

about its assailant fairly, accurately, objectively.

Oh, of course, back on inside page 22 on the editorial page it will rough him up. But a man as astute as Mr. AGNEW will know that the only people who consistently read the editorials are the editorial writers and the people they discuss, plus a very few more.

Studies repeatedly show the enormous readership divergence between a front-page story, reporting what an AGNEW says and inside the paper editorial reporting that what he says is not true.

The editorial does not have a chance. And the good newspaper does not, either.

This is particularly true because a public official attacking an established newspaper immediately becomes a hero. He is a giant killer. He is taking on the biggest, strongest, and one of the richest institutions around. In this fight he is the underdog, the New York Mets in the world series or Namath's Jets in the super bowl.

And a good newspaper does not have many friends. One time or another it has cut up a lot of people and struck out at a lot of popular prejudices. It has probably taken on veteran groups and the chamber of commerce, the labor unions, and the farmers.

And all the people whose groups have been opposed feel—rightly—that they are helpless. Unless they have \$20 or \$30 million or more to buy a newspaper, they just swallow their frustration and fume. They forget the times they agreed with the paper. They never forget when they disagreed.

So this man taking on the newspaper is their boy. He is fighting their fight.

Let me give a case in point. The mayor of Milwaukee is Henry Maier, I think he is a good mayor. He works hard. He is smart. He is a leader among the Nation's mayors.

Most remarkable—unlike other mayors who are falling out of their jobs right and left or squeezing through by paper-thin majorities or pluralities—Mayor Maier was reelected mayor of Milwaukee in 1968 with more than 80 percent of the vote, the biggest majority any Milwaukee mayor had ever won in the city's history.

He did this although he had to ask for tax increases, and not provide the services he wanted to provide, and although Milwaukee has been plagued with as tough and militant a minority movement led by Father Groppi as any city in the country.

What is Maier's secret? He took on

one of the Nation's best newspapers, the Milwaukee Journal, and just for good measure he cuffs the city's other newspaper, the Milwaukee Sentinel, also a very good paper and one that does its best to play by the best newspaper rules of fairness, balance, objectivity, and no sustained feuds.

These papers have complete Milwaukee coverage. They go into virtually every home in the city. An outsider would say that the mayor does not have a chance, the papers will get him in the long run.

To the great credit of those Milwaukee papers, they have not gotten Mayor Maier and they will not. By their reasonably objective and comprehensive coverage of Maier's speeches and actions, while berating him editorially, he has the best of all possible worlds. The people of Milwaukee know and like the job he is doing. And he gets credit for having the courage to take on the newspaper Goliath and the savvy to chop them up in the process.

Mr. President, this is not just a Milwaukee story. What has happened in Milwaukee can happen nationally.

The Washington Post and the New York Times—and other responsible, conscientious papers the Vice President will very likely attack as he moves around the country—will not be intimidated.

But they will report the Agnew attack on them fully. They will continue to report what Mr. AGNEW and the rest of the Nixon administration does fully and with as much objectivity as they can get out of their reporters. They will measure inches on the front page in any campaign involving the administration to make sure the administration has a completely fair shake. The editorial page will continue to criticize Mr. AGNEW and Mr. Nixon when they disagree. But now even the criticism will have its benefits for Mr. AGNEW, as it did for Mayor Maier in Milwaukee.

So here we have a dimension of the Agnew attack that has not really been considered. How inviting this is to all of us in politics. The Vice President's attacks on the television networks is of precisely the same nature. His overwhelmingly favorable responses indicate this. And the Vice President cannot lose. In fact, he found a sure way to get on all TV networks simultaneously.

Does this mean that the price he will have to pay is to be roughed up by Chet Huntley and David Brinkley and Frank Reynolds? Of course not. Does it mean he will not be covered in the future on television by the networks? Quite the

contrary. Their failure to respond would be validating the Agnew criticism.

Mr. AGNEW has found an ingenious formula for political success. It will be hard for the great newspapers of this country, great in their efforts to report fully, fairly, objectively, and with balance, to find a way to meet this without destroying their principles.

It will be a new test of popular understanding and intelligence to see how the American people respond to this new technique. I suspect there is nothing really the newspapers can do except be patient and count on the ultimate collective wisdom of the American people. If there is anything else the TV networks can do, this Senator would like to hear it.

#### AUTHORIZATION TO FILE REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to file reports on bills and resolutions, together with minority and individual views, during the adjournment of the Senate until 11 a.m. on Monday, November 24, 1969.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll. Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1969, AT 11 A.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock Monday morning next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, November 24, 1969, at 11 o'clock a.m.

#### REJECTION

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate November 21, 1969:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr., of South Carolina to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### COINCIDENTAL RACISM

#### HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, many black Americans and peoples of other colors throughout the world have suspicioned that racial overtones are involved in the Vietnam war. I might add that the suspicion is based more on fact than fan-

tasy. For Americans being racist oriented as they are—have justified the intrusion militarily into the internal affairs of Vietnam on the pretension that the spread of international communism must be resisted. Further, Americans rationalize that it is in the best interest to coexist with the chief architects of this international Communist conspiracy.

Our country has divided the Communist world into two groups—the good and the bad. And it may just be coincidental that all the bad Communists are

peoples of color—Chinese, Cubans, Vietnamese, Koreans. If in truth it is coincidence, I contend it is racist coincidence.

Mr. Speaker, I charge the American Government with hypocrisy of the highest order. Our troops are dying in Asia to prevent a colored minority from determining the future of a colored majority supposedly, and at the same time this Government is supporting white minorities in African countries who are forcibly dominating black majorities.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my

colleagues to the following article which appeared in the Washington Afro-American on November 18, 1969.

"QUIET WAR" GROWING

The world's biggest "quiet war" is growing more intense with every passing year.

Not much is written on a regular basis by the American press about the guerrilla war black Africans in the southern area of the continent are waging for self-determination against white oppressors.

There now are more than 26,000 guerrillas battling an estimated 250,000 government troops in Mozambique, Angola and South West Africa. The number is growing.

Most of the oppression forces are white South Africans and Portuguese. There also is growing conflict now in Rhodesia.

