power.

Natural and logical questions for us are whether this government of ours and this Twentieth Civilization must also pass? Can we assume there is any valid reason this Republic will endure indefinitely or, in fact, any longer than have hundreds of other governments? Can we assume there is a valid reason this Twentieth Civilization will last any longer than did its nineteen predecessors? Surely we cannot take it for granted Divine Providence is, for our benefit, making an exception for the United States and for mankind in general. I suspect that about all we can do is use our best efforts and our best judgment to improve upon what we have and hope for a better world.

Perhaps the most notable feature of this Twentieth Civilization has been the frequent substitution of popular governments for the monarchies. The most important of those substitutions is the popular government of the United States. But, you will remember, de Tocqueville told us a hundred years ago that we nurtured our own seeds of destruction. He said a government such as ours, composed of a multitude of men, all equal and alike, each existing for himself, must end in the loss of equality and individual independence.

About the same time Lord Macaulay prophesied that an ambitious leadership would seize the reins of our government and lay waste to our freedoms and liberties; that such lustful ambitions will have been engendered within our own country by our own institutions.

I find it interesting that de Tocqueville foresaw that, above the multitude of men in America, ultimately would stand an all powerful, paternalistic government which would pander to our desires. He said that paternalism would be absolute in its power, regular, provident and mild; that the State would be like a parent who seeks to keep his children in perpetual childhood; that the central government, once having circumscribed man's free agency, would cover society with a network of small complicated rules, minute and uniform. He said the will of man would not be shattered, but it will be softened, bent, and guided; that men will not be forced to act but constantly will be restrained from acting.

De Tocqueville, along with other examples, must have been thinking of the Israelites, some 1100 years before the birth of Christ, and their desire for less work and less civic responsibility and more free food, free circuses, and free pleasures. They were

tired of responsible citizenship and wanted a more paternalistic king. Samuel, later to be known as the Prophet, aware of the frailties of human nature and remembering the fate of other nations, told the Israelites if they swapped their freedom for handouts the paternalistic king would make them slaves. And, of course, being human, the Israelites made the swap and they did become slaves.

And of course de Tocqueville was thinking about the Romans, a thousand years later, the classic example of a free people grown weary of work and the burdens of citizenship who sought the benevolent care of paternalism. The Romans, ignoring wise counsel, evincing the attitude of some of our modern-day teachers and students, told Cicero, the hell with all that patriotism; the flag and civic responsibilities are square, we want the government to keep us in fun and idleness.

Cicero thought the great middle class, the doctors, the lawyers, the bankers, the merchants and the farmers could save the nation but Sulla, practical and ruthless, said, "no, those people would make no sacrifices for freedom."

When Cicero counseled with his supposedly substantial people they confirmed Sulla's judgment. They thought, as we in America think of our future, that Rome was immortal, there was no limit to what the government could spend—they told Cicero, "We do not meddle in politics. Rome is prosperous and at peace. We have our villas in Caprae, our racing vessels, our houses, our servants, our pretty mistresses, and our comfort and treasures. We implore you, Cicero, do not disturb us with your lamentations of disaster. Rome is on the march to the mighty society, for all Romans."

Sir Samuel Dill, the British scholar and historian, said the Roman system of bureaucratic despotism produced a tragedy in which the claims of fanciful omnipotence ended in a humiliating paralysis of administration; that the government's effort to remedy social evils only aggravated them.

A contemporary of de Tocqueville's, John Stuart Mill, said it was his conclusion the tyranny of an unthinking majority is an evil to be feared because it will execute its mandates in things over which government ought not to meddle. He pinpointed a weakness in popular government which has, in recent years, been demonstrated in this country: The inescapable and human selfishness of the individual which predisposes men to array themselves on one side or the other of public questions according to the degree of their personal interests, rather than on principle to which they should adhere.

The point is illustrated by the New Deal of the 1930s under which, by popular demand, the Federal government initiated the program of distributing alms to the poor and subsidizing industry for the rich. The recipients of the dole were happy because they gained governmental favors and the politicians were happy because they gained the votes of the people.

Another example is the great battle for the Negro vote which was started by Mr. Roosevelt and accomplished the enthusiastic political manipulation of a dissatisfied race. When the politicians of the large cities in the North began to plead for the downtrodden blacks of the Southland, ignoring their own back yards, they divided the people within their cities, colliding head-on with the time-honored maxim: "The way to the destruction of the Nation lies in the division of its people."

The sad part of it all is this collision came about, not because of any humanitarian motive but because callous political ambitions preyed upon the credulity of ignorance.

The founding fathers thought they were in the Constitution safeguarding the country against inordinate ambitions by the im-

position of what they called checks and balances. They thought the Congress would curb a grasping White House, the President would veto the efforts of the Congress to centralize powers and, in any event, the Supreme Court could be depended upon to hold both the Congress and the President within the boundaries of the Constitution. But the authors misjudged human nature and, as it happens, the Supreme Court some thirty years ago embarked on its policy of ignoring Constitutional restraint and usurping powers it was never intended to possess.

It must be said many of our people have approved those judicial usurpations. The criminals are happy with their immunity from convictions; the Communists are happy because as teachers and lawyers they can now legally advocate the overthrow of our government by force; the mothers of millions of illegitimate children appreciate the generous contributions by the Congress and are delighted with the pleasure and profit of repeat performances; many students on publicly paid scholarships and many teachers on the public payroll are pleased with the prospect of being rewarded and trained by the Federal government to riot and demonstrate.

Our people have noted the cynical judicial disregard of constitutional restraint and some have remembered Lord Acton's words, that "power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely." It is just as well that we remember, as the historians have pointed out, time after time, that popular government, as it approaches its end, has something to offer to each of us in appeal to our inborn desires. It should have scared the daylight out of every thoughtful citizen when the New Dealers said, in effect, "If the voters wish paternalism they can have it, in fair exchange for individual freedom." We must have known that, once the Federal government started paying individuals not to work, farmers not to grow, the old people to sit and the young people to fiddle, the habit of receiving probably could never be broken.

But notwithstanding all historical precedent, notwithstanding logic to the contrary, I have an abiding faith in the quality of the American people. They have the power, leavened by good common sense and a desire for survival, to recapture the qualities of constitutional government. Let's hope and pray we do not procrastinate.

GOVERNOR PRAISES GARY JOB CORPS CENTER

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, an endorsement of considerable merit has been issued for the Gary Job Corps Center in San Marcos, Tex. The Honorable Preston Smith, Governor of Texas, made an inspection of the facilities recently. And Governor Smith makes pointed observations regarding the success of this, the largest Job Corp center in the Nation.

At this point, I insert an Associated Press story from October 30, 1969:

SMITH LAUDS TRAINING AT JOB CORPS FACILITY

SAN MARCOS.—Gov. Preston Smith took a look Wednesday at the nation's largest Job Corps Training Center and called it "one of the most rewarding experiences of my life."

"I sincerely believe," Smith said, "that it is the responsibility of government to provide each and every citizen with the training to earn a decent living."

The governor's remarks were in a news re-

lease, following his visit to Camp Gary, a federal facility which has grown from an enrollment of 200 in March, 1965, to 3,000.

More than 20,700 trainees have been processed at the center, and Smith said job opportunities far exceed Gary's ability to provide trained workers.

Smith said, "The Gary Job Corps Center's success amply demonstrates what we could be doing and what we must do in the area of vocational-technical education. In the minds of too many people vocational training has a stigma that we must begin removing."

"Less than 20 per cent of the school children of Texas will go on to college, but 80 per cent of the curriculum and a comparable percentage of educational appropriations have in the past, been directed towards educating and preparing that 20 per cent. Although we cannot afford to curtail our support of our college-bound youth, neither can we afford to continue ignoring the 80 per cent who will never make it beyond high school.

"Unemployment is a ridiculous and senseless waste when there are skilled and semi-skilled jobs, crying to be filled. The Gary Center, like our own state programs of vocational-technical training, is attempting to insure that no one who is physically or mentally capable of any kind of work ever again be considered 'unemployable.'"

URGES CONFEREES TO ACT ON MINE HEALTH AND SAFETY BILL

HON. WILLIAM C. WAMPLER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, today the Congress is faced with a sense of urgency in the field of coal mine health and safety.

We all remember the tragedy at Farmington, W. Va. We all remember the grief and the horror of that accident. We all remember the way Americans, both in the coalfields and in areas where coal is not mined or used, witnessed the death and disaster which came to coal miners and their families in a little West Virginia town 1 year ago today.

Recovery operations are now underway at Consol No. 9. Two men have already been recovered. Seventy-six more bodies still lie entombed in the mine. When they will be recovered is uncertain at this time, but the rescue crews continue to carry out the long, laborious, and dangerous task of bringing them to the surface.

Just as the recovery operations remain unfinished, so, too, does the task of the Congress. Health and safety legislation still remains a matter of pressing priority. Both the House and the Senate have enacted separate but strong statutes. Both bills represent decided progress in the mine health and safety fields. Both bills provide regulations for the health hazards endured by miners, especially in dust levels. Both bills provide some form of compensation for the victims of coal workers' pneumoconiosis.

There are differences to be sure. But these differences are neither insurmountable nor irreconcilable. They represent basically a question of semantic differences which honorable men can and must resolve, and resolve quickly.

Delay means injury. Delay means disease. Delay could mean death. The price

of delay is unacceptable to the American people. The price of delay is unacceptable to this Congress.

I know of the dedication and the zeal of the conferees to the cause of coal mine health and safety. I urge them to bring us a bill as soon as possible. Then we as the legislative branch of Government can discharge our solemn duty to the coal miners of this Nation, and to the widows and orphans who have suffered the loss of a loved one because of the inadequacies of coal mine health and safety regulations.

PROBLEM OF A DIVIDED GERMANY

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, the 57th Conference of the Interparliamentary Union was recently held in New Delhi, India. Delegates from 65 countries were in attendance. During general debate the problems of individual nations and the common concerns of mankind were reviewed. There were moments of passion, and undeniable tensions existed. However, strong voices were raised in behalf of international understanding and true freedom. One of the most impressive was that of the chief of the delegation from the Federal Republic of Germany, the Honorable Peter Petersen. In a subdued but clear tone, he addressed the problem of a divided Germany in objective terms. His sincere and conciliatory approach deeply impressed his listeners and I share his eloquence with my colleagues:

PROBLEM OF A DIVIDED GERMANY

(By Peter Petersen, M.P.)

The President of India when he gave us the honour of opening this conference may have given us the key to our problems when he said that Chandiji had had a dream that kindled this nation—a dream of peace and freedom and brotherhood of men. Mahatma Gandhi belongs to all of us, the whole world. What would his life mean for us today in this strife-torn world? I would like to say a word to my Polish colleagues: Your Speaker, the Honorable Mr. Wende, said yesterday that the people of Poland will never forget the sufferings and sacrifices of the war. As a German, I understand that: Hitler and Stalin divided your country. The German army marched in and millions of your people suffered and died. We know that we cannot expect you to forget—I would like to ask you to forgive.

And then in the terrible Winter 1944/1945 millions of Germans were driven from their homes, hundreds of thousands died—my people suffered deeply—most of them, especially the women and children, had committed only one crime—to be born German. Much bitterness was in my country too. And bitterness, unless healed, can cause new hatred and conflict.

The Russian and the Indian delegates complained that the Communist German Parliament has not yet been accepted in these halls. I beg you to understand that we Germans want to live like everybody else. We don't want to live behind a wall and be shot and killed when we want to go from one part of our country to another. We want to read any paper we are interested in reading,

whether the government likes the article or not. Our journalists want to write what they like to without state censorship. We want to be able to travel anywhere in the world without having to ask the government for permission. We Germans—all of us—don't want to belong to the government. Our government should belong to us.

That is why I don't want to sit at a table with delegates of a regime that owns 18 millions of my countrymen.

We Germans know—we learned that from history too—how power corrupts. That is why we want a government dedicated to freedom and peace; a government that gets power only for a limited time, that is controlled while it is in power by a freely elected Parliament and an independent Court of Law.

We don't want to impose this on anybody else—but we Germans—all of us, long for that. If in that way we can determine our own fate and control those in power, we don't mind whether we live in one state or two or five or six. The German problem is not one of organization but of freedom. Lasting peace can only live where there is freedom and justice—that too, Mahatma Gandhi has taught mankind.

Mr. Wende, the Polish delegate, talked about the Oder-Neisse-Line. Let me suggest, Sir, that borders are not the problem or solution. Nowhere in Europe you can draw a line that clearly divides two peoples from one another—because for hundreds of years we have been living together.

Let me give you one example: my grandparents were Danish. As long as I can remember my father had bitter disputes with his Danish cousins about the border line between Denmark and Germany. The Danish people also have suffered greatly in the last war. But my Danish colleagues will bear me out what I say that since Danish children can go to Danish schools in Germany and vice versa—I can go to a German church in Denmark; we trade, we travel, we marry, we can settle here or there; nobody is interested anymore in the border line.

Is that not the way peoples are meant to live together?

The best security of a country lies in the confidence of her neighbors. To win the confidence of our neighbors in the East as we have won it in the West is the most important task of our government, my Parliament and my people.

Let us—my fellow delegates—dedicate our lives to create a world free of hate and fear and greed; a world free of suspicion and of walls between men and nations. India has much to give to the world; all of us would be richer if we would interpret the life of Gandhi for our deeply troubled times.

FORMATION OF STUDENTS FOR AMERICA

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have been very gratified by the mail I have been receiving in the wake of President Nixon's November 3 address to the Nation and the recent moratoriums. I am pleased to report that the great majority of the residents of the 18th District of Texas support the President and disapprove of the "surrender now" moratorium groups.

Most gratifying to me has been the tremendous response from the young people of my district. One of the smaller towns in the 18th District is McLean, Tex., but the students are long on their

interest in our great Nation. I insert at this point in the RECORD a letter from one of their teachers who assisted in the formation of Students for America:

STUDENTS FOR AMERICA,

McLean, Tex., November 12, 1969.

Hon. BOB PRICE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRICE: Attached are 4223 signatures secured throughout the Panhandle area to let you know that we support the stand for a patriotic America as voiced so often by you and our President.

After the October 15 Moratorium, my students and I decided that before the next one could be held we would let you know that the "silent majority" can indeed speak.

So many times in my history classes, our discussions have revolved around Americanism and the seeming twist of events in our country. My students always asked, "But what can we do?" A puzzled look is not an adequate answer when young people fired with idealism are looking for something on which to hold. I did not (and do not) have sufficient knowledge of the best way they could "do something," but we decided on a petition campaign stating our views. They chose STUDENTS FOR AMERICA as their name and contributed enough money to get us started in paper, stamps, envelopes, and posters.

Petitions and letters were sent to 46 schools in 42 towns. Of these, we received 19 back—some indicating a concentrated door-to-door effort.

My students have learned a great deal from this type of action. I am very proud of them and I know it makes you feel the same to know that the young people from your area of representation are deeply interested in your stand in American politics.

We would appreciate it if you would convey to President Nixon the support manifested through these petitions.

May I personally say "thank you" for your contributions to the Panhandle by your service in Washington?

Very truly yours,

Miss BARBARA LAWTON,
Social Studies Department,
McLean High School.

JOSEPH P. KENNEDY

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 18, 1969

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has lost another member of the Kennedy family, the Honorable Joseph P. Kennedy. The former Ambassador to Great Britain passed away at the age of 81, leaving behind him a legacy which all Americans will cherish.

Ambassador Kennedy served his country beyond the call of duty, first through his own service and then through the Kennedy sons whom he encouraged to dedicate all for their Nation. He lived through tragedy after tragedy but never wavered in his devotion to public service.

Many men have given their time and energy to Government service but few have ever dedicated their family to public service in the manner of Joseph Kennedy. I extend my sympathies to the family and join with all Americans in taking comfort in the great record which he left behind.

FAVORABLE RESPONSE TO REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, Vice President Agnew drilled into a sensitive nerve with his speech on television news coverage.

AGNEW hit the bullseye. Response to his remarks by the American people has been overwhelmingly favorable.

It was disappointing that the networks did not take the criticism on face value, and examine their performance in the light of AGNEW's pinpoint examples.

The Congress itself, through the Senate Commerce Committee, documented the networks' slanted coverage of the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago.

And, I believe that if the networks will take a hard, cold look at themselves in the mirror, they will have to admit that their proliberal, anticonservative bias has been on display regularly.

Instead of accepting this criticism, which they so frequently dish out, and seeking ways to improve news objectivity, the networks are distorting AGNEW's remarks and seeking to make the Vice President the issue, rather than their own poor performance.

The Vice President took careful pains in his remarks to voice his opposition to censorship in any form whatsoever, but insisted that the American people have the right to receive their news in a separate package apart from biased and prejudiced editorial comment.

But, the networks and their liberal supporters, have turned on the Vice President and the "censorship" bogeyman, instead of balancing the ultraliberal news diet fed daily to the American people.

Reaction to Vice President's remarks from Indiana has been highly favorable, and the newspaper editorial comment also sustains the Vice President.

I believe the network television executives should carefully read and digest the following editorials from the Marion, Ind., Chronicle, November 15; Frankfort, Ind., Morning Times, November 16; the Indianapolis News, November 17; Wabash, Ind., Plain Dealer, November 17, and the Peru, Ind., Tribune, November 18.

The editorials follow:

[From the Chronicle Tribune, Nov. 15, 1969]

ON TARGET

When Vice President Spiro T. Agnew charged the three major television networks with broadcasting selective and sometimes biased news reports, he was pretty close to the truth. He most certainly was reflecting the opinion of a great many Americans, who long have felt they were not getting the full story in network news telecasts.

Network officials quickly and hotly denied the charge, and accused Agnew of suggesting censorship of their broadcasts, which he didn't. He did suggest that people make their feelings on the matter known to the networks, which they have since done, supporting Agnew by about a three-to-one margin.

While we also feel that television newscasts frequently present only one facet of a specific situation and that the commentators' personal views—generally ultraliberal—are expressed, we also defend the right of the networks to present their newscasts in what ever manner they choose. If Agnew was feeling out the public on censorship of the news, he was completely out of line. The entire nation must be on guard to make certain that this never happens.

Agnew was right when he said that simply the raising of an eyebrow by a commentator can indicate to millions that he doubts the truth of what he is saying, quite possibly when he is quoting someone.

The present national government undoubtedly is keenly aware of the personal bias of commentators, a majority of whom are of a liberal stripe, and therefore critical of the Nixon Administration.

One of the principal errors is that the opinions of the commentators are included in what is purported to be a straight news report. So long as it is made clear that the program is a comment and opinion telecast, there can be no complaint.

There is no doubt that selection of what will be shown in the few minutes available can play a big part in molding public opinion. Thousands of feet of film may be shot on a demonstration or riot. Only a small part can be used. Those few scenes can be made terribly one-sided, and often have been.

Agnew took the networks to task for comments made immediately after President Nixon's Nov. 3 Vietnam speech and pointed to the coverage of the Democrat national convention in Chicago in 1968 as a prize example of slanted and one-sided reporting.

Television viewers were shown lengthy and continuing films of police cracking hippies' heads and herding demonstrators into paddy wagons. Newspapers initially were guilty of stressing these points, although they did eventually discover that the demonstrators were starting the brawls by taunting, disobeying and rushing police. Few scenes of this ever were shown on television.

The networks accused the vice president of using his government position to try to cow them into presenting only news favorable to the administration. Possibly. But on the other hand, Agnew has a right to criticize the networks, just as they and anyone else can criticize the government. And there are plenty of valid criticisms of the government.

A tipoff on what is wrong with network news coverage could be the telephone calls to the stations. Across the country, the calls were heavily in favor of Agnew. But at NBC in New York the network received slightly more calls endorsing the network than praising Agnew.

The major networks have their headquarters in New York. Their national news broadcasts originate there and in Washington. The East Coast population leans heavily to the liberal side, and it is in this area that the newsmen live and work.

The networks should clearly label their telecasts as news reports or opinion programs, and they should present both sides of every question.

This is not the procedure at present, and the networks will have to admit that the vice president was on target with his charges.

[From the Frankfort Morning Times,
Nov. 16, 1969]

AGNEW HASSLE SHOWS, AGAIN, ADVANTAGE OF PRINTED WORD

The hassle involving Vice-president Spiro T. Agnew and the television networks shows, again, a basic advantage of the printed word.

Agnew fired a well-expressed blast of criticism at the commentators who followed Nixon's Nov. 3 speech on Vietnam.

"When the President completed his address—an address that he spent weeks in

preparing," Agnew said, "his words and policies were subjected to instant analysis and querulous criticism."

"The audience of 70 million Americans—gathered to hear the President of the United States—was inherited by a small band of network commentators and self-appointed analysts, the majority of whom expressed, in one way or another, their hostility to what he had to say.

"It was obvious that their minds were made up in advance."

The remarks by the commentators were just that—comments, and some of the comments clearly showed the personal bias of the speakers.

They were not labeled as "editorial comment," however, and many of the listeners did not know they were personal opinions. The listeners are accustomed to hearing factual news reports from these same men and many of them may have accepted the opinionated comments as objective facts.

In a newspaper or magazine, editorial opinion appears on the editorial pages. Readers know the editorials are the opinions of the newspaper or the by-lined writers.

Agnew obviously has made a telling point. Opinion polls show that about 70 per cent of all Americans approved Nixon's speech and his policies on Vietnam.

Why should a mere handful of men, with spur-of-the-moment remarks, and with no time for perceptive analysis, be allowed to tear the President apart without telling their listeners they are, generally speaking, expressing merely their own opinions?

[From the Indianapolis News, Nov. 17, 1969]

AGNEW ON TV

Vice-President Spiro Agnew called down the furies on himself last week with his criticism of news coverage on network TV, but in our opinion he was right as rain.

The political one-sidedness of network television, blanketing the whole nation and with no available options, has been glaringly apparent for years. It has cropped up not only in many phases of news-casting but in talk shows and even some entertainment programming.

Cries of "censorship" by the TV chieftains won't wash, although we can no doubt look forward to a lot of them in the days ahead. The facts of the case are that a kind of "censorship" already exists in the national TV field, as liberal opinion is purveyed to the nation nightly as "news" or "news analysis" or supposedly interesting conversation and other forms of opinion are studiously ignored.

Indeed, in a recent interview with Edith Efron of TV Guide, some network spokesmen admitted more or less what Agnew was saying: That the overwhelming majority of TV-casters and reporters are liberal in outlook, and that this fact shows up in their presentations of issues and events. Various leftist spokesmen and demonstrators can command TV coverage seemingly at will; conservative opinion, with rare exceptions, is not presented.

Cases in point are easily cited: Network coverage of the 1964 Republican and 1968 Democratic conventions; the continual brow-beating of Sen. Goldwater in the '64 campaign; news "specials" on controversial issues like the Newburgh, N.Y., welfare program; the talk-shows whose idea of rewarding discussion is three liberals in a row, with no countervailing opinion offered.

Most of all, as Agnew noted, the networks have built up and glorified militants and demonstrators into an importance they cannot legitimately command on their own account. Such people become major figures simply because they are continually presented to the public and their opinions perpetually solicited. Relatively conservative views, if they appear at all, appear as odd-ball exceptions to the rule.

Agnew did not, as his TV critics allege, call for governmental action against the networks. What he did do—and what they don't like—was to expose their long-playing malperformance in a fashion that could not be ignored. In so doing, he has performed an important service to the public. Perhaps his critique of one-sided TV coverage will cause those responsible for it to mend their ways a bit.

[From the Wabash (Ind.) Plain Dealer, Nov. 17, 1969]

RESPONSIBLE NEWS PRESENTATION

Spiro Agnew had every right to express his complaint against television networks. Incidentally, he expresses himself very well.

American democracy has—and has had for almost 200 years—effective machinery for dissent. It is the world's most responsive government to the opinion of its electorate. The machinery has maintained itself admirably; still responds with alacrity when there is bona fide stimuli.

The President said he would pay little heed to moratorium participants back before the Oct. 15 demonstration.

It's a cinch he didn't ignore it. The men in charge of television networks did not ignore Mr. Agnew's remarks.

They responded quickly and properly, stating their positions.

Television is focusing on the nation's shortcomings. The public is learning more about these shortcomings and is responding. The nation is benefiting.

The ultimate decision rests with the people. This decision should rest with the people. This is freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

Mr. Agnew cited the commentary after President Nixon's talk on Vietnam.

Some people want this. These commentators are experienced and seasoned Washington observers. They are not interested in a party's welfare. They have steady highly-paid positions whether the Republicans or Democrats are in power. They are knowledgeable about national and international problems.

Many people watch professional sports—because the men are proficient. The commentators are welcomed—because they are proficient.

However, for those who don't want to listen it's simple—just leave the room or turn off the set. There are other stations available for entertainment. The choice (censorship) lies in the hands of each viewer.

There is hardly a better solution than this. It's true that television can raise someone quickly from obscurity—like Mr. Agnew. But this is an important contribution to public information.

There is no narrow distorted view emerging from television. There are three networks in addition to other stations without network affiliations. If censorship existed the public would soon tire of it and turn elsewhere.

Good people are thinking and debating the Vietnam situation more seriously because of remarks made by Mr. Agnew.

It was impossible to sweep the Chicago situation under the rug last year by Mayor Daley and the Chicago Tribune because too many people saw on television what happened. The big thing going for television: you see it yourself.

Any suggestion of censorship would be reverting to the Russian system: suppression of freedom.

Mr. Agnew didn't propose any answers "Let them find their own," he said, alluding to the television networks.

No matter how good you are doing you can always do better.

Mr. Agnew, no doubt, challenged the networks to do better. They probably will do better, just as Mr. Agnew is doing himself.

Mr. Agnew has decided to be a principal spokesman for the administration. So he has

become the target of criticism. Now he is trying to do better. At the same time he is stirring up Americans against Americans and he is getting criticism for this.

Dr. Frank Stanton, CBS president said, "Networks shouldn't be immune to public criticism."

Neither should Mr. Agnew.

Networks trying to put across a single point of view might be more palatable to critics. The public should reject any network that would be required to be subservient to any one point of view or any group in authority.

[From the Peru (Ind.) Tribune, Nov. 18, 1969]

LET'S TALK POLITICS: WHAT DID AGNEW SAY?
(By Al Spiers)

When Spiro Agnew upbraided television's news managers, the knee-jerk reaction of at least two major networks was round-aboutly revealing. Their lame, irrelevant response indirectly confirmed the Vice President's charge.

The NBC and CBS answers were a subtle variation of an old trick of politics. Nailed to a cross of truth and bereft of adequate reply, canny old pols didn't cringe or confess. Instead, they built phoney bogeymen by putting words in the foe's mouth, then belabored these straw men with distracting vigor.

Essentially that's how Presidents Frank Stanton (CBS) and Julian Goodman (NBC) replied to Agnew's blast. Consider:

Stanton—"We do not believe that this unprecedented attempt . . . to intimidate a news medium which depends for existence upon government licenses represents legitimate criticism . . . there are bound to be some deficiencies (but) they are minor compared to those of a press which would be subservient to the executive power of government."

Goodman—"Mr. Agnew uses the influence of his high office to criticize the way a government-licensed news medium covers the activities of government itself . . . Evidently he would prefer a different kind of television reporting—one that would be subservient to whatever political group was in authority. It is regrettable that the Vice President would deny to television freedom of the press."

(ABC's President, Leonard Goldenson's comment balled to bland faith "in the ultimate judgment of the American people.")

There are intriguing similarities in these replies of ostensible competitors, but forget that! Don't be picky. Stick to gut issues and pertinent core questions, such as these:

Did Agnew really try to intimidate TV's newsmen? Did he threaten—or even remotely suggest—using government's licensing powers to subvert, cow, harness, censor or discipline the electronic press? Would he really "deny to television freedom of the press"?

Did the Vice President say (or imply) that great presidential problems, or the national welfare, or even the people's wishes may at times transcend press freedom?

In short, did he propose what TV's moguls rebutted?

In one word—no! Read the entire text of Agnew's speech at Des Moines. Then search it for veiled between-lines threats or implications. Nowhere can be found what Stanton and Goodman counterattacked.

In fact, incredible as it may seem, Agnew took careful pains to make it very clear that the power of government must not be used to remedy TV's news ills—or any other media's. Here's exactly what he said:

"Tonight I have raised questions. I have made no attempt to suggest answers. These answers must come from the media men. They are challenged to turn their critical powers on themselves. They are challenged to direct their energy, talent and conviction toward improving the quality and objectivity

of news presentation. They are challenged to structure their own civic ethics to relate their great freedom with their great responsibility.

"And the people of America are challenged too—challenged to press for responsible news presentations. The people can let the networks know that they want their news straight and objective. The people can register their complaints on bias through mail to the networks and phone calls to local stations.

"This is one case where the people must defend themselves—where the citizen, not the Government, must be the reformer, where the consumer can be the most effective crusader."

An intelligent viewer needs only clear eyes and good ears to judge the merit of Agnew's charge that TV's newscasts cry for disciplining by a badly served public.

And, praise be, we appear to have far more such can't-be-fooled viewers than network moguls evidently expected, considering their lame, diversionary response. Polls and surveys have favored Agnew over networks by a landslide.

That's all to the good—and also the best hope for cure. As the Vice President so clearly stated, this is a problem that must be solved by the people, not their government.

Moreover, it is a problem too perilous to neglect much longer. Agnew said it well in conclusion:

"We would never trust such power over public opinion in the hands of an elected government. It is time we questioned it in the hands of a small but unelected elite.

"The great networks have dominated America's airwaves for decades. The people are entitled to a full accounting of their stewardship."

LYNDON B. JOHNSON NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

HON. RICHARD C. WHITE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 17, 1969

Mr. WHITE, Mr. Speaker, Lyndon B. Johnson grew from the soil of Texas. His parents and grandparents helped to tame the land and conserve its soil and its waters. The story of how one man grew from this land, and rose to the highest position of leadership our Nation can bestow, is a part of the American dream; and it is of the highest importance that we should preserve the physical evidence of that dream for the inspiration of future generations.

To this House of Representatives has come the opportunity of designating the humble home where Lyndon B. Johnson was born, and another home where he grew toward distinguished manhood, as a national historic site. We can say to future generations that, here in the Texas hill country, dreams grow large and sturdy—that this land developed a giant among men.

Under the direction of the National Park Service, the story will be well told. Generations to come will learn of the boyhood influences that built courage, and determination, and the ability to conquer obstacles into the character of this man. They will learn how a love of his fellowmen and a desire to serve them became a part of his way of life.

They will learn anew the essence of the American dream: that greatness

among men can grow from small beginnings such as this, just as mighty oaks grow from the tiny acorns along the banks of the Federales. One of the greatest legislative leaders ever to grace these halls of Congress—a President who led this Nation through some of its most perilous and progressive years—was born, and tutored by loving parents, in the birthplace and the boyhood home we are to preserve by this legislation.

Mount Vernon and Monticello tell the story of Virginia leadership and statesmanship. A different story is told in the humble cabin that was the birthplace of Abraham Lincoln. And, still another will be told by these homes where Lyndon B. Johnson's character was shaped toward a destiny that served this Nation and all mankind in the building of a better world.

Thank you.

THE STALLED OIL IMPORT STUDY

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. KYROS, Mr. Speaker, New Englanders have been patiently waiting for 9 long months for the Presidential Task Force's report on the oil import quota program.

We are hopeful that this report will clear the way for a foreign trade zone at Machiasport, Maine, which would allow construction of an oil refinery that would bring cheaper fuel oil to us.

President Nixon assured us that the task force decision would be reached "before the snow flies in New England." That deadline has passed, and New England's patience is wearing thin.

Our feelings are clearly spelled out in an editorial which appeared in the Boston Globe on November 17. I include this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

THE STALLED OIL STUDY

A presidential task force appointed to study the U.S. oil import quota system has been working for nearly nine months, and still it has not reported its finding to the administration. The word now is that the President will not receive the report until shortly before Christmas.

The report has important implications to the entire nation, but particularly to the New England area, which pays the highest fuel rates of any section of the country.

Hinging on the recommendations of the task force is a proposed free trade zone for Machiasport, Me., which would allow the construction of a \$145 million refinery and result in cheaper oil for New England.

U.S. Sen. Thomas McIntyre (D-N.H.), writing in the Globe Sunday magazine, noted that President Nixon had assured five of his Republican colleagues from New England that under the law Maine was entitled to the necessary free trade zone, and that a decision would be reached by the task force "before the snow flies in New England."

There are indications that the task force will suggest major changes in the oil quota program. In fact, an editorial in a recent issue of a petroleum trade journal told its readers that "all signs in Washington indicate that import controls on foreign crude are in deep trouble."

The 10-year-old oil quota system has benefited only the domestic oil industry, which already is overprotected by the 27.5 percent depletion allowances and additional financial advantages not enjoyed by other businesses.

President Nixon should urge the task force to submit its report as soon as possible, and end at least one aspect of the oil industry's unfair competitive position, a force so powerful that Sen. McIntyre describes it as "The Secret Government of Oil."

AGGRESSION AND DECEIT STILL COMMUNIST POLICY

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, on October 24, the Honorable R. Hunt Parker, chief justice of the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, addressed the North Carolina State Bar. His address, a copy of which has been sent to me by Mr. Edward J. Brickhouse of Norfolk, Va., is so striking in its exposure of our Communist enemies that I believe my colleagues in the House should have the benefit of it. Mr. Speaker, I take pride in inserting Justice Parker's speech in the RECORD. I regret to say that Justice Parker passed away within a few weeks of making this address. It seems appropriate that the address by Hon. R. Hunt Parker and an editorial from the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PART-VIRGINIAN

Chief Justice R. Hunt Parker of the North Carolina Supreme Court, who died last week at 77, was a Tidewater neighbor and part-Virginian. He was born in Enfield and began a law practice in Roanoke Rapids. His law degree was from the University of Virginia.

In North Carolina, Supreme Court justices come out of the political thicket. Chief Justice Parker was no exception. He reached the high bench by defeating at the polls a gubernatorial appointee. Once in their robes, however, North Carolina justices usually fade into the cloister. There Chief Justice Parker was an exception. He frequently was a public speaker, and his pronouncements on subjects like morality, race, and strong drink were sternly uncompromising. His own manner and standards supported such pronouncements; he was a man of much dignity, learning, and valor.

Chief Justice Parker's successor oddly enough, once was defeated by him in an election. He is William H. Bobbitt of Charlotte, who was appointed an associate justice in 1954 and now is the court's senior member. His mild and folksy look belies a tough and able mind.

Who will fill the vacancy on the court is a topic of much political speculation in North Carolina. Whoever he—or she; North Carolina has a woman justice—may be, the appointee will have to run to hold the seat in the next general election. North Carolina insists on keeping its judges subject to the people's will.

ADDRESS BY HON. R. HUNT PARKER TO THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE BAR, INC., AT THE ANNUAL MEETING IN THE BALLROOM OF THE SIR WALTER HOTEL, OCTOBER 24, 1969

My brethren of the Bench and Bar: Many of our college professors and instructors, many paid professional agitators, many of our newspaper editors and correspondents,

and many of the liberalized press shout from the house tops that they are Communists. They believe the Communists are another political party. They ignore the fact that Communist Russia is a mortal enemy of the United States pledged to world conquest or dominion and pledged to the destruction of the United States of America and its form of government. Many of these self-proclaimed Communists in the event of a Communist take-over, in my opinion, will face firing squads.

Action—naked aggressive action—replaced talk on August 20, when troops from five Warsaw Treaty countries, headed by the Soviet Union, invaded Czechoslovakia. The process of democratization which the Soviet leaders had accepted with understanding—or so Dubcek thought—came to a screeching halt. Among other things, Dubcek was ousted as First Secretary in April, and very recently he was kicked out of the Presidium. The Soviet masters, calling the tune for the Czech Communists in the week-end purge, did let him remain as a member of the Party's Central Committee. Within the last few days Dubcek has been removed from the Party's Central Committee. Knowing Dubcek's popularity with the Czech people, the Reds may have tried to avoid going so far as to arouse the Czechs to retaliatory action. Once again the face of Communism is exposed to the world, and it is monstrously ugly.

Dubcek's heretical views included the intolerable concept that people should be permitted to vote as they wish. "Let the struggle of ideas commence," he said—an astounding doctrine in the Communist camp where the free expression of ideas is abhorrent. They were incendiary words to the men in the Kremlin. They summoned Dubcek and other Czech leaders to the Soviet Union for conferences in early May last.

Last month, shortly before the purge—of Dubcek and his allies—Czechoslovakia "temporarily" closed the country's borders. Several days ago the restriction on travel became permanent, for all practical purposes.

Even under the regime of Antonin Novotny, the Communists of Czechoslovakia had been relatively free to travel abroad, but in the months since Soviet tanks and troops invaded the country to halt Dubcek's experiment with liberalized Communism, some 50,000 Czechs have fled their native land for freedom in the West. Very recently the regime announced that henceforth, with few exceptions, the people of Czechoslovakia will not be permitted to leave the country for any purpose. Prague officials explained that the ban on private travel was essential because of "the danger to stabilization of the economy." That was the same excuse made by the East Germans eight years ago when they built the ugly Berlin Wall. Before the erection of that ugly Wall—which is actually 27 miles long, 300 feet wide, with death traps of bricks, barbed wire, watch towers, searchlights, police dogs, and men armed with machine guns—the East Germans had left Germany by the tens of thousands. Before the Wall was built, in fact, the East German "Utopia" was one of the few countries on the face of the earth where the population steadily declined. In the past eight years the exodus has slowed to a trickle, though some manage to escape at great risk, but many have failed and met death.

The East Germans have generously permitted more than 11,000 transferees to leave the country—but almost all of them are the very old or the very sick who are of no further use in the sweatshops of the worker's paradise, and now represent a burden, rather than an asset, in the stabilization of the economy.

However ugly and obscene the eight-year-old Wall around Berlin and the new ring around Czechoslovakia, they are in one sense, at least, very useful. For nothing else so starkly reveals the cruelty, the inhumanity

of Communism, and nothing else so dramatically demolishes the myth that the Soviets and their puppets are mellowing. Prison is a prison.

I wonder if patriotism among many of our people is dying or dead in this country. So far as I am concerned, I agree with the immortal words of Stephen Decatur, a hero of the War of 1812: "Our country! In her intercourse with foreign nations, may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong."

By a decision of the majority of the members of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Escobedo and Miranda decisions, they have made it almost impossible for the States to enforce their own laws to preserve peace and order. In their zealous endeavor to protect the rights of criminals, they have rendered overbalanced decisions in their favor against the rights of the vast number of law-abiding Americans. In recent times we have seen ugly rioting in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Newark, and Washington City. I have been told by one of the leading biographers now living in the State that the only five-star General alive, who lives with his wife in a fashionable apartment in a high-priced section of Washington City, told him that he and his wife dared not walk around their apartment building at night for fear of being robbed, mugged, or murdered.

We have seen ugly demonstrations on college and university campuses throughout the Nation where a minority of bearded beatniks and hippies and women dressed in pants are seeking to take over and run the colleges and universities according to their whims, or to break up the colleges and universities, when the vast majority of students are zealous to maintain order on the campuses and acquire an education. Such conditions are intolerable. We have seen college administrators, professors, and teachers supinely give in to their demands instead of throwing them off the college and university campuses. Cannot these same people recognize that if they cannot preserve peace and order in our colleges and universities and afford our children who want an education to get it, the people of this Nation will quit voting for the support of our colleges and universities, and they will wither on the vine?

In the face of the rioting in the big cities of this country where bearded beatniks and hippies are fighting the police and calling them "pigs," and in the face of all the rioting that is going on, I seriously doubt if our big cities—sodden with poverty, crime, Communism, and lack of patriotism—can survive. Make no mistake about it, these people are dedicated to overthrowing our republican form of government in the name of Communism. I believe Russian Communists are behind it all. They have proclaimed from the house tops for nearly half a century that they will destroy the United States by revolt and rebellion within, by arraying race against race, class against class, and religion against religion.

The Supreme Court of the United States has made it almost impossible to enforce the State laws against obscenity and the publication and distribution of obscene and filthy matter in the press. We have seen the day of girls dancing bare-breasted, and now we are seeing the day of bottomless dancing and nude dancing in theaters and night clubs throughout the Nation. No decent man is willing to marry such "go-go" girls, to let them bear his name and to be the mother of his children. The press does not seem to be exercised over this filth and obscenity with which the Nation is being deluged, because they think to stop it will be an abridgment of freedom of the press which is guaranteed by the United States Constitution and the North Carolina Constitution. God save us from such a deluge of filth and obscenity.

I am reminded of the following lines written by Alfred, Lord Tennyson in Locksley Hall Sixty Years After:

"Bring the old dark ages back without the faith, without the hope,
Break the State, the Church, the Throne,
and roll their ruins down the slope.

"Authors—essayist, atheist, novelist, realist, rhymester, play your part,
Paint the mortal shame of nature with the living hues of Art.

"Rip your brothers' vices open, strip your own foul passions bare;
Down with Reticence, down with Reverence—forward—naked—let them stare.

"Feed the budding rose of boyhood with the drainage of your sewer;
Send the drain into the fountain, lest the stream should issue pure.

"Set the maiden fancies wallowing in the troughs of Zolaism—
Forward, forward, ay, and backward, downward*too into the abyss.

"Do your best to charm the worst, to lower the rising race of men;
Have we risen from out the beast, then back into the beast again?

* * * * *

"Is it well that while we range with Science, glorying in the Time,
City children soak and blacken soul and sense in city slime?"

I do not at all subscribe to that gloomy view of Alfred, Lord Tennyson. I believe in his statement later on in the same poem:

"Follow you the Star that lights a desert pathway, yours or mine.
Forward, till you see the Highest Human Nature is divine.

"Follow Light, and do the Right—for man can half-control his doom—
Till you find the deathless Angel seated in the vacant tomb."

We hear people expressing the view that they espouse the cause of democracy. The founding fathers were learned and distinguished men, most of whom had held or were holding high public office in their respective states with vast experience in administering public affairs; they were good Christians who believed in the existence of the Deity, but who were also characterized with a large measure of religious toleration, and some of them were desirous of establishing a monarchy. When the learned and illustrious Dr. Benjamin Franklin, chairman of the Pennsylvania delegation, who was eighty-one years old, was leaving the Convention Hall in Philadelphia after the Constitution had been written, a lady asked him, "Dr. Franklin, have you given us a republic or a monarchy?" He replied, "Madam, we have given you a republic, if you can keep it." The Supreme Court of the United States by its decisions has sought to establish a democratic form of government in this country. Its decision of one man-one vote goes down into even town and village elections. No one will claim that they are equal in stature to the founding fathers, who have been proclaimed for nearly two centuries as the most distinguished legislative assembly that ever gathered in this country.

If you think I have been too severe on the Supreme Court of the United States, I quote from the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Harlan in the case of Utah Public Service Commission v. El Paso Natural Gas Company, decided 16 June 1969. Mr. Justice White and Mr. Justice Marshall took no part in that decision. Justice Harlan wrote: "All semblance of judicial procedure has been dis-

carded in the headstrong effort to reach a result that four members of this Court believe desirable. In violation of the Court's rules, the majority asserts the power to dispose of this case according to its own notions, despite the fact that all the parties participating in the lower court proceedings are satisfied that the District Court's decree is in the public interest. . . . I cannot possibly subscribe to such an abuse of the judicial process."

Sir Walter Scott was perhaps our greatest novelist and, in addition, a man who could talk to everybody, poor and rich, as if he were a blood brother, and was perhaps the best beloved figure in British literature. As he lay dying within the sound of the murmur of the Tweed River, he said to his son-in-law, who was kneeling by his side, "Be a good man, Lockhart, for nothing else can bring you any consolation at such a time as mine."

We have seen the Supreme Court of the United States drive out of the public schools of this Nation everybody who wanted to pray to the Supreme Being though anyone who disagreed was at perfect liberty to walk out or not participate, and even though there was no taint of a religious denomination in such a prayer, thus misjudging entirely, in my opinion, the constitutional provision that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." In my opinion, that provision was written into the Constitution to prevent the establishment of Presbyterianism which at that time was dominant in Scotland, and to prevent the Establishment of Episcopalianism which in England was established by law and supported by taxation. In England at that time there were savage laws against Roman Catholics, although it is said that a majority of the people in England were Roman Catholics, including the wealthy Duke of Norfolk, the premier Duke of England, who, because of his religion, could not sit in the House of Lords. The provision was also intended to prevent the establishment of Congregationalists and Presbyterians, who were dominant in New England; Episcopallians, who were dominant in the South; backsliding Quakers and Roman Catholics, who were dominant in the Middle Atlantic States. In the days when there were legal giants upon the Supreme Court of the United States, they have said in opinion after opinion that this is a Christian country. When they took their offices, every member of the Federal Supreme Court who outlawed a prayer to the Deity in the public schools of this Nation by their fiat, every member of the Federal judiciary, and the President of the United States swore to and subscribed oaths that they would support the Constitution of the United States and faithfully perform the duties of their offices so help them, God, thus recognizing the existence of the Deity. I cannot see how an innocuous prayer to God, perfectly nonsectarian in character, in the public schools of the Nation, is any violation of the Constitutional provision that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." I wonder how the gentlemen on the Supreme Court of the United States, when they lie on their death beds, will feel about driving God out of the public schools.

Recently, some freethinkers have shouted from the house tops the strange doctrine that "God is dead." I do not believe such arrant nonsense. When one stands on the shores of the ocean and sees the waves roll in as at creation's dawn, and stands and sees the majestic grandeur of our mountains, I do not see how one cannot believe that the Supreme Being is alive and still rules the destinies of men and of nations.

GOVERNMENT OF RHODESIA

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 18, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I join a number of my colleagues this week in requesting the administration to revoke the economic sanctions being applied against the government of Rhodesia. The time has come for the United States to recognize the government of Mr. Ian Smith and abandon these self-defeating sanctions.

Since November 11, 1965, the Smith government has maintained continuous and effective control over its territory and population. In fact, the country has achieved stable economic progress and there is no longer any doubt that the sanctions have utterly failed. Yet, the United States is almost alone in its stubborn enforcement of the United Nations' sanctions resolution. And to what advantage, Mr. Speaker? The RECORD clearly indicates that the United States is seriously endangering its own national security as well as aiding in the destruction of several American industries by continuous enforcement of the sanctions.

Testimony recently given before the Subcommittee on Africa of the House Foreign Affairs Committee by government and industry officials indicates that the United States has become almost solely dependent on the Soviet Union for its supply of high-grade metallurgical chromite ore. This high-grade ore, which is necessary to production of vital military and industrial materials, can only be obtained in sufficient quantity from Rhodesian and Russian sources. We have opted to rely on the Soviet Union even though the price charged for its chromite is at least 50 percent higher than that at which Rhodesian ore can be purchased. Testimony from industry officials also reveals that in addition to having to pay these extortionate prices, the Soviet Union now requires that for each ton of high-grade ore supplied, a purchaser must accept a ton of worthless low-grade ore. To continue allowing ourselves to be blackmailed and abused by our enemy when we have other options available is ridiculous.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, we have no other choice but to begin buying Rhodesian chromite again. Recent testimony by the Office of Emergency Preparedness revealed that in order to meet current needs and maintain the necessary stockpile we must buy Rhodesian ore. Otherwise, we face a certain and dangerous shortage of this strategic material.

I am submitting for publication, following my remarks, testimony given before the Subcommittee on Africa by the Office of Emergency Preparedness. In addition, I am also submitting for publication a column written by Willard Edwards which appeared in the November 8, 1969, issue of the Chicago Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the United States to reevaluate its policy toward Rhodesia. I urge the adminis-

tration to give this matter immediate attention in view of the critical shortage of chromite ore and its potential effect on the defense of our Nation.

The testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF FRED J. RUSSELL, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, OCTOBER 31, 1969

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: The Office of Emergency Preparedness is charged with the primary responsibility of determining which items are to be included in the stockpile of materials which are critical to national security and for determining the stockpile inventory objectives and levels of such items. Other qualified Federal agencies assist us in these determinations.

Present stockpile items, of which there is production in Rhodesia are: Chrysotile asbestos, and chromium ore.

The chrysotile asbestos is in substantial supply and is available to us from a number of countries. No near future shortage threatens.

The situation on chromium ore is a different matter. The stockpile inventory condition of ore and ferrochrome is set forth in detail on the attached exhibit A. Referring to this exhibit A, I call your attention to the subspecification or impractical location ore in the amount of 1,095,564 SDT which is excess but which is virtually useless. Although it has been authorized for disposal, there are no takers. You will see

that we have a stockpile deficit of 708,664 tons of chromium ore. By this same exhibit A, you will notice that there are surpluses of the various ferrochromes. The figures here shown for these ferrochromes are the chromium ore content thereof. Whereas these ferrochromes presently are usable, they do not in all instances conform in alloy to exactly what the steelmaking industry presently uses, and it is conceivable that a future year will find these ferrochromes not suitable for use by steelmakers under the practices that they then will be employing.

At the bottom of this exhibit A, you will see a note which points out that, were we to combine all of usable ore and the ferrochromes (except ferro, silicon), we would have a net stockpile excess of 590,205 short tons, none of which has been authorized by Congress for disposal.

The attached exhibit B shows the sales of chromium ore from the stockpile and the quantities of these sales which have been shipped thus far. You will notice that 982,450 short tons have been sold and that 425,659 short tons of the material sold has not yet been delivered from the stockpile.

A part of the problem on chromium ore is revealed by the accompanying exhibit C. It shows that each year's consumption, both past and future, exceeds the total amount of chromium ore which has been imported into the U.S. It is substantially below the consumption rate, and it shows that shipments from stockpile have served as the means by which each year's ore deficit has been met. Since the stockpile excess is limited and one which might further be reduced by the need to increase the stockpile

objective in order to accommodate the future increased consumption level, further sales from the stockpile would only serve the need for the relatively short time it would take to exhaust the stockpile excess.

By referring to exhibit C, you will notice that shipments of chromium ore from Rhodesia were reduced in 1967 and were terminated thereafter. This was the direct result of the sanctions against Rhodesia. You will also notice that shipments from the Soviet Union have increased from 27% of United States' supply in 1965 to 45% in 1969, placing us in heavy dependency upon the Soviet Union. If the U.S.S.R. were to decide to discontinue sales of chromium ore to the United States for one year, we would use up the entire uncommitted stockpile excess in that year, if Congress would authorize it.

It is our understanding that there are no prospects of significant increase in output of ore from Turkey, South Africa, or any other country which presently exports chromium ore to the United States and that all of their mines gradually are becoming exhausted.

We have no reason to believe that the Soviet Union would increase its future chromium ore shipments to the U.S.

Assuming that the U.S.S.R. would continue to ship chromium ore to the United States at the present level indefinitely, realizing that the other known amounts of chrome ore elsewhere in the world gradually are becoming exhausted, and knowing that U.S. needs are increasing each year, there is no way to see the chromium ore needs of the United States being met without chromium ore from Rhodesia.

EXHIBIT A.—METALLURGICAL CHROMITE INVENTORY

Form	Inventory unit	Stockpile inventory	Stockpile objective	Stockpile excess	Stockpile deficit	Authorize to dispose	Form	Inventory unit	Stockpile inventory	Stockpile objective	Stockpile excess	Stockpile deficit	Authorize to dispose
Ore:							Ferro, low carbon:						
Specification.....	SDT.....	2,408,746	3,117,400	0	708,664	0	Specification.....	ST-E.....	746,427	135,000	611,427	0	0
Subspecification or, impractical location.....	SDT.....	1,095,564	0	1,095,564	0	987,132	Subspecification.....	ST-E.....	50,810	0	50,810	0	0
Ferro, high carbon:							Ferro, silicon:						
Specification.....	ST-E.....	1,004,942	317,500	687,442	0	0	Specification.....	ST-E.....	83,413	58,500	24,912	0	0
Subspecification.....	ST-E.....	1,760	0	1,760	0	0	Subspecification.....	ST-E.....	4,121	0	4,121	0	0
							Chrome metal, elec-trolytic: specification.	ST-E.....	12,565	21,560	0	8,995	0

¹ Specialty item, not feasible to consider its comparable chrome ore content as a substitute for the chrome ore objective.

Code:
SDT—Short dry tons.
ST-E—Short tons of ore equivalent.

NOTE: If chrome ore and ferrochromes (chrome ore equivalent) were added together and compared with the combined ore-ferrochrome stockpile objectives, the ore equivalent net stockpile specification quality excess would be 590,205 short tons.

EXHIBIT B.—SALES OF CHROME, METALLURGICAL GRADE

[In short tons]

Contract No.	Contracting company	Contract date	Removal period			Quantity shipped				Balance
			Sold	Number of years	Final date	Prior to 1967	Calendar year 1967	Calendar year 1968	Calendar year 1969	
29330	Vanadium Corp. of America.....	Sept. 7, 1966	33,308	2 years	June 28, 1968	10,604	13,640	7,457		()
72003	Interlake Steel Corp.....	July 25, 1966	22,040		May 31, 1967	9,774	10,536			()
72008	Ohio Ferro-Alloys.....	July 27, 1966	6,272		Oct. 27, 1966	6,219				()
72053	Union Carbide—Canada.....	Oct. 11, 1966	2,800	2 months	Dec. 10, 1966	2,792				()
7,270	Phio Ferro-Alloys.....	Feb. 17, 1967	8,400	3 months	May 31, 1967		8,442			()
70053	do.....	Dec. 5, 1966	11,128	10 months	Oct. 31, 1967		3,449	4,414		()
70052	Philipp Brothers.....	Apr. 14, 1967	24,450	2 years	Apr. 19, 1969		4,433	1,936	17,267	()
70054	Corhart Refractories.....	May 11, 1967	7,455	do	May 11, 1969				7,386	()
70067	Union Carbide Corp.....	Apr. 7, 1967	3	At once	Apr. 12, 1967		3			()
70078	do.....	May 11, 1967	30,852	1 year	May 11, 1968			30,576		()
70079	do.....	June 20, 1967	44,337	4 months	Oct. 2, 1967		7,014	22,876	13,376	()
70079	Metallurg, Inc.....	July 10, 1967	2,522	18 months	Dec. 10, 1968		2,079			450
70027	Pittsburgh Met. Co.....	Mar. 3, 1967	118,421	3 to 4 years	Mar. 3, 1971		12,968	13,987	19,509	69,571
70041	do.....	June 2, 1967	222,327	6 years	June 2, 1973			16,293	26,098	178,537
70048	Vanadium Corp. of America.....	May 1, 1967	46,669	3 years	May 1, 1970		8,613	12,972	16,819	8,417
70055	Interlake Steel Corp.....	May 1, 1967	76,349	4 years	May 1, 1971			15,879	13,656	46,710
70055	do.....	July 10, 1967	1,352	do	July 10, 1971			6,973		1,352
70060	Vanadium Corp. of America.....	June 2, 1967	7,297	3 years	June 2, 1970			1,211	1,410	7,687
83082	Foote Mineral Co.....	Apr. 29, 1968	10,336	2 years	Apr. 29, 1970					()
83106	do.....	Jul. 2, 1968	2,547	do	Jul. 2, 1970				3,314	()
92103	Airco Alloys.....	Jan. 1969	43,793	5 years	Jan. 1974				7,478	36,315
92104	Foote Mineral Co.....	Jan. 15, 1969	44,419	3 years	Jan. 15, 1972				12,273	32,146
92105	Union Carbide Corp.....	Jan. 13, 1969	53,775	do	Jan. 13, 1972				29,254	24,520
92137	do.....	Mar. 5, 1969	20,746	1 year	June 30, 1969				12,817	7,928
01051	Foote Mineral Co.....	Sept. 18, 1969	2,297	do	Sept. 18, 1970					2,297
01055	do.....	Sept. 25, 1969	9,729	3 years	Sept. 25, 1972					9,729
	Subtotal.....		853,624							
	Sales prior to fiscal year 1967.....		128,826			128,826				
	Total.....		982,450			158,215	71,177	134,574	218,057	425,659

¹ No balances are shown since all of the ore contained in the piles contracted for have been shipped.

² First 9 months.

EXHIBIT C.—METALLURGICAL GRADE CHROMITE DATA
1. COUNTRIES SUPPLYING CHROMIUM ORE TONNAGE AND PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL
[1,000 short tons, gross weight]

	1965	Percent	1966	Percent	1967	Percent	1968	Percent	1969	Percent
Rhodesia.....	329	37	219	22	147	20	1	0	0	0
U.S.S.R.....	242	27	302	29	299	40	335	47	440	45
Turkey.....	164	19	186	18	108	15	151	22	225	23
South Africa.....	115	13	184	18	95	13	74	11	69	7
Other.....	34	4	22	2	11	2	6	1	50	5
Subtotal.....	884	100	913	89	660	90	567	81	784	80
Shipments from stockpile.....			115	11	71	10	135	19	200	20
Total.....	884	100	1,028	100	731	100	702	100	984	100

2. CONSUMPTION OF CHROMIUM ORE
[1,000 short tons, gross weight]

	Estimated actual				Projected future			
	1965 ¹	1966 ²	1967 ²	1968 ²	1969 ²	1970 ²	1971 ²	1972 ²
Weight.....	981	1,034	905	905	923	950	978	1,010

¹ Estimated.

² BuMines data, increased 7 percent to compensate for survey omissions.

³ Projected forward from 1968 at annual increase of 3 percent.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Nov. 8, 1969]
CAPITOL VIEWS: SECURITY PERILED BY U.N.
RULING

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, November 7.—A blanket of silence has been gently drawn over the warnings of two high government officials that the United States is at the mercy of Russia for supplies of an ore vital to national security.

Most members of Congress have averted their eyes from the alarming implications of this testimony before a House subcommittee. The news media virtually ignored it.

A simple reason underlies this reluctance to face up to a disturbing development. Its public discussion involves recognition of the farcical nature of the United Nations sanctions against Rhodesia, where a white minority rules a black majority.

Rhodesia celebrates the fourth anniversary of its independence from Britain next Tuesday. A few daring members of the House and Senate are preparing speeches to note the event. The great majority will be too timid, knowing that they will be damned as racial bigots if they venture into the mildest of observations on the total failure of U.N. sanctions to crush the Ian Smith regime and force black majority rule.

Rhodesia's economy, by every account, is expanding. The government is more firmly entrenched than ever. Fear of terrorist raids from neighboring Zambia has faded.

American participation in sanctions [trade boycotts and embargoes] was dictated by former President Johnson. Because they are now hurting the United States and having no effect on Rhodesia, the time has obviously come for a reappraisal of American policy.

But political courage is not high on Capitol Hill, and the questioning of sanctions, still strongly supported by the state department, carries the risk of being branded as an advocate of white supremacy. Not even an official government warning about the danger of continuing sanctions stirred acceptance of the challenge.

Appearing before a House foreign affairs subcommittee inquiring into United States-Rhodesia relations, Kenneth N. Davis, Jr., assistant secretary of commerce, and Fred J. Russell, deputy director of the office of emergency preparedness, expressed their deep concern.

Rhodesia is the major free-world source of chrome ore, they said. There is none in the United States. Russia is the other major source. The cutoff in supplies of this ore from Rhodesia has placed this country "in heavy dependency upon the Soviet Union."

If Russia, now supplying the United States with chrome ore under a contract expiring in 1970 [at prices 50 per cent above the former level], decided to end its sales, the stockpile excess in the United States would be used up in one year.

Even if the Soviet Union, because of the rich profits involved, continues to sell chrome ore to the United States, other world sources are becoming exhausted and American needs cannot be met without resumption of supplies from Rhodesia.

How essential is chrome ore? Without it, the United States cannot produce stainless steel and alloy steels for jet and aerospace engines and for atomic energy development. The national defense could be crippled and national security endangered.

The irony of this situation was enhanced by testimony from the management of the Union Carbide corporation and Foote Mineral company, two American companies which owned mines in Rhodesia. They can't even get the state department's permission to obtain 207,000 tons of the ore, already mined and paid for. Rhodesia would not have benefited.

The U.N. embargo was supposed to strangle Rhodesia. But that country is booming. Instead, Russia has the United States by the throat. Thru the ore monopoly created by sanctions it can continue to extort high prices from American business men or it can cut off the supply creating a genuine peril. This was the message sent to Congress by the two government officials which has thus far been studiously ignored.

"JAPANESE AMERICAN RELATIONS,
II," REPORT OF THE SECOND
JAPANESE-AMERICAN ASSEMBLY

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as the Prime Minister of Japan, Eisaku Sato, has arrived in our country to meet with President Nixon and other American officials to discuss the question of Okinawa and other matters that touch upon the relations between the United States and Japan, I take this opportunity to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the report entitled, "Japanese American Relations, II" of the Second Japa-

nese-American Assembly which was held in Shimoda, Japan, from September 4-7, 1969.

A number of Members of the House of Representatives, of whom I was one, and of the Senate, of both our political parties, as well as scholars, businessmen, and communication specialists from both the United States and Japan met in Shimoda this year, as we had in 1967, for the purpose of discussing the entire spectrum of relationships between our two countries.

At this point in the RECORD, I insert the preface and final report of the Second Japanese-American Assembly:

JAPANESE AMERICAN RELATIONS, II—REPORT OF THE SECOND JAPANESE-AMERICAN ASSEMBLY, SHIMODA, JAPAN, SEPTEMBER 4-7, 1969

PREFACE

The Second Japanese-American Assembly, sponsored by the Japan Council for International Understanding and The American Assembly, met in Shimoda, Japan, September 4-7, 1969. As in the first Assembly, also held in Shimoda, in 1967, the participants (70 in all) included scholars, government officials, businessmen and communication specialists from both nations.

For three days in small groups they discussed the outlook for the bi-national relationship in the 1970s in the light of present political, economic and social postures in each nation as well as in other countries of Asia. Their talks were based on issues raised in papers prepared as advance background reading by James W. Morley, Saburo Okita, Gerald Curtis, Muniyoshi Hirano, Jiro Sakamoto, George McT. Kahin, Fuji Kamiya, Mineo Nakajima, and Marius B. Jansen.

The participants also heard formal addresses by Shojiro Kawashima, vice chairman of Japan's Liberal Democratic Party and Kogoro Uemura, president of the Federation of Economic Organizations; and by United States Senator Charles Percy of Illinois and Edwin O. Reischauer, former United States Ambassador to Japan.

In plenary session on the final day the participants reviewed the following report which had been drafted by the co-editors of the background papers—Messrs. Curtis and Kamiya—and by the discussion leaders and rapporteurs:

Jun Eto; Hans Baerwald; Herbert Passin; Masataka Kohsaka; Marius Jansen; and Michio Rohyama

The views contained in this report are those of the participants in their private

capacities and not of the Japan Council for International Understanding or of The American Assembly, a non-partisan educational organization which takes no views on issues it presents for public discussion. Nor is The Ford Foundation, who generously underwrote the costs of the Assembly on the American side—gratefully acknowledged herewith—to be associated with the opinions herein.

CLIFFORD C. NELSON,
President, The American Assembly.

FINAL REPORT OF THE SECOND JAPANESE-AMERICAN ASSEMBLY

(At the close of their discussions the participants in the Second Japanese-American Assembly reviewed the following report in plenary session. The report represents general agreement. However, no one was asked to sign it, and in view of the often differing opinions expressed during the course of the discussions, it must be clearly understood that not every participant agrees with every statement.)

The relationship between the United States and Japan and their role in Asia have become the subject of serious public debate in both countries. While Japan and the United States share many common interests, there are significant differences in their views of the world and their respective roles in it. Furthermore, these views have not remained constant within each country but have been undergoing change.

There is today in the United States a great concern to solve pressing domestic problems such as poverty, race relations and a variety of urban ills. The American experience in Vietnam has generated a general questioning of America's foreign policy posture. American public opinion clearly desires a reduction in the overseas commitments of the United States, particularly in its military aspects. The timing and extent of this reduction are at issue but not the principle itself.

Japan's rapid industrial growth has created urgent pressures for attention to educational, urban, and environmental problems. At the same time its enormous economic power has contributed to an increase in national confidence. In this setting, America's desire to limit its commitments coincides with a changing political environment in Asia to create new choices and constraints for Japan. There is also a questioning of past policies and a public desire for a different, though still unspecified, role in international affairs.

Asia in the seventies will see a greater complexity in international relations than has heretofore existed in the postwar period. The Sino-Soviet split, the ongoing withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam, and internal developments in Asian countries are combining to create new challenges and new opportunities for the United States and Japan. Both countries must work out policies for the changing political environment in Asia appropriate to their respective capabilities and the desires of their publics.

Political instability will continue to characterize much of Asia in the 1970's, often as a result of the social and political strains of nation building. This will sometimes be constructive and not necessarily dangerous to world peace or subject to outside influence.

Japan will play a more influential role in Southeast Asia in the coming decade. This is partly the inevitable consequence of its position as the only highly advanced industrial nation in Asia. Japan thus has a unique opportunity further to participate and assist in the economic development of other Asian nations. This role, if fully accepted, would be extremely complex and challenging, given the great differences in stages of economic growth, political stability and other conditions among the states in the area. It will require greater involve-

ment but should exclude any military role. By the same token, the United States too should seek new opportunities to increase its role in economic development programs. Both countries should place emphasis on multilateral means in this field.

It is highly desirable that both the United States and Japan try to normalize their relations with mainland China and to have it participate in a variety of international conferences and organizations. The continued isolation of China and the misunderstanding of intentions between China, Japan, and the United States pose obstacles to the reduction of tensions in Asia.

The existing tensions between China and the Soviet Union are not expected to decrease in the near future. On the contrary, an increase in the conflict is a possibility in the coming decade. Military conflict between China and the Soviet Union is not in the interests of either the United States or Japan.

The problem of Taiwan is a major concern of both the United States and Japan. Eventually it must be solved by the people of Taiwan and China themselves. There was vigorous discussion concerning this formulation, but differences of opinion could not be resolved.

The Vietnam War must be brought to a quick settlement. All efforts should be made to insure that the Vietnamese themselves be free to decide what type of regime they desire. Both the United States and Japan should aid the reconstruction and economic development of North and South Vietnam in the postwar period.

The form of reversion of Okinawa to Japan is the most urgent issue confronting the United States and Japan. The Okinawan problem is not only one of national sovereignty but also of the basic rights of the Okinawan people. It is imperative that a timetable for reversion be set within this year and that immediate steps be taken to provide for Okinawan participation in Japanese life during the process of transition. It was the general view that the return of the islands in such a manner as would place American bases there on the same terms as apply to bases in other parts of Japan is most desirable. However views favoring the immediate, unconditional return of Okinawa were also expressed. Okinawan reversion to Japan will remove a major irritant in United States-Japanese relations and will contribute to the development of great mutuality of interest between the two countries.

The problem of Korea is of direct concern to the United States and cannot be disregarded by Japan. We were in general agreed that forcible change of existing borders in the Korean peninsula would present serious problems to the United States and Japan, although we did not arrive at conclusions on the extent of this danger or counter measures to be taken.

Mutual security arrangements between the two countries must be considered in terms of the long range friendship between the United States and Japan. There was a wide variety of opinion ranging from abrogation to the indefinite continuation of the present Treaty without change. The prevailing view was that, in the immediate future, there was no alternative to automatic extension. However, dissatisfactions in both the United States and Japan clearly require that the Treaty be constantly examined and adjustments made as expeditiously as possible. Even under the present Treaty, the further reduction of American bases in Japan is desirable. It was generally agreed that both countries should work toward creating conditions under which the security of Japan and its neighbors could be insured without the presence of American bases.

Close relations between the United States and Japan are in part the result of their ex-

tensive economic ties. As great trading nations, both share a common interest in maximizing the opportunities for the freest possible world wide economic interaction, in this context it is imperative that both nations eliminate as quickly as possible barriers to trade and take necessary steps to insure the free movement of capital between the two countries. It was generally recognized that at this stage Japan should take the initiative in this regard in order to avert a vicious circle of retaliatory protectionist measures. The economics of both countries are sufficiently strong to make protectionist measures unnecessary.

There is unanimous agreement among Americans and Japanese that a friendly and equal relationship is of fundamental importance. As advanced industrial societies both countries share many common problems despite differences in language, culture and historical experience. We both must improve our mass education systems, deal with the dissatisfactions of youth, make our cities more liveable, and make government and large organizations more responsive to the needs of society.

It was resolved in plenary session that the funds specified for cultural purposes in the repayment of Japan's debt to the United States be used for the creation of a foundation devoted to the fuller development of dialogue and the study of our common problems.

PARTICIPANTS IN THE SECOND JAPANESE-AMERICAN ASSEMBLY

JOINT CHAIRMEN

Tokusaburo Kosaka, Chairman, Japan Council for International Understanding, Tokyo.

Clifford C. Nelson, President, The American Assembly, Columbia University, New York.

JOINT EDITORS

Gerald Curtis, Professor of Political Science, Columbia University.

Fuji Kamiya, Professor of International Relations, Osaka Municipal University.

CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR AND LIAISON OFFICER

Tadashi Yamamoto, Japan Council for International Understanding.

Shigeyoshi Aikawa, Adviser to Editorial Board, *Yomiuri Shinbun*; Yoshikata Aso, Member, House of Representatives, Democratic Socialist Party; and Hans H. Baerwald, Visiting Professor, International Christian University, Tokyo.

A Doak Barnett, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.; John Brademas, Representative from Indiana, Congress of the United States; and William E. Brock, Representative from Tennessee, Congress of the United States.

Jerome Cohen, Professor of Law, Harvard University; Frederick Dutton, Executive Director, The Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Foundation; and John Emmerson, Professor of Political Science, Stanford University.

Jun Eto, Literary Critic and Author; Thomas S. Foley, Representative from Washington, Congress of the United States; and Aichiro Fujiyama, Member, House of Representatives, Liberal Democratic Party.

Motoo Goto, Assistant Editorial Writer, *The Asahi Shinbun*; Noboru Goto, President, Tokyo Electric Railway, Ltd.; and Kazushige Hirasawa, Editor-in-Chief, *The Japan Times*.

Stanley Hoffman, Professor of Government, Harvard University; Hiroki Imazato, President, Nippon Seiko K. K.; and Rokuro Ishikawa, Vice-President, Kajima Construction Co., Ltd.

Marius B. Jansen, Professor of Japanese History, Princeton University; Nicholas Johnson, United States Federal Communications Commissioner; Motoo Kaede, Sub-Chief Editor, *Tokyo Chunichi Shinbun*.

George McT. Kahin, Director, Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University; Raymond

A. Kathe, Senior Vice President, First National City Bank; Shojiro Kawashima, Member, House of Representatives, Vice-Chairman of the Party, Liberal Democratic Party.

Yohel Kohno, Member, House of Representatives Liberal Democratic Party; Zentaro Kosaka, Member, House of Representatives, Liberal Democratic Party, Former Foreign Affairs Minister; Masataka Kohsaka, Professor of Law, Kyoto University.

Hiroshi Kurokawa, Assistant Managing Editor, *Nihon Keizai Shinbun*; Akira Kuroyanagi, Member, House of Councilors, Vice Secretary, Komeito; Shigeharu Matsumoto, Chairman, Board of Directors, International House of Japan, Inc.

Shiro Mikumo, Chief Editorial Writer, *The Sankei Shinbun*; Seigen Miyazato, Professor of Law, Ryukyuu University, Okinawa; Osamu Miyoshi, Editorial Writer, *The Mainichi Newspapers*.

James W. Morley, Professor of Political Science, Columbia University; Kinhide Mushakoji, President, Institute of International Relations for Advanced Study of Peace and Development in Asia; Eichi Nagasue, Member, House of Representatives, Member, Central Executive Committee, Democratic Socialist Party.

Mineo Nakajima, Lecturer in International Relations and Chinese Studies, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies; Yasuhiro Nakasone, Member, House of Representatives, Liberal Democratic Party; Yasumasa Ohta, Sub-Chief Editorial Writer, *The Kyodo Press*.

Herbert Passin, Professor of Sociology, Columbia University; Hugh Patrick, Professor of Far Eastern Economics, Yale University; Charles Percy, United States Senator from Illinois.

Richard Pfeffer, Assistant Professor, Dept. of Political Science, Johns Hopkins University; Gerald Piel, President and Publisher, *Scientific American*.

John Powers, Aspen Institute, Colorado; Edwin O. Reischauer, Professor, Department of Asian Studies, Harvard University; and Donald Rumsfeld, Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.

Kiichi Saeki, President, Nomura Research Institute of Technology and Economics; Shoichi Saeki, Professor of Literature, Tokyo University; and Jiro Sakamoto, Professor, Hitotsubashi University.

Joseph E. Slater, President, The Salk Institute; William A. Steiger, Representative from Wisconsin, Congress of the United States; and Nathaniel B. Thayer, New York.

S. Fletcher Thompson, Jr., Representative from Georgia, Congress of the United States; Seiji Tsutsumi, President, Seibu Department Store Co., Ltd.; and John V. Tunney, Representative from California, Congress of the United States.

Gordon Tweedy, Chairman, C. V. Starr & Co., Ltd., New York; Morris Udall, Representative from Arizona, Congress of the United States; and Kogoro Uemura, President, Japan Federation of Economic Organizations.

Jiro Ushio, President, Ushio Electric Co., Ltd.; Arthur L. Wadsworth, Executive Vice-President, Dillon Read & Co., New York; and Kei Wakaizumi, Professor of International Relations, Kyoto Sangyo University.

Ichiro Watanabe, Member, House of Representatives, Komeito; Robert M. White, II, Editor & Publisher, *The Mexico Ledger*, Missouri; and Masakazu Yamazaki, Playwright, Assistant Professor, Kansai University.

THE AMERICAN ASSEMBLY

The American Assembly was established by Dwight D. Eisenhower at Columbia University in 1950. It holds nonpartisan meetings and publishes authoritative books to illuminate issues of United States policy.

An affiliate of Columbia, with offices in the Graduate School of Business, the Assembly is a national, educational institution incorporated in the State of New York.

The Assembly seeks to provide information,

stimulate discussion, and evoke independent conclusions in matters of vital public interest.

AMERICAN ASSEMBLY SESSIONS

At least two national programs are initiated each year. Authorities are retained to write background papers presenting essential data and defining the main issues in each subject.

About 60 men and women representing a broad range of experience, competence, and American leadership meet for several days to discuss the Assembly topic and consider alternatives for national policy.

All Assemblies follow the same procedure. The background papers are sent to participants in advance of the Assembly. The Assembly meets in small groups for four or five lengthy periods. All groups use the same agenda. At the close of these informal sessions participants adopt in plenary session a final report of findings and recommendations.

Regional, state, and local Assemblies are held following the national session at Arden House. Assemblies have also been held in England, Switzerland, Malaysia, Canada, the Caribbean, South America, Central America, Japan and the Philippines. Over one hundred institutions have co-sponsored one or more Assemblies.

AMERICAN ASSEMBLY BOOKS

The background papers for each Assembly program are published in cloth and paperback editions for use by individuals, libraries, businesses, public agencies, non-governmental organizations, educational institutions, discussion and service groups. In this way the deliberations of Assembly sessions are continued and extended.

ARDEN HOUSE

Home of The American Assembly and scene of the national sessions is Arden House, which was given to Columbia University in 1950 by W. Averell Harriman. E. Roland Harriman joined his brother in contributing toward adaptation of the property for conference purposes. The buildings and surrounding land, known as the Harriman Campus of Columbia University, are 50 miles north of New York City.

Arden House is a distinguished conference center. It is self-supporting and operates throughout the year for use by organizations with educational objectives. The American Assembly is a tenant of this Columbia University facility only during Assembly sessions.

THE JAPAN COUNCIL FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

(*Ginza Tokyu Hotel, Tokyo*)

The Japan Council for International Understanding was founded in 1962 by Japanese business and civic leaders. Its purpose is to stimulate research and discussion on international issues.

The Japan Council endeavors through regular contacts with foreign organizations of a similar nature to maintain a flow of information between Japan and other free nations on an unofficial basis.

Through the efforts of the Japan Council, Japanese leaders from many fields of specialization are afforded an opportunity to candidly exchange views with leaders of other countries in informal settings.

EXECUTIVE MEMBERS

Tokusaburo Kosaka, *Chairman*, President, Shin-Etsu Chemical Industry Co., Ltd.

Kazuaki Fujikawa, *Secretary General*, President, Topy Industries, Ltd.

Noboru Goto, *President*, Tokyo Electric Express Railway, Ltd.

Yasuhiro Nakasone, *Member*, House of Representatives.

Euchi Nagasue, *Member*, House of Representatives.

Kazushige Hirasawa Yuichi Yuasa, *Commentator*, President, Yuasa Battery Co., Ltd.

Nobutaka Shikanai, *President*, Fuji Tele-casting Co., Ltd.

THE AMERICAN ASSEMBLY COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Trustees

Arthur G. Altschul, New York; George W. Ball, District of Columbia; William Benton, Connecticut; Courtney C. Brown, *Chairman*, New York; William P. Bundy, New York; and Andrew W. Cordier, *ex officio*, New York.

John Cowles, Minnesota; George S. Craft, Georgia; Douglas Dillon, New Jersey; Mariner S. Eccles, Utah; Milton S. Eisenhower, Maryland; Arthur S. Flemming, Minnesota; and Katharine Graham, District of Columbia.

W. Averell Harriman, New York; Hubert H. Humphrey, Minnesota; George F. James, *ex officio*, New York; J. Erik Jonsson, Texas; Sol M. Linowitz, New York; Don G. Mitchell, New Jersey; and Clifford C. Nelson, *ex officio*, New Jersey.

Officers

Clifford C. Nelson, *President*; Kurt Ludwig, *Executive Associate*; Marian Wezmar, *Treasurer*; Mary M. McLeod, *Assistant to the President*; and Renee D. Morrison, *Assistant to the President*.

Chairman Emeritus

Henry M. Wriston, New York.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS MAKES OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTION

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars for its outstanding contribution to the Nation's activities on Veterans' Day this year in the organization and promotion of "Operation Speak Out."

In organizing Operation Speak Out, VFW Commander in Chief Ray Gallagher has demonstrated the kind of enlightened and vigorous national leadership which has long characterized the VFW's service to America.

I was heartened by the strong support the other great veterans' organization gave to Operation Speak Out. This occasion afforded an opportunity to encourage members of the VFW and all veterans to continue their interest in national affairs and actively to support the principles and ideals they fought to defend. It served as a forum for a strong expression of national unity—an expression which will not go unnoticed in Paris or Hanoi.

As a longtime member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I have been pleased many times to see the quickness with which this organization responds where the public interest is concerned.

This organization's leadership in Operation Speak Out is consistent with VFW history and noble in concept. I hope Speak Out can be developed as a continuing program. I hope we can continue to offer an opportunity to the people of America to express opinions of strong support for this Nation and its principles. Freedom is the greatest privilege, and the veterans who belong to VFW

have helped to win and protect this privilege. Speaking out for freedom is one of the surest ways to insure that freedom remains ours. I commend the members of this outstanding organization.

**FAT CATS—FAT PROFITS—
INFLATION**

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that the facts about inflation be revealed for public consumption. In view of the great interest this body has on this subject, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following statement by George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO. Mr. Meany's reply was prompted by a statement on inflation issued by the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. MEANY

The blatant hypocrisy of the Chamber propaganda campaign, designed to fool the public into believing workers are responsible for inflation, was exposed by the Wall Street Journal on the very day (November 14) that the statement was issued.

The Chamber advised its members to resist union demands for wage increases, as the patriotic way to halt inflation. Of course, the Chamber made no mention of holding down profits, which the Wall Street Journal had already shown to be the cause of the current inflation, nor did the Chamber advise its members to hold down wage increases for top executives.

The reason is obvious. The Wall Street Journal reported that "the average chief executive's compensation jumped 9.8% in 1968"—the highest gain in 15 years.

The reason, the Journal said, was that "1968 was a year of fat profits."

It is those "fat profits"—not wage increases—that have caused inflation.

Organized labor is seriously concerned about inflation. It is workers who are hit hardest by the rise of consumer prices that washes out part of the buying power of their wages. It is workers, too, who are hit hardest by the government's severely restrictive economic policies, including the highest interest rates in 100 years, that are increasing unemployment and boosting prices still further.

Secretary of Labor George Shultz reported last month that the median wage increase in new collective bargaining agreements negotiated this year is "a little under 2 percent for 1969," after accounting for the rise of consumer prices.

Moreover, the buying power of the average non-supervisory worker's weekly take-home pay, in recent months, has not been much greater than a year ago—or than in 1965. Large groups of non-supervisory workers have had little, if any, increase, in the buying power of their take-home pay in four years.

In the meantime, profits have skyrocketed in the 1960s. The increase in the compensation of an individual big business executive in 1968, alone, is more than the average worker earned in the entire year.

Under these conditions, workers and their unions are seeking to offset the effects of previous price increases on wages. They are seeking some advance in buying standards.

American workers and their unions are exercising their rights, through collective bar-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

gaining, to achieve a fair share of the gains of economic progress. That is their only recourse.

Before the Chamber issues any more free advice on how to halt inflation, it ought to examine its own closet of skeletons.

**A BILL TO INCREASE THE NUMBER
OF DROPOUT YEARS AVAILABLE
IN DETERMINING SOCIAL SECURITY
BENEFITS**

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in the cosponsorship of legislation correcting a major defect in the computation of social security benefits. Presently, workers' benefits are determined on the basis of their average social security taxable income between 1951 and the year they are eligible for benefits—age 65 for full benefits and age 62 for reduced benefits. Each worker, under the present system, is permitted to delete his 5 lowest income years before computing his average—the average which determines the size of his retirement benefits. Most workers delete the years between 1951 and 1956 because then the social security tax base was only \$3,600 and their wages were much lower than present.

Unfortunately, this dropout provision of the "low five" is restrictive and works an unnecessary hardship for the many workers who may be laid off before the age they are eligible for social security. If a man is laid off because of plant closure or merger at the age of 60, for example, it is extremely difficult for him to locate new employment at his previous, often highly skilled, rate of pay.

Additionally, the present arrangement conflicts 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 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 bill I am cosponsoring provides 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 5 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 retirement benefits on the same basis that women do.

November 20, 1969

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 bill will receive consideration during the House Ways and Means Committee's current review of the Social Security Act.

**THE WAR AGAINST WATER
POLLUTION**

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned about the urgent need to act to solve the critical water pollution problem in this country, and I joined in the effort to obtain approval of \$1 billion for projects to be carried out under the Water Quality Act of 1965. Unfortunately, we were not able to win approval of the full amount in the House, which approved only \$600 million. However, the Senate has now moved with wisdom and urgency and has approved the full amount of \$1 billion. I hope that in conference the Senate figure—or one nearer it—will prevail. In this connection, I would like to include in the RECORD an excellent editorial from the November 14 issue of the Evening News of Newark, N.J., which strongly presents the case for assigning a higher priority on the war against pollution:

PRIORITY FOR POLLUTION

In authorizing \$1 billion for clean-water projects in the next fiscal year, the U.S. Senate demonstrated its awareness of the imminence of the pollution problem confronting the nation. Unfortunately, its realism has not been matched by the House, and even less by the executive branch.

The House measure would provide \$600 million to be matched in whole or part by the states for building sewage treatment plants. Responding to Congress' mandate to keep within a budget of \$192.9 billion, the Nixon administration has scaled down its antipollution requests to \$214 million, a totally unrealistic amount.

The inadequacy is emphasized by the fact that New Jersey alone has been authorized by its voters to float \$242 million in bonds for anti-pollution projects. Under the federal Water Quality Act of 1965, the ratio of matching funds is: States 25 percent, federal 50 percent and municipalities 25 percent. Under the administration plan, Washington couldn't even keep up with New Jersey in combating pollution of its water.

Obviously the war against pollution ought to be assigned a higher priority than it has been given by the administration. If need be, pork-barrel projects could be delayed in order to free funds for needs that bear directly on the health and welfare of the nation. Neither should pollution control suffer while the fat in military spending goes untrimmed.

A paucity of matching funds at the federal level is bound to discourage initiative by municipalities, where the regional arrangements needed to combat pollution must begin. That's why an upward revision toward the Senate's more realistic figure should take place in conference committee.

GUIDANCE SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, Ralph P. Romano, who is chairman of the Bulkeley High School guidance department, and who lives in West Hartford, recently summarized the values of guidance services to our young people in an article he wrote for the Hartford Times Sunday magazine.

He noted the ways in which counselors can be of assistance, and he points out that opportunities for schooling, work and self-fulfillment are improving and have been better. I believe the points he makes deserve the notice of all our Members and I offer them for the Extensions of Remarks:

[From the Hartford Times, Sept. 21, 1969]
STUDENT WORRIED ABOUT JOB, COURSES SHOULD SEE COUNSELOR

(By Ralph P. Romano)

(Ralph P. Romano, who lives in West Hartford with his wife and five children, is chairman of Bulkeley High School guidance department. He is a member of the Urban Coalition of Greater Hartford.)

"Doctor, lawyer, Indian Chief!" So concludes the old, familiar nursery rhyme. According to the workings of that time-honored, childhood ritual, one's ultimate lot in life is strictly a matter of pure chance. Even in a supposedly advanced time, the ways which some educational and vocational choices are made are disconcertingly hit or miss. Some students and parents don't sufficiently use organized, professional services. Many don't invest enough time and effort in making school and career plans.

High school days particularly are days of important decisions. Which curriculum will be taken? Which subjects and divisions? Work at a part-time job? How many hours a week? Want to be a skilled tradesman? Service worker? A professional? Participate in extracurricular activities? How much time for homework? Enroll in tutorial, compensatory or enrichment programs? How to avoid the "hang-ups" of alcohol, drugs and sex? Stay in school or drop out?

These are just a sampling of the dozens of questions and dilemmas that confront the student and his family. How they are met and answered will have effects not only during the individual's school year, but also during the rest of his life. (Fortunately, the mistakes of youth are no longer so irreversible as they once were.)

Young people give the puffed-up impression that they already know all the answers and are, in fact, prepared to take over. This is far from a true expression of their real feelings. Down deep, many teenagers are self-doubting, perturbed and apprehensive about their places in a complex society. All youth need information, encouragement and advice from many sources.