Unlike in South Vietnam, where the United States government has gone to the aid of Vietnamese the U.S. says must have self-determination, this country has given no assistance to the oppressed Africans.

In fact, the Africans insist their efforts to prevent the domination of millions of their people by thousands of whites, are hurt by the political and economic ties the United States has with South Africa, Portugal and Rhodesia.

If the United States government is to have a policy of upholding self-determination, it should be a uniform one.

This country should not be guilty of supporting the minorities in Southern Africa who are using force to prevent the black majorities from exercising full rights in their native lands.

Time is against the oppressors.

CHILDREN'S PRAYERS

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, every week we have been inserting children's prayers into the RECORD.

Purpose of this project is to provide short devotionals for the Nation's schools to open their morning sessions.

The Supreme Court has outlawed prayer and Bible reading in the public schools, thus depriving our children of the privilege of starting their day on a prayerful and religious note.

However, even the Supreme Court has dared not prohibit the Congress from daily prayers, and by inserting these children's prayers in the official RECORD of the Congress, I believe the schoolchildren can repeat them with impunity.

This week's prayers include:

I

Thou art great and Thou are good,  
And we thank Thee for this food.  
By Thy hand must all be fed,  
And we thank Thee for this bread.

II

Dear God in Paradise  
Look upon our sowing:  
Bless the little gardens  
And the green things growing.

III

God be in my head,  
And in my understanding;  
God be in mine eyes,  
And in my looking;  
God be in my mouth  
And in my speaking;  
God be in my heart,  
And in my thinking;  
God be at my end  
And at my departing.

IV

(Sixteenth Century)

Lord help me today  
To do and say,  
The kindest things  
In the kindest way.

V

Bless, O Lord Jesus, my parents,  
And all who love me and take care of me.  
Make me loving to them,  
Polite and obedient, helpful and kind.  
Amen.

THE SCOTT REPORT

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. Edward J. Sloane of Springfield, Va., has sent me the following Scott Report, dated November 19, 1969, which I include at this point in the RECORD:

THE SCOTT REPORT

(By Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON, November 19.—Six years after the assassination of President Kennedy, the FBI is still seeking to unravel a number of mysteries involving the activities of Lee Harvey Oswald, the suspected assassin.

Probably the most baffling of these mysteries, still under investigation, is the last letter Lee Harvey Oswald is believed to have written before the Dallas tragedy.

Intercepted and read by the FBI before it arrived at its destination, the Oswald letter was mailed to the Soviet Embassy here on November 12, 1963—or 10 days before the assassination.

In his request for a Soviet visa, Oswald made reference to the unannounced recall of an official in the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City whom he had dealt with during his visit there two months before the assassination. The highly significant reference was as follows:

"Of course the Soviet Embassy was not at fault, they were, as I say unprepared, the Cuban consul was guilty of a gross breach of regulations, I am glad he has since been replaced."

The unanswered question still baffling the FBI is: How did Oswald learn about this official's unannounced recall?

According to the FBI's investigation, there was absolutely no way Oswald could have obtained this information during his September visit to Mexico City, since the secret recall order from Havana was not transmitted until after he had returned to Dallas.

Even then there was no publicity and only a handful of persons know about the recall, one FBI report states. This report along with several others pertaining to Oswald's trip to Mexico City have never been released. The reports are among the documents ordered sealed by the Warren Commission following its investigation of the assassinations of Kennedy and Oswald.

THE CIA FINDINGS

During its investigation, the Warren Commission spent considerable time trying to check out the letter and its content.

One inquiry directed to the CIA to determine where Oswald might have obtained the unannounced information about the official's recall produced negative results.

The CIA's memorandum to the commission, now declassified and on file in the National Archives, states:

"We surmise that the reference in Oswald's

9 November letter to a man who has since been replaced must refer to Cuban Consul Eusebio Azque, who left Mexico for Cuba on permanent transfer on 18 November, 1963, four days before the assassination.

"Azque was scheduled to leave in October but did not leave until 18 November. We do not know who might have told Oswald that Azque was to be replaced."

In its investigation of the letter, the FBI inquiry ascertained that CIA and KGB operators in Mexico City learned of the official's recall at approximately the same time and only a week before Oswald wrote his letter.

While the FBI investigation has been unable to resolve the mystery, it has narrowed the sources of where Oswald could have obtained the information. These sources are:

(1) An informant in the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City who contacted Oswald after he returned to the U.S.; (2) the Central Intelligence Agency; or (3) the KGB, the Soviet Secret police.

OTHER DETAILS

The Warren Commission's inquiry into the Oswald letter, most details of which were buried in the 26 volumes of testimony, revealed that Mrs. Ruth Paine on whose typewriter the final draft was made, and Marina Oswald, wife of the alleged assassin, knew of the letter and its contents before it was mailed.

Significantly, Mrs. Paine testified Oswald typed the letter while spending the November 9 weekend at her residence with his wife. After observing the letter when Oswald was not around, Mrs. Paine said she copied it. The commission's record shows she turned the copy over to the FBI on November 23, the day after the assassination.

A check of declassified FBI reports on file in the National Archives shows that the agency started its investigation immediately on intercepting Oswald's letter after it was mailed in Irving, Texas, on November 12.

One report reveals that the FBI agents involved in the intercept copied the text of the letter and put it in Oswald's Washington file with a note that one paragraph verified earlier information on Oswald's Mexico City visit.

The FBI report pointed out that Oswald's mention of "Comrade Kostin" in the letter confirmed a CIA report that he had met with Valeriy Vladimirovich Kostikov, a member of the consular staff of the Soviet embassy, and one of the top KGB officers in the Western Hemisphere.

But the FBI report did not answer the question of how and when Oswald learned that Cuban Consul Eusebio Azque, was recalled.

Several government investigators believe if this mystery could be solved that it would go a long way toward determining whether Oswald had any accomplices.

THE SECRET DOCUMENTS

President Nixon has the authority to make public the documents that the Warren Commission decided to keep secret after its investigation of the Kennedy assassination.

That's the private report that Attorney General John Mitchell has sent to the White House after studying the Johnson Administration's handling of the storing of the commission's files in the National Archives.

Mitchell ruled that the President has broad authority to declassify all of the commission's documents under the National Freedom of Information Act passed by Congress in 1966.