In pondering the selection of a school subject, for example, these are a few key questions: What is it about? Is it suited to aptitude and interest? Is it required or recommended? What purpose will be served by taking it? (In some schools prescribed and arbitrary arrangements of subject matter by "tracks" are being replaced by more open and liberal patterns.)

Teachers are more than willing to help. They know their students. They can point out the vocational implications of their subjects. Even teachers "over 30" are capable of drawing from their own experience in aid-

ing others. More than ever students feel free to talk over their career goals, their achievements and their worries with their favorite teachers. Different opinions reflect different points of view.

Parents have an all-important stake in the business of choosing, too. Their knowledge of their children and of the total family situation is invaluable. In trying to assert their independence, teen-agers tend to keep from confiding in their parents. This is a costly and unfortunate error.

It can be difficult but parents must find ways to keep lines of communication open, even though at times sons and daughters make them feel like "the enemy." The unfulfilled career wishes and dreams of Mom and Dad should be kept out of the picture.

School friends and older brothers and sisters are not to be overlooked as prospective "advisers" because they have the advantage of thinking, speaking and aspiring in teen terms. The influence of others in the same age group is pervading and powerful. It can be seriously misleading though when a teenager settles on a course of action merely because "all of my friends are doing it."

In selecting a job, school, branch of the military service, or college, visits are a must. It is necessary to study the possibilities firsthand. Representatives are glad to arrange interviews. The Hartford business, industrial, labor and educational communities are most eager to cooperate. Municipal, state and federal agencies are devoted to the service of youth. And so are civic, fraternal, social, religious, racial and ethnic societies and groups.

Other means of gaining valuable exploratory experiences may be found in part-time work or in such programs as work study, work training, apprenticeships, vocational and distributive education, volunteer service, summer projects and club membership.

Every bit of background a student acquires is useful during counseling sessions. Counselors frequently yearn to be taken "off the hook" by letting someone else decide for them. But a skilled and effective counselor does not tell anyone what to do or what to be.

Counselors do have special knowledge of the world of work and education. They accumulate a surprising degree of insight into the life styles of their charges. They try to help a counselee to relate all of the facts regarding his interests, abilities, strengths, weaknesses and opportunities.

Prejudice, discrimination, politics, "contacts" and nepotism still impose barriers for those who are not "in the know." Most people of reason, justice and good will have not yet completely committed themselves to the battle for equal opportunity.

Nevertheless, opportunities for schooling, for work and for total self-fulfillment are improving—and they have never been better. The limits are few: ability, initiative and willingness to work. The status of one's color, race, creed and nationality is rapidly becoming less and less significant.

Our way of life is founded on unique and remarkable ideals—that the dignity, worth and potential of an individual is of primary concern . . . that the right to decide for one's self is inviolable . . . that all are entitled to still another chance, and still another.

In a free and open society, freedom to choose is both a benefit and a responsibility.

JOSEPH P. KENNEDY

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 18, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, this body has often paused in its deliberations to

pay tribute to the passing of great men. Now, sadly, we must do so again. One of the most illustrious sons of Massachusetts, Joseph P. Kennedy, is dead.

"The end of an era" is an overworked term, and yet the death of Joseph P. Kennedy truly fits that description. Never again will we see one who so avidly and so successfully moved in the arenas of America's economic and political worlds. Growing up in the Boston of the late 19th century and early 20th century, he knew what it was to be discriminated against. He railed against the prevailing prejudice of the time which was symbolized by the legend "No Irish need apply." He vowed to overcome that bias and, as was typical of the man, he overcame it in grand style. He did it by amassing both fortune and power.

But history will remember Joseph P. Kennedy more for the children he gave to this country and the world than for his own unique achievements. Besides intelligence, ambition, courage, and style, his children benefited from their father's vast experience, beginning in Boston ward politics and culminating in international diplomacy at the Court of St. James. It was a unique legacy, and one valued and well used by his sons.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his beloved widow and to all the members of that remarkable family.

H.R. 4599—BILL TO EXTEND CERTAIN PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein some extended view which I presented to the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization, of which our very able and distinguished colleague and friend, the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, is chairman, on H.R. 4599, to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments. This is a very vital, necessary bill and I urge its early enactment by the committee and the House.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HONORABLE PHILIP J. PHILBIN IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 4599 BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, OCTOBER 29, 1969

Mr. Chairman and members of this distinguished subcommittee, I am very thankful to you for this opportunity to testify in favor of H.R. 4599, sponsored by our good friend and valued colleague, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Robison.

This subcommittee is well aware of the very serious problem presented by the expiration of previous legislation which permitted Federal payments in lieu of taxes on government plants transferred from the old Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the

Defense Plants Administration to other Federal agencies.

I am here primarily this morning to join Congressman Donohue in whose District such a plant is located because many constituents of mine are employed by this facility. In addition, serious revenue problems have arisen for the community involved, the town of Grafton, Massachusetts, so ably represented in the Congress by my very distinguished friend from Worcester, Congressman Donohue.

Briefly, the situation is this:

During World War II the Defense Plant Corporation, now out of existence, erected a large factory in Grafton, Massachusetts, for the account of the Air Force. The buildings cost about 5 or 6 million dollars of Government funds, but the Air Force subsequently installed very complex, expensive machinery and equipment which cost in the neighborhood of 77 to 80 million dollars. In this latter equipment are two large heavy presses which fabricate, among other things, entire wings for aircraft under various pressures. One of these machines has a pressure capacity of 35,000 tons and the other 50,000 tons. They are considered to be of great value and very high importance to the Air Force activities.

When Congress terminated the Defense Plant Corporation the RFC took over these properties as liquidating agent and entered into an arrangement with the Air Force, to occupy and use the property in question. The Air Force, in turn, made an agreement with a very substantial concern of Worcester, Mass., Wyman-Gordon Company, to operate the plant for its account and this the company has been doing for a number of years.

Under the arrangement permitted by previous legislation, which expired on December 31, 1968, the Air Force made very substantial payments to the town of Grafton in lieu of taxes, in return for which the town furnished valuable and necessary educational and other services to the plant and its employees. These services include extensive water, sewer, streets, fire and police service, and school facilities.

The Air Force is no longer permitted to make such payments and consequently while the town is living up to its part of the bargain by continuing to provide essential services, the loss of this Federal money in lieu of taxes, if no solution is found, will have to be borne by the small homeowners and businesses of the town, already beset by high real estate taxes.

Of course everyone will agree, I think, that this would be a great injustice. The industry has brought many new people into the town. They have bought homes and have settled there. They require expensive services from the town and the same is true of the industry itself. Certainly the town should get some revenue from this valuable property and it not only would be a great inequity but a hardship on its citizens if the town were to lose this revenue.

I feel this is a situation Congress should clarify because there are numerous instances where towns have become dependent upon the revenue from plants similarly set up, and it is very unfair, in my opinion, to deprive these various communities of revenues which they need to discharge their proper functions.

The interests involved here are not only substantial but really concern millions of dollars and it is only fair the town should receive some tax revenue from these properties.

I know that the committee will be glad to give Congressman Robison's bill most careful consideration and I hope very earnestly that you may in your wisdom, decide to report it favorably at an early date so that the situation it is intended to correct can be adjusted.

I should like to say to my very distin-

guished and able friend, the Chairman of this splendid committee, and to all the members, that I have the greatest confidence in all of you, and am sure that you will do everything you possibly can to achieve the remedial objectives of this very worthy measure.

Thank you all very much for your generous attention.

COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMP IN 1972 URGED BY MARYLAND GROUPS

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the Metropolitan Civic Association and the Ensign C. Markland Kelly, Jr. Memorial Post No. 174 of the American Legion, two prominent groups in Baltimore, Md., are conducting a drive for the issuance of a Constellation stamp in 1972. This drive is explained in a joint statement issued by the executive boards of both organizations. The text follows:

The Metropolitan Civic Association and the Ensign C. Markland Kelly, Jr. Memorial Post No. 174 of the American Legion, both of Baltimore City, are now in the midst of a campaign for the issuance of a U.C. Commemorative Postage Stamp in 1972, in tribute to the 175th anniversary of the U.S. Frigate Constellation.

As noted by the Constellation Restoration Committee, the Constellation, launched on September 7, 1797, was the first warship built for the U.S. Navy. It has the longest record of total service of any U.S. warship, and it is the oldest ship in the world continuously afloat.

Since a U.S. Frigate Constitution commemorative stamp was issued in 1947 to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the launching of Old Ironsides—it is eminently fitting that such honor also be accorded and the accolades she has received since 1797.

Founded in 1960, the Metropolitan Civic Association is dedicated to metropolitan issues affecting transportation, rehabilitation, beautification, taxation, governmental administration and sponsorship of Citizens' Clinics for the interpretation of urban and suburban issues.

Basically, the Metropolitan Civic Association aims at a "Dynamic Baltimore" and equally dynamic metropolitan community. Such aims can be achieved by individuals and organizations who believe in becoming involved in the problems and welfare affecting their community.

The Metropolitan Civic Association will hold its Ninth Anniversary Achievement Award Banquet on Wednesday evening, December 10, 1969, at Martin's West. Achievement Awards will be presented to Dr. Harry Bard, President, Community College of Baltimore; Byron Millenson, Vice President and General Manager, Radio Station WCAO; Gilbert Rosenthal, Assistant Attorney General of Maryland; Richard A. Lidinsky, Deputy Comptroller, City of Baltimore; and Charles G. Tildon, Associate Administrator, Provident Hospital. Judge Solomon Lis, Associate Judge of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City, will serve as Toastmaster.

The Ensign C. Markland Kelly, Jr. Memorial Post No. 174 of the American Legion, was formed to perpetuate the name of Ensign C. Markland Kelly, Jr. (September 22, 1916–June 4, 1942), who gave his life for his country in the Battle of Midway, World War II. The Kelly Post aims to perpetuate his name and keep alive the American ideals for which he gave his life.

The 1969–70 officers of the Ensign C. Markland Kelly, Jr. Memorial Post No. 174, are Earl G. Davis, Commander; Thaddeus J. Hense, First Vice Commander; Roland Louis Sydnor, Second Vice President; G. LeRoy Haslup, Chaplain; Russell W. Gettler, Sergeant-at-Arms; James E. Ways, Service Officer; Warren A. Burdette, Historian and Forrest R. Gabler, Judge Advocate. The Executive Committeemen are William Adams, John Bianca, Joseph Brooks, Hubert E. Buchar, Michael Coyne, Lt. Colonel Phillip Levoff, Henry Miller, Philip Schnering and Charles Tiedbohl. Donald W. Smith is Treasurer and Joseph K. Walker is the Adjutant.

Metro and the Kelly Post were pleased to note that an article published in the Baltimore Sun on November 13, 1969, carried under the headline, "Mandel Firing Gun for Frigate." The article follows:

"Governor Mandel said today that he will ask the General Assembly to appropriate \$100,000 to match a possible federal grant of the same amount for the full restoration of masts, rigging and armament of the U.S. Frigate Constellation.

"The Constellation, oldest ship in the United States Navy, is permanently docked at Pier 1, Pratt Street in Baltimore's Inner Harbor redevelopment project. It is owned by the Star Spangled Banner Flag House Association, a non-profit private organization.

"Governor Mandel said the \$200,000 in grants would permit the Constellation to be restored to its original appearance. The application for federal funds is being made by the Baltimore Department of Housing and Community Development.

"Marylanders and other patriotic Americans are aiding in restoring the Constellation with her full complement of rigging and sails, so as to remind us, upon restoration of her majestic image, of her cherished place in our hearts—and in the heritage and history of our country. A Constellation stamp in 1972 would be a fitting tribute to the 175th anniversary of this historic and honor-laden vessel—the Navy's oldest ship afloat."

In conjunction with the campaign for the issuance of a Constellation commemorative postage stamp, Metro and Kelly Post sponsored a statewide Constellation poetry contest. Mrs. Anne Albaugh of 3101 Ferndale Avenue, Baltimore, Md., a charter member of the Maryland State Poetry Society, won first prize, a \$50 U.S. savings bond. Mrs. Albaugh also received two awards when the State of Maryland celebrated Poetry Day: a prize of \$25 for the best Mason Sonnet and a citation from the poet laureate of the State for her contribution in promoting poetry and poets in Maryland.

Her prize-winning Constellation poem follows:

THE CONSTELLATION

(By Anne Albaugh)

Noble stars give her lustre! Golden stars
light her crown!
The frigate no vessel can pass in renown!
First ship in our navy to sail the blue seas—
With the flag of brave seamen, unfurled in
the breeze!
She was built in our city—she bolsters our
pride—
To save a young country, the French she
defied!
In beauty and glory, she fought for the free—
On the pages of honor, she carved history!
Reminder of duty and service so clear,
Her image has lasted through many a year!
A symbol of what true America needs—
An emblem of many beloved Maryland deeds!
She shines for the Free State—a bright
diadem—
A brilliant, victorious, unsullied gem!

And so I'm saluting this brave pioneer—
I give her a hearty and hale birthday cheer!
May she reign in the firmament, spread high
above!

Reminder of all that we cherish and love!
A brave, lustrous Flagship, in war's gal-
axy . . .

An eminent guerdon for all who are free!
Let's preserve her, protect her—she merits
our care—

In a space-minded world, make us newly
aware!

Constellation—her name! Constellation—her
fame!

May she ever remind us that peace is our
aim!

BIG TRUCK BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, my editorials for today are from the Tiffin, Ohio, Advertiser-Tribune; the Columbus Citizen-Journal; the Defiance, Ohio, Crescent-News; the Youngstown Vindicator; and the Cleveland Press, in the State of Ohio. The editorials follow:

[From the Tiffin (Ohio) Advertiser-Tribune, July 30, 1969]

AND WHAT ABOUT THE ROADS?

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 reasonings 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.

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Citizen-Journal, July 19, 1969]

THE TRUCK BILL AGAIN

Congress, which last year shelved a bill to permit longer, wider and heavier trucks on the interstate highway system, is engaged now in studying a somewhat modified version.

The new bill would lift the present 73,280-pound weight limit, extend the width limit from eight to eight-and-a-half feet and impose a length limit of 70 feet. This last provision was absent from last year's bill.

The trucking industry argues an axle-spacing formula set out in the new bill would permit more even weight distribution, thus easing the strain on bridges and highways despite heavier loads and greater length.

These factors, the truckers contend, also

would promote safety by permitting improved braking ability for big rigs and better road visibility for their drivers.

The industry's primary interest in the bill, of course, is the greater "economic return" larger vehicles would provide for truckers and lower per unit hauling costs for customers—a legitimate interest, certainly.

But that interest must be weighted against the public's interest in the use of the interstate system—a \$60 billion, taxpayer-financed project—and the other highway arteries onto which it empties.

Executive Vice President George Kachlein of the American Automobile Ass'n, which opposes the bill, charges the extra truck weights permitted (up to 108,500 pounds for a nine-axle truck) would cost \$1.8 billion for road repairs in 10 years.

And even if the bigger rigs could operate safely on the interstate, millions of miles of feeder roads on which some of them would have to travel are far below the interstate's design and safety standards. Congress has been warned by the National Ass'n of County Engineers, the National Ass'n of Counties and other opponents.

Further, the improved safety factors of the bigger rigs are projected rather than proved. And the sight of a passing truck 15 feet longer and tens of thousands of pounds heavier than the 55-foot vehicles now permitted throughout most of the east seems unlikely to steady the nerves of the average motorist.

On balance, the truckers' interests are outweighed by the public interest in safe and economic use of the highways. The new bill should join the old one on the congressional shelf.

[From the Defiance (Ohio) Crescent-News, Aug. 9, 1969]

ANTI-SAFETY BILL

Motorists who shudder when they see a big tractor-trailer truck pounding down a hill from behind or approaching on a narrow road ahead probably will join the American Automobile Association in denouncing proposed legislation before Congress as an "anti-safety bill."

The bill to permit even bigger trucks on the highways is back again after nearly slipping through Congress last year before public outcry killed it.

The measure is called a permissive bill as it would merely permit the states to authorize larger truck sizes on interstate highways within their borders. But in the past, states have been quick to go along with the trucking interests.

The bill would allow an increase in maximum width from eight to eight and a half feet (plus side mirrors and other outcroppings) and contains a formula that would increase maximum load weight from 73,280 pounds to 108,500 pounds.

A "grandfather clause" in the bill makes the length limit meaningless and would permit use of triple-trailer trucks 105 feet long in some states.

Opponents, including Rep. Richard D. McCarthy (D-NY), estimate that the bigger trucks would add billions of dollars in repair and construction costs as well as result in more fatalities and injuries in traffic.

Area motorists are urged to convey their views to Congressman Delbert L. Latta and other area legislators.

[From the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator, Sept. 15, 1969]

MORE HIGHWAY HAZARDS?

Virtually on the heels of charges that the trucking industry has been violating federal highway safety regulations with consistent callousness, the Nixon Administration has come out in support of permission for wider, longer and heavier trucks on interstate highways.

That the endorsement for mammoth trucks

was somewhat grudgingly given only adds to the amazement that it was offered at all. While repeating industry propaganda that the benefits would outweigh costs involved (and they are considerable) Federal Highway Administrator Francis Turner admitted federal officials really haven't determined the extent of the hazards involved.

By suggesting that Congress might be justified in delaying the effective date of the bill for three years, Mr. Turner made an indirect confession that approval was being extended with little thought to the primary objections to the proposed authority.

Larger loads and profitability are not the chief considerations. The safety of the general motoring public is the major issue.

Larger tires and greater braking power do not justify the industry's grab for a still greater share of the public roadway. The length limit of 70 feet, which the bill would authorize, will not minimize the danger of jackknifing accidents. Further, the loose language of the bill opens the way for further telescoping of truck length and the possible use of "triple trailers" that could run as long as 105 feet in some states.

Such leviathans are not appropriate even on some of the most modern portions of the interstate system, let alone that substantial part of the network that is barely adequate for the present mix of auto and truck traffic.

The basic objections to big trucks on little highways are sizable indeed. They are as valid today as they were a year ago when Congress buried the proposal with solid public support.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press, Sept. 4, 1969]

CRITICS FORM RANKS TO FIGHT NIXON-BACKED TRUCK BILL

WASHINGTON.—It didn't plan it this way, but the Nixon Administration found itself today accused of siding "with the giant trailer truck barreling down the thruway and against the terrorized motorist nearly blown off the road by the resulting blast of air."

A Republican congressman, a Democratic congressman and consumer champion Ralph Nader mounted the opposition to the Administration stand.

The Administration unveiled its long-awaited position yesterday on legislation that would permit heavier, wider and longer trucks and buses on the nation's interstate highway system.

The administration stand was outlined in a day of testimony before a House Public Works Subcommittee by Federal Highway Administrator Francis C. Turner. He said the bill would benefit the economy and that the Government didn't have "sufficiently reliable data" to say whether the bigger trucks would pose additional safety hazards.

The three disagreed.

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

"We're not safety experts," was the response of Cong. Richard D. McCarthy (D-N.Y.) to Turner's proposal that Congress decide the safety question. "You have them. But you take a Pontius Pilate attitude of washing your hands of the whole affair."

"I am convinced as I can be," said Cong. Fred Schwengel (R-Ia.) "that people are going to end up in hospitals and the graveyard unless we have more controls (over truck traffic)."

Schwengel, who led the battle last year to kill a similar bill, said he had a feeling Nixon had not gotten the full story and that he intended to see that he did.

The bill, supported by the trucking industry and opposed by the American Automobile Assn., would increase from 8 to 8½ feet the

maximum allowable width of trucks and buses using the interstate highway system.

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

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

AN AMERICAN TRAGEDY

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a National Observer article describing a tragedy caused by the abuse of drugs. It speaks directly to the need for prompt action on H.R. 14252, the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969:

AN AMERICAN TRAGEDY

At Amherst College in western Massachusetts a student died by falling 70 feet off the roof of a dormitory; he had earlier taken a trip on LSD. George Mountcastle was a Harvard University sophomore from Baltimore who was visiting an Amherst friend Oct. 11. State police have arrested another Amherst student on charges of selling the LSD to the visitor. But to Amherst's dean of students, Robert A. Ward, there was a particular agony about the tragedy that was personal. In a letter to his students written Oct. 16, Dean Ward tried to express it. His letter follows:

Gentlemen of the College: He was not an Amherst man; he was a visitor. But his death occurred in our community, and we shared in the loss. We were shocked by the tragedy and stunned by the senselessness of it. He was young and bright—too bright to surrender his life in the foolish madness blighting a generation. In a week in which we paused to reflect on the waste of life half a world away, it may have been a strange irony that we were starkly faced with meaningless death on our own campus. But that week is nearly gone—and memory fades.

I will not rehearse the statements made in the past about drugs. Many of us for some time have been apprehensive that a tragedy would come—and last Saturday night it did. Repeated warnings had gone unheeded; it couldn't happen here. I only wish those who ignored those warnings could have spent part of that horrible night waiting in Cooley Dickinson Hospital while the student's life ebbed or part of Sunday afternoon in my office while his parents struggled to comprehend the reality of that day.

I did not become a dean to watch a generation of students pollute their sanity or distort their lives, and I confess to a numbing and depressing sense of helplessness. Words are inadequate and deeds seem fruitless. More than ever students have taken on themselves the individual responsibility which shapes their lives in all areas. It should be so, but the judicious exercise of such responsibility demands wisdom. I see no wisdom at all in the growing and indiscriminate use of drugs. I also see a danger that one major tragedy may obscure other tragedies, smaller perhaps but no less frightening. On a beautiful Saturday afternoon which was in itself a natural somnolent, why the need for some artificial or uncertain drug? And where were we all on that night or on

any night and when will we awake to the need to replace a disinterested privatism with a sustained concern for troubled people in our community? And why do we tolerate in our midst the profiteers of poison? And by what moral right do we pass into the hands of others substances which can threaten their well-being and even their lives? What in God's name is happening to us?

Last Sunday in a scriptural lesson the timeless chastisement of Thomas was repeated: "Because you did not see, you would not believe." Last Sunday we did see. Now I plead as never before—please believe.

VETERANS DAY 1969 AND THE SILENT AMERICANS

HON. EARL B. RUTH

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. RUTH. Mr. Speaker, Veterans Day 1969 was more than a day to remember those Americans who fought to maintain freedom in the world in many wars. This year "silent Americans" chose this day to assemble and state that they support the President in his effort to end the Vietnam war and they support the American Government in its struggle against communism.

Among these nonpartisan Americans who wish to be counted were nearly 400 "silent Salisburians" from Salisbury, N.C., who rode all night in buses 350 miles to be in Washington on November 11 to show they care. They returned home that night to resume their daily responsibilities the next day.

An editorial in the November 11, 1969, issue of the Salisbury Evening Post states the case for the hearty group of patriots. And an editorial in the November 14, 1969, issue of the Stanly News & Press of Albermarle, N.C., states the case for all of those who are "silent Americans."

The editorials referred to follow:

[From the Salisbury (N.C.) Evening Post, Nov. 11, 1969]

AMERICAN VETERANS DAY

Fifty-one years ago today, envoys of the Imperial German Government sued for peace in the railway carriage of General Ferdinand Foch, the supreme commander of American, British and French armies.

The event occurred in the Forest of Compiègne, a place name that is about forgotten by today's generation. The armistice that was signed ended more than four years of warfare which had cost more than eight million lives and more than 20 million wounded.

This was the beginning of Armistice Day, a name that was to be erased by World War II, a bloody calamity that required us to change this solemn memorial to Veterans Day in order that we honor all men who have fought and died in America's wars.

Our roles in World Wars I and II were completely justified under the strictest code of morals. In neither holocaust was America motivated by a desire to seize territory from our enemies. There in the Forest of Compiègne we and our allies had gained an empty victory. All these millions of the wounded and dead had resulted from a flimsy incident in which a so-called Austrian archduke and his wife were assassinated in June, 1914.

The madness eventually enveloped Russia, France, the British Empire, Italy, the U.S., Japan, Rumania, Serbia, Belgium, Greece, Portugal, Montenegro, and Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, and Bulgaria.

America entered in 1917 when Germany began unrestricted submarine warfare. Our costs in lives lost was 126,000. No one who knew President Woodrow Wilson, a true idealist, did not believe that his aim was to win a war that would end all wars.

Yet that victory 51 years ago planted the seeds for World War II and for communism which was fired by the massive losses that were inflicted on Russia by the German armies. The Germans revolted, too.

The Versailles treaty, largely fashioned by France, the United States, Great Britain and Italy was a harsh instrument inflicted on the German people. The U.S. Senate flouted Wilson by refusing to accept it.

France, in particular, exploited Germany's Saar region. Germany became unable to meet the reparations imposed on her. Meanwhile a feverish-eyed man called Hitler began visiting beer gardens to spread his preachments about the superiority of the German people and the alleged greed of the Jewish population. He became chancellor in 1933 and the 12 years following his inauguration, a period that covers World War II, is a chapter that is well known to even the young generation.

The League of Nations proved completely ineffective. In short, Woodrow Wilson dreamed the wrong dream.

Currently we are bogged down in Vietnam in a no-win-no-lose war which has cost about as many American casualties as did World War I. The frustration over the Vietnam struggle is similar, but of an apparent deeper magnitude, to that which occurred during the Korean War.

We commend the many local people that are in Washington today to express their support of President Nixon's prosecution of the Vietnam War. Like the majority of our citizens, we shall back the President of the United States in foreign policy. But if the Vietnam mess stays on dead center, we shall reserve the right to dissent. We admit to some dark thoughts about the South Vietnamese government which seems to want neither peace nor Democracy.

Our "Silent Salisburians" in Washington today are making a nonpartisan gesture in support of the President's handling of the Vietnam War. We believe President Nixon would do well to follow the nonpartisan example set by our local delegation which resulted from the combined ideas of two leading local citizens, Dr. Ed McKenzie, Republican, and Rex Wood, Democrat.

Meanwhile, we salute those where the action is—the service men and women of the armed forces who are on duty in Vietnam. And we hope that everyone will pause today for a moment, at least, in silent tribute to our fighting men whose gallantry has written illustrious history from Valley Forge to the rice paddies of Southeast Asia.

[From the Albermarle (N.C.) Stanly News & Press, Nov. 14, 1969]

TIME TO SPEAK OUT

We are convinced, as is President Richard Nixon, that the vast majority of Americans support, at least in a general way, the government's policies, especially as regards to Vietnam.

This vast, "silent majority" of Americans, instead of getting out into the streets and demonstrating, or picketing draft boards, or occupying college buildings, has been going about its business of earning a living and carrying on activity as usual. In so doing, it has earned few headlines.

But it is time for these "silent Americans" to take enough time away from routine affairs to let the world know just where they stand.

Dissenters from the adopted policies of the government have a right, under our Bill of Rights, to express themselves and to make known their complaints.

They do not, however, have the right to conduct themselves in an unlawful manner.

to consider themselves above and beyond the law, and to seek to foment revolution within the United States. And that is the stated purpose of some of the militant leaders.

And it should be further stated that they do not have the right to so conduct themselves that they give aid and comfort to our enemies. In times of declared warfare that has been characterized as treason. With a state of undeclared war in existence, the facts should be the same. No individual should be permitted to brazenly fly the Viet Cong Flag, to speak and work for the defeat of the Americans. Certainly, such actions give Hanoi, Peking and Moscow the idea that the war is most unpopular in the United States and that our government will soon be forced to surrender.

Americans do not like the war in Vietnam. In fact, they do not like WAR. They are a peace-loving people. They do want to extricate this nation from the mess in Asia.

But they want to get out with honor. They do not want any settlement which might be construed as surrender.

This, then, is the message "silent Americans" need to tell the world: that the United States does not like war, and especially the war in Vietnam; that it hopes for peace with honor; but that surrender is unthinkable.

Far too many Americans have already died in Asia in the cause of anti-communism for us to let their deaths be in vain.

Speak out, fellow Americans! Let it be known where you stand.

Your country needs your voice to drown out the radicals of the left and the peaceniks who speak out of fear or a lack of what is really at stake.

This could be a very important time in our nation's history. The heretofore "silent majority" can set the goal and the direction toward which the nation will move. In fact, the path must be charted by this group.

MOB RULE IN AMERICA?

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, on November 15 the Post-Advocate of Alhambra, Calif., which has a large readership in the district I represent, published an editorial calling attention to the fact that the American people are deeply concerned about the methods being used by the participants in such events which occurred in the Nation's Capital last weekend.

The editorial emphasizes that the American public does indeed have reason to be fearful for the future of our representative democracy in that the tactics of threats and mob rule are in direct opposition to our constitutional form of government as it has been so successfully practiced for these many years.

The thoughts expressed so cogently in this editorial ring a note of concern in the minds of its readers and call upon those who are dedicated to reason and the rule of law to examine intelligently the goals of those who are resorting to violence in the name of dissent. It is for this reason that I consider this editorial to be worthy of the attention of my colleagues and under leave to extend my remarks, I insert it in the RECORD:

MOB RULE IN AMERICA?

Again deep anxieties are disturbing the majority of the people in the United States of America as those who take to the streets to communicate their dissatisfaction about

our activities in Vietnam resume their activities.

There is reason to be apprehensive. The appalling anti-American overtones and tactics used by the demonstration organizers even have frightened off nearly all of the major doves in the nation.

The arrogance of the organizers of the marches to protest our involvement in Vietnam has been dramatically displayed in Washington, D.C., during the last few days.

Sponsors of the so-called "March Against Death" today in the Capital have blamed the government in advance for any violence or illegal acts that may take place.

They are saying that if the government tries to stop a mob from breaking a law, then it automatically assumes the blame for any violence that may occur. This is a pure strain of the old totalitarian trick—accuse your enemy of the crime you are about to commit.

In another tactic that would make the Mafia proud, the Vietnam Moratorium Committee already has issued the threat that it will boycott stores across the nation during the Christmas shopping season unless merchants "express their sympathy with the moratorium."

In other words, any merchant can buy protection from the mob against loss of business or possible violence if he comes to heel.

No angle is overlooked by the revolutionaries. In hundreds of schools across the nation children are being urged to wear black armbands—ostensibly to mourn for the casualties in Vietnam—unaware that this also is a protest against our assistance to that unfortunate land.

And not the least of the ironies that we will see is the proposed student strike in high schools and colleges. Great emphasis will be placed during the "strike" on the casualties in Vietnam.

The concern of many of the same students and professors for our servicemen was not encouraged on Veterans Day, national occasion set aside to honor the men who served in military uniform.

What we are seeing on the streets today is the fruit of nearly a decade of lawbreaking in the name of dissent. The taste is bitter. Taking to the streets in the name of dissent and debate has led to rioting, looting, burning and killing in cities and on campuses across the nation.

The willful bombing of three major buildings in downtown New York City this week is a symptom of the same philosophy which equates lawbreaking with dissent.

As we look at those in the streets today, we must think of the organizations behind the events, of their enormously un-American tactics and what those tactics are doing to our nation.

And the best way to show our aversion is to support the President and our government.

TIME TO RECONSIDER THE REST OF THE GUN CONTROL ACT OF 1968

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives took a great step forward yesterday when it voted by an overwhelming margin to exempt rifle and shotgun ammunition sales from the ammunition recordkeeping requirements of the Gun Control Act of 1968. Under the act, a person selling ammunition was required to obtain the purchaser's name, address, date of birth, and some form of identification, and to note certain additional information in his records. I heartily endorse yesterday's decision by

the House, and I am hopeful that it is but the first step in a process leading to the complete repeal of the Gun Control Act. From its inception, it has been clear that the act would fail to accomplish any worthwhile purpose.

In fact, this attempt at Federal gun control has failed miserably. Sportsmen have encountered severe difficulties in obtaining guns and ammunition; homeowners often are left defenseless. Yet, the incidence of crimes of violence is continually rising. Would-be criminals can acquire firearms and ammunition with ease by illegal means, but law-abiding citizens find it difficult and burdensome.

While some restrictions may be necessary in certain circumstances, regulatory legislation should emanate from State and local governments, which are capable of responding to local needs. Gun control problems in any given State tend to differ in substance and scope from those encountered in other States. Hence, a uniform Federal law can serve no useful purpose.

The ammunition recordkeeping provisions which were repealed yesterday constituted an especially great and unwarranted infringement on the right of law-abiding citizens to buy and own guns and ammunition. In every section of the Nation, these provisions often imposed heavy burdens on hunters and other outdoorsmen. However, in my State, the great State of Alaska, the recordkeeping requirements caused especially severe hardships. Many of Alaska's citizens live in remote areas, hundreds of miles from the nearest ammunition outlet. Before the enactment of the Gun Control Act of 1968, these people were able to buy ammunition from bush pilots who delivered guns and ammunition when they brought in other supplies. However, because the recordkeeping provisions of the act draw no distinction between urban and rural areas, Alaska's rural people were compelled to travel many miles over hazardous and often snowy trails in order to obtain the ammunition, which is so vital to their survival. Thanks to yesterday's enlightened decision by the House, much of the severe burden imposed by the 1968 act will be alleviated.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that yesterday's vote to exempt rifle and shotgun ammunition from the Gun Control Act is the harbinger of the complete repeal of this legislation. Federally imposed firearms restrictions have no place in our Republic, which was founded on the principle that governmental power should be wisely and equitably allocated between the Federal Government, on the one hand, and State, and local governments, on the other. It now remains for us to consider the rest of the Gun Control Act of 1968 in light of this guiding principle.

U.S. POLARIZATION GROWING, GINSBURG SAYS

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, an article by William Raspberry in yesterday's

Washington Post articulates a problem that is becoming more painfully apparent—the increasing polarization of our society. The lack of constructive leadership in binding this Nation together has been a serious flaw of this administration. All partisan arguments aside, the responsibility of national leadership requires this administration, using the President's own words, "to bring us together." As this article points out, the current administration has fallen very short of this announced goal. I submit this article for the readers of this RECORD:

U.S. POLARIZATION GROWING, GINSBURG SAYS
(By William Raspberry)

The Kerner Commission warned last year of a trend toward "polarization" in the country, a headlong if inadvertent rush toward two societies, black and white, separate and unequal.

The man who was executive secretary of that commission now believes that this polarization is increasing because some of our top leaders want it to increase.

This is a serious charge, but David Ginsburg makes a good case for it.

"For some time now I've thought we may be heading again toward new violence and perhaps repression," he told a conference of the Pittsburgh Communications Foundation last weekend.

"The main reason is that there seem to be some in both parties prepared to play the new and dangerous political game of polarization."

Ginsburg, a Washington lawyer, sees two basic strategies at work.

First was the "series of signals" to the South that it shouldn't worry too much about integration. The signals included a relaxation of the enforcement of the 1954 school desegregation decision, a slowdown on voting rights and the placement of fewer blacks in high government office.

"This was a program for liquidating old political debts and coining new political currency," Ginsburg said. "It had potentially explosive and disastrous results. It could only say to the blacks that 'they'—the whites—really hate 'us'—the blacks. And it took place without any audible outcry in the ranks of the business and professional elite of the nation."

The second strategy, he said, is the Forgotten American/Silent Majority theme—"the explicit appeal to all the resentments of race and class that infuse the culture of the white working man."

"Law and order" is the recurring refrain of that theme, Ginsburg said, but there are others that speak of blacks wrecking neighborhoods, ruining schools and threatening the safety of family and property. For example: "Why should you pay higher taxes so that they can get federal handouts? Why should you open up your union so that they can take your job or your seniority?"

The major thrust of Ginsburg's charge was echoed Monday by former Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, who recalled President Nixon's bring-us-together inaugural theme.

The Nixon administration, said Humphrey, is not trying to "bring us together" but is waging a deliberate campaign of "polarization."

"I personally doubt that our country has seen in 20 years such a calculated appeal to our baser interest. I disagree with those who would create an atmosphere of suppression and call it patriotism," Humphrey said.

Ginsburg's emphasis was on racial injustice, Humphrey's attacks on the peace Moratorium and network television news reporting.

But both seem to see a deliberate Nixon administration attempt to forge a new majority among white Americans who feel themselves threatened by young people and blacks.

As Ginsburg put it, "We are making the Forgotten American feel sorry for himself without offering him a helping hand."

This is not only irresponsible and dangerous, he said, but it is also unnecessary and bad politics.

"What we must understand," Ginsburg said later, "is that these things aren't isolated tactics. They're part of an overall strategy."

"The President's Southern strategy, the vice president's attack on the media, the attorney general's characterization of the anti-war demonstrators—they're all a part of the same thing."

"We don't recognize it for what it is because we've never seen anything quite like it before."

TRIBUTE FOR JUDGE PEREZ

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on November 5 the friends of the late Judge Leander H. Perez, and I am privileged to count myself among them, dedicated a lake in Plaquemines Parish in his honor.

I want to insert in the RECORD at this point the speech which Judge Walter Hamlin delivered at the ceremonies dedicating Lake Judge Leander H. Perez:

REMARKS OF JUDGE WALTER HAMLIN

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Perez Family, Honored Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is with a feeling of extreme pleasure and of having been highly honored that I appear here today to join with you in honoring the memory of my dear old friend and benefactor, the Honorable Leander H. Perez, in the re-naming of ancient Lake Hermitage "Lake Judge Leander H. Perez."

It was my good fortune to have known Judge Perez for many years. I met him in November, 1916, in the old courtroom of Judge E. K. Skinner, who then presided over Division "C" of the Civil District Court. He was then a lawyer for a little more than two years, having been admitted to the Louisiana Bar in June, 1914, as a graduate of Tulane University. I was a freshman law student at Loyola and was 18 years old.

He was a spectator at a jury trial in which an attorney by whom I was employed was participating. I introduced myself to him that afternoon and there commenced a deep friendship and regard for him which has continued without interruption for over fifty long years.

On March 19, 1969, death came, as it must to all men, to the Honorable Leander Henry Perez. His death was a great loss to the Bar of Louisiana, the community in which he was born and reared, the Parish of Plaquemines, the State of Louisiana, and the entire nation.

Born on July 16, 1891, at Jesuit Bend, Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana, in which Parish he resided all of his life, he could be found in the forefront of almost all movements for the betterment of his Parish, his State, and our Nation.

He was the seventh son of thirteen children born to Roselius E. Perez and Gertrude Solis. He was married to the late Agnes Chalin, who preceded him in departing this life on February 11, 1967, and was the father of the Honorables Chalin O. Perez and Leander H. Perez, Jr., Mrs. Joyce A. Eustis and Mrs. Betty Ann Carrere. At the time of his death he was also survived by 19 grandchildren and two great-grandchildren.

He was admitted to the Bar of Louisiana on June 4, 1914, after having received the degree of Bachelor of Laws from Tulane University, New Orleans.

Judge Perez had his first taste of public and political life at the age of 28 when he won a legal battle for appointment as a district judge of Plaquemines and St. Bernard Parishes in 1919, and was in the political arena and a close associate of Louisiana Governors, ever since.

After serving about five years as district judge, he served for about thirty-six years as District Attorney of Plaquemines and St. Bernard Parishes. He also served as President of the Commission Council of Plaquemines Parish for about six years, retiring about two years before his death.

He was a lover and student of the law. It is not feasible to enumerate his many triumphs before the Bar of the Federal and State Courts, and other public forums. His ability and his reputation as a lawyer were second to none appearing before the courts of Louisiana and the United States, from the Supreme Court of the United States down. Suffice it to say that he was clear and distinct in his approach to all legal problems. His command of the English language was letter perfect, poetic and enthralling.

His erudition and enormous capacity for research and preparation, his sound advice to the Police Juries and various boards of St. Bernard and Plaquemines Parishes had much to do with the prosperity and phenomenal growth of these two communities and contributed more to their governmental, economic and educational facilities than it is within our limited power to describe. He possessed a vast knowledge of constitutional law, as well as the history of the laws and treaties of this nation, thus enabling him to be at a perfect forefront of all legal matters pertaining to oil-rich Plaquemines, and to endeavoring to obtain Louisiana's offshore oil wealth.

Beside trying to prevent what he considered the Federal Government's illegal efforts to take over the State's submerged tidelands he spent years in advocating the rights of the states as guaranteed by the Tenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. He was a man of boundless energy until his death, and established a fine reputation for getting things done in an exacting, thorough fashion. He had a zest for life, loved the great outdoors, loved all things good, and dedicated himself wholeheartedly to the service of his native land. Many times he went fishing in this area.

Judge Leander Henry Perez is sadly missed. His role in this nation has been unique. The place that he occupied in public affairs will be very hard to fill; and the memories of the thousands who benefitted by the putting into operation of his ideas will be green for many years to come. Plaquemines Parish and the State of Louisiana can well be proud of a son who will go down in the history of this State as ranking with such famous names as John Slidell, Judah P. Benjamin, Francis T. Nicholls, Edward Douglas White and Murphy J. Foster, to name but a few.

We wish him eternal rest.

I am of the firm belief that we who have gathered here today to participate in the naming of Lake Judge Leander H. Perez have carved for ourselves a niche in the History of Louisiana, which for ages to come will redound to our credit.

I now proclaim the continued existence of this Lake as "Lake Judge Leander H. Perez."

HEED THIS CRAFTSMAN

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, the furor and static continue over the controversy stirred up by Vice President SPIRO T. AGNEW because he had the courage to

challenge some present-day objectivity in presentation of television news and special reports.

The bitterness and yes, the rancor, showered on our Vice President convinced me last Monday that there was a "false ring" to the statements issued by a great many in opposition to Mr. AGNEW's views.

I am pleased, however, to bring to the attention of all Members the words of one of Michigan's finest newspapermen—still a working reporter—a man who is a legend in his field in his lifetime, Will Muller of the Detroit News, Detroit, Mich.

I have never had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Muller personally. It has been to my benefit to be a reader of his exceptional column for a great many years. He has, as I should have expected, written a very keen and perceptive column on the television uproar. He has, as I should have expected, chided his own newspaper profession as well.

I urge all Members to read this column. Granted, it favors the Vice President. And, granted it favors my earlier views. However, it also sheds a fuller and brighter light on all the controversy. It reads so well because it, as do most of Mr. Muller's columns, makes sense. The column follows:

ALL REPORTERS "DILUTE NEWS WITH OPINION"
(By Will Muller)

So the humble shepherd boy of American politics, Vice-President Spiro T. Agnew, fitted a stone into his simple slingshot and sank it into the forehead of that Goliath, the TV industry.

The industry is still staggering from Agnew's calm-voiced dissection before a Des Moines party gathering of how TV commentators adulterate the news with personal opinion.

TV tycoons are blustering about "intimidation of the press," "appeals to prejudice," "a bid for government censorship of the news." Malarkey. They are just frightened by a bit of truth coming from a man for whom the people voted but TV newscasters have been trying to make out a zero.

Small credit to the three TV networks for suddenly deciding to carry Agnew's speech alive. They could hardly afford to keep it off the air and prove his case.

For the TV networks to protest against government supervision is silly. They took the king's shilling when they bargained for the use of public property—the limited facilities of the airways. They subjected themselves to licensing in order to profit, just like airlines in the air and steamships on the rivers.

An inarticulate public long has smoldered over the personality call in network news-casting. The impact of the news is slight compared to the drama of its presentation. A sneer, a shrug, a gesture can color a whole account.

If TV is truthful in its claim of presenting the untouched picture of the day's news, then why makeup on the broadcaster's face, why the credit lines after each performance for the program manager, the stage director, the art director?

Every listener to an instant analysis of the world's daily problems and the world's great brains by a TV pundit must sometimes ask himself the question Shakespeare's Prince Henry propounded:

"Upon what meat doth this, our Caesar, feed that he hath grown so great?"

Agnew was unduly kind to the newspapers. True, they are subject to no licensing since they are not built through exploitation of a public property. Yet they would do well to

look at themselves in the light of Agnew's speech.

Agnew told his audience it could read what he said and the paper's comments on it in the Des Moines Register the next day. But the news would be in the news columns and the comment on the editorial page. He suggested a similar division of news and opinion on TV.

Maybe Agnew is right. Maybe the Register distills its grist to keep fact from opinion and both pure. If so, it's a delightful departure from what's happening elsewhere.

"A good reporter," one of the finest men ever in this business said back in the misty days of beginning, "writes what he sees and hears and keeps himself out of it."

Today the reporter often leaps into his story with both feet. He does it under the term "interpretation." Which means he dilutes the news with opinion any way you look at it.

Suddenly the reporter is interviewing himself. He comes to believe the world is interested more in what he thinks than in what is actually happening.

"Send a reporter to Washington today," observed a colleague recently, "and tomorrow you have a pundit on the payroll."

Quite possibly Agnew has soberly identified the problem. TV is interjecting itself between the news and the public. Newspapers hardly can cheer that criticism without looking to their own performance.

The polls have been showing an erosion of public confidence in newspaper leadership. Their salvation may be a return to the best kind of reporter, the one who tells what he sees and hears and leaves the decision making to his readers.

And from now on, that should be the safest way to cover Agnew.

IMPROVING THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, all of us are becoming increasingly aware of the need to protect the environment. Edwin A. Locke, Jr., president of the American Paper Institute, recently spoke of the concern of the forest industries for an improved environment for all Americans.

In his speech to the American Forest Institute here in Washington Mr. Locke calls for "bold and vigorous action" to protect our cherished resources.

I think my colleagues will be interested in Mr. Locke's remarks. The speech follows:

WANTED: A UNIFIED STRATEGY FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

(By Edwin A. Locke, Jr.)

When I tell you that it's a pleasure to be with you today I mean it, but in all honesty I was not sure for a while that I was going to be able to say that. The fact is that when your president asked me some two weeks ago to talk about the environmental problem I was rather at a loss. Certainly I have long been interested in what some people call the problem of "the affluent society," but it seemed to me at first that the subject had been so thoroughly analyzed forwards and backwards by so many writers and speakers that there was really nothing fresh or worthwhile left to say. I had a mental picture of myself standing up here and repeating things you have all heard before, to our common misery.

But now I am grateful to Buzz Hodges for stimulating me to come to grips with this

problem. I felt impelled to try to see the environmental dangers confronting the nation as a whole, as well as those aspects of it that relate to the forest-based industries. As a result my outlook has gradually changed. I have come to some tentative conclusions about the nature of the effort needed to improve environmental quality and I would like to share those conclusions with you today.

Let me say at once that there has not been time to discuss the purport of these remarks in any formal way with others in the industry. But on the basis of recent talks about the environmental problem with many paper company executives, I think there would be considerable support for my views among them. And let me say further that there is every reason for people in our industries to speak out on the broad national aspects of the environmental effort, when we see some step that might soundly be taken. We have I think proved our earnest intention to promote the environmental cause. We have long since realized that aside from the dictates of social responsibility, our long-range economic interests are inextricably linked to the quality of the environment.

I believe that anyone who objectively examines our efforts to cope with the environmental threats that have gathered so much momentum in recent years must realize that we are taking determined strides to conserve the nation's resources and protect its air and water. It is worthwhile reminding ourselves how much has already been done. Let me take a minute or two for that.

Critics who have not yet caught up with the facts sometimes assume that we are lukewarm about conservation, but what are the facts? Since 1950 the pulp and paper companies alone have put at least a billion dollars into reforestation, fire prevention and forest research. This effort is now showing substantial results. Take research alone. Recent advances in tree genetics and techniques of fertilization have opened up the prospect of producing and speeding the growth of superior trees that in the next generation will greatly enlarge our forest resources.

Meanwhile we are by no means standing still. Important developments in forest management, the improvement of harvesting methods, successful research in tree chemistry and improved techniques of pulping are already enabling the industry to make use of increasing amounts of wood substances previously regarded as waste. Equally important, the industry in recent years has found ways to produce light-weight papers for purposes that formerly required heavier stock, thus saving large amounts of wood fiber. We are also beginning to move vigorously in the collection of waste paper which is recycled and used again. Putting all these factors together, one of the leading scientific authorities of the industry recently told me that within the lifetime of most of us an acre of typical timberland will go a great deal farther to satisfy consumer demand than at present. He actually said six or seven times farther, but I think we would all gladly settle for half of that.

The industry's progress in fighting pollution of water and air has been equally impressive. Our liquid waste discharge per ton of production has been cut to considerably less than half as compared with 10 years ago, and great quantities of water are being conserved as our mills progressively install recently developed processes that permit the recycling of industrial water. As for air improvement, at the present time virtually all the kraft paper mills of the country have now installed major devices to control particulate emissions. More than 90% of all such emissions have been eliminated, and industry research is concentrating hard on ways of coping with other aspects of the air pollution problem. In some of our research projects, the government has given us valuable cooperation.

We have, I believe, earned our credentials

as convinced supporters of the national effort to protect the environment. For that matter, I think the public would be surprised to learn how far industry as a whole has come in its determination to improve the environmental picture. Recently I have been working with more than a score of major industry associations assisted by the staff of a major institution in the field of economic research and analysis. By the end of this year, we hope to have completed the outline of a program to which all industries could subscribe, as a basis for even greater efforts to assure future environmental quality.

Now in saying what I have said about the positive gains already made, I am not for a moment losing sight of the magnitude of the nation's environmental problem as a whole. It is perfectly clear that however much industry has accomplished, and however much government has achieved, it is still not enough—not by a long sight—certainly not enough to permit complacency.

I try to be conservative in my use of language, and I draw back from using words like "emergency", but I think we must seriously listen to ecologists who tell us that if we do not promptly, as a nation, take adequate preventive measures, we will have an environmental emergency in the next decade. The essence of their warning is simple and blunt. Increasing amounts of deleterious substances entering the air threaten to impair the nation's health and productivity, perhaps on an epidemic scale. A water emergency may be even more imminent. It is now familiar that a number of our rivers and lakes are so badly polluted that they will no longer support much aquatic life and are a biological threat to human populations on their shores; but what may not be so well known is that by the middle 1970's, if the current trend of demand continues, the need for water in our expanding population may well exceed the total potential supply from present sources. Whether by that time desalination of ocean water will be far enough advanced to make up the shortage is still uncertain.

I think we must all ask ourselves why is it, since industry is doing so much, and government is striving so hard to prevent further deterioration of the environment—why is it that there has not been more progress overall?

A good part of the answer is that the effort to protect the environment is badly fragmented on both the local and national levels. Let me take the local situation first. The tendency has been to attack the problem piece-meal, as situations become critical in one respect or another. There has been comparatively little overall environmental planning in local communities. Few have been able to figure out how to deal with the complexities of pollution from sewage and garbage, from automobile exhausts, from domestic heating, and from industrial smoke and effluents, together with the problems of waste disposal; and few could find the money to do the job even if they knew how. As a result there is often a good deal of procrastinating and an inclination to blame the other fellow for worsening conditions, but too little constructive action.

People need to realize that pollution is not an evil visited upon their communities by this or that segment of society. It is the common problem of all, the inevitable accompaniment of the process of social growth and development. Wherever people produce and consume there are bound to be residues that are extremely difficult to dispose of, and which if they accumulate too rapidly can poison the air, water and soil on which man depends for life. These are simply products of the social metabolism. The problem is to keep the residues at tolerable levels—a difficult but by no means impossible task. But unless and until the environment is dealt with as a whole, there will not be enough for-

ward momentum, in my opinion, to reverse present negative trends.

Now I am a great believer in local initiative. I know that the well-springs of our success as a nation lie in the spontaneous response of many thousands of separate communities to local conditions and challenges. But it is all too easy for the energies of a community to be frustrated and dissipated unless they are synchronized with the primary goals of the nation as a whole. If we are going to be effective in checking environmental deterioration at the local level—if we are going to pass on to our children an environment that offers promise for a good life, I believe we will have to make a much more unified effort than we have seen to date—an effort that will combine all the now scattered energies devoted to this problem into a single force to the benefit of the entire country.

I imagine that all of us here know that President Nixon and the Congress have recently begun to move toward a national approach to environmental protection. The President has already established an Environmental Quality Council with himself as Chairman, and with a membership made up of appropriate Cabinet members and White House advisers, with the aim of arriving at sound national policies. Bills with much the same purpose are currently being considered by the Congress. One of them, sponsored by Senator Jackson, proposes to set up a council consisting of full time professionals in this field to advise the President. Another bill, introduced by Senator Muskie, aims to establish an Office of Environmental Quality in the Executive Office of the President, as an intelligence center and advisory body.

These are useful steps as far as they go, but in my opinion they do not go nearly far enough to meet the requirements of our national situation. If we are going to deal successfully with the mounting dangers to the environment, the government needs not only sound information, advice and policies, but an operating organization that can move fast to do what needs to be done. At present executive authority in this field is divided among so many government departments and agencies that the complete list runs to several typed pages.

We have in the not far distant past seen *ad hoc* agencies of this kind called into being by the President and the Congress to meet emergency situations, and with good results. One of them was the War Production Board of the early 1940's, where I was able to see close up how much could be accomplished by an agency with broad powers to tap the energies of the nation's complicated economy, and direct them to a specific end. The other was the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of the 1930's, which had the task of helping to revive a declining economy, together with the power to raise the needed capital. Both of these organizations were staffed primarily by businessmen. While I would not presume to try to define the right kind of government agency for the present need, it strikes me that the nature and accomplishments of the WPB and RFC might be profitably studied and the lessons applied in the current environmental situation.

My feeling is that the sooner the President and the Congress create an "Environmental Protection Board" with strong executive, rather than merely advisory powers, the better off the country will be a few years from now. I can see no more hopeful way to carry out the necessary work. A top level agency reporting to the President and acting under his authority would be in a position to analyze the environmental needs of every part of the country, and set up regional models and priorities to enable local authorities to see what has to be done, in what sequence, how soon, and at what cost. Such an agency could coordinate scientific research on the

environment throughout the country, with a view to arriving at sound criteria and standards, and the use of the most efficient equipment and processes. The Board could assist states, cities and towns in systematically initiating essential projects in the most economical way. Of great importance also would be the intensive education of the public in their responsibilities to the environment—not only adults, but especially the young who will have to carry on the effort to protect the environment in the years ahead.

My remarks here have concentrated on the aspects of environmental deterioration that demand prior attention from the forest-based industries, notably air and water pollution and conservation, but in all probability a Federal program of action to be fully effective might finally have to deal with other major aspects of the ecological balance, as they derive from such major conditions as urban blight and soil pollution.

Plainly, the cost of environmental protection is going to run to many billions of dollars over the next decade—and this is a time when the government is already faced with many urgent and competing demands on the budget. The new agency, however, by centralizing operations which are now appallingly fragmented, could undoubtedly achieve important economies. Certainly, it would offer for the first time a fully coordinated attack on the problem—and one that is essential if we are going to overcome the threats of a water famine, epidemics of respiratory diseases and shortages of raw materials. I think the American public has the good sense to recognize the imperative need and would support the government in a unification of executive powers over the environment.

Bold and vigorous action by the Federal government along these lines is also likely to have a tonic effect on the nation's morale. The depressing psychological climate created by a deteriorating environment cannot be easily measured, but I suspect that it is an insidious negative force now working below the level of consciousness to weaken the spirit of the people. The reassurance that would be given by an all-out drive to improve the environment might do more to unify, encourage and energize our nation than any other development that I can foresee.

In fact, if the government should move soon to create and implement a unified environmental strategy, the benefits might be felt internationally, as well as within our borders. The United Nations has called a conference to formulate world policy on the environmental problem in 1972. If by that time we in the United States are moving strongly to protect our own environment, many another nation may find our example worth following. This is one of the few issues on which international solidarity might be achieved in our time. By displaying vision, by leading the way, this country may open up new vistas of hope to all men threatened by environmental deterioration, and may enrich the lives of future generations, not only on this continent, but throughout the world.

THE LATE JOSEPH P. KENNEDY

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 18, 1969

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I learned of the passing of Joseph P. Kennedy of Massachusetts, an outstanding American, re-

nowned business leader, diplomat, and father of great men. There have been very few like him in our history, and he shall be long remembered by everyone with knowledge of his genius.

Joe Kennedy was a man of remarkable ambition, ability, and purpose, in the great American tradition, accomplishing everything by improvisation, and improving his own style, step-by-step, as he went along. Advised by his university professors to keep away from high finance, he entered at once into the banking business and was immediately a great success, becoming one of the youngest bank presidents in the country. Shortly afterwards, he was hired by the president of Bethlehem Steel to assist in the management of the giant Fore River shipyard at Quincy, Mass. In this capacity, Joe Kennedy directed the activities of 22,000 employees, and made the acquaintance of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Assistant Secretary of the Navy under Woodrow Wilson. Successful at banking and manufacturing, he next turned to Wall Street, and promptly made a name for himself as one of the leading investment figures in the world.

Renowned as a business leader, he entered the political field under the regime of Franklin D. Roosevelt, whom he supported for President in 1932. Following passage of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, he was appointed Chairman of the Securities Exchange Commission, serving as a watchdog over the activities of Wall Street. As a further reward for services rendered in the 1932 political campaign, he was appointed by Roosevelt as Ambassador to Great Britain in 1937, and served almost until the outbreak of World War II.

In the meantime, he was raising a large, magnificent, and talented family, three of whose members were elected to the U.S. Senate, and one to the Presidency. The power and talent of the man, Joe Kennedy, was a dramatic part of the American story, during his days on earth, and his presence on the economic scene seemed to bear out the age-old contention that energy and genius combined can sweep the field in any form of competition.

I am saddened by his passing, as are all who knew of his remarkable career and warm, exciting personality. I extend to Mrs. Rose Kennedy, Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, and the other members of his family my deepest condolences and express, once again, my profound admiration for this man of brilliance, the late Joseph P. Kennedy.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC
OPPORTUNITY

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, much debate has centered on the merits of the Murphy amendment passed by the Senate during its action on the extension of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I have expressed opposition to this amendment on the basis that it had

the potential of destroying the legal services program. In coming to this conclusion, I have had great confidence in the ability and dedication of the new Director of the OEO, our former colleague, Donald Rumsfeld.

If there is an area throughout this country where the disadvantaged are truly disadvantaged it is in the legal services. Continuation of the OEO legal services program is essential. I feel confident that there will be a reduction of the radical activity which has brought the program so near disaster in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I am immensely pleased that the very able Governor of Oregon, Tom McCall, agrees with my position. The legal services program is of such importance that Governor McCall is willing to forgo the veto provided in the Murphy amendment in order to make certain that there is a continuation of the program on a nationwide, continuing basis.

Here is the text of Governor McCall's letter on the Murphy amendment:

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Salem, November 12, 1969.

HON. WENDELL WYATT,
House of Representatives, Longworth House
Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR WENDELL: Within a short time, the House of Representatives will consider S. 3016, relating to the Federal Economic Opportunity Program. When this measure was before the Senate, the "Murphy" amendment was adopted to provide that the Governors of the various states in effect possess power of veto over the activities of legal services programs funded by the office of Economic Opportunity.

I am aware that the proponents of this amendment argue that its purpose was to "channel legal services programs into productive areas, rather than, as in the past, into areas that have created great dissatisfaction and confusion." At the same time, I am cognizant of the action of the American Bar Association's Board of Governors on October 18, 1969, calling for the deletion of this provision from S. 3016.

It may seem paradoxical that I, a Governor oppose enactment of a provision that would vest greater power in my hands. My position also should not be construed as approval of all activities that have been carried out by attorneys retained by OEO; indeed, our own Welfare Division recently was subjected to a vexing lawsuit in which such attorneys represented welfare recipients.

At the same time, letters come to my desk every day from persons who are aggrieved by actions of public officials and private individuals, but who cannot afford the services of an attorney. Many of the legal actions that might be brought by them could create "great dissatisfaction and confusion." However, if we are to make our judicial system available for all, including the poor, we must prepare ourselves, as government officials, to be discomfited upon occasion. It is a healthy thing for public officials to be required to face these tests, and it is an unhealthy attitude on their part to seek to prevent impeccable litigants from having their day in court.

In conclusion, I endorse the resolution passed by the Board of Governors of the American Bar Association, which asserts that the legal services programs should operate with full assurance of independence of lawyers within the program not only to render services to individual clients, but even in cases which might involve action against government agencies seeking significant institutional change.

Sincerely,

TOM MCCALL,
Governor.

JOE McCAFFREY COMMENTS ON
THE VICE PRESIDENT

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD two commentaries of Joseph McCaffrey, as broadcast over WMAL-TV, channel 7, Washington, D.C., concerning Vice President AGNEW's November 13 address:

COMMENTARY OF JOSEPH McCAFFREY,
NOVEMBER 15, 1969

It was a nice touch that Vice President Agnew should devote a major speech to an attack on freedom of television news during the week which was labeled national unity week. If there was any unity during the past week, it was mighty hard to discern.

It could appear that President Nixon has discarded his "bring us together theme."

The effect of Mr. Agnew's remarks is a kind of censorship by intimidation. The worry is—is there still another step.

Harry Truman, one of the most interesting men ever to serve in the White House, took more criticism in one day than this Administration has taken since January. Old Harry had a very simple motto, it was "If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen." But Harry Truman had what it took, not just courage, but a deep, passionate devotion to the freedom which this country has nurtured since it won its independence from England.

A man has to be born to this, he has to understand it, otherwise he can never aspire to be a leader of men.

A free country has to allow its leaders to be criticized, leaving the value of that criticism up to its citizens.

The people make up their own minds. Mr. Agnew seemed to survive the criticism on election day in 1968. Now that he is in office he shouldn't panic and try to stifle free expression.

He could read a book on Harry Truman. There are plenty of them around. They tell the story of a man who knew what this country was all about. The story of a man of courage.

Harry Truman, as President, was a big man.

COMMENTARY OF JOSEPH McCAFFREY,
NOVEMBER 16, 1969

By their nature Americans, older Americans, have thought of their country as being just about perfect.

It is hard, thus, for them to rationalize the present upheaval in American society. The peace marchers, the black militants, the welfare protestors—the incessant screaming of one minority group after another.

Could this all be because . . . because . . . of television?

Yes, that must be the answer.

Television has promoted and fomented all of these disturbances. If there wasn't television to play back a small disturbance, then it would not become a large disturbance.

The blacks would be placid and accept their fate, as they had accepted it for generations. The youth would be content to fight the wars, never asking the why of the wars; ignoring the history of and the lessons of the Nuremberg Trials.

It is television. It is television which has ruined our perfect world.

To this myth the Vice President of the United States pandered in his amazing speech at Des Moines.

The Democrats love the myth because it explains away, completely, Chicago and the 1968 convention. The Republicans love it because as the Administration in power it absolves them of any blame for conditions today.

The average guy loves it because it gives him an easy explanation for everything, much like blaming all trouble in the world on Communism.

The greatest danger in any country, and especially in a Democracy, is to translate everything simplistically.

If the war in Vietnam means that the rights of free expression, free speech and free criticism are to be curtailed in this country, then more than forty thousand young, brave Americans have given their lives in vain.

WHY LAST THINGS FIRST?

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration and the leadership in Congress have yet to understand or appreciate the necessity of reordering the grossly misplaced national priorities. An excellent case in point is the funding of the supersonic transport plane in the appropriations for the Department of Transportation. These appropriations clearly illustrate again the intransigence of this body in refusing to recognize where the real emphasis should be—with the human needs of the people. When will the leaders of this country realize that prosperity does not depend as much on the material objects we can parade before the rest of the world as it depends on the well-being of our citizenry?

It is hypocritical to cut desperately needed social programs in the name of economy and then begin spending hundreds of millions of dollars on unwarranted and overblown projects such as the SST. At this very moment, an extremely important function of the Department of Transportation itself is being handicapped by the underfunding for personnel within the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems. Our inability to establish realistic priorities is being increasingly recognized across the Nation. And it is not only young people who are dissatisfied. Citizens of all ages, all races, and all occupations are increasingly disturbed by the myopic vision with which the Government tries to discern the needs of this country.

A letter which appeared in the Washington Post yesterday, written by a woman from Silver Spring, Md., is—in my judgment—an excellent example of this citizen awareness. In the event some of my colleagues did not have the opportunity to read this statement, I include it in the RECORD at this point:

SST VERSUS HEALTH RESEARCH

On Nov. 14 The Washington Post reported: "By a 2-to-1 margin, the House Appropriations Committee voted yesterday to continue the subsidy to eventually total \$1.3 billion for development of a supersonic transport."

On July 29 the House Appropriations Committee voted stringent cuts in the budget for HEW, which in turn has adversely affected medical research programs throughout this country funded by NIH grants. The administration states that these cuts will not really damage research in this country. The administration is wrong.

I have a child in the research program on

Down's Syndrome, which is currently under study by Dr. Mary Coleman at Children's Hospital, Washington. While this program will be assured part of its funds from NIH through April 1971, the blunt fact remains that another \$50,000 is needed to assure that 20 children will not have to be dropped from the program for lack of funds to cover them.

Now many people today shake their heads and wonder why the student youth have become radicals. Well, I want to make it perfectly clear, I am not a student and I am not very young, but I am definitely on my way to becoming a radical—if radical means shame and disappointment in a government with such misplaced priorities.

To my radicalized mind there is something very wrong with a government that will spend over a billion dollars to build a huge, noise-problem aircraft so that a relatively few important people can get somewhere in three hours rather than four, while refusing to spare \$50,000 to help give hope and promise to thousands of babies yet unborn. Some government.

Mrs. ALLEN C. TRAINER.

SILVER SPRING.

A POSTAL CLERK SPEAKS OUT IN FAVOR OF H.R. 11750

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD a letter which has been received by the Citizens Committee for Postal Reform from a postal clerk in Louisville, Ky.

His letter reflects the sentiments of a majority of postal workers of this country. It is unfortunate that the postal union leadership is working against true postal reform and H.R. 11750. For, in so doing, that leadership is working against the best interests of its constituents, the postal workers themselves, as Mr. Hall's letter makes clear. It is certainly a strange turn of events when the union leadership oppose legislation that is designed to improve the lot of the postal worker. The union hierarchy prefers to come to Congress hat-in-hand instead of instituting the collective bargaining process.

We need people like Mr. Hall in the postal service, but we are going to lose them for the reasons stated by Mr. Hall in his letter. Let us hope that more members of the "silent majority" raise their voices in protest against the position that has been dictated by the postal union hierarchy; and let us hope that more of the rank-and-file workers will express themselves as Mr. Hall has done in this letter here inserted:

NOVEMBER 12, 1969.

To Citizens Committee For Postal Reform, Washington, D.C.

From Harry P. Hall, Louisville, Ky.

Sirs: I am a postal clerk, living and working in Louisville, Kentucky. I have been a postal clerk for the past 9 years. During this time I have witnessed the inadequacies, the politics, and the just plain undesirable working conditions existing within the Postal Service. I soon realized that as a clerk, my opinions or my ideals of how things should be was like unto one crying in the wilderness.

At present I am a senior at the University of Louisville and plan to obtain my Masters Degree in the field of Administration in the

Fall of 1971. I entered the Postal Service with the intention of making it my life's career. After about five (5) years of wishful thinking, I finally realized that I might become or in fact was a part of that large majority who end their postal career in the same grade in which they start.

When HR 1750 appeared on the horizon of congressional enactment, I felt that "A better day was on the way." Don't be misled into believing that I am the only Clerk who felt that way. There are literally thousands of Postal Clerks across the Nation who favor HR 11750. They are simply led by a biased Union leadership whose main concern is in maintaining their power status at all costs. If you could check the records you would find that not 20% of the Union membership ever actively attend Union meetings. There are many reasons for this and the majority of them are valid. I, myself am a member of the U.F.P.C. and have served as Union Steward of my Tour of duty however being a member does not condone the policy that Mr. Filbey continues to pursue.

I am writing just to let you know that the great silent majority of all Postal employees favor the enactment of HR 11750. We are sick and tired of our larger mail volumes and slimmer chance of promotion. We, unlike our Union bigots, are not afraid of change; we welcome it! The Post Office would still be delivering mail via horseback instead of air if it were not for change. Please continue to do all you can to enact HR 11750 for the silent majority who so desperately need it.

Thanks a Million.

SECRETARY STANS SPEAKS AT FOREIGN TRADE CONVENTION

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include, as part of my remarks, the text of a significant address given by Secretary of Commerce Maurice H. Stans before the 56th National Foreign Trade Convention in New York on November 17, 1969:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE MAURICE H. STANS

It is an honor and a pleasure to join in opening this Fifty-sixth National Foreign Trade Convention.

This provides me a very welcome opportunity to discuss some of the challenges in the international economy that are the concern of both business and government.

Over the years, these annual gatherings of the National Foreign Trade Council have considered many such challenges to Free World progress and prosperity.

And your distinguished organization has made major contributions toward meeting them. It has been a wise counselor to government in the shaping of public policy and programs. And it has been an eloquent advocate of cooperation among nations in the development of the international economy.

But never, I think, has your leadership been needed more than today, both collectively as members of the Council and individually in your corporate capacities. Because never have government and business faced more formidable challenges to progress in this area.

Fortunately, we've had the experience that enables us to meet these challenges. We remember where the regressive policies of a bygone era took us; to a world-wide depression that left the international economy in a

shambles. We know where the more progressive trade policies of the past third of a century have led us: to the greatest era of prosperity the world has ever known. And we can be sure where even more open trade policies in the rest of this century can take us: to the fulfillment of comfort and well-being for the people of the United States and of the world.

ADMINISTRATION'S COMMITMENT

Let me assure this notable council that President Nixon and his entire Administration are firmly committed to a continuation of policies aimed at expanding world trade through more open markets. I have given this assurance to our trading partners on trips to both Europe and the Far East, and also to many audiences in our own country.

I would like to repeat here what I have said in a dozen foreign countries: This Administration pledges its full support for Four International Economic Freedoms which can be the guiding principles for progress in the Free World: Freedom to travel; Freedom to trade; Freedom to invest; and Freedom to exchange technology.

No one knows better than yourselves that these are ideals, a guiding star, and not goals fully achieved by any nation. Nor will they be soon, nor without determination.

Every nation has special problems which arise from time to time, and for which adjustments must be made. We all recognize these, and as trading partners are prepared to cooperate in resolving them.

CHALLENGES

But beyond these, a variety of factors today is threatening to slow the benefits that flow from each of these four great economic freedoms.

And it is on some of these challenges that I would like to focus your attention for a few minutes.

All are the concern of the entire Free World. Some require action by our trading partners; others are peculiarly our own responsibility. In these, I want to discuss what your government is doing to help meet them. More importantly, I want to appeal for your assistance in areas where the dynamic qualities of American business hold the key to success.

In connection with the imbalance in our international accounts, let me say that this Administration views the Free World economy as all of one piece. The interrelated nature of travel, trade, investment and technology exchange makes the problems of one nation the problems of all. We can solve them only through the one essential for all human progress: cooperation and reciprocity.

In this respect, the balance of payments difficulties of one nation are the concern of all others. This is especially true in the case of the United States. Our dollar is the world's principal reserve currency. It is backed by the greatest productive capacity that ever existed. But we must continue to strengthen it by bringing our international accounts into better balance.

TRAVEL

Closing the gap in our travel account is one very important way.

I won't dwell at length on the problems in this area, because I want to concentrate on some other things. But you and other businessmen can make a major contribution here, and I want to call your attention to the need.

The problem centers on our enormous \$2 billion travel deficit, and its direct adverse effects on the U.S. balance of payments.

Today, our people are going abroad in record numbers—but this is only the beginning. Soon traffic will be opened across a flying bridge of jumbo jets. Next, some airline will be establishing a shuttle run to Paris.

BUSINESS VISITORS

Now this Administration is not going to follow the example of its predecessor and try to interfere with the right of Americans to travel abroad.

But we are stepping up our program to get more foreign visitors here, to do business and continue on to see the wonders of this great country.

And that's where you businessmen come in. We need your help in getting more business visitors here. As one step in our program, we've just appointed an International Director of Convention and Business Travel Development, with headquarters in Paris. He is working to increase the number of international meetings held in the U.S.

These conventions constitute a billion dollar market. Europe gets 67 percent of this; the U.S. and Canada combined get only 10 percent.

You businessmen are members of many of the organizations that hold these meetings. We need your help in convincing them to hold their conventions here, the greatest country in the world. We want a lot more of that billion—and we're out to get it.

TRADE

Second, there are growing challenges today to freer trade.

These consist primarily of a rising wall of nontariff barriers, which are causing serious distortions in international trade. Many of them are covert forms of protectionism which discriminate against American exports.

In Europe, American businessmen face such problems as:

Over-adjusted border taxes on incoming goods, while exporters receive advantageous tax rebates.

Restrictions on participation in procurement by government entities.

Protectionist aspects of the Common Market agricultural policy.

Artificial technical restrictions placed on imports, which mainly affect high technology goods from the United States.

European subsidies which unfairly injure American markets in third countries.

The Nixon Administration is mounting a full scale attack, the first in history, on these restrictive practices.

OPEN TABLE

One of the main purposes of my recent trips to Europe and the Far East was to lay the foundation for progress in this area. I proposed to our trading partners the adoption of an Open Table policy under which all such barriers would be brought into the open, probed, diagnosed and dealt with on a reciprocal basis. And by "all" I meant not only those visible in law and regulations, but also the invisible, those effected by administrative action and inaction.

This met with a favorable response everywhere, and I am glad to be able to report that concrete steps are being taken toward a reduction of these obstacles.

In the case of Japan, we have exchanged lists of nontariff barriers, and three weeks ago our representatives met in Geneva to begin an exchange of views on a wide range of restrictive systems and practices.

In addition, the member nations of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade have just agreed to move out of the fact-finding stage on nontariff barriers, and get down to brass tacks, the business of how to eliminate them. Guidelines have been established for five working groups, and progress reports are scheduled for next May.

I can assure you that the United States will press very hard to move these discussions forward. We in the United States have some nontariff barriers against certain imports, but we are convinced that we are more the victim than the culprit. And we want

them eliminated, or at least dealt with on a fully reciprocal basis.

TRADE BALANCE

They've got to come down as part of our campaign for an improvement in our merchandise trade balance, the mainstay in our balance of payments.

Last year we just barely missed recording our first trade deficit in 75 years. Imports soared 24 percent, while exports rose only about 10 percent. This year imports are up about 6.7 percent and exports about 7 percent. We may end up with a 1969 trade surplus barely better than last year's.

But if we are going to keep our aid and defense commitments abroad, and continue to finance overseas investments and travel, we must boost our trade surplus back to levels of the early 1960's, around \$5 billion.

The Cabinet Committee on Export Expansion, of which I am chairman, has set an export target of \$50 billion by 1973. This compares with \$34 billion last year. It is an ambitious goal, but also one well within our capabilities to achieve.

Today we export about 4 percent of our Gross National Product. Some countries export 35 percent of theirs. If we could raise ours to only 4.3 percent by 1973, we would reach our goal.

I am confident we can do it. In a free enterprise economy like ours, it is always business that must actually carry the ball. But this is not going to be one of those exercises where government just sits on the sidelines and cheers. We're going to be right down there on the playing field doing our best to run interference for you.

ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

With the elimination of nontariff barriers on the list for long-term market improvement, the government's immediate assistance program includes:

2. Adequate credit for exports to assure competitive financing. Through the Export-Import Bank, we are going to try to insure that our exporters can meet credit competition anywhere.

3. A more reasonable taxation of export earnings, in order to make exports more profitable. This is under intensive study at the present time, and I am hopeful that concrete proposals can be formulated real soon.

4. Strengthened commercial representation abroad, to upgrade performance. In this, we need guidance from exporters on how our commercial representatives can be most helpful. And I would welcome your suggestions.

5. Expansion of export promotion activities. We are stepping up the number of our commercial exhibitions abroad; working with the National Export Expansion Council in targeting industries which offer the greatest export potential; sponsoring a new program of industry-government trade missions abroad; and increasing our efforts at home and abroad to help develop foreign sales for groups of small and medium-sized firms.

6. Streamlined export documentation procedures. We have cut export paperwork to the bone, saving tens of millions of dollars for business and government, and eliminating costly delays in export shipments.

7. Rebuilding the American merchant marine. The President's program to modernize our merchant fleet is now before Congress, and I am confident that its adoption will mean better service to shippers.

8. Finally, and very importantly, the Administration's attack on inflation, which makes our goods less competitive in the world market, and foreign goods more easily salable in ours. The President's courageous action in combining prudent fiscal policies with the tight monetary policies of the Federal Reserve has brought pressure on the inflationary conditions that had been building since 1965. These conditions are now easing. As a result, we expect a moderation in the growth of the economy next year, and we

are calling on business and labor to take that fact into consideration in their wage and price decisions, so that inflation will be brought under control.

INVESTMENT AND TECHNOLOGY

After travel and trade, there are the world-wide challenges to freedom of investment and exchange of technology. I want to consider these together because they often go hand in hand in their benefits to a nation and its people. This is especially true in the developing countries of the world, whose hopes for economic improvement rest largely on increased capital for building sound industries. It is their only hope for growing away from subsistence, agricultural economies.

The whole world knows of the long-standing U.S. commitment to progress for the developing nations.

The reason is obvious: it is in our own self-interest. For the United States to prosper, we must have a world of peace and stability. Economic progress for the developing nations will help achieve it. This is the way to a better life for people everywhere. This is the best hope for lifting the burdens of poverty, hunger, disease and ignorance from the shoulders of mankind forever.

Moreover, our own continued prosperity is tied to the growth of markets for our exports with a high technology content. The economic modernization of the developing nations opens up such markets.

These are some of the underlying reasons why this government has spent billions of dollars in assistance programs in the developing nations in the past quarter of a century. And this is why we have encouraged private investors to undertake vast development projects of all kinds in these countries.

BENEFITS

Accompanying these great infusions of capital have been the benefits of advanced technology.

Most important of all has been the fact that millions of people have learned new skills. They have received training in production, distribution, marketing, and promotion, and many other functions of a modern economy. In a very real sense, American and other private investment has built the "Schoolhouse of the World" in the developing nations. Here the old order of ignorance, despair and hopelessness has been overturned as people have learned new skills and acquired new hopes and new expectations.

This infusion of technology also has set in motion the whole development process in those countries. The costs of products have been lowered, personal income has gone up, markets have been developed, and the standard of living has been raised.

In addition, American private investment has often boosted exports of the developing nations, providing foreign exchange for them to increase imports.

OUR EXPERIENCE

We in the United States know first hand what foreign capital can mean to a country's development. In the 19th Century, we were the great underdeveloped nation of the world. Foreign capital came in and built much of our original transportation network—roads, bridges, canals and railroads. It was attracted here because we offered investors the advantages of political stability, full legal protection of property, and the unlimited right to take out earnings or withdraw capital.

Later, foreign businessmen started making direct investments in manufacturing in our country, a happy development which still continues to grow year after year. And it is one that we continue to encourage because it increases competition and brings us the benefits of foreign technology and managerial techniques. It is a working, successful

example of the value of the international principle of "Freedom of Investment."

EXPROPRIATION

I touch on these benefits of foreign direct investment as background for a few comments I want to make on the insecurity of the investments of American firms in some of the developing nations.

We know that if we are to advance the well-being of the world community, each member of the family of nations must accept certain obligations. Surely one of these is to respect the property rights of others.

If he isn't, how can we carry on the great work of helping the developing nations to modernize through the investment of private capital and the transfer of technology?

PRESIDENT'S VIEWS

President Nixon, referring to the problem in a recent speech, pointed out that a developing country must "expect a serious impairment of its ability to attract investment funds when it acts against existing investments in a way which runs counter to commonly accepted norms of international law and behavior."

And he added: "We will not encourage United States private investment where it is not wanted, or where the local political conditions face it with unwarranted risks."

As we all know, investment capital enjoys a free marketplace in the world. It is attracted by the legitimate profit incentive. It will go where there are prospects for a fair return without undue risk. It will flee from conditions which threaten its freedom and security.

These are inexorable facts. If a nation is to attract private capital and enjoy the benefits that it offers, conditions must be favorable for its long term investment.

It is to every nation's benefit to create these conditions.

Many nations which recognize the value of private investment have entered into the "Convention on Settlement of Investment Disputes," an effort led by the World Bank. Under the terms of this convention, which the U.S. entered into in 1966, machinery is available at the headquarters of the World Bank for both conciliation and arbitration.

We all hope that this and similar efforts will lead to a growing body of international law which will assist international investors in learning and enforcing the rules of the game.

FAVORABLE CLIMATE NEEDED

Even more basic than the assurance of security for existing investments is the need for a climate receptive to new investments on a large scale. For one thing, it would be helpful for leaders in both the public and private sectors in the developing nations to emphasize the value of foreign direct investment to the general populace. They could and should point out the benefits in terms of jobs, personal income, standard of living. They could cite the example of how other nations, including the United States, were largely built by foreign capital in their formative years, and still benefit from such investments today. And among the developing nations today are outstanding examples of such growing countries as Korea and the Republic of China.

I believe the leaders of all countries have a responsibility to create a favorable climate for the reasonable entry and repatriation of capital and earnings. Investors need assurance of a welcoming attitude on the part of every segment of society—working people, farmers, professional people, businessmen, as well as government leaders. They should understand, of course, that their country is competing against every country for scarce resources—capital and know-how—and that foreign investment will go to the country that offers the most hospitable climate.

Reassurance is sorely needed today to restore the confidence of U.S. firms, and those of other industrialized countries, in the poli-

cies of all Free World nations toward private investment.

SUMMARY

So let me summarize the position of this Administration as we move to meet the new challenges in the international economy today.

First, we will not impose financial restraints on the American people traveling abroad, and will increase our efforts to bring more foreign travelers here.

Second, we are committed to the principle of freer trade among nations, and we are moving in that direction.

Third, we seek to reduce nontariff barriers to international commerce through "Open Table" discussions.

Fourth, we are undertaking a broad program of active assistance for exporters in order to help restore a healthy trade surplus.

Fifth, we deplore the restrictive attitude toward American investment abroad. We urge a receptive climate in all countries under a public policy of encouragement that should provide assurance for the security of all foreign investment.

These are the principles that we believe are our best guides in meeting the challenges that loom on the economic horizon of the international community today. They embody the Four Freedoms I mentioned earlier as the paths to economic progress across the borders of nations—Freedom to travel; Freedom to trade; Freedom to invest; Freedom to exchange technology.

CONCLUSION

We know that all men seek a better world. In his Latin American policy speech, President Nixon said "there is no task more urgent than lifting up the hungry and the helpless, and putting flesh on the dreams of those who yearn for a better life."

One way to help build this better life is to continue to free up the elements that promote international development—travel, trade, investment and technology.

This Administration is fully committed to work at this task with energy and determination, and I am confident that we can count on the full support of the members of the world's business community.

HOW BALL BOUNCES—WORTH A TV LOOK

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the attacks by the Vice President on the media and on one of the greatest Americans of our time, Averell Harriman, are no laughing matter. Especially to the extent that the Vice President appears to be speaking for the President, the implication of these attacks is very grave indeed. The battle lines are being drawn for another long struggle on behalf of our basic freedoms, including freedom from fear.

However, even in the most serious battles affecting our democratic system, humor can be a valuable weapon.

With that thought in mind, I insert herewith the following column by Art Buchwald which appeared today in the Washington Post:

HOW BALL BOUNCES—WORTH A TV LOOK

(By Art Buchwald)

Today I would like to discuss with you the dangers of television sportscasting and how a small group of men decide what 20

million people will see during a football game.

Last Saturday, Ohio State played Purdue in one of the most important football games of the year. While viewers had tuned in to see this great contest pitting two of the finest teams in the country, two or three commentators who had made up their minds in advance on the outcome, had subjected the game to instant analysis and querulous criticism.

It was obvious to those of us watching that these self-appointed analysts expressed their hostility toward one team or the other before the television audience had a chance to digest what had happened.

Two of the commentators, Chris Schenkel and Bud Wilkinson, by the tone of their voices and the expressions on their faces, indicated sharp disapproval of Purdue's defense and couldn't hide their admiration for the way Ohio State had managed to score at will.

They offered gratuitous advice, challenging the policies of the Purdue quarterback and coach, and the networks seemed happy to offer the commentators all the time they wanted.

Now everyone has a right to say what he wants about the Ohio State-Purdue football game, but the American people also have a right to make up their own minds as to what they have seen.

How was this football game telecast? A small elite group of men, no more than a dozen, decided what you would or would not see Saturday. They chose the plays and the players that you would follow. You had no choice in this matter.

They also, at their own discretion, decided what instant replay would be shown and when. This great power in the hands of a few men is too frightening to imagine. Who is to say how much Chris Schenkel's inflections or Bud Wilkinson's raised eyebrows contributed to Purdue's defeat?

We know that Mr. Schenkel lives in New York and Mr. Wilkinson lives in Washington, the most unrepresentative communities in the United States.

Both men read the same newspapers and draw their views from the same sources. Worse, they talk constantly to one another, thereby providing artificial reinforcements of their shared viewpoints.

Is it not fair and relevant to question the concentration of power when it comes to college football games in the hands of a tiny enclosed fraternity of privileged men, elected by no one and enjoying a monopoly sanctioned and licensed by the government?

We should ask ourselves: What is the end profit of watching such a game? Why, for example, did the network in question choose to show the violence of the Purdue-Ohio State football game, rather than the peaceful scenes on the sidelines? Why were their cameras constantly aimed at confrontation between the two teams instead of showing us what was going on outside the stadium in the parking lot, where all was calm and serene?

At halftime, we saw demonstrations on the field, cheerleaders screaming and urging their respective teams to violence. In the search for excitement and controversy we were treated to a small minority of people numbering no more than 85,000, shouting and yelling their heads off. Was this representative of all the people in the United States? I do not have the solutions to the questions I have raised today. I believe it is up to the sportscasters themselves to re-examine and improve the objectivity of their football reporting. I don't say the government should get into it at this time, but if we can't have a football game without violence on the field and prejudice on the part of the commentators, then I can't see any other alternative than for the FCC to step in.

BEARDEN HIGH MEMORIAL IS DEDICATED

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the belligerent youth who march and make loud protests receive much public attention. And we often speak of the "silent majority." However, there is another group that is active, yet gets little attention or recognition for its efforts.

Today I would like to recognize the young people of America who are doing something positive for their Nation. Throughout this country thoughtful young men and women are banding together to express deep-felt patriotism.

I specifically want to recognize groups of students in Knoxville, Tenn., who designed and carried out their own programs.

On this Veterans' Day, 1969, Bearden High School dedicated a memorial stone at their school in honor of four of their graduates who gave their lives in Vietnam. The Bearden choir sang moving tributes as faculty, students, and members of the deceased graduates' families listened thoughtfully.