Approximately two-thirds of the commission's estimated 28,000 documents have been declassified since it published its findings on September 28, 1964.

The remaining one-third, which includes a number of CIA and FBI reports believed to have significant news value, are still barred from public scrutiny.

Many of these documents deal with Lee Harvey Oswald's trip to Mexico City.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, MAC—A NEWS-PAPERMAN'S NEWSPAPERMAN

**HON. JAMES HARVEY**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a rare occasion that I take this means to focus on an individual to proudly point out an accomplishment or a milestone. But, today, this is a rare individual whom I wish to praise. In doing so, I can assure you that I run the very serious risk of a stern admonition from Mac.

But, I did want to have a very nice column on Saginaw's "Mr. Newspaperman," Robert T. McMillen, brought to the attention of my colleagues. On Tuesday, November 18, Mac celebrated his 80th year. He has spent 61 of those years in the newspaper field, always as a worker, and all but 10 of those years on the Saginaw News, Saginaw, Mich.

The fine article by Ed Miller presents the statistical information on an outstanding gentleman. It could have added one other thought. If our city of Saginaw, now over 100,000 persons, has a claim to fame—which it has as an All America City in 1969—then the work of this man as a reporter and as the "author" of Saginaw's council-manager city government charter some 35 years ago is the principal reason for that success.

As the headline reads: "All Right, Mac," Take A Bow":

ALL RIGHT, "MAC," TAKE A BOW  
(By Ed Miller)

We've an extremely hearty and lively legend walking around the newsroom here today, smiling pleasure at the many handshakes and congratulations.

He's Robert T. (Bob or Mac, take your choice) McMillen, who owns one of the best names ever among Michigan newspapermen, and who's 80 years old today. He looks and acts much younger.

Mac has been a newspaperman 61 years, 51 of them on this newspaper. He and his wife, the former Mary Downey, have been married 54 years.

He became librarian of The News in 1947 after mending from a severe heart attack. He planned and set up the reference and historical library here which is vital to this newspaper.

As a slayer of errors, he still is the same unerring marksman he was during his younger days as city editor here.

He also writes the Bygone Days column on this page and makes it a delightful compound of nostalgia and sprightliness.

Occasionally, on assignment or by his own inclination, he sits down and bangs out a news story or feature article in the style which won him unsuccessful imitators in his days as a reporter-writer.

Mac was born on this date in 1889 near Logansport, Ind. After graduating from high school in Bellefontaine, Ohio, he started newspapering in Ohio.

All of us here are required to fill out biographical blanks. These contain personal backgrounds, statistical information and accomplishments.

Before I wrote this, I took from the library file the biographical blank of one Robert Tilton McMillen. I read the list of newspapers for which he worked and reportorial and desk editor positions he held.

On the back page of the blank, under the heading of "additional data," this is what Mac wrote about himself as an addendum: "And, casting modesty into the hellbox: As a reporter for the Courier-Herald, News

Courier and The News, covered many of Saginaw's major news stories over a span of more than a quarter-century. Notable among these was the Kimbrough murder case in 1915, the county treasury scandal in 1916, the Academy Music fire in 1917, World War I draft, Liberty Loan and Red Cross campaigns of 1917-18; Wright Hotel fire (6 died) in January, 1918; return of "Saginaw's Own," (Company K, 125th Infantry) in 1919; public discrediting of old city government (not the people in it, but the inept and extravagant methods forced on them by a carelessly written and cumbersome charter); participated as "the tenth member" in the Charter Commission's writing of the council-manager charter. Had the job of pruning excess verbiage from the charter text, contributing to "bolting it to about 2,700 words, shortest city charter in the world. Covered draft of charter commissioners as council candidates, adoption of the new charter and establishment of the new government which took over Jan. 6, 1936; City Hall fire, April, 1935; Hamilton Square Fire, March, 1929; sensational Blank murder case at Ithaca, February, 1936."

Hellbox is a newspaper expression for a receptacle in the composing room into which used type is thrown, Mac used that word "modesty" with a snuckle.

All he wrote about himself in his biographical blank is a terse matter of record. I can tell you he was modest by a couple of newspaper columns or so.

AGNEW VERSUS TV

**HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the speech of Vice President AGNEW in Des Moines last week has brought to the spotlight a situation that many of us have worried about a very long time. His remarks were long overdue. People throughout the Nation now realize that they must themselves "analyze" the news they receive on the national television networks because they may not always be watching impartial reports.

Mr. John Helms III, of the Gazette & Mail, Morristown, Tenn., did a great job in reviewing the remarks of the Vice President. He points to some good examples of what news media can do to and for a Nation.

He concludes:

The Vice President's scoring of TV news is richly merited, as any analytical viewer of television can attest, but news bias is not confined to TV.

I urge my fellow Members to read the following editorial by Mr. Helms as it appeared in his newspaper of Sunday, November 16, 1969:

AGNEW VERSUS TV

(By John Helms III)

A short year ago last week the U.S. elected a new President. Richard M. Nixon's running mate was a stranger to most of the country, and he was generally considered—if considered at all—to be another Vice-Presidential non-entity, a political zero.

Yet today Spiro T. Agnew is widely known as few if any No. 2 man in the U.S. have ever been known.

Senator Barry Goldwater may have exaggerated when he said that Agnew "may find himself boomed for president before it's even his turn," but it is safe to state that the Vice-President is having an immediate impact on the country which none of his anonymous predecessors has ever had.

In some eyes Agnew's outspokenness may produce no more effect than did Don Quixote's charges against the windmills, but however his crusade turns out, the Vice President is challenging some of the sacrosanct entities of this country as they have never been challenged by a public figure of his stature.

Agnew has dared to speak out against the irresponsible elements among the intellectuals, the pacifists, the black militants, and the nation's youth—and this is simply not done.

Now he has questioned the impartiality of the news coverage of America's three major television networks.

The howls which his questions in a Des Moines speech last week have elicited indicate that Agnew is getting close to the mark.

What did the Vice-President say? He charges that a distorted and narrow picture emerges from TV news: "The American who relies upon television for his news might conclude that the majority of American students are embittered radicals, that the majority of black Americans feel no regard for their country; that violence and lawlessness are the rule, rather than the exception, on the American campus."