Following is a news account of the special ceremony from the November 11 Knoxville, Tenn., News-Sentinel:

BEARDEN HIGH MEMORIAL IS DEDICATED

(By Charles Armstrong)

There was a dedication ceremony and a tribute to American veterans today at Bearden High School. And although it was not planned, there was also a demonstration — of a deep mixture of sadness and pride.

There were few words spoken, and no signs were held in the hands of the students and families. Instead they held in their hearts the loss of four classmates fallen in Vietnam.

The students' tribute was a monument with the four names inscribed, which is under the flagpole at the entrance of the school. It was unveiled during the ceremony today.

ROLL OF HONOR

It read: "A Tribute to Our Vietnam Dead." And it listed the names only of:

Sp 4 George E. Clark Jr., class of 1961, husband of Mrs. Martha Lember Clark and son of Mr. and Mrs. Clark Sr., Woodbrier Rd.; Lance Cpl. James D. Travis, class of 1965, husband of the former Sherry Sharpe, and son of Mr. and Mrs. William B. Travis, Westland Drive; Lt. Charles H. Pilkington Jr., class of 1964, husband of Mrs. Jane Moon Pilkington and son of Mr. and Mrs. C. H. Pilkington, 809 Northshore Drive, and Sgt. William B. Bishop, class of 1965, son of Mr. and Mrs. William B. Bishop, 1104 Burton Rd.

The feeling of the student body was perhaps summed up in the simple service by Rev. William J. Carter, pastor of Bearden United Methodist Church, who gave the invocation.

REMEMBERED AS FRIENDS

He said, "We will remember these who died as warriors and patriots, but most of all as friends." He concluded, "This is the final moment of honor for all men who have died that we might live."

Families of the dead were seated in front of the monument as the ceremony began; members of the student council and executive council stood soberly as their leaders began the program.

Mike Delorenzo, student leader, asked each of the families of the fallen to stand. Dean

Kleto, president of the student council, introduced Kathy Townes and Susan Mooney, students who organized the memorial at the end of last school year. Every student in the high school made a contribution to the memorial fund.

BATTLES CITED

In a short address, Dean named major battles throughout U.S. history, including recent ones at Danang, Hue, Que Son. He said the four Bearden graduates had been added to the list of those "who have made the supreme sacrifice to make democracy endure."

As the choir sang "Let Us Now Praise Famous Men," the faces, young and old, became more sober. Several cheeks were wet as the anthem ended with "their name liveth forever more."

The memorial ended with the playing of "Taps." The students and citizens and military representatives left quietly, leaving the monument behind to speak for them.

Other young people have come up with constructive projects, including adding to the packages the soldiers in Vietnam will open this Christmas. The Central High School Senior Y-Teens collected money in shopping centers and in downtown Knoxville to send packets to men in Vietnam. Headed by President Susie Kempainen, the Y-Teens collected their funds with patriotism and great enthusiasm.

There is a certain exuberance common in youth. When they decide to lend support, they do not fall short. These young citizens are to be commended and today I salute them. I thank them for their outstanding efforts.

REPRESENTATIVE HAYS' FIRM NATO POLICY

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of November 18, 1969, praises the sound judgment of our very able and distinguished colleague the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

The North Atlantic Assembly is fortunate to have as its President our colleague, Mr. HAYS, whose knowledge and keen understanding of foreign affairs has been and will continue to be of inestimable value in its deliberations and determination of policy and recommendations.

With leave granted, I insert the editorial as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE HAYS' FIRM NATO POLICY

U.S. Rep. Wayne L. Hays, new president of the North Atlantic Assembly, talks sense when he says America should not pull out any of its 300,000 troops from Western Europe.

Too much erosion has weakened the North Atlantic Treaty Organization military force already. And if NATO's conventional war strength gets too thin, then the West would have to shoot tactical nuclear weapons all the earlier, in a crisis. That would inevitably trigger a nuclear holocaust.

Airlift plans, as the congressman from Belmont County says, do not substitute for troops ready in the field in case of a Soviet strike of any dimensions.

NATO manpower is rated at two-thirds or Warsaw Pact troops, and NATO tanks at only one-half the Warsaw Pact's, in the September report by the Institute for Strategic Studies in London.

"If a European crisis developed gradually enough to permit full reimbursement," says the ISS report, "the West would be in a position much more resembling equality."

How gradual was the slick, quick occupation of Czechoslovakia by the Warsaw Pact war machine?

NATO military men gasped in awe at the way the Soviet bloc could pounce on a neighbor country and render it helpless.

But the shock value of that illustration did not last. France's defection from NATO and Canada's intent to reduce its NATO commitment leave unplugged gaps. Other European members of NATO have not been hastening to plug them.

Nor has there been any cutback of Warsaw Pact strength. Military observers in fact are marveling at the Soviet Union's huge and growing navy and its passing the parity mark in deploying intercontinental ballistic missiles.

It is unlikely that the United States would use any nuclear weapon in any European squabble. The more reluctant Americans are to use such weapons, the more they should favor an adequate conventional force to guard the safety of a free Europe.

SAN DIEGO STATE COLLEGE GIRL HONORED

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in these days when student unrest and campus turmoil receive front-page news coverage each morning, we sometimes lose sight of the fact that this is only a small minority. We in San Diego are proud of Denise Evers, a sophomore from San Diego State College, who exemplifies the vast majority of "not so silent" young people working for the betterment of our community and our Nation. I am pleased to share the following article from the San Diego Union, outlining Denise's activities, with my House colleagues:

"SUPER PATRIOT" NAMED LA MESA'S "YOUTH OF YEAR"

(By Betty Lubrano)

LA MESA.—Denise Evers, a 19-year-old San Diego State sophomore, is what some call a "super patriot." And she's proud of it.

Denise, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Ellis Evers, 8443 Lemon Ave., yesterday was named outstanding youth of the year by the La Mesa Optimist Club.

Police Sgt. Bill Cook, the man who made the award at an Optimist Club youth appreciation breakfast, knows first hand just why Denise was named for the honor.

The Helix High School graduate, one of six Evers children, is chairman of the Heartland Youth for Decency. Members of the club—there are about 75 of them—thrive on activities that reflect love for God and country and support of the armed forces and law enforcement officials.

CLUB SPONSORS

Cook, who is area lieutenant governor for the Optimist Club, sponsors the club along with Mr. and Mrs. Evers and police officer Bill Daw.

Denise admits that when some high school and college students hear the group's name, they say "Wow, what a bunch of square kids."

"But when they see what we're like—what we're really like—they like it," she says.

Representatives of the club are 16 youngsters who call themselves Freedom Sounds. The boys and girls dress in red, white and blue. When they sing, they let themselves go to the rhythm of the music, whether its the stirring "This Land Is My Land" or the moving Civil War ballad, "This Cruel War."

Heartland Youth for Decency was formed when Cook, Denise and her parents put their heads together to come up with "something" to get kids involved in positive community action to counteract adverse publicity on riots and other activities.

"It's to get kids to realize they have a fantastic heritage in their country," Denise said.

During the Freedom Sounds performance at the breakfast, Denise sensed that some of the teenagers were somewhat embarrassed by the "superpatriotic" atmosphere generated by the group.

She didn't mince words. "When you see what they've got in other countries, you guys will realize that you've got the greatest thing in the world," she said. "I'm proud to be an American."

Since the movement began last May, the Evers house has been one of the gathering place for members. The singing group practices at least once a week. Denise's 18-year-old sister, Dianne, is leader of the group.

Freedom Sounds has participated in about 50 performances since its formation three months ago. And although the musicians are an important element of the club, members also have been busy with other activities.

They've sent gift packages to servicemen in Vietnam and Korea and are planning a memorial for the war dead. The club also has "adopted an orphanage in Korea."

CHRISTMAS PLANS

For Christmas, the Heartland group is hoping to supply the 40 boys and 40 girls with warm clothing. "They need clothes and socks really bad because it gets so cold there," Denise said.

The orphanage receives \$300 a month from a Marine battalion, but the donation is not enough for everything the children need, Denise said. Donations may be left at the American Legion hall in La Mesa.

Tomorrow she will be honored along with other outstanding youth from San Diego and Imperial counties at an Optimists Club banquet at the Hanalei Hotel.

THE VFW'S "OPERATION SPEAK OUT" AND AMERICAN POW'S

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 18, 1969

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars are to be commended on their national program encouraging not only their own organization, but other organizations, and especially each American citizen, to speak out in support of our country and its institutions. This great veteran's group has always devoted tremendous time and effort to programs that relate to patriotism and to building national will. In support of this effort, I would like to join with many of my other colleagues and countless Americans in continuing to bring to the public attention the plight of American prisoners of war.

Portions of what I have to say appeared in another form in a statement I made last week before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in reference to these prisoners.

It is important that we emphasize the brutal contrast between promise and performance in the matter of prisoner of war treatment by the Hanoi regime and their Vietcong allies. Hanoi has professed adherence to the Geneva convention, but it has ignored repeated pleas for free flow of prisoner mail and has refused to permit inspection of detention facilities by the International Red Cross or any other unbiased international agency.

Even more serious is the record of calculated mistreatment being written by the few American servicemen who have escaped or been released after protracted confinement. While all do not tell of overt cruelty, there is a substantial body of testimony establishing the failure of the North Vietnamese to take ordinary humanitarian measures in sanitation and medical care.

Our consciences will not permit us to ignore this contempt for minimal standards which have had long acceptance among civilized nations, to which company the Hanoi regime pretends. The world conscience needs to be aroused in the matter, particularly those segments of it which have viewed the North Vietnamese as innocent victims of American military might.

The treatment of prisoners of war is a matter of concern to all who value human dignity. It transcends the issues of any particular conflict. It is a matter apart from national or individual views as to where right lies between contesting causes.

Our duty to those imprisoned in an alien land, therefore, is clear. It is to press continually for their humane treatment, for an accounting by the adversary as to the numbers and identities of those held, for prompt prisoner exchange, and for international participation in the effort to achieve these goals of common decency.

SINO-SOVIET TENSIONS AND AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an insightful article written recently by one of my distinguished constituents, Mr. Daniel F. Halloran.

His article, entitled, "Sino-Soviet Tensions and American Foreign Policy," was published by the Catholic World magazine.

Mr. Halloran, a resident of Albany, N.Y., is a former fellow of the National Institute of Public Affairs and is a candidate for the doctor of philosophy degree in political science from the State University of New York. His article follows:

SINO-SOVIET TENSIONS AND AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

(By Daniel F. Halloran)

The recent flare-up of hostilities on the Asian border between China and Russia has had effects other than the provocation of mass demonstrations in Moscow and Peking. It has also revived American interest in the Sino-Soviet rift. Shortly after news of the outbreak reached the United States, American political analysts were discussing the situation, not in terms of a power struggle over national boundaries, but as a new manifestation of an ideological dispute over Communist doctrine between the two socialist superpowers.

The current focus of interest on the Sino-Soviet dispute can be seized as an opportunity to examine our foreign policy in the light of the interpretation it tends to place on the tensions between China and Russia. It may well be that this interpretation is more a reflection of our own view of international society than a thoughtful consideration of all the factors which could have contributed to the present situation.

Under the pressure of conditions partly the result of, and partly the cause of, the Vietnam war, American foreign policy has become more and more oriented toward the idea that the whole world revolves around the "international Communist conspiracy." With prospects improving for a solution to the Vietnam situation, the resolution of this conflict will be meaningless if we are just going to stumble into another Vietnam in some other place in the simplistic belief that we are again fighting the good fight to save the world from Communist enslavement.

This is not to deny that there is such a phenomenon as an "international Communist conspiracy." Nor is it to deny that many of its members wish that it were even half as cohesive and effective a movement as its most dedicated enemies believe it to be. However, the fact remains that the strongest force today in international relations is not economic or political ideology, but plain, old-fashioned nationalism.

President Nixon has stated his intention to avoid "any more Vietnams," and there is no reason to believe he does not mean it. His ability to achieve this objective, however, without resorting to an undesirable policy of isolationism, will be largely dependent upon his adoption of a more enlightened foreign policy than that which has prevailed for the past five years. And the development of such a foreign policy presupposes a rejection of the tendency to view the entire world through Red-tinted glasses and a new willingness to take a real look at the world around us and at the forces which created it and the tensions under which it exists.

Our Communist-dominated view of the world is well suited to interpret and explain subversive "wars of national liberation" and other internal conflicts in the developing nations. One would expect it to falter in the face of tensions arising within the Communist world itself, such as the lengthy rift between China and Russia. We have risen to the occasion, however, with heroic attempts to explain it in terms of strictly ideological differences while we completely ignore the historic roots of Sino-Russian conflict.

The present Communist governments in Russia and China both came into being through the forcible overthrow of pre-existing political structures. Both based their ideological pretensions on a disavowal of the illegitimate activities of their predecessor governments. Yet after a period of initial reaction, each country has shown a disconcerting tendency to assume a certain rightness of past territorial claims without regard for the "illegitimacy" of the governments which asserted those claims.

The Soviet government was not created in a vacuum. Like any other dynamic, living political organism, it had to take root within

the context of an existing society and could not escape the influence of the policy which preceded it in that society. Just as the present Communist governments of Russian and China are inevitably based to some extent on the past governments of those countries, the present Sino-Soviet rift was not created in a vacuum but must be considered as largely a continuation of Russian-Chinese relations dating back several centuries.

The first treaty China ever made with a foreign power was the 1689 Treaty of Nerchinsk with Russia. This in itself—recognition of another nation as equal enough to negotiate a treaty with the Celestial Empire—was a concession on the part of China. From about the middle of the nineteenth century on, Russia applied colonial pressure against the Chinese "border," largely in the areas of Sinkiang, Manchuria and Outer Mongolia.

Russia acted as a mediator to negotiate the end of the Chinese-Japanese War of 1895 largely to establish preferential treatment for itself in the Liaotung Peninsula. On the strength of its support for China against Japanese claims, Russia negotiated with China for rights to build the trans-Siberian railroad across Manchuria. Russian insistence on special rights to the ports of Darien and Port Arthur led to the Russian-Japanese War of 1904-05. Following the War, in 1907, Russia and Japan agreed to share certain interests in Manchuria at the expense of Chinese sovereignty. This began a ten-year period of cooperation between Russia and Japan in the application of imperialistic pressure on China.

Following the establishment of the U.S.S.R. in 1917, internal Russian strife which spilled over into Chinese territory was used as an excuse to continue Russian imperialistic advances. In 1921, Russian troops followed retreating White Russians into Sinkiang and Outer Mongolia. Sino-Russian negotiations eventually wound up in agreement on the independence from China of Outer Mongolia and mutual recognition of Sinkiang as an "autonomous" part of Chinese territory.

In 1935, Russia sold its Chinese Eastern Railroad to Japan over heavy Chinese objections. Possibly as a holdover from the days of mutual imperialistic interests, in 1941 Russia and Japan signed a neutrality pact. During the early years of the long Sino-Japanese War, Russian material assistance was given to the Kuomintang, and the Chinese Communists were left largely on their own. It was Moscow's hope—and this wish was realized—that Japan, Russia's colonial competitor in greater Asia, and the Kuomintang government of China would neutralize each other, eventually leaving the field to Russia and the Chinese Communists.

In 1945, Churchill, Stalin and Roosevelt met at Yalta and contracted mutual agreements on the disposition of a number of matters affecting China in the absence of any Chinese representation. Stalin insisted on the restoration of certain Russian rights which went clearly back to Czarist imperial Russia despite an official Communist line which disavowed Russian imperialistic pretensions. He demanded restoration of Russian rights in the Liaotung Peninsula which predated 1904. Stalin thus completely ignored a 1918 statement by Chicherin, the Soviet Foreign Commissar, which specifically renounced imperialist Russia's claims in China.

For several hundred years before World War II, China suffered the advances of Western colonialism. During this same period Czarist Russia was in itself an imperialist power. Also, Russia had long been recognized as a distinct national power by the Western community of nations. China, on the other hand, had been considered by the West as a continent or an ancient civilization rather than as a nation in the same sense that the West recognized its own national sovereignties. Partly as a result of these historical differences, the Russians and the Chinese

have adopted different views of the nature of Communism.

The Chinese, still smarting under the prolonged humiliation of Western economic exploitation during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, tend to stress Communism as salvation from imperialism. The Russian view of Communism is much more strongly directed toward the class struggle between the workers and the propertied class. China refuses to make any concession in its determined stand against Western imperialism to the possibility of a modification of Western interests. The Chinese view is that—if the Western nations appear to have retreated from their imperialistic posture of fifty years ago—that is only a temporary pose and their ultimate objectives remain unchanged.

Russia, perhaps due to both a greater sophistication in world politics and her role in the United Nations, cannot help but be aware of the retrenchment of Western colonialism. China, on the other hand, tends to view the West of today as the same imperialistic aggressor of a century ago. Also, the Communist regime of Russia predates that of China by thirty-two years, giving it perhaps a greater maturity and a stronger sense of security among the community of nations.

Under the long, autocratic reign of the Czars, substantive participation in the process of government in Russia was effectively denied the masses and reserved to the nobility and large landowners. The late awakening of the Russian people was initially answered by the autocracy with greater and more tyrannical oppression. What concessions were made to popular demands were almost immediately retracted or nullified. Thus, the Bolshevik movement which eventually emerged victorious found its natural enemy in the Czarist autocracy and the landed nobility within Russian society.

The Chinese and Russian concepts of the "enemy" differ: Russian Communists see the enemy rather clearly in terms of the class society—capitalistic exploitation of the workers. In other words, the Russian "enemy" has no ethnic or national identity and could and did exist inside Russia just as easily as outside.

Although the Chinese have made valiant attempts to see the struggle in this idealistic light—witness the sporadic campaigns to eliminate the landlord class—they have never been able to overcome the tendency to view the true enemy as outsiders, as "non-China."

The Russian Communist, sophisticated in the ideological intricacies of dialectical materialism, generally has a deep commitment to the theories of Communism: the classless society, overthrow of capitalistic oppression, and the eventual universal achievement of the Communist millennium—the self-ordering society devoid of any need for a managerial or authoritarian class. The Chinese Communist, on the other hand, does not see Communism as an end in itself but only as a means to the end of a stronger China. The Chinese will not easily abandon the concept of China as the "center of the world."

The first eight years of Communist domination in China represented a general economic improvement over the preceding decades of intermittent war, famine, and natural and unnatural catastrophe. From 1958 on, however, government repression has been added to economic reverses and not a month has gone by since 1958 without the occurrence of some type of local uprising. It would be an unwarranted optimism, however, on the part of the West to assume the probability of a successful internal revolt in view of the unquestioned loyalty and support of the army. Mao's dynamic personality—not generally appreciated in the West—is also a prime factor in the probably continued successful existence of the regime, and his eventual death is a subject

of strong speculation for the impact it will have on the Chinese policy.

In the view of the more knowledgeable China watchers, there is no simple solution to the problem which China poses to the Western world regardless of the direction taken by Sino-Soviet relations. Given the present situation, it is easy to lose sight of the fact that much of the problem is inherent in "China" rather than "Communist China." It would be folly to assume that the fall of the Communist regime would automatically solve all of the complex problems involved in China's relations with the world in general and with the West in particular—or would even greatly change them! Most Americans viewed with horror the brutal takeover of Tibet by the Chinese Communists. What they were not aware of was that Chiang Kai-Shek had every intention of invading and conquering Tibet—he was deterred only by his inability to unify China.

In Chinese anti-imperialism there is a strong element of racism which is incompatible with the continuance of a close fraternal relationship with Caucasian Russia. As one writer put it:

"For obvious reasons the rise of a Communist regime in China affected the colonial and ex-colonial countries of the Orient much more directly than did the rise of the U.S.S.R. The Russia in which Lenin seized power appeared to the Eastern observers as a European country—and one that until recently had exercised imperialist control over vast expanses of Asia. The China in which Mao's party seized power was still an Oriental country and one that had suffered seriously from Western and Japanese imperialism." (Wittfogel, Karl A., *Oriental Despotism*, Yale Press, New Haven, 1957, p. 433).

A younger and possibly more open-minded Walt Rostow, writing in 1954 before the Sino-Soviet rift, speculated on the possibility of just such an occurrence. He pointed out the danger of over-simplification of the relationship in attempting to gain perspective and defined six major areas distinguishable in Sino-Soviet relations. These were: (1) military balance, (2) the problems of the border areas of Manchuria, Outer Mongolia and Sinkiang, (3) world power politics, (4) regional Asian power politics, (5) ideological differences in emphasis and objectives, and (6) economic relations. He mentioned that Russian economic aid to China after 1949 was probably less substantial than generally believed, and pointed out that some aspects of it were designed to establish Chinese technical dependence on Russia. There was also a heavy emphasis on technical advisors who played an intelligence role in addition to their overt functions.

In June, 1960, meeting, in Peking, of the World Federation of Trade Unions was chosen by the Chinese for an attack on Khrushchev's 21st Congress statement on peaceful coexistence. Liu Chang-sheng, Chinese Vice-President of the W.F.T.U., attacked Khrushchev for thinking that peace could ever be legitimately achieved while imperialism still existed. Liu stated that local wars were "unavoidable" as long as any people were enslaved under the yoke of colonialism. He also attacked Khrushchev's disarmament proposals as a "downright whitewash and embellishment of imperialism."

In the competition for influence on the newly independent Afro-Asian countries, China has a double advantage over Russia, with its stronger anti-imperialist line as well as its nonwhite ethnic composition, and it has not been backward in the employment of these advantages.

Communist expansionist activities of Russia and China are interpreted differently by Asians for two reasons. First, because Russia has historically been involved in imperialistic adventures in Asia and Eurasia, there is a tendency to see current Russian interest in

Asian affairs as an extension Czarist imperialism (or at least there is an underlying suspicion of this nature.) Secondly, Asian resentment is directed specifically at Western colonialism rather than at the very concept of imperialism. This makes it possible for the Asian to view the Chinese takeover in Tibet, for example, as an extension of national interests with some degree of legitimacy rather than as the ruthless act of aggression which it appears in Western eyes.

The Chinese perist in referring to "imperialism"—rather than capitalism—as the adversary. For example, in 1958, *Jen-min Jih-pao* wrote:

"Some people who observe things superficially, and do not see the essence of a question, do not believe that socialism is really superior in strength to imperialism."

One of the chief areas of contention between Russian and Chinese ideology is the struggle for the uncommitted Afro-Asian nations, many newly independent and politically immature. Peking has devoted much attention to this matter stressing both its brand of anti-imperialist Communism and the desirability of establishing solidarity among the colored peoples of the world. The Bandung Conference of Afro-Asian nations held in 1955 was attended by Russian delegates on the strength of Russia's territorial extension into Asia. Since then, the Chinese have had some success in isolating Russia from the Third World, although they have been somewhat less than successful in establishing themselves as the champion of the nonwhite people of the world.

The strength of Chinese resentment of imperialism was captured clearly in the following statement made by Miss Chen Yu-wua, principal of a primary school in Peking, during an interview by a Western reporter. When questioned as to why school children were being taught to hate, Miss Chen replied:

"There is a clear demarcation line between enemy and friend. We hate the imperialists, who are the common enemy of oppressed people of the whole world. We teach a class point of view with regard to China—hatred of those who exploited us in the bitter times."

In summary, our distorted view of current Sino-Soviet tensions is simply another example of the tunnel vision with which we now see the world. We have fallen into the trap of accepting the Russian claim to a disavowal of its imperialistic history because it fits in with our own narrow world outlook. We want to interpret all events in terms of the Communist—"free world" dichotomy, and, when events don't quite fit this pattern, we distort them until they do. And yet, Communist internationalism to the contrary notwithstanding, the plain fact is that nationalism, with its emphasis on the maintenance of national borders, is still the predominant moving force in the world today. This fact applies no less within the Communist camp than it does either outside it or in relations between Communist and non-Communist nations. The sooner the makers of our foreign policy recognize this fact and incorporate it into their thinking, the sooner they will achieve a more realistic understanding of world society upon which to base a workable foreign policy.

ARE COMMUNIST TEACHERS ON THEIR WAY OUT OF OUR CLASSROOMS?

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the public's lengthy battle to keep avowed Communist teachers out of our schools and

universities has hit the front pages again in the case of a Miss Angela Davis of the University of California at Los Angeles.

Miss Davis is a professor in the philosophy department at UCLA and an admitted member of the Communist Party of the United States. She also claims the right to advance the cause of communism in the classroom.

The regents of the university, including Gov. Ronald Reagan, promptly voted to recommend to the chancellor of the university that Miss Davis be dismissed. The chancellor decided, however, to retain Miss Davis as an instructor but ordered that no credit would be given for any of her classes.

The case was taken to court in Los Angeles in line with the most recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in matters such as this, *Keyishian v. Board of Regents*, 385 U.S. 589, 1967, the California court ruled that to deny Miss Davis the opportunity to teach was in violation of the Constitution. As a result, she was reinstated.

There is little doubt that this case will eventually end up in the U.S. Supreme Court again. And when that happens, it will present an opportunity to reverse or restrict application of the *Keyishian* decision.

That 1967 decision was a 5-to-4 decision with Justices Warren and Fortas, both now departed from the Court, voting with the majority.

It overturned the 1952 decision in *Adler v. Board of Education*, 342 U.S. 485, which had held that barring Communists from teaching in public educational institutions is within the power of the State.

The *Keyishian* decision was a foreboding one. If carried to its logical conclusion—that members of the Communist Party are not *per se* conspirators against the American form of government—then it seems logical that the Army and the Navy might someday have to accept avowed Communists as commissioned officers.

With the complexion of the Supreme Court now significantly changed since the 1967 decision, it is possible that the "new" could use the Davis case to constrict the possibilities for mischief inherent in the *Keyishian* decision.

Columnist Willard Edwards of the Chicago Tribune recently explored the possibility that the Court might again reverse itself and again give Americans their basic right of self-preservation.

Mr. Edward's column follows:

COURT FACES RED TEACHER CASE

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, November 17.—Angela Davis, a member of the faculty at the University of California, Los Angeles, is 25 years old, black, the possessor of impressive academic qualifications, and proud of her membership in the Communist party.

The university's board of regents fired her under a rule banning Communists as teachers. Seeking reinstatement, she won her first court appeal and the case seems destined to wind up eventually in the Supreme Court.

There, it may furnish the first test, in the field of internal security, of the high court's attitude, under Chief Justice Warren Burger, toward some of the controversial 5 to 4 decisions of the court when it was headed by Chief Justice Earl Warren.

Miss Davis, whose discharge kicked up a storm on the U.C.L.A. campus, would unquestionably win the right to influence young minds, despite her avowed Communist party membership, if the Warren court were still functioning.

On Jan. 23, 1967, a bare majority of five justices [Warren, Brennan, Black, Douglas, and Fortas] declared unconstitutional a New York state law banning Communists from teaching. Mere proof of membership in the Communist party was insufficient evidence of subversive tendencies, they declared.

In a memorable dissent, a minority of four justices [Clark, Harlan, Stewart, and White] assailed this edict as an astonishing reversal of a long list of decisions stretching back to 1952. The dissenters virtually declared their colleagues guilty of legal fraud in reaching a conclusion based on "strained and unbelievable suppositions."

"No court has ever reached out so far to destroy so much with so little," the minority asserted. Its stinging conclusion:

"The majority has by its broadside swept away one of our most precious rights, namely the right of self-preservation."

What interests lawyers is that only six of the participants in the 1967 ruling now remain on the high court. The departure of Warren, Abe Fortas, and Tom Clark has removed two of the majority and one of the dissenters. Assuming a continuity of position, which seems justified in view of the great vigor of the opinions expressed, there would be a 3 to 6 division of the issues presented in the Angela Davis case.

Two of the three vacancies have been filled by Burger and Thurgood Marshall. The third replacement will be Judge Clement F. Haynsworth Jr. or, if he is rejected, another Nixon appointee.

Conjecture on Supreme court lineups is always hazardous, but court watchers believe the odds are at least even that the 5 to 4 majority of 1967, sanctioning communist teachers, could become a 5 to 4 majority upholding the constitutionality of expelling them from the schoolroom.

The interest in this issue, for obvious reasons, has always been intense and nationwide. One of the best selling congressional documents over the years has been a brilliant study entitled "Permit Communist Conspirators To Be Teachers?" by Hamilton A. Long, New York lawyer and a constitutional expert. Available for 25 cents a copy from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., the supply has been repeatedly exhausted and a new printing has just been ordered.

Miss Davis has made the issue crystal clear. She claims not only the right of a teacher to be a Communist but to advance the cause of communism in the classroom. She asked one embarrassing question which remains unanswered.

"Why pick on a Negro Communist?" she inquired. "There are plenty of white Communists on the faculty who have not been dismissed."

THE WORK OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR EUROPEAN MIGRATION

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the 31st meeting of the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, which I will attend, I think it is important that as many Americans as possible know of the outstanding work of this international organization.

The director of ICEM, Mr. John F. Thomas, at the invitation of Bishop Edward E. Swanstrom, president of the National Conference on World Refugee Problems delivered the following statement to the conference here in Washington, Tuesday.

Mr. Thomas' statement clearly sets forth the impressive efforts of ICEM in easing the world refugee problem and, with the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I enter it here in the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY MR. JOHN F. THOMAS

I am greatly honoured at the opportunity of joining such a distinguished array of speakers to address some remarks to an audience of people experienced and knowledgeable in the field of migration and refugees. Seldom has such an august group of people versed in both international and national aspects of the problems, representing both the governmental and the non-governmental sectors of endeavours been assembled under one roof. I wish to pay tribute to Bishop Swanstrom and the organizing committee under the joint directorship of John Schauer and Norrie Wilson for the splendid and effective job done.

The Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration is a non-UN body governed by 31 member countries with headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland. It came into being following a meeting of concerned countries in Brussels in December 1951. I say "concerned" because the founding governments were concerned lest the job left by the demise of the International Refugee Organization go unfinished. Camps in many European countries were overcrowded with displaced persons from World War II activities and most of these countries were suffering from depressed economic conditions and, what was then called "surplus population". In the course of its seventeen year existence, ICEM succeeded in moving 1,680,700 migrants of which 804,897 were refugees to new lives mainly in overseas countries. These past two decades have been complicated with human errors causing untold suffering but in one facet of life, governments, private agencies—all the people who were involved in making the movement of some 805,000 human bodies possible can be very, very proud of their accomplishments.

When I assumed the Directorship of ICEM in late February 1969, I had just completed giving guidance and leadership to two difficult refugee programmes—Cuban refugees in the United States and the refugees in South Vietnam. I found myself in the midst of another serious refugee problem, the numbers streaming into Austria, Italy and Germany from the East. Now, after ten months have elapsed I am happy to report that the major part of this crisis has been met. The operations were difficult, ICEM staff, and the voluntary agency staff, worked long long hours in meeting the needs of the people. Governments responded with remarkable demonstrations of understanding and compassion in stepping up the rate of intake of refugees. I must point out, in particular, the fine co-operation received from the United States Refugee Programme without whose support voluntary agencies would have found themselves in difficult positions to carry out their responsibilities. In mid-1969 refugee camps were overflowing to the point where many envisaged that a return to the days of the 50's was with us. Only the rapid action of agencies such as ICEM, in full co-operation with others who deal with refugees and the willingness of many governments to respond to our pleas of anguish prevented such a disaster from happening. To those in ICEM it has been a hard but interesting experience. Many were assuming that there no longer were refugees in Europe. Interest had transferred to South Vietnam and to Africa. There is no doubt but that

these situations too were serious and needed support from all concerned. But the painful vision of overcrowded camps loomed before us in Europe and only the continuous action on the part of the resettlement agencies will keep the unfortunate people from accumulating again. It is interesting to note that ICEM in 1968 moved 50,987 refugees and in 1969 will move 58,000. In analyzing the figures for 1969 we find that only 18% of those moved are of Czechoslovakian origin. Taking the total refugee movement accomplished by ICEM one will find that over 30 countries (by former nationality or place of birth) are represented. No, the refugee problem is long from being over in Europe.

One cannot categorically confine the refugee problem to one or two continents. If facts and realities are faced squarely it will be seen that this is a world-wide phenomena. It is necessary to recognize that refugees are the products of hostilities, political tensions both national and international and as long as these tensions exist, and they are certainly not confined to one continent, refugees will appear and will require assistance. This assistance must come from the international community which, by its basic beliefs, guarantees such assistance.

It is the international community which sustains ICEM as a common migration machinery. I am pleased to report that the machinery is functioning effectively. As I speak today movements effected under ICEM auspices this year have passed the 75,000 mark and somewhat more than 50,000 of these have been refugees or displaced persons. By the end of the year the total will have reached some 85,000 and it will include more than 58,000 refugees. What is required for a movement of this scope? It will have been necessary to make bookings from 66 different embarkation points on some 275 sailings and 1,700 scheduled air services, and to charter 210 aircraft. I can assure you, ladies and gentlemen, this also means that ICEM field missions are fully engaged in this task and ably supported at both the sending and receiving end by the activities of many voluntary agencies.

How was it possible to arrange the resettlement of 53,000 refugees and displaced persons, thereby relieving the congestion of refugee centres in the major asylum countries. First, because these asylum countries maintained liberal admission policies. Second, because the receiving countries increased their intake of refugees substantially and speeded up processing procedures. Third, because the Member Governments of ICEM generously increased their contributions towards ICEM's budget for refugees. Last—but not least—because the Voluntary Agencies and other organizations on whom we rely as copartners—showed once again that they were able to meet a difficult challenge successfully.

In taking stock with satisfaction of the results achieved in 1969, I can not look forward with complacency towards 1970. In fact complacency in many quarters seems to exist, largely because the refugee resettlement machinery functions effectively and efficiently without leaving a dramatically visible residue of stranded human beings. As we approach 1970 ICEM foresees a total movement of 51,000 refugees and displaced persons. This may seem strange to persons not working in the field, particularly when the borders of Czechoslovakia have recently been closed. However, large numbers entered the resettlement processing pipe-line only in recent months and will be ready to depart early in 1970. Other applications can be anticipated from a trickle of new arrivals and from the 55,000 Czechoslovaks in Western European countries when the border was closed. So we estimate 9,000 Czechoslovaks within the total of 51,000 refugees of many nationalities. I am concerned that at this time it can not be known whether adequate resources will be available to ICEM during

1970 which will permit the same record of achievement as performed in 1969.

When I referred before to the early beginnings of ICEM, I emphasized what was then the population problem. Thus the "e" became an integral part of ICEM's name and Constitution. But it must be pointed out that the founding fathers, in their wisdom, did not confine ICEM's capability of assisting refugees to Europe. Council discussions since the beginning have served to support ICEM's "constitutional ability" to render assistance to refugees outside of Europe. The main problem as I see it, is one of financing. The Council has given permission for us to work with refugees outside of Europe for whom resettlement appears to be the solution to their problem. Presently, because of financial implications, I must seek the approval of the nine-member Executive Committee before the Administration can go ahead with such a movement but the Constitutional question is clear.

Because many of you in this room have questioned me about ICEM's ability to act in refugee situations outside of Europe I will dwell a few moments on my rationale of this matter. The ICEM Constitution was adopted in Venice, Italy on 19 October 1953, just over two months subsequent to the enactment by the United States of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. Section 8 of that law placed upon ICEM extensive financial and operational responsibility for carrying out the movements of three groups of non-European refugees destined to the United States, i.e., "refugees indigenous to the Far East", "refugees of Chinese ethnic origin" and "Palestine Arab refugees in the Near East". My point is that the same United States parliamentarians who bore the responsibility for the enactment of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 with the wording just quoted were responsible for framing the ICEM Constitution. By the time the Constitution came into force, following the ratification by 15 member governments, ICEM was actively engaged in moving non-European refugees. I hope this brief review of the historical factors will be of some help to those of you who have pondered this question.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that while analyzing varying mandates of international organizations whose task it is to assist refugees, as well as by studying proposals aimed at a definition of the term "refugee", great caution must be exercised. It appears to be of utmost importance to keep the legal texts flexible as far as possible and thus applicable to the fast-changing world conditions. The disadvantage of even the most carefully elaborated text is that once it is put into print, approved or enacted, it stays frozen. Interpretations may not find ready acceptance for political reasons and since there is no equivalent of the U.S. Supreme Court whose interpretation of the law becomes the law, rigidity of texts may serve—and does, in fact, serve—to exclude from the benefits of international assistance precisely those persons who at various times may need it most.

The 1951 Geneva Convention is a milestone in the body of international law which has been created to find a legal basis for the recognition of refugees by ordinary national police or judicial authorities. It further extended the very specific provisions of the Convention of 10 February 1938, which was the source of action for the Intergovernmental Committee for Refugees (IGCR) and which was related to the major problem at that time of "refugees coming from Germany" who were defined as "Persons possessing or having possessed German nationality and not possessing any other nationality who are proved not to enjoy, in law or in fact, the protection of the German Government".

It is of interest to note that even when the

Geneva Convention was going beyond this outdated narrow definition of 1938, there was a certain compartmentalization of refugee problems in that persons were excluded from the Convention who were receiving protection or assistance from UNRWA (the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees) and UNKRA (the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency).

I believe that this distinguished gathering may find it proper to study the new Convention on Refugees in Africa adopted in September of this year, in Addis Ababa, by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU).

Article I of that new Convention restates the key definition of the 1951 Geneva Convention. However, the importance of the new text lies in the addition of a series of new eligibility provisions and, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I shall briefly quote the text:

"The term 'refugee' shall also apply to every person who, owing to external aggression, occupation, foreign domination or internal disorder affecting either part or the whole of his country of origin or nationality, is compelled to leave his place of habitual residence to seek refuge in another place outside his country of origin or nationality."

I submit that it may be fitting for this assembly to congratulate the authors of the Addis Ababa Convention and I wish to submit that the words I just quoted from it should be worked into an international, universal, document equally applicable to Europe and to other continents where refugees experience difficulties in obtaining assistance now restricted or circumscribed by antiquated texts.

The only point which is narrowing in this definition is the question of whether or not a person has to be outside his country of origin or nationality before he can receive assistance. Though recognizing the legal and political complications and the need for legal limitations, I do not personally conclude that victims of disaster displaced from their normal abode—such as refugees in Vietnam or the population of Biafra—are undeserving of international assistance.

The able authors of the Addis Ababa Convention and the African statesmen who in their wisdom adopted it, also deserve congratulations for another precious part of the new document. They have made a part of this document a brief but most meaningful simple statement of fact. That statement should be adopted, I believe, by the entire international community and be recognized as valid worldwide. Its meaning is clear: *assistance to refugees is not a political but a humanitarian act.*

Article II of the Addis Ababa Convention, entitled "Asylum" says the following:

"The grant of asylum to refugees is a peaceful and humanitarian act and shall not be regarded as an unfriendly act by any Member State."

This statement is just as brief as it is important. It would be a pity if it would remain in print only. It truly deserves to be engraved on every stone marking the borders which the refugees have to cross before they reach a country of asylum.

This fine text is preceded by an expression of a voluntarily accepted obligation:

"Member States of the OAU shall use their best endeavours consistent with their laws and constitutions to receive all refugees and to secure the settlement of those refugees who, for well-founded reasons, do not want to return to their country of origin or nationality."

Turning to the question of an ICEM definition of a refugee, this does not formally exist in its Constitution and I take it this was a deliberate omission to permit the flexibility

which I mentioned earlier is essential so that individuals are not precluded from international assistance because of changing circumstances whose characteristics may differ somewhat from a traditional legal interpretation. In fact therefore ICEM's definition is more directed towards the type of persons who can benefit from its refugee assistance programmes, than an actual determination of who is a refugee. Therefore in practice the ICEM Council has accepted that a refugee or displaced person who can benefit from its assistance is any person who is considered as having this status by the authorities of the country in which he is resident prior to his resettlement, or who is accepted under criteria specified in special refugee schemes or legislation instituted by countries of immigration. Within this framework an individual may be regarded as a refugee or displaced person deserving of ICEM assistance if meeting any one of the following criteria:

(a) He is stateless and without any country of nationality.

(b) He has been or will be denied the right of return to his country of nationality or former residence.

(c) He has been forced to leave his normal country of residence due to racial, political, or religious discrimination.

(d) He has been the victim of a war or a disaster which has seriously disadvantaged his condition of living.

(e) He is unable or unwilling to accept the protection of the government of his country of origin as a result of fundamental political changes and cannot avail himself of the protection of another government except as a "right of asylum".

(f) He can be regarded as "prima facie" within the mandate of such organizations as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, the International Refugee Organization, or the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees providing he did not receive resettlement assistance from these organizations, or if he did receive such assistance that his integration in a country of resettlement has not been feasible for reasons beyond his control or due to compassionate circumstances.

As you will note the criteria followed by ICEM conforms more to the generic term of a refugee rather than to his legal status. In this sense there are refugees from fire, from floods, hurricanes, earthquakes, invasions, hostilities, persecution, oppression, denial of human rights and so forth. By his own decision and by the act of moving away from what he fears or considers to be an area of danger, a person becomes a refugee or perhaps a displaced person.

Many authorities have grappled with the problem of terminology, with the multitude of circumstances in which a person becomes a refugee. Recently I have been most impressed by the work of those scholars and scientists who have participated in studies published by the Association for World Refugee Problems. Their publication in 1968 of "Das Weltflüchtlingsproblem" attempts to give methodical and comprehensive definitions of the varied factors which cause individuals to become refugees—population transfers, forced migration, flight for political reasons, expulsion, displacement, evacuation, etc. In one reference it is striking to note that it is considered the same individual may belong to more than one category: that is, he may be first transferred, then displaced, then expelled, and finally emigrate—thereby never losing the characteristic of being a refugee. It is then admitted by these scholars that "it will therefore often be necessary to revert to the common, even if imprecise, use of the term which is already the case with the term 'refugee'."

Mr. Chairman, my study of the Addis

Ababa Convention has brought another thought to my mind which I wish to share with this Conference.

Although fires of hostility are still burning in several parts of this globe, although shots are being exchanged, bombs dropped and although people are dying in combat, there appear to be signs on the horizon that efforts at obtaining a lasting peace in even the most vulnerable areas of several continents are making progress.

It just could be that, faced with the un-dreamt-of horror of modern weapons and the futility of attempting to resolve a conflict through the recourse of arms, countries with even deeply conflicting ideologies and political and humane concepts may arrive at a general agreement to resolve their differences peacefully.

There certainly is no community anywhere in the world which would welcome and bless such resolve more than one community, a community of people and agencies who since three or four decades have dedicated themselves to the alleviation of the plight of refugees, to the *alleviation of human misery created by brutal force and armed conflicts.*

We are the true pacifists. We have for many years seen at close range, in camps and elsewhere, the refugees, the concentration camps' inmates, the prisoners of war. We have learned *there* how to hate war more than any pacifist demonstrating on the street.

Thus it is that from the bottom of our hearts we wish every success, and speedy success, to all of those who strive to establish political, economic and cultural relations between nations of widely conflicting ideologies for one simple, overwhelming reason—*eliminate war.*

Having said that, I wish we could find a way to remind all governments working on peaceful arrangements that bridges built between nations, that the most cordial diplomatic or cultural or trade relations will not change *internal* regimes, *internal* policies and *internal* repressive actions. Therefore, the minorities compelled to leave whether for national, religious, racial or political reasons will remain so compelled. And, coming from the ranks of those minorities, refugees will continue to cross borders, to seek asylum and to seek new homes in countries which offer them freedom and opportunities.