NONE TRUE

As Agnew added, none of these conclusions is true.

Speaking of the TV "news" commentators such as Huntley and Brinkley, he notes that "a raised eyebrow, an inflection of the voice, a caustic remark dropped in the middle of a broadcast can raise doubts in a million minds about the veracity of a public official or the wisdom of a government policy."

And, with reference to a network's "trotting out" in rebuttal critic Averell Harriman immediately following President Nixon's address on Vietnam two weeks ago, the Vice-President observed pungently that "when Winston Churchill rallied opinion to stay the course against Hitler's Germany, he did not have to contend with a gaggle of commentators raising doubts about whether he was reading public opinion right, or whether Britain had the stamina to see the war through."

The Vice-President did not add, as well he might, that such challenges in Britain (or in the U.S.) during the course of World War II would have been exceedingly dangerous to the challengers' life and limb.

Agnew made plain that he was not asking for governmental censorship of TV or other news media, but he was calling for responsible news presentation. He concluded with this comment: "In tomorrow's edition of the Des Moines Register you will be able to read a news story detailing what I said tonight; editorial comment will be reserved for the editorial page. Should not the same wall of separation exist between news and comment on the nation's networks?"

The Vice-President's scoring of TV news is richly merited, as any analytical viewer of television can attest, but news bias is not confined to TV. The current issue of Newsweek magazine in its cover "news" story on Agnew describes the Vice-President as "feisty," an adjective which originally means a small dog breaking wind.

That's unsigned journalistic objectivity for you!

MAXINE BRIGHT, MENTAL HEALTH VOLUNTEER OF THE YEAR

**HON. ORVAL HANSEN**

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my col-

leagues to the remarkable story of a distinguished citizen of Idaho who is being honored this week as the Katherine Hamilton Volunteer of the Year, an award presented on behalf of the Indiana Mental Health Foundation during the annual meeting of the National Association for Mental Health.

Mrs. Mack Bright of Blackfoot, Idaho, turned a family tragedy into a career dedicated to helping others. Hers is a story of quiet courage and compassion. By her devoted and unselfish service to the mentally ill, she has earned the Nation's highest mental health award and brought great honor and distinction to the State of Idaho.

The love, patience, and concern for the welfare of her less fortunate fellow human beings that is reflected in Maxine Bright's volunteer services to the mentally ill will serve as a shining example and an inspiration for others. It is one of the "small, splendid efforts" that President Nixon called for in his inaugural address in order to build the strength and spirit of America.

President Nixon said:

With these, we can build a great cathedral of the spirit—each of us raising it one stone at a time, as he reaches out to his neighbor, helping, caring, doing.

Mr. Speaker, we are grateful for Mrs. Bright and for the great contribution she is making to the betterment of our society. We extend to her our most sincere thanks and congratulations. We would also like to commend the Bonneville County Mental Health Association for calling attention to her outstanding work and the Indiana Mental Health Memorial Foundation for the recognition which this award represents.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks excerpts from the nomination submitted by the Bonneville County, Idaho, Mental Health Association and a press release issued by the Mental Health Association of Indiana:

KATHERINE HAMILTON VOLUNTEER OF THE YEAR

Excerpts from the nomination submitted by the Bonneville County (Idaho) Mental Health Association:

Volunteer work took on new meaning at State Hospital South, Blackfoot, Idaho, about January 1963—when Maxine Bright joined in with a helping hand and all her heart.

About a year later, she used organizational skill to get volunteers reorganized and going again.

In the hospital Maxine was quick to see what could be done to make life happier and open a new world to chronic patients living in a slump of despondency. She organized volunteers in Good Grooming projects for women patients and planted petunias and marigolds around all the hospital buildings, and before the days of activity therapists at our state hospital, organized outside games such as volley ball. A most worthwhile project of hers was organizing a group of patients to do volunteer work at the hospital. They wore volunteer pins and were rewarded with a trip to town for a banana split once a month by Mrs. Bright.

She personally took patients on shopping trips—first seeing that each woman was groomed and dressed so that she would feel comfortable downtown.

She helped at the patient dances, organized exercise classes, fashion shows, and a gift case where patients could sell handiwork.

The unpleasant jobs that some volunteers shunned were quietly accepted—handfeeding

patients helpless to feed themselves—working with patients in the recovery room, following shock treatments. Where a helping hand was needed, there you would find Maxine.

Some of this feeling that Maxine has for patients may come from working with her own nephew, Tommy, mentally retarded and psychotic. She spent hours helping him beginning with when he was a little fellow of three. When he entered the state hospital six years ago, at fourteen, Maxine spent hundreds of hours with him expanding her services to other patients wherever she felt a need.

Working to help patients adjust to life outside the hospital has been a "natural" for this warm-hearted woman. She encouraged a project where patients made and sold caramel corn on the grounds—and used the proceeds for a real dinner out, at the Colonial Inn. For days they planned, fussed and groomed, and polished up good manners. And when the time came, Maxine and the Director of Volunteers proudly took their group for an evening out.

Maxine Bright has been one of those working each year at the state hospital exhibit of Eastern Idaho State Fair, where sales of patient-made rugs, pottery, pictures and needlework bring money for patient funds, to be used for gifts and party prizes.

Over 3,000 hours served working as a volunteer in the hospital mark only part of the volunteer work done by this amazing woman.

When troubles struck her personal life—she redoubled her efforts to help others. The death of her husband, Mack, about a year ago brought great sorrow but not self-pity. Three times a week she invited groups of patients to her home for dinner and cards . . . and concentrated on giving these institution people a taste of home life.

When she went to work on the housekeeping staff at the hospital, and then became an attendant—Maxine Bright continued to do volunteer work and invite patients into her home. She is an inspiration to every volunteer, loved and respected by every patient there.

[Press release of the Mental Health Association in Indiana]

WASHINGTON, D.C., November 21—A woman who learned tolerance, compassion and the love of handicapped through her young, retarded and psychotic nephew, and, therefore, dedicated her life to helping the mentally ill, today received the nation's highest mental health award during the meeting of the National Association for Mental Health at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Mack Bright, 788 South Broadway, Blackfoot, Idaho, received the Katherine Hamilton Volunteer of the Year Award presented by the Indiana Mental Health Memorial Foundation.

Miss Amy Vanderbilt, chairman of the Awards Committee of the National Association for Mental Health, presented a plaque and a check for \$1,000 to Mrs. Bright, which she will use to help purchase a bus for the patients at State Hospital South in Blackfoot.

Nominations for the coveted award came from eighteen states. Only close relatives of patients who are or have been hospitalized with mental illness are eligible for the award which is named in honor of Miss Katherine Hamilton of Terre Haute, Indiana, a long time volunteer worker for the mentally ill and a sister of a patient who died in an Indiana state hospital.

Senator Frank Church of Idaho said, "The honor which is being bestowed on Mrs. Bright is highly deserved and is an honor for the State of Idaho. Mrs. Bright's work typifies that of countless volunteers whose endeavors are of great benefit in making our country a better place in which to live."

She was nominated for the award by the Bonneville County (Idaho) Mental Health

Association for her work as a volunteer with the patients at State Hospital South. She made life happier and opened a new world to chronic patients living in a slump of despondency. Starting in 1963 she organized volunteers in good grooming projects for the women patients, planted thousands of flowers on the hospital grounds, and organized outside games and activities before the hospital had activity therapists.

She personally took patients on shopping trips, organized patient dances, exercise classes, fashion shows and opened a gift department at the hospital where patients could sell their handiwork. She extended her work by recruiting others to work with her and the patients.

Providing an evening out at a local restaurant was another activity which proved to her the value of community contact. From then on patients were constantly invited to her home for an evening or a weekend.

When Mr. Bright died over a year ago, her efforts redoubled but still she did not believe she was doing all she could. She, therefore, accepted a job at the state hospital so she could spend full time with the patients she loves. This did not stop her volunteer activity and almost every weekend her time is filled with patients from the hospital.

A member of the hospital staff said, "She is an inspiration to every volunteer and loved and respected by every patient."

Mrs. Bright was the sixth person to win the national award. It was first awarded to Mrs. Reuben Waller of Salisbury, Maryland in 1964; to Mrs. Franklin Kearney, Indianapolis in 1965; to John Edward Counts of Farmington, Missouri in 1966; to Norris Adams, Jr., of Ankeny, Iowa, in 1967 and to Mrs. Joseph DeGross of Weehawken, New Jersey, in 1968.

The award was made possible when Miss Hamilton left the bulk of her estate to the Mental Health Association in Indiana and to her Vigo County chapter. The State Association then formed the Indiana Mental Health Memorial Foundation which is dedicated to undertake, promote and develop research, education and all services related to the field of mental health through the careful use of bequests.

Miss Hamilton dedicated thirty-three years of her life to the mentally ill during which time she helped in the organization and growth of the Vigo County chapter, served the Mental Health Association in Indiana for ten years as a board member, secretary and delegate to the National Association for Mental Health, eliminated the practice of patient jailing in her county and improved the situation in Indiana, helped establish psychiatric clinics and helped develop the Adopt-A-Patient program in which the people assume the role of a relative of a patient. She assisted in the development of hospital volunteers in Indiana and lobbied for increased appropriations for the Department of Mental Health and helped expand the National Association for Mental Health.

Mrs. Wilbur F. Pell, Jr., Shelbyville, Indiana, president of the Indiana Mental Health Memorial Foundation, said, "We are honored to give the award to Mrs. Mack Bright, who is in so many ways like our beloved Katherine Hamilton."

FEDERAL CITY COLLEGE ENTERS SECOND YEAR

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's Capital has for too many years trailed the other 50 States in providing its young people access to a low-tuition

public college. Today the District of Columbia is moving out of these dark ages as the Federal City College enters its second year of academic life bringing new educational opportunities to talented students who could not otherwise afford college at all.

My colleague from Iowa, Representative FRED SCHWENDEL, as everyone knows, has worked for years to improve the life of the District of Columbia. In his recent address at the dedication of the Working Library for the Federal City College, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa pointed to the critical need of developing able urban leaders by solid education and progressively responsible experience. We are proud that through the Federal City College these opportunities are being made possible today in contrast to what has been too often the suppression and the educational deprivation of the past.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the remarks of Mr. SCHWENDEL as he addressed the Federal City College reception on October 29, 1969:

Good friends of Federal City College. I am glad to have had a part in this coming together in this building where Federal City College was really born. I am glad to note the success already evident.

In my political life I have been on over three hundred different college campuses and always made it my business to be with, counsel with and listen to students. I believe from this experience that the students of today are as good and maybe even better in many respects than the students I knew in college and I know this to be true!—Students graduating from high school today are better prepared for college than the high school graduates of my time.

Today as never before, students are thinking about important things. They are dedicated and real serious about a lot of things. I think the students I talked to and counseled with know and believe that this age and time calls for intelligent leadership. I also believe they are aware of the gaps in many places in our society and they are determined to do something about those gaps. They are interested in setting proper priorities. This is good for it stems from a moral base—a moral base is so important where there is freedom. My counsel, to the students, based upon experience and my knowledge and feelings about history tells me that it is most important to seek to do the right thing the right way at the right time and place. I believe and history confirms, that right things can be done wrong ways and when they are, they derail and handicap progress.

It is good to be here with you and share in this display of interest, excitement and dedication. Today, however, we are paying tribute to those with an interest in libraries. And especially to honor Roy and Jeanette Nichols.

America has a great many libraries. Some of them good and a few great. For various unfortunate reasons most of them are relatively weak. It gives me pleasure to speak here this afternoon in behalf of Federal City College and its Media Service System which may represent the college library of the future and which, judging by the evidence before us, does not intend to be weak. It is determined to be strong.

Federal City College should have been founded a hundred years ago. Let's hope it gains strength as rapidly as Jack's beanstalk, because this college with the opportunities it gives people to learn has long been needed. Federal City College is Washington's only low tuition public college of arts and sciences. Eighty-five percent of its students could not otherwise afford college at all.