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, for taking up so much of the time but I felt that these comments would be pertinent to the discussion of today and tomorrow. ICEM plays a dominant role in the solving of refugee problems through resettlement and I wanted to make our position very clear. I am a firm believer in the need for communication among ourselves and to our constituents. Every opportunity should be taken to describe the problems of human misery as they appear among the refugees of today's world and to make certain that support among our government officials is gained by sharing this knowledge. I have visited 16 countries during the past 10 months talking with government officials at all levels and I can assure you that there is not a very clear picture as to all the facts surrounding refugee matters. One hears all sorts of misleading phrases and loosely coined definitions but one misses on most occasions the simple thought "there goes a man and his family who are in need".

Therefore I must revert to my original plea to avoid narrowing confines in defining who merits assistance. Let us face the fact that only God could read a man's mind to determine whether he is a refugee or not. No individual takes up his suitcase and turns his back on all that he has worked and lived for—his relatives, his friends, his possessions—and crosses a border just for undetermined reasons. Let us believe his decision was taken genuinely, and let the international community accept his appeal for help.

SNEERS AT VICE PRESIDENT WILL NOT DISPEL DOUBTS ABOUT MEDIA'S PERFORMANCE

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in further regard to the Vice President's remarks on television news coverage, I believe my colleagues will find interesting the following article by Richard Harwood and Laurence Stern:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 19, 1969]

SNEERS AT VICE PRESIDENT WON'T DISPEL DOUBTS ABOUT MEDIA'S PERFORMANCE

(By Richard Harwood and Laurence Stern)

When Vice President Agnew unloaded last week on the alleged biases of the "tiny and closed fraternity of privileged men" in the television news business, cries of foul were heard throughout the land.

That often happens when public figures attack the media, probably because there is a theory in the industry that people shouldn't bite back at their dogs.

In Agnew's case it has been charged that he seeks to erode "freedom of the press" that he is trying to muzzle the administration's critics, that he is subliminally blackmailing a \$3 billion industry with a reminder that TV licenses are given and taken away by a Federal Communications Commission whose members are appointed by the President. There is even talk about a new era of McCarthyism.

"My feeling," an overwrought CBS commentator told Newsweek, "is that the White House is out to get all of us, all the liberals in all the media . . . We're in for some dangerous times."

Perhaps. But the issue of media performance is not going to evaporate in this country simply because publishers and network presidents wrap themselves in the First Amendment and sneer at Spiro Agnew. For the facts are that the media are as blemished as any other institution in this society and that there is growing public concern over their performance.

This is reflected in the spectacular proliferation of underground newspapers whose constituents are young radicals and dropouts turned off by the Establishment press. It is reflected in the creation (with private and public funds) of a vast network of "educational" television stations offering an alternative to whatever it is that the commercial networks happen to be selling.

In Chicago, reporters and editors think so little of their daily product that they produce each month a Journalism Review cataloguing the sins and omissions of the newspapers that employ them.

Politicians from Dwight Eisenhower to George Wallace to Eugene McCarthy have raged at the Eastern Liberal Press. Newton Minow, a former chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and Nicholas Johnson, a present member of the Commission, made their reputations assailing the TV "wasteland" to the cheers of many of the same editorial writers and critics who are now shocked at Agnew's gall.

Indeed, Commissioner Johnson has been one of the principal advocates of community pressure groups that are trying, in Agnew's phrase, to make television stations more "responsive" to public desires in programming.

If successful, these efforts will lead to the transfer of television licenses in various cities—Jackson, Miss., New York and Washington, for example—from "conservative" to "liberal" owners and managers.

One of the reasons for all this agitation is that people have come to recognize that the selection and presentation of information and "news" is a very unscientific enterprise. Except for a few platitudes about "objectivity," "responsibility," and "news that's fit to print," there are no accepted or enforceable standards in this business.

"News" is what the media says it is and the definition varies from day to day and place to place. It was "news" in The Washington Post and The New York Times last week when three doves in the Senate announced support for the antiwar demonstrations on Nov. 15. It was not "news" at all in The Times the following day when 359 congressional hawks and dawks endorsed the President's negotiating posture on the war.

In some parts of the country last week, people were told that Washington was braced for war against the howling mobs in the city. Elsewhere they read about love and singing and picnics on the public lawns.

There is no conspiracy in any of this, despite Spiro Agnew's dark suspicions. But there is much room for criticism, debate and discussion. And that debate and discussion need not be limited—should not be limited—to the dreary convention halls of the broadcasters and editors.

POLICE CHIEFS FOR MECHANIC LICENSING

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving numerous communications indicating support for my proposed legislation, H.R. 14064, to provide for training and licensing of auto mechanics. It is clear that industry, labor, and the public and many organizations interested in highway safety and consumer protection recognize the concept embodied in my bill as an "idea whose time has come."

In particular I wish to highlight the support of one organization which is vitally involved in highway safety and emphasizes the importance of competent mechanics to this end. On October 2, 1969, the International Association of Chiefs of Police at their 76th annual conference adopted the following resolution:

TRAINING AND LICENSING AUTOMOBILE MECHANICS, 1969

Whereas, the police profession supports the need for approved training of personnel in all segments of traffic accident prevention in the interest of safety and mobility on the nation's streets and highways; and

Whereas, systems of certifying qualified persons in numerous technical job areas in highway transportation and in other fields have been accepted for many years; and

Whereas, today's demand for automobile service has created a problem of the emergence of unauthorized auto service and repair shops which are, in many instances, employing incompetent personnel; and

Whereas, we recognize the need for thorough analysis of the requirements for certification and licensing of auto mechanics; now, therefore be it

Resolved, that the International Association of Chiefs of Police recommends to the United States of America Standards Institute that they pursue their proposed project on training and licensing of auto mechanics.

JAPANESE-AMERICAN RELATIONS

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent days the flag of the rising sun has flown alongside the American flag on Washington streets around the White House. This is a far cry from the days when "Made in Japan" on American products was a dirty word.

Undoubtedly, Japanese-American relations have vastly improved since the harsh days of World War II, but there are many Americans who can never forget—nor should they—Japan's unprovoked attack on Pearl Harbor, nor the aggressive designs of the Japanese military leadership at that time. Likewise, the Japanese people will never forget Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

In an interesting column, the distinguished philosopher and statesman, David Lawrence, writes of the importance of the Japanese-American cooperation in maintaining the peace of the world through the decade of the 1970's. Interestingly enough, he suggests the possibility of some formal expression of apology on the part of both countries in respect to the events which caused continuing resentments. While the word "apology" may be inappropriate, there is, nevertheless, valid basis for favoring whatever course of action that will strengthen and improve Japanese-American relations at this time.

Hiroshima and Nagasaki cost many thousands of Japanese lives but saved many hundreds of thousands of American lives that would have been necessary to accomplish the same military victory. In this instance, history proves that victory by the Allied forces and the United States in particular was not sought to establish imperialism or for American conquest but rather to assure world peace and to secure a Japanese Government that was not bent on world conquest. American treatment of Japan after World War II is an impressive record of helpful cooperation in rebuilding a country that has now become the strongest economy in the Far East.

It is tragic that so many young people in Japan are not more aware of America's proud record of helpfulness to Japan, or that American nuclear power as a Japanese ally is a powerful protection to that country against the huge aggressive Communist nation of Red China that is separated from Japan by only a few miles of ocean.

I commend Mr. Lawrence's remarks to the thoughtful consideration of citizens of both countries, young and old, as follows:

UNITED STATES-JAPANESE ANTAGONISM RUED
(By David Lawrence)

The conscience of the American people and the conscience of the Japanese people might well be invoked to examine the deep-seated feeling that still continues in both countries. It is due, in the first instance, to the wanton attack on our naval vessels at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, by the Japanese Navy, and, in the second instance, to the dropping of an atom

bomb on Hiroshima and on Nagasaki by our air force four years later, with the loss of tens of thousands of civilian lives.

Outwardly, Prime Minister Eisaku Sato of Japan, who is conferring here this week with President Nixon, is concerned about the return of Okinawa, one of the islands which his country for many decades has considered to be its territory. But the demand that the United States give up this island—which is used as an important military base and also as a place to store nuclear weapons in order to respond to a possible attack by Red China—has raised a controversy which is a mere symbol of the underlying antagonism toward this country now prevalent in Japan. Demonstration after demonstration against the United States has occurred in Japan.

With the all-important meeting this week in Helsinki, Finland, between the United States and the Soviet Union in an effort to limit the manufacture of nuclear weapons—if not to destroy existing stockpiles altogether—this is an appropriate time for peoples to register their feelings on the subject.

When the two bombs were dropped on Japan in August 1945, this writer one week later in a magazine editorial deplored the use of atomic weapons, particularly on unarmed civilians—against whom attacks had for generations been prohibited by international law.

The American people were shocked when many American sailors and soldiers were killed at Pearl Harbor on Dec. 7, 1941. As the war progressed, there seemed to be less and less concern about how it was fought, just so long as America showed its might. A high-ranking officer of the United States Army, when asked by this correspondent after the war why a second atom bomb had been dropped, declared that this was due to a fear that the Japanese would not surrender unless they were sure more bombs would be used.

Twenty-four years ago it was impossible to foresee the ill effects of the use of atomic weapons. The subsequent manufacture by other nations came much quicker than expected. Only four years later the Soviet Union exploded its first atomic bomb.

But hasn't the world advanced in the last quarter century? Aren't people more aware than ever that nuclear weapons can mean mutual suicide? This correspondent wrote in August 1961:

"The memory of Pearl Harbor and of Hiroshima and Nagasaki remains today a festering sore in the relations of the Japanese and American peoples. It would be a wonderful thing if somehow we could proclaim a mutual apology, a mutual regret, and a mutual pledge of a new era in our relations.

"For on January 9, 1942, a month after the attack on Pearl Harbor—which was made without warning and before any notification was received of even a break in diplomatic relations—this writer said:

"It would be a grave mistake to assume that all the Japanese people are guilty of the treachery which gave us our Pearl Harbor tragedy . . . Defeat in the long-range sense is inevitable. Out of the debris must come a new Japan, a Japan ready to take her place with a responsible government in the family of nations. Our strategy in fighting Japanese militarism must not condemn all the Japanese people. We must constantly hold out hope for a new Japan after the militarists are rendered powerless to disturb again the peace of the world."

"The militarists are gone today in the new Japan, but another sinister force is working now toward the breakdown of Japan's new democracy. It is the crafty hand of the Communists as they seek to push Japan into unfriendly relations with the United States through student riots and other demonstrations that play on emotions inflamed by the dropping of the atom bombs. They are more skillful than the militarists of

yesterday in concealing their identity, but their objectives are no less dangerous.

"A mutual apology as between the peoples of America and of Japan is important in rebuilding Japanese-American relations."

A new Japan has truly emerged and is bound to be helpful to us in deterring a big war in the Far East.

FORMER GOV. FOSTER FURCOLO'S
PLAN TO CURB NARCOTICS**HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the question of narcotics control is being studied from every possible angle to find a solution which will prove effective. Control from the Federal and local level is essential to stop the narcotics traffic, however, I believe that it cannot succeed completely until we enlist the active assistance of every citizen. Of prime importance is that we concentrate these efforts toward our youth to make them aware of what it means to become an addict.

To understand this, education in the nature of what these drugs will do to the body and mind is essential. Also, that our youth be informed about those who sell narcotics. This is a criminal element difficult to describe. I would say that there is not a word strong enough in the lexicon to describe those who induce for profit and who destroy without pity. This criminal element is busily recruiting its clientele from our youth of today. Somehow or other they seem to have little trouble communicating across the generation gap. How tragic.

In fact, I dread to think what it forebodes for the future of this country if the criminal mind is capable of rapport and communication with our young and responsible segments of our society are not. At the same time, while this crisis worsens we hear all sorts of excuses for inaction and complaints of the difficulty we have in bridging the gap between generations. Turned away from parental communication and authority the young seek elsewhere and the stage is set for their eventual degradation due to drugs.

How does it all start? It usually begins as an adventure for a kick and it usually ends in tragedy. They are induced to purchase marijuana which is easily obtainable and inexpensive. This is the first step.

After using the weed with no apparent harmful effects and now feeling that it has become an old thrill and passé, they embark on further adventure. This takes them usually into the hallucinogens or LSD and the like. I would like to point out that, unlike most of the narcotics, barbiturates, and amphetamines which have a place in legitimate medical treatment, the hallucinogens do not have any medical value whatever.

The real danger has now begun to take over the individual, the psychological and physical dependence which develops. This dependence is based on a psychological or emotional need to continue taking the drug which in turn is a result

from using certain drugs regularly, often in increasing amounts. For drugs which depress the central nervous system, the dependence is based on physical need.

The abuse of narcotics does not, in each case, result in dependence. However, when it does, it is because the deep-rooted causes for dependence lie within the psychological makeup of the individual rather than in the drug. But, in turn, the drug serves to feed the deep-seated cause.

There are many drugs which, through abuse, may lead to dependence. There are four categories. One, narcotics—pain killers—such as heroin, codeine, and morphine. Two, the sedatives, such as barbiturates, tranquilizers, and alcohol. Three, the stimulants, such as amphetamines. Four, the hallucinogens, such as marijuana and LSD.

Heroin is one of the most addictive of drugs both physically and psychologically. For a hooked person, it becomes a way of life. Heroin addicts live only to take the drug. The longer they take it, the more they require. For this habit, a great deal of money is needed. A study of crime in New York City revealed that a large part of the crime was traced to addicts. Their offenses consist mainly of shoplifting, burglary, and prostitution. The same is true in other areas.

The barbiturates are used to ease tensions and anxieties. Some users carry their abuse to such a degree that they remain in a semistupor or bedridden. Overdosage can be fatal. A long-term use causes strong physical dependence. Withdrawal, if abrupt and sudden, can cause death.

The amphetamines are used to combat fatigue or overcome depression. They are dangerous to the heart and the circulatory system. Also, they induce a specific mental illness. Abrupt withdrawal can cause serious depression which might prompt suicide.

The hallucinogens produce, as the name implies, hallucinations but, more accurately, a distortion of reality. One toxic effect observed from the use of LSD is an attack on the retina of the eye. There is also the possibility that LSD can cause permanent brain damage.

All these drugs, no matter what category, lead to not only permanent physical damage, but to psychological damage as well. In other words, what is obvious is the fact that a user ceases to be a productive member of society as he withdraws into this nether world to be a slave to an addiction, a human vegetable in a sense. The life which could have been well spent in a conscious appreciation of reality, is wasted. The talents remain unused. The mind is reduced to impotence. Is this what people want? Is this the bright prospect of the future for those young people who have taken that first step, a puff of the weed?

Mr. Speaker, enlightened educational efforts aimed at all strata of society are needed at once. We must prevent a further rise in drug use and pave the way for a society free of this plague. The youth themselves can play the key role in this war on narcotics.

I have a film available on the dangers of drugs to be shown to schools and

various organizations. It corroborates many of the points in the Massachusetts plan which I am inserting in the RECORD. The plan is for a volunteer army to fight narcotics traffic and use as outlined in this article which appeared in the Boston Sunday Advertiser of June 1, 1969. It was proposed by a distinguished public servant, the former Governor of Massachusetts, Foster Furcolo. Having been the chief executive of a sovereign State, he is well aware of this problem from the administrative side.

As a Member of Congress, concerned and deeply disturbed about crime in general and narcotics in particular, I urge my colleagues to read this plan, and see that authorities in their States and districts know of it. At the same time, however, I urge that we take prompt action to prevent us from becoming a Nation of "hopheads."

The future can be a nightmare or the fulfillment of a wonderful dream. I think that it is largely in our hands to make the choice.

The article follows:

**MOBILIZE VOLUNTEER ARMY NOW TO FIGHT
DOPE AMONG OUR YOUTH**

(By Bill Dunccliffe)

Massachusetts, with a lot of effort and little expense, can mobilize a million-member army of volunteers to join the fight against the scourge of dope among its youth.

The man who says so is former Gov. Foster Furcolo, who has wrestled with the problem of narcotics for the past 18 months as an Assistant District Attorney in Middlesex County—and who, in the process, has struck upon a way to help many victims before exposure to drugs kills them or wrecks their lives.

Furcolo is an unabashed backer of the battle plan unveiled by Atty. Gen. Robert H. Quinn to combat the growing traffic in drugs in the Commonwealth. It is from within the framework of that plan, he maintained, that the army—trained to know the nature of the enemy and educated on how it can be fought—can be drawn. Its members would include:

Young people: "We've got to make them fully aware of just how great a peril dope is," Furcolo declared. "We've got to make them realize the physical, mental, moral, and legal havoc it can wreak on them."

"But we can't lecture or talk down to them. We've got to speak their language, so they'll know what we're trying to say. The best program in the world is no good at all unless the kids themselves understand what it's all about."

Teachers: "We need teachers and administrators who are fully alert to the problem and who are geared to spot small things that may indicate a boy or girl is using 'pot' or some other narcotic."

"Yet, when Dist. Atty. John J. Droney obtained a movie that was aimed at educating young people to the dangers of dope, we sent letters to 50 schools in Middlesex County asking whether they'd be interested in showing it."

"Only one bothered to reply—and yet we know teachers must be interested in helping the young or they wouldn't be teachers in the first place. So we've got to get them steamed up about this, and keep them steamed up—and give them something to do that will keep their interest at a high pitch."

Parents: "There isn't one parent in 100 who knows what marijuana looks like or who can detect its aroma," Furcolo continued, "and there aren't many more who are able to recognize the symptoms that may indicate their son or daughter is on marijuana or something else even more dangerous."

"We've got to educate parents so that they can help their children before it's too late."

"If a boy or girl develops a sharp change in habits—if, for instance, an outgoing, normally noisy kid becomes withdrawn, the parents should try to find out why."

"If he takes up with new companions, his mother and father should know who they are, where they come from, and what they're like."

"And if they learn that he's hooked or sold his watch, or radio, or something of that sort to get extra money, they'd better be alarmed enough to find out why he needs it."

"The plain fact is that if a boy or girl is smoking pot, it may not be because their parents have been too permissive. It may be because they've been too ignorant."

Police: "When teenagers or their parents need help, there should be someone, easily available, who is able to give it," Furcolo declared.

"We need, in every city, town, and county in the Commonwealth, police who are trained to give direction and advice to those who seek it. More manpower, by itself, isn't enough to combat narcotics. What is required is more educated manpower—because not all police are as familiar with the problem, with those who cause it and those who are victimized by it, as they should be."

"The more knowledge they have about dope, the better they'll be able to fight it."

The spreading of that knowledge is, in Furcolo's view, one of the most important and compelling features of the Quinn battle plan.

"Up to now," he said, "the fight against narcotics has varied; strong in one city or town and terribly weak in another. Quinn's program recognizes narcotics as a statewide evil that must be attacked on a statewide basis—and that alone marks a great stride forward."

"Just the pooling and sharing of information will add greatly to the effectiveness of police in making life miserable for professional dope peddlers."

"Ordinarily, if a pusher is spotted in one area, he merely moves to another where police may not know him and sets up shop again."

"The State Police, who do a good job in their narcotics bureau with only a handful of men, distribute as much information as they have, but it may not always be available at the moment it's most needed."

"When this new setup goes into operation, a police officer in the smallest town in the Commonwealth will, at any hour of the day, be able to get what information he needs on all known or suspected pushers and users."

"And when a pusher moves from one area to another, police will have his name, record, and even the license number of his car before he arrives."

"They'll be waiting for him—and they'll be able to move in on him before he can get established."

Some parts of Quinn's program will, Furcolo agreed, cost money—for there is no cheap way to treat or rehabilitate a user, or to recruit and train police for undercover work.

But mobilizing public support—getting young and old alike interested enough to care—should not, he said. And winning that active support is vital, especially in the light of surveys such as that at Malden High School which indicated that one out of every four of the 1,672 teenagers who took part had tried drugs at one time or another.

Even before Droney gave him the responsibility of handling most of the narcotics cases in the county, Furcolo became convinced that, to win the war on drugs "you've got to bring in the kids."

"Several times," he said, "Droney has brought young people in here to hash things out with this staff, to talk them over. They're not users themselves, but they know

why other kids use drugs, and they have opinions on various things.

"But they've given us an idea of what kids are thinking these days—and even though we don't always agree with them, we always listen to what they have to say.

"And they listen to us, too, because now and then they discover they may not be opposed to certain policies and practices of law enforcement—once they know the reason of them."

Furcolo, before showing the movie which Droney had obtained to educate the young on the danger of drugs, "previewed" it for his own teenagers, Richard and Hope—and their friends—in his Newton Center home.

"We talked about it," he said, "and I asked them whether it rang true, or whether it made them laugh in the wrong places. I asked them whether they were able to identify with the people in it, whether they got the message, and whether they were impressed by it.

"Well, they were impressed—because the movie laid the facts right on the line and they understood what we were trying to tell them."

Some people, particularly those who live in the suburbs, would like to believe that the narcotics problem doesn't exist, Furcolo said.

"They can't get rid of it simply by trying to sweep it under the rug," he said. "It's here and it's serious, and it's widespread—and it could even now be hitting their kids.

"If they don't believe that, they ought to hear—as we've heard—girls in their teens and early 20s telling us that, if they don't smoke pot at parties, they're considered squares—and they're not invited again.

"They ought to hear the kids who have become hooked—and they ought to see some of the misery that narcotics has caused.

"It's a grave problem, you bet it is—but we won't begin to solve it until we all become involved, until we all do our part to get rid of it."

WE REMEMBER OUR HONORED DEAD

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, there is no question in my mind that a vast majority of American citizens support the President's stand concerning our involvement in Southeast Asia. For most Americans, dissent involving our Nation's foreign policy ends at our shores, and they feel it vital that we present a united front to the rest of the world.

I know that most of our American servicemen are disheartened and disappointed over the activities of many so-called peace demonstrators, and I feel certain that many of our fighting men, facing possible death in South Vietnam, often think that their fallen comrades may have died in vain. Such is not the case, however, Mr. Speaker, and one of my constituents, Mrs. Olene F. Dykes of Troy, Ala., has written a poem which adequately expresses my thoughts regarding these servicemen who have given their lives in the cause of freedom. I would like to share Mrs. Dykes' poem, which appeared in the November 9, 1969, issue of Alabama Sunday Magazine, with my colleagues in the Congress. It follows:

WE REMEMBER OUR HONORED DEAD

Sleep on fair youth,
Peacefully sleep, our heroic dead.
It is better you cannot know
Violent youth march overhead
Forgetting your quest

Sleep on gentle youth,
Who died beyond the sea.
They care not you fought and died
That they might be free,
This war to protest.

Sleep on sweet youth,
Your valor will be rewarded yet.
You bought our freedom and
Some will not forget
Where freedoms laurels rest.

—Mrs. Olene F. Dykes, Troy, Ala.

BUILDING NAMED FOR YOUNG MARINE HERO

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Traughber Hall was recently dedicated at the Naval Communications Training Center in Pensacola, Fla., in my district. It is named for Cpl. Steven L. Traughber, a marine who gave his life for our country. His father was one of the speakers at the dedication. His statement was one of the finest examples of courageous patriotism during a period of great emotional stress that I have seen. I include it at this point for inclusion in the RECORD:

SPEECH BY MR. CHARLES TRAUGHBER—DEDICATION OF TRAUGHBER HALL

Ladies and gentlemen and distinguished guests: It's not an easy task to stand here and pay homage to a very fine young man, as my preceding speaker just mentioned. The young fellow that you are paying tribute to today was, in a way, an outstanding young fellow, not so much that I'm speaking as a father but as a man that believed in high ideals. I'm going to quote very few statements which, in essence, our son stated at a time when he was very young.

Back during his eighth grade and the early part of his high school, he pointed out that a military man in the United States is a man for all seasons, a man of honor, integrity, truth, and courage, a man who can be counted on to do the best things in the worst times. He is a man who is among the most respected citizens of all free men and those who seek freedom throughout the world. Corporal Traughber felt that it was a privilege and an honor to serve his country. He had a high esteem for the Marine Corps. In fact, his first time he attempted to enlist, he was turned down and he went back a second time, and with some corrections, was accepted in the Marine Corps.

I recall an English paper that our son wrote when he was in the eighth grade which reflects, in part, his ideals on what freedom is and what he thinks should be the ideals of men. And I quote: "What Constitutes Success? Success equals happiness; and a man can be poor or rich, black or white, and still have success. I must have success upon my own standards and judge it not by what I would expect of myself.

"I must have a sound moral foundation upon which to build. As a first step, I have a basic belief in God but I also believe in the worth of the freedom of the individual. Being loved and relied upon by others is im-

portant, and this would give me responsibility; and as I fulfill this responsibility, I would be at ease with myself. I must feel I am accomplishing something of good to my country and, for these efforts, see my children step into their lives and become more successful than I."

Our son and many other dedicated men before him have paid the supreme sacrifice. It is our hope that naming this facility in his honor and of this sacrifice, future sailors and Marines will draw pride and humility from that memory.

On behalf of his mother, his sister, Pamela, and his brother, Lance Corporal Michael Traughber, we wish to express our sincere appreciation to all those that had a part in naming these facilities in memory of our son.

AMEND THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT TO PROTECT AMERICAN JOBS

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 18, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon, in his message to Congress Tuesday, made special mention of the fact that although freer trade policies may benefit the aggregate, there are certain parts of the community which can be and have been adversely affected by foreign imports.

It is obvious to all concerned that high among those domestic industries presently adversely affected and deserving of immediate and special attention and aid is the American footwear industry. Even a casual questioning of over 300 Members of this body, as illustrated by the petition recently sent to the President, will produce a firsthand account of the injury which is in fact being inflicted by the flood of foreign imports. In New Hampshire's First Congressional District alone, four shoe plants have been closed with unfair competition from imports listed as a primary factor. As a result, a total of 1,170 employees have been put out of work: Foot Flair's division of U.S. Shoe Co., 370 employees; Pittsfield Shoe Co., Newmarket division, 350 employees; Fronia Shoe Co., Dover, 100 employees; Jody Shoe Co., Derry, 350 employees. This is a tragic situation, and as cochairman of the House Footwear Steering Committee with my friend and colleague, Congressman JIM BURKE, as chairman, I believe action must be taken now to protect this industry.

As the President pointed out in his message, the escape clause provision of the 1962 Trade Expansion Act has proven so stringent and technical that the Tariff Commission has not been able to provide the relief necessary to the survival of the affected industries. This language must be broadened to provide avenues for prompt assistance to an industry in crisis. This relief must be made available, as the President said, "whenever increased imports are the primary cause of actual or potential serious injury."

Relief of a temporary nature, providing to a given industry an ample opportunity to improve its competitive position, must be made available, and it must be done on a basis that will be prompt

enough and effective enough to be certain that jobs are not lost and machinery is not left idle.

This is an urgent matter. As I have repeatedly pointed out, the floodwaters are rising and the pressure behind the dam is building. The leaks have begun, the cracks have been started. Our economy, our working people have already begun to suffer the consequences. Congress must be prompt. It must react to the dangers so inherent in the existing law.

I have introduced, alone, and with other Members of this body, several pieces of legislation which would alleviate this situation: H.R. 733, to arrange for the orderly marketing of certain imported articles; H.R. 7696, to provide for orderly trade in footwear; and, with Congressman BURKE, H.R. 14178, to establish an orderly trade in textiles and in leather footwear, a bill previously introduced in the Senate by Senators COTTON and HOLLINGS.

With imports continuing to rise and with the word from key people in the industry that more shutdowns can be expected, these bills must be considered and action for reform must be taken.

The amendments to the Trade Expansion Act, necessary to provide adequate protection for industries adversely affected by import are so broad that in the opinion of Congressman BURKE and myself, and other members of the Footwear Steering Committee, it is necessary to substantially revise title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The revised statute should provide the following changes:

First. Authority to the Tariff Commission to provide for tariff adjustment whenever increased imports are the primary cause of actual or potential serious injury to a petitioner.

Second. In making its determination the Tariff Commission should not be required to relate such injury to a prior tariff reduction.

Third. Time limitations should authorize the Commission to issue temporary orders whenever the petition alleges continuing irreparable damage from imports and the Commission is unable to hear the petition within 30 days from the date of the filing. Such authority in the Commission should be plenary and not require approval of any other governmental agency.

Fourth. Reports to the President and to departments and agencies of the Government by the Tariff Commission concerning the results of its investigations shall be for information purposes only.

Fifth. Provisions for Presidential action should be repealed insofar as they relate to tariff adjustment as distinct from adjustment assistance as defined in the act.

Mr. Speaker, once again we find an entire American industry embroiled in the redtape of statutory bureaucracy. Even a casual examination of the provisions of the Trade Expansion Act discloses roadblocks and delays rendering virtually meaningless the filing of any petition requiring summary relief. Under the act as presently written, the Tariff Commission can take 6 months to complete its hear-

ings and then all it does is report to the President. Obviously, when this is done the Department of State will be called in with the probability that it will oppose relief on the grounds that it might make some foreign country upset.

This is a poor way to protect vitally challenged American industry and the jobs of American workers. Our working men and women and our domestic industries are entitled to more meaningful protection than this gibberish of apparent relief.

Free trade is a splendid concept until it comes to the point where it is putting American workers out of work. More and more it is said by some of our internationalist-minded free-trade advocates that if a product can be made cheaper, yet of equal quality abroad, that we should either meet the competition in America or yield to the foreign source of products. If such a policy is to prevail in a world in which almost no other country pays anywhere near the hourly labor rate that prevails in the United States the result will be the loss of hundreds of thousands of American jobs in the manufacture of those products in which labor costs are a substantial factor.

Somewhere along the road there must be a balance point. This used to be termed a peril point. In the case of the shoe industry—as well as the textile industry to which the President has made specific reference in his message—the peril point is upon us.

It is up to Congress to provide this legislation to protect this industry and these jobs on a crash basis without further delay. They can talk all they want to about voluntary agreements restricting imports. In my opinion, voluntary agreements will not work because money is not patriotic and it is unrealistic to expect one foreign supplier to agree voluntarily to limit his participation in the rich American market without the prior assurance that a similar limitation will be agreed to by his competitors.

In this regard, it appears that orderly marketing legislation is a must.

Mr. Speaker, we urge those in this Congress responsible for continuing to bottle up this legislation to report it favorably without further delay. If this is not done, we predict that a discharge petition will be resorted to and that it will be signed by a sufficient number of Members of the House to force this legislation to the floor.

This is an urgent matter. Tens of thousands of jobs are at stake. An industry's livelihood, its very future, depends upon the response of this Congress. We urge affirmative action on this legislation without further delay.

THE BIRTHDAY OF SENATOR
ROBERT F. KENNEDY, NOVEMBER
20, 1925

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Today marks the 44th anniversary of the birth of Senator Robert F. Kennedy,

the late and beloved junior Senator from the State of New York and former Attorney General of the United States.

The memory of the courage and concern of Robert Kennedy for his fellow men does not diminish with time. The restless new generation of young Americans who seek peace and the call to conscience are his elegy.

His unfinished odyssey grows as though he were still marching at its head. His inspiration is very much alive in the spirits and minds of men of good will around the world.

To the hungry and malnourished his outstretched hands gave them their first bread of kindness—in the underdeveloped countries, among the agricultural workers of our country, and on the Indian reservations and in Appalachia—may they remember him.

To the victims of war—the burned, the bombed, the young who questioned war and its spread—and all who suffer—his was the pledge of peace—may they remember him.

To all who are beginning to wonder whether one man can make a difference, or whether a million on the march for peace can make a difference, may they remember him.

He was born into a world of turmoil and he gave his entire life to building a better world for his children and ours.

With all the Kennedys who at this time are gathered to mark the return to life eternal of Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy, let us pray that on this anniversary of the birth of his son, Robert F. Kennedy, that there is joy in heaven, as the father and his children share in the end of suffering and the beginning of peace.

FOOTNOTES TO A LETTER

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. RYAN, Mr. Speaker, during his November 3 speech on American policy in Vietnam, President Nixon stated that the letter, which he had received from Ho Chi Minh before his death, "flatly rejected my initiative."

Since the night of his speech, the President's interpretation of that letter has been challenged by many Americans, who viewed the letter as an invitation to pursue negotiations. Ambassador Averell Harriman suggested it was "a wide open invitation."

The New York Post on November 13 had an editorial entitled "Footnotes to a Letter," which dealt with the Ho Chi Minh letter and the President's interpretation. I urge my colleagues to consider the question it poses:

[From the New York Post, Nov. 13, 1969]

FOOTNOTES TO A LETTER

I received Ho Chi Minh's reply on Aug. 30, three days before his death. It simply reiterated the public position North Vietnam had taken at Paris and flatly rejected my initiative. The full text of both letters is being released to the press.—President Nixon, Nov. 3.

Since the President did not at any time

during his televised address quote directly from the Ho Chi Minh letter to support his contention that Hanoi had spurned "a major move to break the deadlock in the Paris talks," millions of Americans were initially obliged to take his word for it.

But they are under no continuing obligation to take his or Ho's word for it; there is a growing view among those who reexamine the texts that the President may have rejected a significant overture from North Vietnam.

Sen. Muskie (D-Me.) contends that the concluding paragraph of the Ho letter constituted "an invitation" to pursue negotiations. To Ambassador Averell Harriman—formerly the chief American negotiator in Paris and a diplomat with large experience in hard confrontations with Communists—the section was "a wide open invitation." As we noted at the time, it included this sentence: "With good will on both sides we might arrive at common efforts in view of finding a correct solution of the Vietnamese problem."

That is not characteristic Communist language. There is also an implicit invitation in other aspects of the message, as both Muskie—in a Senate speech—and Harriman—in an interview with this newspaper yesterday—have recognized. In extraordinary contrast to Hanoi's insistent public position that the 10-point program of the National Liberation Front was the "only" basis for a settlement, Ho suggested that the "over-all solution" in the 10 points was "a logical and reasonable" basis.

There are some other equally intriguing nuances, such as Ho's reference to the right of the Vietnamese "to dispose of themselves, without foreign influence"—which can be read as wholly consistent with the sole "non-negotiable" element in the American policy: the right to self-determination by the South Vietnamese. The totality, in Harriman's judgment, reflects a tone "much milder than anything they [Hanoi] normally say."

Muskie, for his part, wonders not only why the White House interpreted the letter as a flat rejection but why the President did not seize the opportunity to explore the matter further with the new leaders in Hanoi. "Such an initiative," the Senator feels, "would have done no harm whatsoever, and it might have opened up a diplomatic initiative of great value."

It was through such a positive reading of a message from Khrushchev that John F. Kennedy opened the way to resolution of the Cuban missile crisis. Perhaps the opportunity is not irretrievably lost even now, despite Ho's death. It is surely essential, when the President's negative interpretation of the Ho letter is being exposed to such serious questioning, that he account publicly for it and explain how he justifies it. In his nationwide address on Vietnam, announced weeks in advance, which he was said to have personally drafted with scrupulous care, he conspicuously avoided such questions. But they will recur as the war drags on.

VIOLENT CRIME ENCOURAGED BY COURTS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, crime in the District of Columbia is not news.

Ending that crime is very largely a responsibility of this House.

Despite the anguished wails of those sentimentalists who are willing to at-

tribute every criminal act to deprived childhood, poverty, discrimination, or other alleged faults of society, civilization has dealt successfully with crime for centuries, and the formula for deterrence is well known. When punishment is swift and certain, crime declines. When the likelihood of punishment is remote and distant in time criminals are encouraged to take chances.

It is common talk in the District of Columbia that after two robberies, the rest are "free." This is because individuals charged with violent felonies, including homicide, rape, and armed robbery are released on insignificant bonds, or on no bond at all, while the date of trial is indefinitely postponed. It is also because of the understandable but not commendable policy of prosecuting for only a few of a large chain of crimes. Thus, an accused charged with two armed robberies, released on an insignificant bond for trial at an indefinite time, perhaps several years in the future, feels free to commit additional robberies. He has nothing to lose.

It is our responsibility to enact appropriate legislation to remedy this situation. Individuals charged with crime, and particularly with crimes of violence, should be brought to trial as rapidly as possible while the evidence is fresh and available. Individuals convicted should be punished swiftly and certainly. Severity is secondary.

Clippings in yesterday's newspaper relating to a violent crime just committed, the long delayed disposition of a murder occurring in the summer of 1968, and the recommendation and presentment of the outgoing grand jury for the District of Columbia show the relationship between the breakdown of criminal justice and ever-rising crime. I include them in my remarks:

[From the Washington Star, Nov. 19, 1969]

KILLER OF TWO MARINES GETS 20 YEARS TO LIFE

A California youth was sentenced to 20 years to life in prison today for the killing of two Marines in a Georgetown restaurant in 1968.

Benjamin Murdock, 20, of Los Angeles, received the sentence from Judge Gerhard A. Gessell in U.S. District Court here.

In addition, he received 3 to 10 years on each of four counts of assault with a dangerous weapon and one year for carrying a dangerous weapon. These sentences are to run concurrently with one another and to the 20-year-to-life sentence for the double slayings.

A jury found Murdock guilty of two counts of second-degree murder last Feb. 26.

Murdock returned to court Monday for a hearing on the sanity issue. The same jury that heard the original case was reconvened for the sanity hearing.

The defense attempted to show through psychiatric testimony that Murdock was not mentally responsible at the time of the shootings.

The psychiatrists stressed that Murdock was not mentally ill, but did suffer from an emotional problem which was manifested in snap actions when faced with what he considered a difficult situation.

William H. Collins Jr., an assistant U.S. attorney, argued that many persons suffer from some form of emotional instability, but do not kill.

At the trial earlier, Murdock was found

guilty of killing Marine 2nd Lts. William G. King, Jr., 21 of Orlando, Fla., and Thaddeus Lesnick, 23, of Fishtail, Mont.

A co-defendant, Gordon Alexander, 27, of San Jose, Calif., earlier this year was sentenced to a total of 5 to 24 years for multiple counts of assault with a dangerous weapon and for carrying a dangerous weapon.

Testimony at the trial showed that the defendants and a third man, also from California, were in the Little Tavern restaurant at 3331 M St. NW. at approximately 3 a.m. June 5, 1968, when five Marines and a girl came in.

The defendants claim one of the Marines made a racial remark and that Alexander drew a revolver. Murdock, who had gone outside, returned to assist his friend and opened fire. His shots killed the two Marines and wounded a third Marine and a girl.

There was no testimony indicating that Alexander fired his weapon and as a result the jury found him not guilty of second degree murder but guilty of the lesser charges. Charges against the third man were dropped before trial because he had been outside at the time of the shooting.

WOMAN REPORTS RAPE, ROBBERY

A 21-year-old Alexandria woman told police she was abducted from a parking lot near her apartment about 9:30 p.m. yesterday and taken to another area where she was raped by two men and robbed.

She told police she was parking in the lot near the Kline's Store on Little River Turnpike when a man with a gun got into the car and drove her to the vicinity of the Hermitage Home off Seminary Road, where the second man appeared.

Both men raped her there, she said, took her jewelry and purse containing an unknown amount of money and tied her up before escaping.

JURY DEPLORES BOND PRACTICE

An outgoing grand jury has expressed "great dismay" to Chief Judge Edward M. Curran of U.S. District Court at finding during its service that suspects in such crimes as robbery, rape and murder remained free on personal bond.

"Further, we have learned that many of these crimes were in fact committed while the individual defendant was on bail for a previous offense," said a letter signed by foreman Albert Barkin.

"As members of the community, in addition to our grand jury function, we view this situation with great dismay and therefore feel obligated to advise you of our thoughts," Barkin wrote.

Copies of the letter went to Atty. Gen. Mitchell, the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and U.S. Atty. Thomas A. Flannery.

VINCENT THOMAS, DEAN OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE ASSEMBLY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to recognize and pay tribute to a man in my congressional district, who has for many years rendered outstanding public service. He is well known to most of my California colleagues, and many of them, like myself, served with him in the California State Legislature.

Vincent Thomas, dean of the California State Assembly, was reelected in 1968 for the 15th straight term, having been elected by the people of his assembly district for the first time in 1940.

Mr. Thomas's home town, San Pedro, is the home port of one of the largest commercial fishing fleets on the West Coast. His assembly district also has many heavy industrial areas. Catalina Island, with its town of Avalon at the eastern end of the island—26 miles southwest of Los Angeles Harbor—is a famed resort area, offering swimming, fishing, and other amusements.

Thomas graduated from San Pedro High School in 1928, where he received the Ephebian Ring of Philosophy and Character. He then went to Santa Clara University, from which he received a bachelor of philosophy degree in 1932. He attended the law school at Santa Clara University from 1932 to 1934, and Loyola Law School from 1934 to 1936. Vince played on the Santa Clara football squad, and then coached minor sports at that institution from 1930 to 1935. He also was physical education instructor there in 1933-34.

He married Mary De Carlo in 1947, and they have a daughter, Mary Virginia, and a son, Vincent, Jr. Thomas is a member of the Elks and the Sequoia Tribe 140, Redmen.

Vince has long been active in the California Democratic Party. He was a presidential elector in 1940 and 1944, and a delegate to the National Democratic Convention in 1948 and 1960.

He has served as the Democratic floor leader in the lower house and has been an active voice in the Democratic caucus in the assembly. Often, he has held a strong position as the center between opposing factions.

During his service in the assembly, Vince Thomas has been a spokesman—and often the only one—for the commercial fishing interests of his hometown and other coast communities. He has served on the assembly fish and game committee and was vice chairman for many years.

In addition to being a member of several important assembly committees, Vince is a member of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission and is chairman of the Joint Legislative Audit Committee.

The veteran assemblyman was honored by the State when they built the huge bridge across the bay from San Pedro to Terminal Island and named it the Vincent Thomas Bridge.

On October 25, 1969, Mr. Thomas was honored as the first recipient of the Annual Man of the Year Award—for the Los Angeles Harbor area—by the San Pedro B'nai B'rith Lodge No. 1106. Mr. Thomas will again be honored at a testimonial dinner on December 8, 1969, on the occasion of the City of Hope's eighth annual salute to the maritime industry. The proceeds of the dinner, sponsored by local 13 of the I.L.W.U., will go toward the establishment of a special heart research fellowship in honor of Vincent Thomas.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to salute Vince Thomas, of San Pedro, a great Californian.

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in a speech to be delivered this evening in Montgomery, Ala., before the Montgomery Chamber of Commerce, Vice President AGNEW returns again to his theme of constructive criticism of particular components of the national news media. The Vice President effectively deflates the rather specious charges thrown at him during the past week that he is threatening the freedom of the press and also that he has hinted darkly that censorship may be imposed by the Federal Government if current practices continue. Nothing could be more absurd, of course, and those who have taken the time to read the Vice President's words carefully will find that he is calling upon the leaders and directors of the news media, in all phases, to engage in some strong self-examination of their operations so that these abuses which are so apparent to the public at large can be corrected and adjusted so that we can get a better balance of reporting and editorial policy than we now have.