Why is Federal City College needed? It is

because America's large cities, including Washington, are far from healthy. No one knows the costs of urban rot. Social stagnation is immeasurable. Educational deprivation, the costs of unemployment, crime, hate, fear, shame, violence and abuse of alcohol and drugs surpasses many times the cost of education. Cities, indeed whole nations, decline from internal strife, from indifference, from incapacity to respond to human suffering and from inability to learn new ways. A new quality of urban leadership is needed now.

It takes more than magic to produce able urban leaders. It takes solid education and progressively responsible experience rather than suppression. Education can and most often does deal courageously with the problems, rights, grievances and long frustrated aspirations of the ethnic "minorities" who are becoming urban "majorities." We must have education that is responsive to the universal needs of the children, of youth, and the young adults who in the last quarter of this violent century will soon comprise over half of our population. Education should not be stagnant, rigid, irrelevant or boring. It should be exciting, interesting and worthwhile.

Many universities, colleges, and even high schools have entered a period in which substantial numbers of their talented students and their average students as well, are losing confidence in them. The young people observe glaring discrepancies between what they are being taught and what is actually happening in their communities and in the world. Washington's young people, because of their unique vantage point, are particularly aware of the discrepancies between classroom and textbook rhetoric and reality.

Although the economy of the District of Columbia offers few opportunities for the uneducated, the Nation's Capital lags far behind every single one of the fifty states in the numbers of its young people who have genuine access to a low tuition public college. Today Federal City College can admit only a fraction of the men and women who seek admission; who through future taxes, are willing and will be able to repay the financial costs of their college education. These young people are willing, often at great personal hardship, to invest several irreplaceable years of their lives in order to better equip themselves to pursue peaceful programs through enlightened self-interest.

The Federal City College students, like students everywhere, are asking for less talk and more action. It was an American who reminded us that no doctrine, faith or knowledge is of value to man except as it bears fruit in action. Older, harder working, more determined, and more self-reliant than typical college students elsewhere, many Federal City College students are confident that in less than a decade they will be occupying key decision-making roles in the life of the Capital City.

Notwithstanding major setbacks in its first year, Federal City College not only survived but developed increased unity, pride and practical realism. Federal City College has been free of the organized provocation and counter violence that have disrupted many colleges and universities. Divergent views have found free expression at Federal City College. This particular market place of ideas is very active. Large numbers of FCC students are of relatively moderate political persuasions. They know that moderation with intelligent action is a virtue.

To the extent that the College and the larger community meet their educational and social needs "Federal City's" students will not be tempted to resort to violence. Necessary changes to eliminate urban injustice and deterioration can come peacefully, naturally, and promptly.

Federal City College bears a unique filial relationship to the Congress of the United States. Congress, through steady support, can help the College to achieve respected stature

as the Nation's first "Urban Grant" college, and distinction for its contributions to the enhancement of urban life as FCC alumni enter the professions, business, and government.

As we celebrate Federal City College's fortunate acquisition of this major collection of scholarly books and historical documents we recognize that the College's faculty, students, and their media resources and services—the contemporary college library—are already good and that they are improving. Instructors and media specialists are cooperating in order to carry forward effective teaching and research to meet the crucial needs of city people.

Among the earliest commitments the College has become especially concerned with early childhood education and with learning resources which meet the specific interests and needs of small children, particularly of inner city children. The College's work in this field may prove to be one of its most valuable contributions to the enhancement of city life. Cities which are unfit for children cannot survive!

I understand that innovative media services such as these have been attracting interested professional educators, librarians, scholars, and even a few statesmen from other countries who visit Federal City College to inquire and to observe. As the College develops, students from all fifty states and from many foreign lands may wish to enroll here.

I congratulate Dr. Harland Randolph upon his appointment as Federal City College's new president and on behalf of the Congress wish him success. The problems of governing a city or even a nation, are certainly similar to those of governing a college and a university today. Many different interest groups collide, conflict, contest, and must be harmonized. Effective government depends not only upon enlightened leaders but also upon active, well educated constructive citizens. As John Gardner, Chairman of the Urban Coalition, has said "We have plenty of debaters . . . blamers . . . provocateurs . . . We don't have plenty of problem-solvers." And therein lies the challenge.

Developing urban problem-solvers is one of Federal City College's chief responsibilities. Any city, state, or nation may easily maintain inferiority imply by providing inferior schools and colleges. The attainment of excellence is another matter altogether. Excellence is not attained by merely mouthing the word as if it were magic. Excellence requires honest long-range commitment and sustained hard work in the face of obstacles of all kinds.

Acquisition of the Roy and Jeanette Nichols Working Library by Federal City College's Media Services System demonstrates that the new College is trying to provide roads toward excellence for the people of Washington who in this era of rapid change must increasingly rely for survival on study and self-development.

As Federal City College fulfills its growing role, may the District of Columbia come to have as enlightened, practical, and effective community leaders and citizens as any city in the world! Here you are heading the ancient admonition "to make other men wiser and better as you can find or make opportunity to do so."

#### APPRAISING THE TUMULT AND THE SHOUTING

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, no doubt there will be additional cries of

anger and anguish over the Montgomery, Ala., speech of Vice President AGNEW before the Montgomery Chamber of Commerce. Because the Washington Post and the New York Times figure prominently in the Montgomery remarks of the Vice President, one should be able to judge the justification of the anticipated tumult and shouting by referring to his actual remarks. For this reason I insert at this point in the RECORD an advance copy of the speech delivered by Vice President AGNEW at Montgomery, Ala., on November 20, 1969.

## ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

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 are not finished with 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 "perceptive 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 may 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 hero's 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 weasel 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."

#### ABORTION, EUTHANASIA—BUCHEM WALD REVISITED

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week in commenting on the action of Judge Gerhard A. Gesell in striking down a portion of the criminal abortion law in the District of Columbia, I pointed out that our Nation's Capital might well become the base of operations for the abortion industry.

A review of the situation in other jurisdictions seems to indicate that a concerted attack on the abortion statutes is being made. Appealing arguments dealing with the so-called rights of women to bear or not bear a particular child can be dangerously misleading. Entirely apart from religious, moral, or ethical sanctions against such conduct, there exist a real pitfall.

This is a situation in which we are dealing with life itself. The essence of abortion is the making of a choice as to whether or not a life will be terminated. If we accept the termination of a life at the will of another we have opened a real Pandora's box. If abortion is permitted we next face squarely the question of euthanasia or other "mercy" killings—efficient disposition of the unwanted, the aged, ill, infirm, insane, or mentally deficient.