I include the text of the Vice President's remarks in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT, MONTGOMERY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, MONTGOMERY, ALA., NOVEMBER 20, 1969

One week ago tonight I flew out to Des Moines, Iowa, and exercised my right to dissent.

There has been some criticism of what I had to say out there.

Let me give you a sampling.

One Congressman charged me with, and I quote, "A creeping socialistic scheme against the free enterprise broadcast industry." That is the first time in my memory anybody ever accused Ted Agnew of entertaining socialist ideas.

On Monday, largely because of this address, Mr. Humphrey charged the Nixon Administration with a "calculated attack" on the right of dissent and on the media today. Yet, it is widely known that Mr. Humphrey himself believes deeply that unfair coverage of the Democratic Convention in Chicago, by the same media, contributed to his defeat in November. Now, his wounds are apparently healed, and he casts his lot with those who were questioning his own political courage a year ago. But let us leave Mr. Humphrey to his own conscience. America already has too many politicians who would rather switch than fight.

Others charged that my purpose was to stifle dissent in this country. Nonsense. The expression of my views has produced enough rugged dissent in the last week to wear out a whole covey of commentators and columnists.

One critic charged that the speech was "disgraceful, ignorant and base," that it "leads us as a nation into an ugly era of the most fearsome suppression and intimidation." One national commentator, whose name is known to everyone in this room, said "I hesitate to get into the gutter with this guy." Another commentator charges that it was "one of the most sinister speeches I have ever heard made by a public official." The President of one network said it was an "unprecedented attempt to intimidate a news medium which depends for its existence upon government licenses." The President of

another charged me with "an appeal to prejudice," and said it was evident that I would prefer the kind of television "that would be subservient to whatever political group happened to be in authority at the time."

And they say I have a thin skin.

Here are classic examples of overreaction. These attacks do not address themselves to the questions I have raised. In fairness, others—the majority of critics and commentators—did take up the main thrust of my address. And if the debate they have engaged in continues, our goal will surely be reached—a thorough self-examination by the networks of their own policies—and perhaps prejudices. That was my objective then; it is my objective now.

Now, let me repeat to you the thrust of my remarks the other night, and make some new points and raise some new issues.

I am opposed to censorship of television or the press in any form. I don't care whether censorship is imposed by government or whether it results from management in the choice and the presentation of the news by a little fraternity having similar social and political views. I am against censorship in all forms.

But a broader spectrum of national opinion should be represented among the commentators of the network news. Men who can articulate other points of view should be brought forward.

And a high wall of separation should be raised between what is news and what is commentary.

And the American people should be made aware of the trend toward the monopolization of the great public information vehicles and the concentration of more and more power over public opinion in fewer and fewer hands.

Should a conglomerate be formed that tied together a shoe company with a shirt company, some voice will rise up righteously to say that this is a great danger to the economy; and that the conglomerate ought to be broken up.

But a single company, in the Nation's Capital, holds control of the largest newspaper in Washington, D.C., and one of the four major television stations, and an all-news radio station, and one of the three major national news magazines—all grinding out the same editorial line—and this is not a subject you have seen debated on the editorial pages of the *Washington Post* or the *New York Times*.

For the purpose of clarity, before my thoughts are obliterated in the smoking typewriters of my friends in Washington and New York, let me emphasize I am not recommending the dismemberment of the *Washington Post Company*. I am merely pointing out that the public should be aware that these four powerful voices harken to the same master.

I am merely raising these questions so that the American people will become aware of—and think of the implications of—the growing monopolization of the voices of public opinion on which we all depend—for our knowledge and for the basis of our views.

When the *Washington Times-Herald* died in the Nation's Capital, that was a political tragedy; and when the *New York Journal-American*, the *New York World-Telegram and Sun*, the *New York Mirror* and the *New York Herald-Tribune* all collapsed within this decade, that was a great, great political tragedy for the people of New York. The *New York Times* was a better newspaper when they were alive than it is now that they are gone.

What has happened in the city of New York has happened in other great cities in America.

Many, many strong independent voices have been stilled in this country in recent

years. Lacking the vigor of competition, some of those that have survived have, let us face it, grown fat and irresponsible.

I offer an example. When 300 Congressmen and 59 Senators signed a letter endorsing the President's policy in Vietnam it was news—big news. Even the *Washington Post* and the *Baltimore Sun*—scarcely house organs of the Nixon Administration—placed it prominently on the front page.

Yet the next morning the *New York Times*, which considers itself America's paper of record did not carry a word. Why?

If a theology student in Iowa should get up at a PTA luncheon in Sioux City and attack the President's Vietnam policy, my guess is that you would probably find it reported somewhere the next morning in the *New York Times*. But when 300 Congressmen endorse the President's Vietnam policy, the next morning it is apparently not considered news fit to print.

Just this Tuesday, when the Pope, the Spiritual Leader of half a billion Roman Catholics applauded the President's efforts to end the war in Vietnam, and endorsed the way he was proceeding—that news was on Page 11 of the *New York Times*. But the same day, a report about some burglars who broke into a souvenir shop at St. Peters and stole \$9,000 worth of stamps and currency—that story made Page 3. How's that for news judgment?

A few weeks ago here in the South, I expressed my views about street and campus demonstrations. Here is how the *New York Times* responded:

"He," (that's me) "lambasted the nation's youth in sweeping and ignorant generalizations, when it is clear to all perceptive observers that American youth today is far more imbued with idealism, a sense of service and a deep humanitarianism than any generation in recent history, including particularly Mr. Agnew's (generation)."

That seems a peculiar slur on a generation that brought America out of the Great Depression without resorting to the extremes of either fascism or Communism. That seems a strange thing to say about an entire generation that helped to provide greater material blessings and personal freedom—out of that Depression—for more people than any other nation in history. We have not finished the task by any means—but we are still on the job.

Just as millions of young Americans in this generation have shown valor and courage and heroism in fighting the longest and least popular war in our history—so it was the young men of my generation who went ashore at Normandy under Eisenhower and with MacArthur into the Philippines.

Yes, my generation, like the current generation, made its own share of great mistakes and blunders. Among other things, we put too much confidence in Stalin and not enough in Winston Churchill.

But whatever freedom exists today in Western Europe and Japan exists because hundreds of thousands of young men in my generation are lying in graves in North Africa and France and Korea and a score of islands in the Western Pacific.

This might not be considered enough of a "sense of service" or a "deep humanitarianism" for the "perspective critics" who write editorials for the *New York Times*, but it's good enough for me; and I am content to let history be the judge.

Now, let me talk briefly about this younger generation. I have not and do not condemn this generation of young Americans. Like Edmund Burke, I would not know how to "draw up an indictment against a whole people." They are our sons and daughters. They contain in their numbers many gifted, idealistic and courageous young men and women.

But they also list in their numbers an arrogant few who march under the flags and portraits of dictators, who intimidate and harass university professors, who use gutter

obscenities to shout down speakers with whom they disagree, who openly profess their belief in the efficacy of violence in a democratic society.

The preceding generation had its own breed of losers—and our generation dealt with them through our courts, our laws and our system. The challenge now is for the new generation to put their own house in order.

Today, Dr. Sydney Hook writes of "Storm Troopers" on the campus: that "fanaticism seems to be in the saddle." Arnold Beichman writes of "young Jacobins" in our schools who "have cut down university administrators, forced curriculum changes, halted classes, closed campuses and set a nationwide chill of fear through the university establishment." Walter Laqueur writes in commentary that "the cultural and political idiocies perpetrated with impunity in this permissive age have gone clearly beyond the borders of what is acceptable for any society, however liberally it might be constructed."

George Kennan has devoted a brief, cogent and alarming book to the inherent dangers of what is taking place in our society and in our universities. Irving Kristol writes that our "radical students . . . find it possible to be genuinely heartsick at the injustice and brutalities of American society, while blandly approving of injustice and brutality committed in the name of 'the revolution.'"

These are not names drawn at random from the letterhead of an Agnew-for-Vice-President Committee.

These are men more eloquent and erudite than I. They raise questions that I have tried to raise.

For among this generation of Americans there are hundreds who have burned their draft cards and scores who have deserted to Canada and Sweden to sit out the war. To some Americans, a small minority, these are the true young men of conscience in the coming generation. Voices are and will be raised in the Congress and beyond asking that amnesty should be provided for "these young and misguided American boys." And they will be coming home one day from Sweden and Canada, and from a small minority they will get a heroes' welcome.

They are not our heroes. Many of our heroes will not be coming home; some are coming back in hospital ships, without limbs or eyes, with scars they shall carry the rest of their lives.

Having witnessed firsthand the quiet courage of wives and parents receiving posthumously for their heroes Congressional Medals of Honor, how am I to react when people say, "Stop speaking out, Mr. Agnew, stop raising your voice."

Should I remain silent while what these heroes have done is vilified by some as "a dirty and immoral war" and criticized by others as no more than a war brought on by the chauvinistic, anti-communism of Presidents Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon?

These young men made heavy sacrifices so that a developing people on the rim of Asia might have a chance for freedom that they will not have if the ruthless men who rule in Hanoi should ever rule over Saigon. What is dirty or immoral about that?

One magazine this week said that I will go down as the "great polarizer" in American politics. Yet, when that large group of young Americans marched up Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues last week—they sought to polarize the American people against the President's policy in Vietnam. And that was their right.

And so it is my right, and my duty, to stand up and speak out for the values in which I believe. How can you ask the man in the street in this country to stand up for what he believes if his own elected leaders wessel and cringe.

It is not an easy thing to wake up each morning to learn that some prominent man or institution has implied that you are a bigot, a racist or a fool.

I am not asking any immunity from criticism. That is the lot of the man in politics; we would have it no other way in this Democratic Society.

But my political and journalistic adversaries sometimes seem to be asking something more—that I circumscribe my rhetorical freedom, while they place no restrictions on theirs.

As President Kennedy once observed in a far more serious matter, that is like offering an apple for an orchard.

We do not accept those terms for continuing the national dialogue. The day when the network commentators and even gentlemen of the *New York Times* enjoyed a form of diplomatic immunity from comment and criticism of what they said—that day is over.

Just as a politician's words—wise and foolish—are dutifully recorded by the press and television to be thrown up to him at the appropriate time, so their words should likewise be recorded and likewise recalled.

When they go beyond fair comment and criticism they will be called upon to defend their statements and their positions just as we must defend ours. And when their criticism becomes excessive or unjust, we shall invite them down from their ivory towers to enjoy the rough and tumble of the public debate.

I do not seek to intimidate the press, the networks or anyone else from speaking out. But the time for blind acceptance of their opinions is past. And the time for naive belief in their neutrality is gone.

But, as to the future, all of us could do worse than take as our own the motto of William Lloyd Garrison who said: "I am in earnest. I will not equivocate. I will not excuse. I will not retreat a single inch. And I will be heard."

THE SILENCED

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. James Weschler in his November 15 column in the *New York Post* described the reaction of two South Vietnamese young people as they listened to President Nixon's November 3 address on Vietnam policy. He was with David and Monique Troung—children of Troung Dinh Dzu, the runnerup candidate in the 1967 election in South Vietnam, who not too much later was jailed by Thieu as a political prisoner.

These two young people share the anguish of those Americans who feel that American policy must change now. And their anguish is acute because it is their country which has been ravished and it is their father who is a victim of a repressive regime which the United States continues to support without any effort to broaden it.

I urge my colleagues to read about the feelings of these two young Vietnamese on the war that plagues their country:

[From the *New York Post*, Nov. 15, 1969]

THEY SPEAK FOR THE SILENCED

(By James A. Wechsler)

There was a moment during President Nixon's redeclaration of war Monday night when I looked at the somber, appealing faces of 24-year-old David Troung and his younger sister Monique and felt an embarrassment at having invited them to listen to the speech in my home.

It is, after all, their father, Truong Dinh Dzu, who remains a prisoner of Thieu—after finishing second in South Vietnam's 1967 election, and gaining more votes than any non-military candidate. It is their country that continues to be devastated, and whose oppressive regime keeps them in exile. And in their eyes it is my government that sustains this corrupt cabal and, by doing so, dooms their father to imprisonment and their countrymen to another indeterminate sentence of suffering.

So in a sense Nancy and I were intrusive bystanders in this living room where our disappointment and dismay over Nixon's rerun of an old Johnson production could hardly match the heartbreak of these two South Vietnamese. For they are neither Viet Cong nor Hanoi flag-wavers but they believe they speak for "the silent (or silenced) majority" of their countrymen who are weary of war and Thieu and Ellsworth Bunker and the U.S.-Saigon axis and dream of a day when this regime will be replaced by a coalition that can make peace. It was for the crime of advocating coalition (and negotiation) that their father was summarily tried, convicted and given a five-year term.

At times during the Nixon speech they were mournfully quiet, as if listening to a funeral oration, and on occasion they laughed bitterly, as when Mr. Nixon said, "We are Vietnamizing the search for peace."

To many Americans the slogan of "Vietnamization" has a comfortable sound. It signifies that we will somehow rid ourselves of the burdens of war and simultaneously justify all the lives we have invested in it. But for Stanford-educated David Truong and his sister (UCLA-summa cum laude), who have never known a day of real peace on earth for their homeland, "Vietnamization" is both a synthetic slogan and a new mockery of hope. They do not believe it will bring any decisive change because they cannot visualize Thieu stirring any genuine popular allegiance; all that they foresee is that more young Vietnamese will be granted the luxury of killing each other.

Perhaps I saw in their response more clearly than ever before the degress to which we have lost sight of the human, individual identities of the people for whom we have ostensibly been fighting.

When Mr. Nixon spoke of "the silent majority" of Americans whose support he claims, Monique said in muted anger: "Yes, one day there will be a silent majority . . . of the dead."

And as the President ended David shook his head grimly and said: "It was very sad, it was so depressing . . . the tone was much less than anyone expected." Then this spirited youth, who has spent so many long months striving to rally American support for his father's release (and has won expressions of sympathy from a remarkably diverse body of Senators, including Southern conservatives as well as Northern liberals) exclaimed:

"I must keep my promise not to become violent until I'm 40 . . ."

It was said with a certain mischievous mirth; David has retained the grace of laughter throughout this interminable nightmare. Yet what he was saying must have expressed the instinctive fury of so many of his generation who had once again been told that their cries for peace are unheard.

But most of all we talked about the impact of the Nixon address on not only Dzu but others—Gen. "Big" Minh, Sen. Tran Van Don—and other non-Communist dissidents whose emergence in a coalition structure might break the stalemate. For such men, and many others inside and outside of Saigon's jails, the Nixon speech will be as destructive as it was exhilarating for Thieu.

It occurred to me as David and his sister left that most of us have failed to say often

enough what should be said about the mission of the U.S. peace movement. We have permitted Agnew—and now Nixon—to promote the view that "disunity" at home is ammunition for Hanoi, and thereby prolongs the war.

But the truth is that peace actions here may embody the last best hope of those in South Vietnam who believe peace can come only if Thieu is compelled to abdicate. They see the President's pronouncement not as a warning to Hanoi but as a surrender to Saigon and a victory for those—there and here—who would extend the war that has ravaged their nation. They do not fear a "massacre of the innocents" if a real coalition is created; what they dread is the continuance (and "Vietnamization") of a slaughter that has shadowed their lifetimes.

But they were non-persons in the Nixon speech. Once again the war was portrayed as a conflict between Thieu's "good guys" and Hanoi's "bad guys." That David and Monique Truong stand for thousands of Vietnamese caught in the cross-fire is the story too long suppressed or obscured. It is they who have been the casualties of the domino game; all the calculations and projections of the Rostows and the Kissingers assumed a dimension of dehumanized unreality in that room Monday night.

NO NEW PARKS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the excellent October 1969 Conservation Foundation report discussing frankly and honestly the failure of this administration to come forward with enough funds to meet the conservation, park, and recreation needs of a rapidly growing nation. This may well be the last decade in which Americans may set aside the desperately needed parks, open spaces, and recreation areas for generations yet to come.

Hopefully, the insertion of this fine document into the RECORD will move Congress, the people, and perhaps but not so hopefully, the administration in a wiser and better direction in this urgent national problem. The item follows:

ADMINISTRATION SPAWNS "NO NEW PARKS" POLICY AS BUDGET KNIFE HITS LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

A "no new parks" policy is emerging from the Nixon Administration. The Administration is putting the brakes on new park and recreation investments by short-changing the vital Land and Water Conservation Fund program.

As a result, all plans for new national park and recreation areas are being stifled, perhaps for as long as four years. It's doubtful that there will be enough money to complete purchase of areas already authorized by Congress. And many state and local park and outdoor recreation programs are also in danger.

The record under President Nixon stands in stark contrast to the promises of Candidate Nixon, who said on May 16, 1968:

"In cutting the budget, the President must set his own priorities. While some sectors are certain to be pared, others must be preserved. Among those that should escape the budget knife are appropriations for conservation and for the preservation of natural resources."

These, along with education, Candidate Nixon added, are the "growth stocks of America, which will net us the greatest long-term capital gains. Investments here are investments in our children, in the kind of country they will live in and in the quality of life they will lead. This is the last place for Americans to be miserly."

Another contrast is offered by these words from the 1968 Republican Party platform: "We will work in cooperation with cities and states in acquiring and developing green space—convenient outdoor recreation and conservation areas. We support the creation of additional national parks, wilderness areas, monuments and outdoor recreation areas."

THE RECORD SPEAKS

Despite this rosy rhetoric, here's the record:

Last year Congress amended the Land and Water Conservation Fund act, guaranteeing the Fund \$200 million a year in earmarked income for five years, beginning July 1, 1968. In its final budget, the outgoing Johnson Administration asked Congress to appropriate only \$154 million of the \$200 million pledged to the Fund for fiscal 1970.

When the Nixon Administration took over, it cut this budget request to \$124 million. And that's what Congress has now appropriated. (Explained Congresswoman Julia Butler Hansen of Washington, chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee: "We followed the Administration's guidelines as contained in the revised budget estimate. I am going to be very frank and say that we would be happy to appropriate the full \$200 million if we receive proper guidelines on how and where it is to be expended in a practical manner.")

The \$124 million represents only 62% of the \$200 million accruing to the Fund during the year. Another \$88.5 million remained in the Fund from the prior year's \$111.5 million appropriation, making a total of \$288.5 million which could have been appropriated. (For fiscal 1969, the first year of the beefed-up Fund, the Johnson Administration sought appropriations of \$130 million rather than \$200 million. Then Congress cut that down to \$111.5 million.)

The "no new parks" policy was revealed September 10 by Robert P. Mayo, the President's Budget Bureau director. In a letter to Congressman Wayne Aspinall, chairman of the House Interior Committee, Mayo, speaking of the National Park Service's land acquisition program, said: "We see little likelihood of the fiscal year 1971 program being larger than the fiscal year 1970 program." The Mayo letter continued:

"If budget constraints approximately equal to the present ones continue in 1971, 1972 and 1973, and at current prices, the Department of the Interior will not be able to complete its program for land acquisition in existing areas by the end of fiscal year 1973, when the current augmented fund authority expires. Thus, even without authorization of new areas and under optimistic assumptions about the stability of land prices, deferrals in the Park Service land acquisition program in recently authorized areas or a reduction in the amounts proposed for acquisition of inholdings in older areas, or both, will probably be necessary. The allocation of funds for acquisition of areas yet to be authorized would require still greater reductions in funds for acquisition of existing areas or inholdings."

In short, don't bother authorizing any new national parks or recreation areas; in the four years ahead we may not even pay for those already authorized.

FEELINGS OF OUTRAGE

Reactions came swiftly. The House Interior Committee called a meeting on September 24 and invited the press "to let the public know what is really involved here" and to

give the committee a chance to show its "feeling of outrage at what is taking place," as Aspinall put it.

At the committee meeting, Aspinall said that the Administration "is not keeping faith with Congress, which intended that this \$200 million a year be available despite any other budget restrictions . . . If Congress is to be thwarted in its work in this respect, and if the Executive, having once given its approval, is to be allowed to change its mind, then the work that we do here is useless."

Said Congressman John Saylor of Pennsylvania, ranking Republican on the committee: "I am gravely concerned with the approach taken by the Budget Bureau. (It) is not keeping faith with this committee and with prior Congresses."

While Aspinall indicated little enthusiasm for holding hearings and passing bills authorizing new park and recreation areas when he knows there's to be no money available to buy them, Congressman Morris Udall of Arizona, a committee member, urged the committee to "plunge" ahead and consider worthwhile park bills. "The only way this national policy set by the Budget Bureau instead of the Congress is going to be changed is by public outrage and public pressure," he said. "We increase the public pressure if we hold hearings."

(Aspinall also took considerable umbrage at the Mayo letter's implication that the Budget Bureau would determine priorities as far as national parks are concerned. "If I know my Constitution correctly," said Aspinall, "it says that the purse strings are in the hands of Congress. When Congress has once made its decision and the Executive has approved the legislation, we have a right to expect that what is provided in the legislation is followed.")

There were other congressional reactions. Said Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin: "It is abundantly clear that it was the intent of Congress to assure this \$200 million spending level. If land costs and development continue to escalate, and adequate funds are not appropriated to meet these commitments, the precedent-setting effort in recent years to expand our national park system will face total collapse."

Said Senator Mark Hatfield of Oregon: "The latest move by the Budget Bureau is but another glaring example of the inverse priorities that exist in this country today."

And the conservation movement has also spoken out. In a letter to President Nixon October 17, officials of 13 conservation organizations wrote they were "deeply concerned that during its first nine months your Administration's performance to meet our growing country's growing outdoor recreation needs is disappointingly inadequate."

They cited the Administration's cut in the Fund's budget, the "extraordinary" Mayo letter, and "a general lack of initiatives and performance evidencing concern and commitment to meet public needs in this field." They also wrote that "delay in acquiring needed park and recreation lands contributes more to inflation and burden on taxpayers than timely capital investments to acquire these lands" and warned that the net effects of delay "are either land speculation and greatly increased costs to the public, or loss of many of the finest remaining opportunities."

They urged the President not to permit the Budget Bureau letter to prevail as Administration policy, to use the full level of revenues available in the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to use advance contracts and options to buy authorized areas, and to develop a "comprehensive nationwide action program" to meet the nation's present and future outdoor recreation needs.

MORE RHETORIC ONLY?

Meanwhile, at the same time that the Land and Water Conservation Fund has failed to "escape the budget knife," Secre-

tary of the Interior Walter Hickel has been espousing new parks to alleviate the urban recreation bind—though he doesn't say where the money will come from.

Said Hickel on May 13: "I have pledged to move ahead with the acquisition and development of parks and recreation areas, and particularly . . . (those) close to where most of our population lives." He then offered the Nixon Administration's first specific new park suggestion—a Gateway National Recreation Area at New York City's harbor. The 15,600-acre area would consist of lands and shallow waters—most already publicly owned—including Breezy Point and Jamaica Bay in New York City and Sandy Hook in New Jersey.

(The Administration has not yet requested legislation to authorize the Gateway area.)

Speaking of the Gateway proposal later, Congressman Hugh L. Carey of New York, a member of the House Interior Committee, suggested that it would be better for the Interior Department "not to go on any hallucinogenic trips and go out and tell the population that we are undertaking new park planning and acquisitions that are not even in the realm of possibility. I do not think we can tell the people stories like this. I would like the Secretary to speak to this budgetary limitation."

On June 21, Hickel announced a study of the possibilities of an "expanded program of federal acquisition and federally assisted acquisition of park and recreation areas in the large urban centers of our nation," including ways to finance such a program. "Time is of the essence," he said. "Opportunities are being lost daily to acquire such lands."

Then on September 17 in Chicago, in a speech to the National Recreation and Park Association, Hickel partially unveiled a grand design for urban parks which "we are considering." The price tag: \$6.3 billion, to be spent over the next five years. At the end of his speech, Hickel conceded that he recognizes that the proposed solutions will be costly and that it may not be possible to carry them out under present fiscal restraints."

THE PRESSING NEEDS

The widespread opposition to the Nixon Administration's posture on the Land and Water Conservation Fund stems from these basic facts: Park and recreation needs are mushrooming, even faster than population. Meanwhile, much of the land most needed for public recreation is threatened with incompatible development. Land prices often escalate so fast that it is prudent to buy as soon as possible after authorization. Recognizing this, Congress placed a top priority on the Fund when it provided \$200 million a year in earmarked money which it meant to be spent.

Harrison Loesch, Assistant Secretary of Interior for Public Land Management, put it this way to a Senate Interior Subcommittee on July 17: "I think we could profitably spend for recreation uses many times the \$200 million a year."

At the federal level, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation estimates that \$275 million—above and beyond the amount just appropriated for fiscal 1970—is needed just to acquire areas already authorized by Congress. (This is for areas eligible for Land and Water Conservation Fund purchase, including Point Reyes and Cape Cod National Seashores as well as older areas of private in-holdings within already acquired parks. In addition to National Park Service needs, the total also includes areas authorized for acquisition by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.)

At the current rate of appropriations (\$124 million a year), and assuming a 50-50 split of fund appropriations between federal and state needs, this leaves \$62 million a year for the federal portion.

This is to say nothing of the money it would take to begin acquisition of new park areas. A number of these have been proposed, some of them years ago. A partial list of those for which bills have been introduced in Congress: Sawtooth National Recreation Area (Idaho), Connecticut River National Recreation Area (New England), Big Thicket National Park (Texas), Voyageurs National Park (Minnesota), Potomac National River (Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia), Buffalo National River (Arkansas), Apostle Islands National Lakeshore (Wisconsin), Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore (Michigan), and Gulf Islands National Seashore (Alabama, Florida, Louisiana and Mississippi).

What about the need for matching grants which go to the states from the Land and Water Conservation Fund—monies which are used to support both acquisition and development of state and local park and recreation areas?

This is difficult to assess, but in a statement presented to the House Appropriations subcommittee, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation had this to say: "Participation of the states indicates their desire to overcome the recreation deficit. All states have submitted or are working on improved and updated statewide outdoor recreation plans." The Bureau said that as of last December 31, states had obligated \$197 million and that \$73 million in projects had been approved for future funding. During the past year, the Bureau added, the states submitted some 1,300 project applications, seeking some \$91 million. (This compares with \$62 million just appropriated from the Fund for state grants.)

"The need for recreation opportunities at the state and local levels is increasing at a much higher rate than the increase in newly developed facilities," the Bureau said. "Most states and political subdivisions lack adequate financial resources to make up the difference."

"Some of the bigger states could spend three to four times as much," one Bureau spokesman said. Lawrence N. Stevens, then acting director of the Bureau, told the Senate Appropriations subcommittee on March 11 that "the states are definitely in high gear, and they are raring to go to get every cent they can get their hands on."

The interest of states and local governments in parks and recreation is further substantiated by the dozens of state and local bond issues which have been approved for these purposes since 1960.

TOWARD A SOLUTION

Three important steps which the Administration could take to ease the plight of the Land and Water Conservation Fund:

Reshape priorities by directing the Budget Bureau to follow a policy of making available all revenues accruing in the Fund each year. Among other things, this would resolve the current difficult impasse between the Budget Bureau and Congress.

Alleviate the problem of inadequate funds in the current fiscal year 1970 by including in the Administration's forthcoming supplemental appropriations bill for the year the full amount of money still available for appropriation—about \$164.5 million over and above the \$124 million already appropriated.

In the new budget now being prepared for fiscal 1971, include the full amount to be available for appropriation from the Fund. This is estimated at \$365 million—less whatever amount might be included in the supplemental appropriations bill for 1970.

The Administration could also take full advantage of several money-saving approaches authorized by Congress last year, which are designed to minimize cost escalation by shortening the time gap between authorization of recreation areas and their acquisition. For example, \$500,000 a year was authorized to secure options to buy. (The Administration did not seek these funds and

Congress did not vote them.) Also, \$30 million a year was authorized for entering into advance contracts to purchase land. (The Administration sought the full \$30 million but Congress appropriated nothing and asked that this matter be reexamined and resubmitted to Congress.)

Other remedies are hard to come by. Congressman John D. Dingell of Michigan and eight colleagues introduced a bill (H.R. 11127) to increase the amount of money going into the Fund from \$200 million to \$400 million a year, perhaps on the theory that if more is available in the Fund, more will be freed for use. Another suggestion: pass a law exempting the Fund from expenditure ceilings imposed by Congress or the Administration.

Congressman Saylor introduced a bill (H.R. 13945) to halt collection of various user fees and taxes which are earmarked for the Fund, as long as there is a limitation put on Fund expenditures.

Seeking another type of remedy to the park and recreation problem, Senator Henry M. Jackson of Washington introduced—and the Senate passed on June 26—a bill (S. 1708) to make surplus federal property, including military installations, available at low cost or no cost, to state and local governments for park and recreation purposes, if they are suitable. A similar bill (H.R. 12651) was introduced by Congressman Thomas M. Pelly of Washington and is pending in the House.

It has also been suggested that the Fund be devoted entirely to state matching grants, and that each national park or recreation area be subject to separate appropriations by Congress. This would presumably have the advantage of focusing public attention on trouble spots.

Indeed, it may be that only through congressional and public pressure on behalf of the Fund, can its long-term prospects be brightened. Results to date of this year's fight for the full \$1 billion in funds authorized for grants help local communities build needed waste treatment facilities demonstrate that public and congressional pressure can reshape priorities—if enough people care enough. A similar effort on behalf of full funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund would not surprise many observers.

THE CALL FOR HELP IN THE CITIES

It has been a truism that the nation's crowded cities are in dire need of more park and recreation space. Numberless politicians, panels and task forces have been saying this for years. But there has been no all-out effort to solve the problem, although Congress created the Open Space Program in the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This program provides 50% matching grants to help states and communities acquire and develop park and open space areas in urban areas. Like the Land and Water Conservation Fund, however, it has also been strapped for funds.

Although Congress authorized \$150 million for fiscal 1970, for example, the Johnson Administration requested an appropriation of only \$95 million. This was cut by the Nixon Administration to \$85 million, and then by the House to \$75 million, the figure expected to come out of Congress. Again, the unmet needs are great. A HUD official said that in fiscal 1969, in the undeveloped land portion of the program alone, there was \$102 million in applications. So far, \$52 million worth has been approved—using up all the money available—and some \$39 million rejected. Of those rejected, he said, almost all would have been approved had there been enough money.

Speaking of urban recreation needs, the August report of the President's Citizens Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality said that the Open Space Program "has channeled all of its grants to metropolitan areas, but for a number of reasons, relatively

little money has been available for central city areas." Similarly, it said that the bulk of the Land and Water Conservation Fund money allocated to the states has gone to suburban rather than central city areas. "The emphasis has been understandable," it added. "The LWCF funds are generally channeled through state recreation agencies, and their historic bias has been towards projects in fringe and rural areas where land costs are lower."

A major program to solve some of these problems is at least on the horizon: In 1963, Congress directed the new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation to make a five-year study and come up with a Nationwide Outdoor Recreation Plan. This wasn't finished before the Johnson Administration left office. Now it has been completed and is expected to be released shortly. The plan calls for a strong urban thrust. It has the endorsement of Interior Secretary Hickel, who has spoken a number of times in favor of more urban park and recreation facilities, and President Nixon is reported to favor the general idea.

In his September 17 speech in Chicago, Hickel gave a brief preview of the new nationwide plan; other details have also been made public. The principal element in the plan is a shift in emphasis from great western parks to smaller urban projects, which would be accessible to more people, particularly the disadvantaged. The urban program, said Hickel, would be funded at \$6.3 billion over a five-year period—from an expanded Land and Water Conservation Fund. (Thus, the program would not detract from current park and recreation programs not urban oriented.)

"The major thrust of this expansion will be aimed at urban grant assistance to help cities and states finance large, comprehensive projects," Hickel said. This would involve \$5.3 billion of the total.

The other \$1 billion would go for a "National Parks Urban Program," under which the National Park Service would directly acquire and develop urban recreation areas of "outstanding quality."

A third important component of the nationwide plan is its emphasis on the use of military lands for park and recreation purposes. This would involve public use of areas which remain part of military installations. It would also involve inexpensive acquisition by local governments of some of the great reservoir of military lands—many of them in or near big cities where their high market value makes acquisition otherwise prohibitive. Thus, some urban recreation needs could be met at little cost.

Funds from the urban grant program would be for use in cities having a population of more than 250,000. The federal government would pay up to 90% of a project's cost, depending on its nature and the financial status of the recipient government.

Hickel said that "in urban America, where 75% of our population is now concentrated—and that percentage will grow—only 25% of available recreation facilities and only 3% of public recreation lands are reasonably accessible." (They are considered "reasonably accessible" if they are within 50 miles of a city with population over 250,000 and 120 miles of a city with population over one million.)

"The urban grant program, to be effective, must shed past restraints and lack of imagination," said Hickel. "Most grant money so far has gone to conventional park projects. We must innovate. This is especially true in the cities where space is at a premium. We must use rooftops, vacant lots, school grounds, streets—anything. We must use night lighting to extend hours and create year-round facilities to get greater public use for our investment. . . . (and) have facilities for the handicapped and elderly."

Some of the possibilities were also sug-

gested in a December 1968 report which the National League of Cities prepared for the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. The report noted that the New York City Recreation Department has "constructed playgrounds on sites acquired from other city departments. In many cases, this land was vacant and unsuitable for other uses. Other devices used to acquire land for parks and recreation include acquisition by tax liens; condemnation; joint development of land with schools and with public and private housing agencies; development in connection with parkways, expressways and civic centers; and by reclamation of waterfront and other neglected or submarginal areas."

Said Hickel: "Public outdoor recreation policies and programs have not changed with the speed of social change and are not meeting the challenge."

Similarly, the President's Citizens Advisory Committee has recommended that the Land and Water Conservation Fund law be amended so the Secretary of Interior can require states to channel a larger share of their grant money to urban areas and to give the Secretary discretionary authority to make grants directly to large cities when the circumstances warrant.

POINT REYES, A CASE HISTORY IN DELAY

In 1962 Congress authorized establishment of Point Reyes National Seashore on northern California's coast. The ceiling for appropriations for land acquisition was set at \$14 million.

The House Interior Committee emphasized at the time that \$14 million would be adequate only if land acquisition could be completed promptly, if land prices would remain "approximately constant for a few years at least," and if some \$9 million worth of the land could be acquired by exchange for unneeded federal lands elsewhere.

Instead, speculators and subdividers moved in and land costs skyrocketed at a rate of 10 to 20% a year, the government's acquisition program got off to a slow start, and only \$4 million worth of land has been acquired by exchange. In 1966 Congress raised the ceiling to \$19.1 million, but the acquisition program never caught up with cost escalation spiral.

Result: Today the entire \$19.1 million has been appropriated—and less than half the seashore has been acquired. Only 22,816 of the 54,136 acres within the boundaries and less than half the shoreline has been acquired, in an "unadministrable" patchwork pattern.

Bills now pending in Congress would authorize \$38.4 million more to secure the rest of the Seashore—based on estimates of land values made by the National Park Service last fall. The Nixon Administration supports the purpose of the bills, but says only \$28.4 million more is needed, based on new appraisals. Thus, the total price tag for Point Reyes will be \$57.5 or \$47.5 million, or somewhere in between, depending upon which amount, if any, Congress authorizes. Point Reyes also was the immediate subject of Budget Director Robert Mayo's September 10 letter to Congress. He stated that even if the appropriations ceiling is raised it appears unlikely that the funds would become available.

Meanwhile, some of the most scenic and strategically located land for public use within the boundaries is headed for private subdivision as owners tire of waiting for government action. The Administration itself, in an unprecedented and controversial action, has announced its intention to sell off development rights on 9,000 acres within the National Seashore as a private enclave for residential subdivision and associated commercial developments. Why? To raise revenues for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which already contains \$164.5 million more than the Administration is willing to spend!

A magnificent seashore protected in perpetuity, close to more than 5 million people, just might not be realized.

As syndicated columnist Marquis Childs said of Point Reyes recently: "The subdividers are on the doorstep and pressing hard . . . Congress can propose but the Bureau of the Budget disposes by freezing extra money that may be voted. As the people push accelerates, the standing-room-only sign covers more and more of a once-free land."

Gladwin Hill of the New York Times reported: "This dramatic promontory just north of San Francisco is at once a monument to natural beauty, to man's aspirations and to government confusion. Its future as one of the nation's choicest preserves hangs in the balance at this moment, clouded by the financial and administrative problems that beset . . . many other segments of the national recreation system."

And Scripps-Howard writer William Steif, commenting on Interior Secretary Hickel's dream of putting "parks where people are," noted acidly that the government can't even get enough money together to finish acquiring Point Reyes, which is only an hour's drive from San Francisco. "What is happening to Point Reyes," said Steif, "is symptomatic of the backward steps the Administration is taking near big cities."

NEED FOR NEW COMMUNICATIONS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, we have had the incredible opportunity in recent days to see color television pictures transmitted from the moon to our homes. To the layman, this feat almost equals the engineering and scientific technology that went into putting our astronauts on the moon itself.

Remarking on this tremendous accomplishment then, it is worthy to note that despite the successful transmission of television pictures from the moon to earth, there are many places in this Nation, including the cities, that do not receive normal television transmissions—or if they do—the transmissions are of no relevance to their needs, tastes, or desires.

In order to expand on the above themes, the relationship of which are somewhat obscure, I would like to enter two speeches on the subject of CATV in the RECORD.

One speech, by John B. Williams, executive director of the redevelopment agency of the city of Oakland, concerns the usefulness of CATV in the urban core areas.

The other, delivered by me, dwells with the need of CATV in the suburbs.

The two do show the relationship of the above themes and point out the dangerous gap in our communications system.

The speeches follow:

REMARKS OF JOHN B. WILLIAMS

(Executive director of the redevelopment agency of the city of Oakland before the fall convention of the California Community Television Association, Nov. 11, 1969)

I have been here at the Del Coronado since last Saturday evening. I have had an oppor-

tunity to meet and talk with many of you. I have toured your exhibit area and attended a number of your sessions. I am impressed with your air of confidence, your prosperity, energy and enthusiasm for the future. It is the kind of energies and abilities we need to deal with problems of our inner cities.

But this has not been my first exposure to CATV, or to its problems. For some years now I have followed, as a layman, the progress of your developing industry and have even paid some attention to your regulatory problems. As some of you may recall, I prepared some testimony in opposition to the action taken last December by the Federal Communications Commission. And though I was not able to attend the hearings in Washington held last February, my remarks were read to the Commission by one of your spokesmen, and I hope were considered by that Body.

My interest in your industry has not been mere idle curiosity. It stems from my conviction that, insofar as the major urban areas are concerned, we must develop some better systems of communication and my conviction that your industry may be the key to providing those systems.

Today, a fact of life is that every segment of our society is constantly required to make decisions based upon inadequate information. Such decisions too often turn out to be bad decisions. If we hope to keep this complex society working together, we are going to have to provide the means for making available more reliable and more adequate information.

There may have been a time during the history of our country when the major portion of our citizenry lived in rural areas and got its news and information in a leisurely fashion by word of mouth, by personal correspondence, by a few sporadic community gatherings, and sometimes even by virtue of a weekly newspaper. There may then have been plenty of opportunity to read the paper leisurely, and to properly think about and discuss such information before making the decisions that affected the economic, cultural, social and political decisions of the time.

But that time, if ever there really was such a time in this country, is long gone.

In today's urban society, we manufacture person to person transactions, person to group transactions, person to government and to institution transactions, and group to group and to government and institution transactions at fantastic rates. One hell of a lot is going on all the time. We buy—we sell—we build—we tear down—we change—we educate—we cultivate—we invent—we destroy—we play—we sue—we demonstrate—we riot—we try and we punish. We do all these things, and more, at a rate that no one living fifty or a hundred years ago—when the form and character of our cities were being molded—could have comprehended.

And as all this activity swirls about within our cities, every child, every adult, every family, business, industry, bureaucrat and elected official has a need to know what is happening in order to cope—to perform—yes, even to survive. When he cannot know, when he cannot cope, he drops out. And when this happens, he becomes unhappy and useless to himself and a further burden on that part of society that is still functioning.

Now you take all this bubbling caldron of activities—this mixture of needs and desires of our city residents and add a few extra ingredients such as a disparity of family and cultural background, a disparity of race, of creed and of color, an existing and growing disparity of income, of education, of economic opportunity, of cultural enrichment. And then, just to make sure the pot boils well, add some extremes of political commitment; add prejudice, fear, insecurity, and a long period of governmental and institutional inattention to the disenfranchised,

and you will have a witches brew that approximates life in most of our urban areas.

And, as you think about that for a moment—let me add that the urban areas I am describing are the same things your industry calls the Top One Hundred Markets.

You all know what slums are. You are every day reminded of the unemployment problem in the ghetto—the problem of the Blacks and of the Mexican Americans and of the other minorities. But so far in the history of your industry you have only been required to read and hear about the problem, and perhaps to see it from a distance.

What is important now is that as you approach these inner cities you are going to have to deal with and take a part in, the solutions to these problems.

You must understand that in these inner cities a far larger proportion of Blacks and other minorities are the victims of poor housing, unemployment, under-employment and poverty. For example, the City of Oakland, with a population of almost 400,000 contains about 35 per cent Blacks, 5 per cent Chinese and smaller but significant numbers of other minorities.

The school population is in excess of 50 per cent Black, and less than 40 per cent Caucasian, with the other minorities making up the balance. The report of the National Commission on Urban Problems to the Congress and to the President of the United States projects that by 1985 over 30 per cent of all urban areas will consist of non-whites.

Our society is designed to assure most of us available alternatives as to where we live, how we live, and what we do. Big city slum dwellers do not have this freedom of choice. They are denied a full range of opportunities in education, jobs, housing and economic development. Mainstream Americans take those opportunities for granted and slum dwellers know this. They know how the more prosperous half lives and they aspire to the same way of life. The fact that they cannot achieve that way of life is a source of much of their anguish and bitterness.

We at the Redevelopment Agency are conscious of this, as is Congress. Though not enough is yet even in the planning stage, we do have 477 acres of inner city land under urban renewal activity, including planning, relocation, the development of lower and moderate income housing, and the renewal of our civic and downtown business area. And we are only part of many forces working on the problems. Others include government at all levels, the endowed foundations and a substantial number of concerned citizens.

As all the various forces, including governmental, foundational and private, have been brought to bear on the multiple problems of the core city, it has become quite apparent that the Redevelopment Agency, which deals with the social and economic as well as the physical aspects of these problems, is the agency which most often becomes the direct point of contact with the citizenry. Especially is this so in the areas which are the points of stress. I mean by this racial unrest and the increasing desire on the part of the minority groups as a whole to become a major part of the economic growth of our city. Indications are clear that this tendency is on the increase.

One of the major problems of renewal and redevelopment is its inability to adequately communicate, to educate, to inform, and advise the people most directly affected by the redevelopment process. The failure to solve these communication needs in other cities has been demonstrated with disastrous results.

Our society cannot long tolerate such disastrous results, and we don't want them in Oakland.

When Oakland has a city-wide CATV system, it is anticipated that the Redevelop-

ment Agency will have the use of a channel on that system with which to provide an inter- and intra-group medium of communication. That is to say that we expect CATV to satisfy at least one of our basic needs in a city with a population makeup like that of Oakland. We need to not only communicate to the disenfranchised what is happening in the rest of the city—we need to and must communicate to our *well-enfranchised* citizens the conditions, the needs and the desires of the *disenfranchised* in some atmosphere other than one of direct confrontation on the streets.