Those who urge the propriety of such action should never forget that under the euthanasia laws of the Third Reich many of the killings which appalled the civilized world were entirely lawful. For their punishment it was necessary for us to join in the creation of ex post facto laws reprehensible as they are to our civilized theory of justice.

I include in my remarks a news clipping reporting the recommended appeal together with other pertinent clippings indicating the relationship between abortion, legalized suicide, and euthanasia in Great Britain:

[From the Washington, (D.C.) Evening Star, Nov. 19, 1969]

#### FLANNERY ASKS APPEAL OF ABORTION LAW RULING

U.S. Atty. Thomas A. Flannery disclosed today he has asked the solicitor general to appeal a ruling by a judge which struck down key segments of the District's abortion law.

Flannery said the decision to appeal the

ruling by Judge Gerhard A. Gesell will rest with the solicitor general.

The matter was turned over to that office because any appeal of Gesell's ruling goes directly to the Supreme Court since the judge held unconstitutional a section of a criminal statute.

Flannery said clarification is needed to guide police and other judges of the U.S. District Court.

Gesell's ruling is not binding on the other judges. Only the Supreme Court could make his decision law.

The judge held on Nov. 10 that the 1901 abortion law was unconstitutional in part because of vague wording.

He held that abortions can be performed by qualified physicians without the physicians being required to show the abortions were necessary to preserve the lives or health of the mothers.

His ruling threw out two charges involving Dr. Milan M. Vuitch, who had challenged the constitutionality of the old law.

However, yesterday Dr. Vuitch was sentenced to a year in prison and fined \$5,000 for performing an illegal abortion in Montgomery County.

Maryland permits abortions if conducted by qualified physicians in accredited hospitals, but under no circumstances in a doctor's office.

[From the Washington, (D.C.) Post, Nov. 20, 1969]

#### SIXTY-TWO PERCENT IN BRITAIN FAVOR ABORTION

LONDON.—Sixty-two per cent of the British public is in favor of allowing abortions, but want Britain's abortion law changed, a recent Gallup poll indicated.

The 62 per cent favoring abortions said they should be performed or supervised by the National Health Service or officially approved consultants, the poll said.

[From the Spartanburg Journal, Apr. 28, 1969]

#### BRITISH LIBERALS ADVOCATE MERCY KILLINGS (By Tom Cullen)

LONDON.—Britain's brave, new permissive society has abolished hangings as the penalty for murder. It has legalized abortion and homosexuality between consenting adults. Looking for new fields to conquer, British liberals have now turned their attention to euthanasia, or mercy killing.

The permissive-minded hold that euthanasia, which is defined as "the painless putting to death of persons suffering from incurable diseases," should be available to all who need it under Britain's socialized medicine.

A bill to this effect was recently debated in the House of Lords, where it was defeated by a 3-to-2 majority. The bill made it lawful to administer euthanasia to a patient so long as he requested it and two doctors, one of whom a consultant, had certified him to be suffering from an incurable condition.

In throwing the bill out, members of the House of Lords argued that it was immoral, impractical, and that, in effect, it provided for suicide by proxy.

However, the British Euthanasia Society is retailing its bill to meet objections and has announced its intention to introduce it again in Parliament.

British euthanasiacs admit that they will have their work cut out to convince practicing Christians, to whom all life forms of life are sacred and rest in God's hands.

Voluntary euthanasia, the clergymen argue, is the slippery slope which could lead to a Nazi-style elimination of those whom future society might judge as undesirable.

Nonsense argue the proponents of mercy killing. That slope only begins when society decides to kill people against their own will.

Another argument advanced against euthanasia is that it would place doctors in an intolerable position. "Everytime the doc-

tor entered the room, the patient would wonder, "Is this man about to kill me?" Lord Brock, a past president of the Royal College of Surgeons, pointed out in the House of Lords.

Legalized euthanasia would also encourage the doctor "to play at being God, a dangerous game," Lord Brock added.

But doctors already "play at being God" by prolonging life, the euthanasians claim. In the modern world the doctor is continually interfering with nature. Besides, many doctors already administer euthanasia.

In a sample poll of 1,000 British doctors taken in 1965, three-quarters agreed that it was right "to help their patients over the last hurdle, even if it involves some curtailment of life." In this same poll, 36 per cent declared that if voluntary euthanasia were made legal, they were prepared to administer it.

The British Euthanasia Society, which is over 30 years old, is headed by Lord Listowel, who is the powerful chairman of committees in the House of Lords, and its members include the Bishop of Birmingham, the Duke of Wellington and actor Jack Hawkins.

It has made two previous attempts, in 1936 and in 1950, to get euthanasia legislation on the books, but failed. However, the subject has never excited so much discussion as at present.

To many the way was paved for the present debate by the 1961 Suicide Act, which made it no longer a felony to attempt to take one's life.

Thus, the Voluntary Euthanasia Bill is merely an extension of licensed suicide.

The debate on euthanasia has widened to include other disquieting issues. Heart transplants and kidney machines have already placed life-or-death powers in the physician's hands, the advocate of mercy killings argue. In what way do the moral problems raised by euthanasia differ from those the doctor already faces?

"If you do not have enough kidney machines to go around, to whom do you give priority?" Lord Ritchie-Calder asked in the recent House of Lords debate. "To a Member of Parliament, or a Nobel Prize winner, because he is old and eminent?"

"Suppose there is a youngster of 15 who needs the machine. We do not know whether he is going to be a juvenile delinquent or is a potential criminal, but he might be a Nobel Prize winner."

#### TO TRIM A TREE

### HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, since it is becoming abundantly apparent that we will be here Christmas eve, I would like all the Members to get a head start on the Christmas season. Enclosed is the Halbach Guide To Trimming Christmas Trees:

#### TO TRIM A TREE

The Christmas tree must first of all be purchased—that's the way Santa wants it. However, before purchasing the tree, it is wise to refer to your almanac. If it's going to be a green Christmas, you will want a white tree. If it is going to be a white Christmas, you will want a green tree. If it is going to be a hot Christmas, you may prefer an elm—an elm will give you more shade.