Let me give you one example. Just recently our agency, in cooperation with the City staff, has put together a concept, and a concrete proposal to clear several square blocks of dilapidated and outworn commercial structures, and create in the very heart of downtown Oakland a 93 million dollar project which will include a hotel, shopping center, office buildings, convention facilities and a major housing complex.

The prospects for this project coming to fruition are excellent. We know that this project upon completion will create some 13,400 jobs, with a 95 million dollar payroll. This means opportunities not only for wage earners, but for retailers large and small, contractors and builders and subcontractors.

As the project develops there is no adequate means available to us to advise the whole of the community of the opportunities here. There is no adequate medium of communication to advise and train the minorities so that they can take a positive part in this huge community project.

And we are not the only ones with a need to communicate. The schools, the adult education centers, the job placement and job training institutions all have this same need. Further, there is a need for the so-called Establishment and institutions involved to communicate with the citizenry and each other.

The Rand Corporation in its part of the report of the President's Task Force on Communication Policy, of which your industry has heard so much, came to the following conclusion regarding communications in the core city:

"It is clear that communication of community information is sorely lacking within the ghetto areas of U.S. cities, and communication between these areas and neighboring communities is equally inadequate. There is considerable evidence that the problem of communications is, to some degree, responsible for the isolation of ghetto residents and for their inability to enter into the economic mainstream of their cities.

"Even a cursory examination of the channels of communication for information concerning the availability of jobs, housing, welfare and health services, educational and training opportunities, and current affairs in city government shows that these channels are inefficient and generally ineffectual. Even when information does get conveyed, those receiving it frequently do not feel that it is credible, and therefore it is of little value."

The Rand Report proposed a pilot program involving a 4-channel wired system with primary emphasis on education, job and training programs and community service programs. And it ably documented the need for this project. It is clear from a reading of that report that the Rand Corporation assumed the necessity of funding such a proposal with foundation or government funds. The report furnished what, I am told, were reasonably realistic cost figures.

With this background in mind, let us now turn and examine your industry and its possible role in these problems.

I am very familiar with your history of providing simple TV reception in the shadow areas of the hills, and I am familiar with your march down out of the hills through the suburbs to the edge of the big cities.

You are now where it's at. Our paths now merge. Your industry is about to get to where it should have been 25 years ago—for any logical man equipped with 20-20 hind sight can now clearly see that both VHF and UHF perform only one function well—that of disseminating mass entertainment and regional and national news.

That may be good enough for the hills and the suburbs, but it just can't do the job in the inner city.

The concept of a wired city with a communications system making positive contributions to the quality of life in the city is not just a wild academician's dream. It is becoming, and in due course, will be an indispensable part of city life.

But as our paths cross I have two things to say, and these two things really make up my message today.

First to you as an industry, let me say that you will not be able to do the job as you are now constituted. Oakland is 35 per cent Black. In the inner cities of the other 99 of the top 100 markets the figures may vary to some extent, but not enough to change my point.

Unless you are prepared to not only serve and deal with these minorities, but are prepared to incorporate them into the whole warp and woof of your industry, you don't belong in our cities.

If you look upon our density of population as just another place to pick up \$5.00 per tap at the rate of hundreds, or even thousands, of taps per mile of cable in exchange for clear color pictures of "I Love Lucy"—then you may need us—but we don't need you. We will have to wait for the Rand Corporation and the Ford Foundation and perhaps AT&T to do the job.

But from what I have seen and heard of your industry, I don't think this is a fair description of your industry. I think that you, in the throes of your own adversities with those who regulate you, have searched for and found a policy of true service to the whole community. I believe, and I hope, that you are prepared to not only come in to the cities and give those services, but you are prepared to involve the total community in your industry. This means the origination of programming directed at the minorities, such as the Black Journal by NET. This means equity ownership in your industry. This means not only programming about job opportunities and job training, but on-the-job training of minorities in your own operations. If you fail to do this, you will not succeed in the inner cities.

To conclude this point, I say to you that \$5.00 per customer will be a fair price to charge if CATV, or Cable, or whatever name you want to give it, can aid our education, can aid our job training programs, can not only produce its own jobs, but can point the way to opportunity in other fields to those seeking it.

In truth, \$5.00 per customer will be a gilt-edged bargain if CATV can help to pull the community together—if it can raise the quality of life for all in the city—and I suspect that it can.

And when I say a bargain, I mean not only a bargain to the individual subscriber, I mean bargain to the society as a whole.

The second thing I have to say is not to you as an industry, but to your Regulators. Here I include the cities, the states, the Federal Communications Commission and the Congress.

In the past, when society has demonstrated a need for a product, or for a service, and there has been a shortage of that product or service, we as a society acting through our elected and appointed officials have found a way to foster the production and distribution of those products and services.

This has been true of food and agricultural production, shelter and the housing industry, travel and the transportation industry. We have spent huge portions of our government's budget to educate, to train, to pro-

vide efficiency, indeed to subsidize all those who would help in producing those scarce goods and services.

If you doubt this, just examine the budget over the last few decades of the Commerce Department, the Department of Agriculture, of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and of its predecessors such as the Federal Housing Administration and Public Housing.

I believe that all those who have seriously examined the question can agree that we have a demonstrated need in our cities for what Irving Kahn, and the Electronic Industries Association, call Broad Band Communications in our cities. Bearing that need in mind, let us now consider the Rand Report project in reference to your industry, and in reference to the regulation of your industry.

While the pattern may not be uniform, my own investigation tells me that there is an extraordinary anomaly present when those who are familiar with the problems in the cities find that we need the very thing that you as an industry are anxious and technically able to produce. That anomaly can only be explained in terms of your regulation. I am familiar with the Second Report and Order of 1966. The basic thrust of that document was to limit the movement by CATV of television signals beyond their B contour. To the extent that this order deprived CATV of a salable diversity of signals, it constricted its economic base.

I have read the FCC Notice of Proposed Rule Making of December, 1968, in Docket 18397. The thrust of that document insofar as I am here concerned, was to limit the signals to be carried in one market to those within that market place. As an exercise in logic, I have some problem reconciling this with the theory of the FCC Table of Allocations and its stated policy of encouraging the most use of wire and radio for the benefit of the citizens of the country.

I have a real problem reconciling this with the needs of our urban areas.

If I understand properly the regulatory philosophy, the FCC, with respect to television, first decided that it was in the public interest to provide the most television to the most people possible while avoiding electrical interference. This policy brought forth the development of a sound and flourishing VHF television industry. The FCC then found that there were glaring deficiencies in television service to the American public and decided that it was in the public interest that all TV sets be manufactured with a UHF tuner; made allocations for UHF frequencies; and has done all in its power to promote that industry. That venture has been less than successful.

While these things were going on, the CATV industry was itself developing, first without regulation then with regulation which has slowed its progress.

I have been advised of the FCC's most recent Order requiring origination capability—and I applaud it. But the important factor to me is that the necessary economic base for the provision of all these services I have been discussing has been, so far, ignored.

I understand from your experts that a CATV system in most urban areas will be economically viable if it is allowed to carry all the grade B or better signals placed in the air over the area. Without those signals, no matter how much dedication and willingness to be involved is demonstrated by the Cable Company, there will be a serious risk involved. For after all is said and done, some method must be available to pay for the eight million dollars worth of equipment required to wire our city.

My point, then, to be more specific to you Regulators is this. If what it takes in order to make the CATV industry viable in the City of Oakland, the City of Sacramento, the City of Los Angeles, in Watts if you will, or in Oklahoma City or Dallas or Pittsburgh,

Detroit, or Chicago, is the carriage of signals from television stations located outside of those cities—then I say *allow the carriage of those signals*. If the lack of the carriage of those signals is prohibiting the development of the kind of wired services that we need and envision, and which are now available, then it must be in the public interest to so regulate the industry so that those signals are available.

It just *must* be in the public interest to foster, and if necessary, to subsidize the kind of communication system that can best serve the people of our cities, and provide a major contribution toward an improved social and economic base in the urban core areas.

Thank you.

PARTS III AND IV OF THE NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING AND NOTICE OF INQUIRY IN DOCKET 18397, FEBRUARY 3, 1969

(Statement of the Honorable JEROME R. WALDIE, Member of Congress, 14th Congressional District of California, before the Federal Communications Commission)

Chairman Hyde, and Commissioners of the Federal Communications Commission: I am Jerome R. Waldie. I am a member of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, representing the 14th California Congressional District.

So as to place my remarks in context from a geographical point of view, my district includes the whole of the County of Contra Costa located in the Bay Area of Northern California.

Immediately to the west of Contra Costa lie Alameda and San Francisco counties containing the major market cities, as defined by you, of San Francisco and Oakland. Immediately to the east lie San Joaquin and Sacramento counties containing the major market cities of Sacramento and Stockton.

To further pinpoint my district, the whole of Contra Costa County lies within the Grade A contours of Channels 3, 6, 10, 13, and 40, all operating stations assigned to the Sacramento-Stockton market, Channel 36 from the San Jose market, and Channels 7, 20, 38 and 44, all assigned to the San Francisco-Oakland market. In addition, Channels 2, 4, 5 and 32, from San Francisco-Oakland, Channel 11 from San Jose, Channel 8 from Salinas, and Channel 19 from Modesto place a Grade A or B contour over some or all of the county.

Contra Costa County has on occasion been described as a bedroom community for the cities of Oakland and San Francisco. To an extent this is, of course, true. Many of our residents commute to jobs in those cities. Yet this is only part of the truth. The facts are that many also commute to jobs in the Vallejo-Benicia heavy industrial complex in Solano County to the north, and to Santa Clara and San Mateo counties to the south and west, and to Sacramento and San Joaquin counties to the east.

And many who live in the surrounding counties commute to work in Contra Costa County where we have a very substantial and rapidly expanding industrial and commercial economy.

The fact is that we, in Contra Costa County, are really a part of the metropolitan complex called the Bay Area, which is bounded by the Sierra foothills in the east, the Napa-Sonoma vineyards to the north, the prune orchards of Hollister to the south, and the Pacific Ocean in the west.

This is an area roughly comparable to the Los Angeles Basin. Yet, within the area, indeed within the county, there are many separate communities—some incorporated, some not—but each having its own identity, its own local problems and its own local needs.

Had we in this area the geography of the Los Angeles Basin, and were we blessed with a prominence as Mount Wilson to serve the off-the-air broadcast industry, our citizens, like those of the Los Angeles Basin, could hope to enjoy the benefits of the Commission's Allocation Plan, which was presum-

ably devised so as to place the maximum number of television signals in the air for all to enjoy—without suffering the frustration of signal interference.

But we do not have the geography of the Los Angeles Basin. The folding of the earth's crust which created our great rivers, our bays and even our climate, has also arranged it so that some, but not all, of our residents can receive the San Francisco-Oakland stations; some, but not all, of our residents can receive the Sacramento-Stockton stations; and some, but not all, can receive the Chico and San Jose stations. Some receive no stations off the air.

Because of this, portions of Contra Costa County were among the earliest recipients of the services of CATV.

I personally have had occasion to watch this industry grow from what has been called primitive television—the handling of a limited number of channels on a pure reception basis—to what it is today. The people of Contra Costa County anticipate and eagerly await the further development of this significant industry, and the services it can and will provide.

I should note that in the past this growth has been steady, consistent and orderly. It has been a growth not only of the amount of area served, but has also included increased channel capacity, increased diversity of program content, and increased quantity and dependability of service. This growth has been marked by lower rates, by lower installation charges and by greater community participation and greater community awareness. It has been aided by firm, yet restrained, regulation on the part of the State, the county and the municipalities, and it has demonstrated no significant adverse economic impact upon the off-the-air broadcast industry of the area.¹ This growth has occurred concurrently with, and I believe has aided the activation of new UHF stations, such as Channels 19, 20, 32, 36, 38, 40 and 44, all of which have come on the air since 1966.

This growth of CATV and UHF has even managed to survive your Second Report and Order, though the rate of growth for CATV has, of course, been measurably slowed.

So far as I am able to determine, this slow down was brought about, in substantial part, by the fact that some of the rules adopted by this Commission in its Second Report were such as to lend themselves to gross abuse.

Northern California demonstrates clear examples of such abuse. A station may, by the use of your automatic stay rules, effectively block any significant development of CATV throughout huge areas—literally hundreds of square miles.

In Northern California, there are franchises which have been granted by cities which have lain fallow for years as the result of the filing, by one station, of unsupported pleadings alleging adverse economic impact, often to stations other than itself. In at least one instance that I know of, the franchising city is at least one hundred miles from the assigned city of the protesting station. The franchises of such cities as Woodland, Manteca, Riverbank, Stockton, Oakdale and Ceres, are all held up by such objections.

Yet, these same objecting stations can, and often have, insisted on carriage of their own signals of CATV systems located in the heart of adjoining markets. For example, I am advised that the various Sacramento stations are carried on over 90,000 separate CATV taps (that represents about 300,000 viewers) within the Grade A contours of the stations assigned to the San Francisco-Oak-

land market. The converse is, of course, not true with respect to the carriage of the San Francisco-Oakland stations into the Central Valley.

Yet, in spite of the inequities above described, and others of which I may not be so familiar, progress was still being made under the restrictive effects of your Second Report and Order. Local governmental agencies were spending many weeks and months exploring the whole field of CATV; adopting standards; asking for and accepting proposals; and granting franchises for CATV on terms that were in the real public interest, i.e., in the interest of our citizens, the ultimate consumers.

I note that many of the questions raised by your notice of inquiry in this matter have been explored and decided upon by the city councils, the boards of supervisors and by the State Legislature.

In this same Bay Area, franchises have been awarded, construction has been commenced, and large investments have been made within the last year, in reliance, on the part of the cities, and on the part of the CATV operators, on those provisions of your rules providing that CATV systems would, at least, be allowed to carry what you have defined as local signals, i.e., those placing a Grade A or B contour over the community. I cite you here as examples the cities of Richmond, Vallejo and Berkeley, located respectively in Contra Costa, Solano and Alameda counties; Oakdale in Stanislaus County; and, most recently, Brentwood, again in Contra Costa County.

This is, of course, a brief but I believe accurate summary of the posture of CATV in this area prior to and up until your decision of December 13, 1968.

I am not now prepared to take, and I take no position on the issue of whether such action, taken without prior notice to the industries affected, or to the public, was a valid exercise of the authority granted this Commission by Congress.

I do say, however, that such proceedings seem exceedingly unfair, unwise, and a rather inappropriate method of exercising the legislative or administrative process.

Putting aside, however, the question of the methods by which these interim rules were adopted, I look next to the rules themselves.

Insofar as they have an interim effect, two things become immediately clear.

First, it appears that the interim rules represent this Commission's copyright act. As such, these rules seem out of order insofar as timing is concerned, and out of place insofar as jurisdiction is involved. This Commission cannot have been unmindful of the fact that Congress, and both Houses thereof, are and have been giving serious and continued attention to the matter of copyright as it affects CATV; nor can this Commission have been unmindful of the recent decision of the Supreme Court dealing with this very issue, and indicating that under the existing laws of Congress CATV has no copyright liability.

It seems to me that this Commission's assumption of legislative power in this instance can be explained in no way other than as an attempt by the Commission to pre-judge, and to prejudicially affect the negotiations going on between the respective industries involved, and to interfere with the work of Congress itself. Nor can I see how this unwarranted intervention can be made any less reprehensible by repeated statements on the part of the Commission that it is "anxious to secure congressional guidelines."

The second thing that appears from these interim rules, especially as "clarified" by your order of January 17, 1969, is that the rules amount to a freeze.

I am advised, and I believe, that under these interim rules the systems ready to be and now being constructed in the communi-

¹F.C.C. Public Notice No. 21547, issued 9-10-68, shows that five stations in the San Francisco-Oakland market had gross revenues down four-tenths of one percent, as opposed to the year 1966.

ties I have mentioned cannot survive economically carrying only the local signals as those local signals are now defined by you.

It also seems that such systems cannot hope to obtain the retransmission consents, as those kinds of retransmission consents are now defined and required by you. Further, in the unlikely event that such consents were to be had, the systems would still be subject to the restrictive automatic stay rules and be faced with the necessity of requiring waivers from you. And, as I understand your statements, you indicate an intention to grant few, if any, of those waivers.

Let me say at this point that I do not mean to display a mere conditioned reflex against the simple idea of a freeze as such. I can accept the principle that sound public policy could possibly justify a governmental freeze of some sector of the economic life of our country, assuming no other reasonable alternative was available.

But let's examine this particular freeze.

This Commission's basic guidelines are set forth in Section 151 of the Act and which states in pertinent part as follows:

"For the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in communication by wire and radio so as to make available, so far as possible, to all the people of the United States a rapid, efficient, Nation-wide, and world-wide wire and radio communication service with adequate facilities at reasonable charges, . . . there is created a commission to be known as the 'Federal Communications Commission', which shall be constituted as hereinafter provided, and which shall execute and enforce the provisions of this chapter."

In other words, contrary to the indications contained in your order of December 13, your function is to promote not only the use of radio but the use of wire and radio for the betterment of the communications of the whole nation.

Now, any freeze that runs contrary to the encouragement of the development of a potential ten thousand separate media outlets, which I understand is the potential number of CATV systems, for the stated purpose of promoting the so-called economic protection of a mere six hundred or so such media outlets, would appear to be bad public policy almost by definition.

It just cannot be that you, as a body, have been constituted for the purpose of limiting the communications available to the public.

It just cannot be that you have been granted the power to make the decision that a choice between three networks, one independent and one educational television station is enough for any citizen.

Your notice of inquiry of December 13 mentions the so-called element of "unfair competition" between CATV operators and existing licensees of the Commission. I have difficulty accepting your initial premise. I think it is self-evident from the history of the broadcast industry, and from the history of the Act that the existing restrictions on the number of broadcast licensees is not the result of ruinous competition resulting from a multiplicity of separate producers, such as developed in the milk industry. The existing restrictions on the number of broadcast licenses results simply, and only from the problem of signal interference.

In Contra Costa County, CATV solves the problem of topography, and thereby allows us the benefits of the Commission's Allocation Plan. If this were all that it did, CATV should have your encouragement. It does more. It should have your active support.

I do not believe it was the function of this Commission when set up, nor do I believe it is the function of this Commission at this date, to regulate competition between those who have been granted broadcast licenses; nor do I believe it to be the function of this Commission to regulate competition between such licensees and other media of public expression.

Further, this Commission's indication of the existence of an adverse economic impact upon broadcast licensees as a result of CATV operations is at least open to question. I understand that the economic history of broadcast licensees in the Bay Area does not substantiate the Commission's position. I note that in the San Francisco-Oakland market where there is significant CATV development, six UHF stations have come on the air within the last two years, and that even in the Sacramento-Stockton area, where abuse of your rules has retarded CATV development, two UHF markets have managed to come on the air. It is also my understanding that the hearing officer in the Midwest television case, cited in your order, came to exactly the contrary conclusion as you did with respect to that case.

However, assuming arguendo that there is in fact some demonstrable adverse economic impact upon broadcast licensees by CATV that requires economic regulation, it is my firm belief that Congress, and only Congress, must be the source of the direction to be taken by any such regulation.

I reiterate that I do not believe that the cries of the status quo should set the guidelines for this Commission. I do not accept, or even regard as possible the theory that the development of CATV will cause the death of UHF as we know it, or VHF as we know it, or will bring about the demise of any local station—whether that station be independent, or network affiliated.

And even were that so, then I suggest to you that no broadcaster will leave the air without being replaced by something—CATV though it may be—and I further suggest that any such replacement might just be a better one.

Again, I urge you to recall your constituency. The public whose interest you are charged to protect, is first of all, the public which buys and wants maximum use of television sets—the citizen consumer. You cannot protect that public interest by shunting it aside in favor of the economic interest of the set manufacturers, or of the networks, or of the network-affiliated stations, or of the independent stations—whether they be UHF or VHF.

The residents of my district want access to CATV. They want access to the local programming, and the diversity of programming CATV can and will bring to them. Their elected officials have indicated their desire for the same thing. Private risk capital has indicated its ability and willingness to offer this.

I cannot accept the idea that a policy which appears to be designed solely for the economic protection of the existing program marketing structure, and the existing station licensees, is public policy, sound or otherwise.

One further point. In your order of December 13, 1968, you indicate the desirability of preventing large and concentrated media holdings.

I agree with this principle. There is no need, or place for an A.T.T. in that portion of the communications industry which has the power to censor.

Yet your interim rules, your freeze, will tend towards the creation of the very evil you say you want to avoid.

Not many small CATV operations will be able to withstand your adverse rulings. Only the large ones will be ready to expand when your freeze is ended.

Should the necessity of securing copyright clearance program by program continue to be imposed on CATV, only the large chain CATV operators, and only those operating in the largest of CATV markets will be able to afford the staff to secure those clearances.

So I point out that your freeze and your retransmission requirements will produce the very set of evils you say you wish to

avoid. This, again, does not sound like sound public policy.

Now, as I close, I urge upon you these specific suggestions.

You have indicated that the 35-mile rule referred to in your order is merely a reflection of your existing practices. To the extent that what you are saying is that no station should be able to protect the development of a CATV beyond that limit, I heartily agree. However, I further add that no station should be allowed to cause an automatic stay of the development of a CATV inside that 35-mile boundary without being required to demonstrate, in the initial instance, an adverse impact on the public interest, not just the private economic interest of that particular objecting licensee. I urge that your rules be expeditiously amended to so provide.

Further, I urgently suggest the immediate suspension by you of any attempt to impose any retransmission requirements whether they be from stations, or copy-right holders, or whether they be for signals only, or for program content, until such time as full hearings are had before this Commission, and before Congress.

Thank you, gentlemen, for hearing me.

MODERN MANAGEMENT IN POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, in recent years increased public attention has been focused on the problems of lengthy and costly political campaigns. The high cost of television has added urgency to this problem.

Last month, the Research Committee, New York Metropolitan Chapter of the American Society for Public Administration published a monograph written by Mr. George M. Paduano, entitled "Modern Management Thinking in Political Campaigns." The article is most interesting and certainly contains an up-to-date approach to the problems which we all face every 2 years.

Mr. Paduano is regional director, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration for GSA region No. 2. He is a professional engineer and holds a bachelor of science degree in engineering and master of civil engineering from New York University. He was also a participant in the advanced management program of the Graduate School of Business, Harvard University. A colonel in the U.S. Air Force Reserve, Mr. Paduano is the brother of the Honorable Dominick F. Paduano, member of the New York State Workmen's Compensation Board.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from Mr. Paduano's monograph which discusses the issues of length of political campaigns and the skyrocketing costs of running for public office:

MODERN MANAGEMENT THINKING IN POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

Two chronic complaints about political campaigns are that they are too long and too expensive. The length of campaigns imposes heavy burdens on candidates, especially incumbents who must neglect their public duties to run, and on the public which must endure a drawn-out, repetitious process, last-

ing many months. This problem has been a source of concern both to politicians and observers, and has stimulated several legislative proposals to impose time limits on campaigns.

The skyrocketing costs of campaigning has been an even deeper cause for alarm. Unless a solution is found, many observers fear that only wealthy persons or candidates who are willing to take on heavy political debts in return for generous financial support, can afford to stand for major public office.

But reform of the political campaign is not easy. Shortening the campaign raises fears that the candidate may suffer loss of exposure, unless he has nearly unlimited funds at his disposal to guarantee saturation campaigning. Even then the fear may remain. Limiting campaign expenses, while universally endorsed as a goal, raises thorny practical questions such as "will the limited funds be sufficient to tell the story in the right places?" and "how can limited funds best be distributed, for example, between relatively inexpensive time on local TV stations and high priced TV time on regional or national networks?"

The techniques of public administration are not usually applied to the electoral process. In the case of campaigns, is the basic problem not one of good public management? As in the utilization of resources in government programs, is not the prime aim in campaigns to utilize time and money most effectively so as to get "the biggest bang for the buck?"

The author believes that by applying the same administrative techniques (Decision Trees, CPM, PERT and PPBS) utilized currently in management of government programs, the fears and doubts that tend to block changes in campaign practices may be alleviated.

WHAT BETTER MANAGEMENT CAN ACCOMPLISH

When the administrative approach is applied, the conduct of a campaign becomes a problem in management. Therefore, the campaign should be seen from a management point of view. Thus, it is necessary first to examine the essential ingredients in the time variable for running a political campaign, and to identify and evaluate alternatives to achieve optimum cost in communicating with the electorate.

Basically this is the planning process, or deciding in advance what is to be accomplished. As applied to a political campaign, the purpose of planning is obvious: to provide exposure of the candidate and to bring the issues before the people.

But an understanding of the elements and objectives tells us little about how to achieve the end result—namely victory.

In the case of the political campaign, victory is achieved only if a majority of voters has been influenced to cast ballots for "your" candidate. Tying the planning process and objectives together results in the realization that the aim of campaign management is to provide maximum exposure for the candidate and issues to those voters who would be amenable to be influenced to vote for your candidate. How can the fleeting days of the campaign and the limited funds available best be used to reach the groups in the electorate which would be so amenable?

As can be seen readily, this is a complex question, and the apparently facile relationship between the basic planning process and the goal of electoral victory is a multi-faceted and involved problem.

For this reason, it is not enough to devise a general or overall plan. In order to achieve the goal of providing the proper exposure for the candidate, in conjunction with presenting the issues to the appropriate parts of the public, subsidiary planning is needed. Subsidiary plans provide objectives toward which detailed plans are directed. This process results in the establishment of a hierarchy of goals, all of which are related and

contribute to the major goal. Without this relationship, integrated planning which is essential to running a political campaign is not possible.

POLITICAL PERSPECTIVE: IS ALL FAIR?

HON. FRED SCHWENGL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGL. Mr. Speaker, the League of Women Voters does not regard politics as a "dirty business" or one where the only ones who survive live by the fang and the claw. On the other hand, the league is well aware that there are techniques in every trade and that it is well to be aware of them. The taped program produced by the league and entitled "Political Perspective: Is All Fair?" features Brooks Hays, former Congressman from Arkansas and currently director of the Ecumenical Institute of Wake Forest University and chairman of the Southern Committee on Political Ethics in a discussion on what constitutes fairplay in politics.

A transcription of the League of Women Voters' program on this subject follows:

POLITICAL PERSPECTIVE: IS ALL FAIR?

Participants in the order they are heard:

Torrey Baker, former broadcaster, Voice of America;

The Honorable Brooks Hays, former Congressman from Arkansas, currently Director of the Ecumenical Institute of Wake Forest University, and Chairman of the Southern Committee on Political Ethics

BAKER. All's fair in love and war but what's fair in politics? This is Torrey Baker speaking to you on behalf of the League of Women Voters and bringing you "Political Perspective: Is All Fair . . .?"

Our guest is the Honorable Brooks Hays, former Congressman from Arkansas. Mr. Hays, a prominent Baptist layman, is currently Director of the Ecumenical Institute of Wake Forest University. He serves as well as Chairman of the Southern Committee on Political Ethics.

Mr. Hays, is name calling a new development in politics?

HAYS. No indeed, it isn't. I think it is as old as elections. Some of the things I have seen attributed to candidates in the early days of the Republic sounded as vicious and provocative as the things we hear today. Not at every level. I think there has been an improvement at the national level, largely because the reaction of the public has been unfavorable to name-calling, but still in some furious campaign struggles in township and county, and even state situations, you'll find that name calling is still a practice that places a shadow over the whole profession of politics.

BAKER. It appears that politicians sometimes say things they shouldn't, but on the whole do you find that politicians are worse than other people?

HAYS. Well, let me put it like this. Politicians are people. As a group I should think that they're no better and no worse. They are a leadership group generally and for that reason I have sometimes told church groups that if they had 435 deacons together, they would find about the same character index as the 435 members of Congress.

But let me add that we tend to create a great problem in this business of raising the tone of politics by giving encouragement unconsciously in most cases, to the idea that

politics is a "dirty business" as a whole, and I think that is what inspired the little lady in Britain . . . when she was asked for whom she voted. She said, "Vote? I never vote. It only encourages them."

BAKER. You have been an observer of the political scene for a long time, Mr. Brooks Hays. When did you first get a look at the tricky side of politics?

HAYS. Well, in the early twenties I would say. This happened, this incident happened on election night in one of the races that I was interested in. I was a part of the management of a candidate for state office, and in one county where I had considerable influence, my home county, while I was receiving returns there, I had a phone call from a friend . . . of the second candidate. My candidate was running third, and the second candidate made this shocking proposal. He said "Turn some votes to us. Take them off of your candidate and throw them to my—to our candidate because I know you would prefer our candidate to the one who is leading, and by pooling our votes we can run ahead of him." Well, this is unthinkable, of course, pure larceny and this was the first intimation I had, as I recall my early experience, that men would stoop to that level.

I was a very young man when I was elected the secretary of our State Democratic Convention in Arkansas, and in the early twenties I was grieved to find religious feelings exploited . . . in 1920 the Ku Klux Klan proscribed the racial minority, the chief racial minority—our Negro people—their participation in politics. And then there was of course antagonism to the other groups—the religious groups—that made politics in that day a very unhappy pursuit.

BAKER. Mr. Hays, how should a candidate prepare himself for a campaign—both from his opposition and among his own workers?

HAYS. Well, the first thing to do, of course, is to let your staff know that you expect them to maintain the same high standards that you have, and that it leads to great embarrassment if someone not authorized by the candidate himself does something that is obviously unethical. This would be, I should think, a basic thing.

BAKER. Everyone who has attended a meeting where there was a wide split over policy or candidates has witnessed parliamentary maneuvers. Mr. Hays, what do you think of such tricks as forcing a vote when your side is in the majority, or when your side is in the minority, delaying the vote until reinforcements arrive?

HAYS. I think it is thoroughly bad for a group even with the best of motives and serving the best of causes to resort to questionable practices from the standpoint of democratic procedure. Now all sides should be heard, and no cause justifies the short-circuiting of this democratic process. We need to drill that into the minds of people, and when justification is offered for shoddy practices on the basis of "well," you can state it like this, they do, "well, we just had to defeat that other crowd. They are a bad outfit." Now that isn't good reasoning, and it is certainly not good political ethics.

You see democracy can never be stated actually in terms of goals or of policies. It has to be defined in the final analysis in terms of procedures and methods. So democracy has to be thought of in these terms, and ethical people—and that includes most of us—I insist, must take a keen interest in these matters.

BAKER. The Southern Committee on Political Ethics is a body of private individuals who do not hold elective office and who are trying to raise the level of political life.

Brooks Hays, what advice does the Committee have for the voter?

HAYS. First, let me say that the Southern Committee on Political Ethics in spite of its name is not thinking in terms of separatism. We are a regional group only

because we find in the South a uniformity of problems, and we would hope ultimately to share with the rest of the nation the things that we accomplish and the lessons we learn from this very penetrating study of corruption in politics. But since racism is a factor in politics all through American society you might say we are making this one of our principal activities—that is the elimination of race prejudice in political campaigns.

We think that by counseling with young people who aspire to political careers or to activity of an influential kind in political life, counseling with them to recognize that the Negro has a right to full participation in our political society and by pointing out the un-American character of efforts to hold him in a secondary position, or to deprive him of the franchise, or the privilege of holding office—that these things are undemocratic, and they do violence to our American avowals, great principles and ideals. This is one of the things that we undertake.

Then, I think that you would agree that the inordinate use of money in campaigning is a problem because it distorts the electoral process. Some express the fear that we may come to the place where only men of great wealth can campaign, or where only men who are capable of acquiring great wealth through pooling resources that are not necessarily consistent with the public interest, that we feel in other words with this questionable practice, the what I call "the inordinate use of money."

Now, I can illustrate again. I remember running into an old friend down in one of the rural communities in Arkansas when I was promoting the candidacy of a friend of mine for governor, and I said, "Mr. Gilchrist, I hope you can help me out there in Mountain Township, help elect my friend governor."

"Well," he says, "Brooks, I wish I'd a known you was interested in him. But," he said, "the other side has done sent me a check for \$25 and I have cashed it, and," he said, "for me to switch on'em," he said, "that wouldn't be ethical."

Well, of course, the old gentleman was right about that but it wasn't ethical in the first place for him to take the \$25 because he was not being paid for driving a car, to nail up posters, or to do something to earn \$25. He was being paid for his limited influence in that little township. So this is what I am talking about. We have to quote our little purple passage in our literature of the Southern Committee on Political Ethics. We have said that "our purpose is to make politics in the South and in the boarder states more ethical, more dynamic and more just," and that means we have to start with the idea that every person—even one's opponent whom a candidate regards generally as an "evil" figure—is entitled to justice and fair treatment and there's a sportsmanship basically in the average American, I think, that we can count on and once he finds that . . . shoddy practices are resorted to by a candidate he's going to rebuke that practice.

So it comes down, don't you think, to a matter of education, of spreading information about the issues, and about even the men themselves, their background, and finding ways to acquaint the public with the candidates.

BAKER. Brooks Hays, have you ever had experience with those who seem to be afraid of the democratic process, and/or with extremist groups?

HAYS. Yes, I have. I remember once when I was interested in getting the merits of the United Nations presented, and there was an extremist group trying to thwart it. They didn't want a vote to be taken by that group, or even the merits to be heard. So when one of our outstanding speakers was scheduled to be there, the opponents came early, they

filled up the front seats, they had been told to shuffle their feet and make loud noises, use every kind of obstructive tactic to keep him from getting over his points. Now this, to me, is reprehensible.

Now you go to some meetings, political meetings . . . you find listeners shouting and screaming to drown out the speaker. You find that often these plans have been made before the assembly, before the candidate came, and even in the early stages of a campaign before these poor performances and shocking things take place, even—in these early stages you find that what you would hope would be a quiet deliberate meeting, you find that a small minority has planned to disrupt it. . . .

Well, I have only contempt for this kind of thing, and it's a real problem for us in America.

BAKER. What can you do in cases of this kind?

HAYS. Oh, I think generally you can annihilate tactics of that type by giving full publicity, seeing to it that the story circulates about shameful performances. . . .

There is a deep repository of sportsmanship in the people, and when they see somebody doing something that prevents their getting the truth and hearing the views of others, or when the voter for example, the individual voter feels that his rights as a listener are being kicked around, he rebels.

I have seen men switch sides because they were shocked by the strategy—the strategy used by unethical people—and in this effort to gain advantages. Ethics then becomes a very powerful force in politics and I think we should find in political history many illustrations of how things have backfired because people have resorted to these questionable procedures.

BAKER. With issues as divisive as they are these days, is it possible to have a discussion of issues without calling names, and using extremist tactics?

HAYS. Of course it is and we just must improve our standards in this regard in this beloved country of ours. We are all grieved by what we are seeing and hearing take place. The news media—all of them—give us a picture of dissension that has gone beyond the bounds of an appropriate and respectful statement of dissent. And there's a place in America for dissent, of course, but courtesy and a sportsmanlike attitude—these are indispensable elements in a political society such as we have tried to develop in America and I—I can sense already a reaction in America that gives us hope that in the next campaign this will be thoroughly eliminated.

BAKER. What you are saying then is that we must have continuing conflict and a consensus about the ground rules for that conflict.

Our thanks to Congressman Brooks Hays for illuminating the essentials of the democratic process.

This is Torrey Baker, speaking to you for the League of Women Voters and bringing you Political Perspective: Is All Fair . . . ?

PARTIAL REPEAL OF THE GUN CONTROL ACT

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I add my endorsement to the proposal to repeal and eliminate the burdensome and ill-conceived registration provisions for shotgun and rifle ammunition in the Gun Control Act of 1968.

Since coming to Congress, I have vigorously opposed gun registration in prin-

ciple and in fact. For this reason, early in this Congress I introduced H.R. 9766, a bill to repeal the Gun Control Act in its entirety. I also approached the act from another direction by introducing H.R. 8628, a bill to eliminate the record-keeping requirements for shotgun and rifle ammunition.

The proposal before the House has been essentially that called for by my bill H.R. 8628. It has been considered because the Senate, acting with foresight and wisdom, added it to the interest equalization tax bill recently passed by the House.

I have called repeatedly upon my colleagues in the House to agree to support the enlarged Senate version of the interest equalization tax bill. Consequently, I am both pleased and gratified that the House, in its wisdom, has voted to adopt the Senate measure. By so doing, the House has repealed the requirement that a dealer keep records on the name, address, and age of persons purchasing ammunition for shotguns and rifles. The House has recognized that this requirement was impractical, unworkable, and placed burdensome inconveniences upon millions of law abiding Americans who enjoy hunting, trapshooting, and other sporting activities involving long guns.

Mr. Speaker, in my view, this repeal does not go far enough, but it is a beginning. I hope, however, that it marks the commencement of serious congressional examination of the purpose and the operation of the Gun Control Act. If the Congress conducts such an inquiry, I am confident it will conclude that the act was passed in the heat of national passion and remorse over a rash of tragedies involving guns, and that insufficient attention was paid to the implications and operations of the act. Once this conclusion is reached, it will hopefully be only a matter of time before the Gun Control Act is repealed in its entirety. I look forward to that day with great anticipation, and I shall continue to do my utmost to see that the act is taken off the books as soon as possible.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS AS A POWER IN DEFENSE

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the scene, forever beyond forgetting, is that of a devastated land which has been struck by a series of nuclear warheads.

I am not talking in exaggerated or sensational terms, but stating what we may see if we accede to the political and economic pressure that has been placed upon all NATO powers to cut back upon conventional weapons and depend upon nuclear power to defend against possible Soviet aggression.

If we are to hope that our world will change and with it our own way of life, it is for us not only to seek a better climate for our children, but for all mankind. We should envision that better tomorrow.

There can be little doubt about the necessity of discouraging nations from using nuclear warheads in the defense of their country. Such a defense would surely bring about a retaliation in kind which would put the lives of many innocent people to a purposeless end.

At one time nuclear power was something that we read about in scientific magazines and in science-fiction stories. Today, we are cognizant of the power that threatens the survival of all mankind. When compared to the age of the earth, man's occupation of our planet has been very short, indeed. And today, we are developing such destructive potentials that all of mankind could be eradicated from this planet in a comparatively short period of time. Man's ability to alter his surroundings to a point of complete destruction has developed in the last several decades.

War is always a potential danger, but war with its most sophisticated weapons is doubly so.

Mr. Speaker, the preliminary Strategic Arms Limitation Talks should concern themselves with these matters of nuclear weapons. If we are to continue to use our technology to keep producing these weapons, we could lead the entire world into a more unstable situation rather than offering a reasonably peaceful outlet to some of these extremely advanced, potentially dangerous technologies.

As part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include an editorial taken from the November 17, 1969, issue of the Record, a newspaper which is widely read in the Ninth Congressional District of New Jersey, the area which I have the honor to represent in Congress.

The editorial follows:

DANGER: BASKETFULL OF EGGS

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is moving toward greater reliance on nuclear weapons as the deterrent against Soviet aggression. It is to be hoped the foreign ministers of the alliance will reflect carefully before approving total commitment.

The political and economic pressure has been on all the NATO powers to cut back

nonnuclear defense forces, and that pressure has led the nuclear planning group, which has been meeting outside Washington, D.C., to plan reliance on nuclear weapons in the event of war in Europe.

The danger is clear. If the Soviet Union should invade an allied nation, say Greece, with conventional armament and the only response of NATO were resort to the use of atom bombs, then the President of the United States would be in an awkward fix.

The use of nuclear bombs, even the ones that are genially described as tactical, would create a grave danger of a Soviet answer in kind, and we'd be off on a war that could depopulate developed sections of the world, to phrase the horror as fastidiously as possible.

The question faced by the President, who must make the decision since the United States would supply the nuclear arms, would be whether the invaded nation, Greece in our example, was worth the risk of general nuclear war.

It is, of course, an indication of the backwardness of all nations, including our own, that such a dilemma is imaginable. There has to be a better technique of international relations than this; but the fact is we haven't found one that can be relied on.

And there also has to be a better response to invasion by conventional means than nuclear bombs. Reliance on the total weapon, to be sure, poses an awful threat against an aggressor. But the aggressor just might calculate that in view of the risks the total weapon would not be used.

Costly as conventional arms may be and much as the peoples of the world are weary of paying for them when there is so much more useful work that ought to be done, they should be maintained until the world finds more civilized ways of resolving disputes. Nuclear bombs or nothing is altogether too risky a gamble to get into.

CRISIS IN AMERICA

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

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

[From the West Carroll (La.) Gazette,
Nov. 6, 1969]

CRISIS IN AMERICA

Our hearts bleed to see this great nation, this land of ours, locked in the throes of civil disorder and racial strife, plagued by a war nobody wants, and weakened by moral vicissitudes.

Sad days fall upon America, the Beautiful. Long shadows lie across the land, tarnishing, nay, obliterating the brilliance of her hope, her opportunity, her freedom and liberty. She battles for her life, locked in mortal combat, not with foreign enemies, but with her own self—her people. This proud, wonderful, bountiful land writhes in torture like a human whose own body vainly fights for its life against the onslaught of cells gone wild. We suffer a "cancer" of the body politic just as surely as some people now suffer that dread malady cancer.

This cancer eats at the heart and soul of America. And, more and more, this land of ours reveals the ravages of this affliction.

Where are her sons of courage and destiny who stood her in such good stead in years past? Where are her daughters who strode across this land side by side with their frontier mates to wrest from the wilderness a living (and a dying) and gave birth to stalwart new generations, (and a new, brighter land, in the process)?

Far too many latter day Americans occupy themselves in a chase after the dollar and a frantic quest after transient pleasure. They let slide civic duty; they seek a vapid popularity with their equals and their peers. Too many of us quail before the prospect of expressing righteous indignation. Affluence makes us squirm with guilt that we "have" and "they" don't. No one ever "gave" a person anything that counts except love and a sense of pride, plus the realization that you must work for what you get. Why then have we a guilt complex over our bounty when some n'er-do-well whines about what we, the majority, "owe" them?

America suffers from a body politic emasculated by guilt and mesmerized by an insane desire to flee from reality into the morass of pleasure seeking.

This country doesn't need a "good 5c cigar." It needs a new generation of people with guts to stand up and fight for principles; to transfix with steely eye the carping, whining, threatening dissidents and spineless apologists; to rise up in righteous indignation and preserve this land of ours, this America, this wonderful God-blessed bastion of liberty.

SENATE—Friday, November 21, 1969

The Senate met in executive session at 11 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., a Senator from the State of Virginia.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, our fathers trusted in Thee and were not confounded. Be to us in our day the guide and strength of old. Grant us the power to discern right from wrong, to separate the important from the unimportant, to distinguish between emotion and sound judgment, and in all things to show charity. Lead all who serve their country in this Chamber in the ways of truth and righteousness that all our doings, being ordered by Thy wisdom, may be righteous in Thy sight and set forward Thy kingdom.

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 assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

Washington, D.C., November 21, 1969.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., a Senator from the State of Virginia to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

As in legislative session, a message from the House of Representatives, by

Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12964) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ROONEY of New York, Mr. SIKES, Mr. SLACK, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. MAHON, Mr. BOW, Mr. LIPSCOMB, Mr. CEDERBERG, and Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota were appointed managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13018) to authorize certain con-