You will probably find that you have purchased a tree that is six inches too tall. Your next question is whether it is too tall at the top or at the bottom. If it is a warm day—compromise and cut a hole in the ceiling.

Now you are ready to start trimming the tree. The lights go on first. Place one light at the top and then one on the tip of each branch. If you run out of lights either go buy some more or cut off some of the branches. You've got to have a light on each branch or your tree won't look as nice as the Porters'.

If some of the branches seem to sag you may need to splice the limb with a special Christmas tree limb splicer. Explicit directions are given in a manual which comes free with each box of Christmas tree limb splicers. Send for your kit today. No money down. Easy monthly payments, adjusted in accordance with your income, won't start until January first.

So much for the first week. The lights are in place and have passed inspection. You are now ready for ornaments. Well, maybe not quite. The question of two red lights being separated only by one yellow light must be settled. To avoid this situation, it is wise not to have two lights of the same color on the tree.

Now the ornaments. Unpack them very carefully from the big box in which they have been stored. Throw away those that have been damaged or have faded or any that don't look quite as good as you remembered. With luck, you should have a few good ones, but you will undoubtedly need to make a trip to town for more. Regardless of what it costs, it is important to have attractive ornaments that are just a little bit different. No cost should be spared in obtaining ornaments that will make the Christmas season a joyous occasion. If you can't find attractive ornaments in your town, take a jet to New York or Germany, if necessary. This will cause a slight delay.

Since standing on a ladder does present a hazard, before placing the ornaments on the tree, it is well first to fortify yourself with some sort of stabilizer (it has never been necessary to give directions for this). When you are on the ladder ready for action, place one hand in the handle you have nailed to the ceiling and with the other hand hold the tree limb and with the other hand place the ornament on the limb. Those who do not have three hands may find it possible to hold on to the handle with their teeth or to put one foot through the handle. There are numerous possibilities.

Be sure to put the expensive ornaments at the top out of the children's reach. If the child is smart enough to get the fancy ornaments by shaking the tree, it is only sporting that his ingenuity be rewarded.

Don't stop with just ornaments and lights. Make the tree a masterpiece that reflects your own deep personality. Look for ideas in the attic, the cupboards, your wife's purse—you'll create a tree that everyone will talk about for years!

The wondrous joy of decorating the tree does not end when the last piece of tinsel is in place; for all through the season, as lights blow out and ornaments crash to the floor, you once again will have the thrill and challenge of expressing yourself anew. The greatest moment of all may come when the whole tree falls over on Christmas Day!

Disposing of the tree is a personal matter, but it isn't just a coincidence that so many houses mysteriously burn down a day or two after New Year's.

#### VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW'S PUBLIC SERVICE

### HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, Vice President AGNEW's address to the Montgomery, Ala., Chamber of Commerce today is

a public service of the highest order. It has often been said of those in public life that even constructive criticism of the news media is dangerous in the extreme because you get one crack and they have every day to follow. But the Vice President seeks true freedom of speech and accurate reporting of the news events of the day.

Nowhere in his remarks, either in the address that follows or in his previous public statements, is there any call to stifle the press or muzzle TV. On the contrary, all the Vice President seeks is objective reporting of the news events of the day so that the people of our land may arrive at their individual judgments well informed and accurately informed. This has not been the case in many demonstrable instances with which the general public is familiar as they watch their televisions and listen to the radio commentators in the far corners of this great country.

I urge those who have reservations or doubts concerning this great debate to read the remarks of the Vice President in their full context. Once read it will be recognized, I think, that the Vice President of the United States is performing a distinct and valuable public service. The address follows:

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 hearken 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 are not finished with 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 "perceptive 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 nation-wide 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 may 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 "racial 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 hero's 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 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 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 weasel 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 adventures sometimes seem to be asking something more—that I circumscribe my rhetori-

cal 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."

#### THIS STAR SPANGLED BANNER

### HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the postmaster of Fredericksburg, Va., a city within my congressional district, has written an item in the *Postmaster's Gazette* which I would like to share with my colleagues entitled "This Star Spangled Banner." It is a thought-provoking patriotic article by Lemuel W. Houston, a vice president of the National Association of Postmasters and a friend of long-standing. Let us hope that the long silent majority will begin to speak out in force on such timely subjects. The full text of the article appears below:

#### THIS STAR SPANGLED BANNER . . .

Postmasters are among the few Americans who proudly fly the Flag of our country each day. This is a high privilege.

In these turbulent times, perhaps more than ever before, we may need to remind ourselves and others of the grandeur of Old Glory.

The Flag of a nation is but the symbol of that nation's institutions, epitomizing its morals, its purpose, its traditions, its spirit, its people and its government.

The Stars and Stripes represent the greatness of America, and the greatness of America is determined; not by the resources hidden in her soil, nor by its pomp, power or wealth, but by the devotion of its people to the fundamental principles of Liberty, Justice and Democracy.

No greater curse could befall us as a people nor one that would more speedily accomplish our destruction as a nation than for the Flag of our country to become the flag of a goddess people.

Like you, I am disturbed and I am angered by conditions which now prevail in many parts of our country. There is a sickness in this land we love. Thank God it is presently confined to only a small segment of our so-

ciety but there is real danger in the complacency and the apathy of the masses.

Too many of us wring our hands in despair and do little else.

Too many of us shrink from becoming involved.

Too many of us who are well have surrendered to those who are sick.

Too many of us hope—hope, but not pray—for a miraculous cure to the ills which beset us.

Bums who seek a dole instead of honest work brazenly burn their draft cards and the Flag of our nation while the flower of our youth is blighted in a frustrating, far-off war not of its making.

Communist-inspired splinter groups create havoc on college campuses and even now are infiltrating many of our high schools, thus impairing the educational opportunities of millions of right-thinking young Americans.

Sedition, treason and crimes of violence often go unpunished because our highest courts seem to have substituted license for justice.

Law and order have been shackled, not because our law enforcement officers are incapable or inept but because we, the people fail to demand positive action on the part of our elected representatives in government.

We must realize and never forget that we are engaged in a life or death struggle with a growing communist menace. One quarter of the land area of the world and one-third of the earth's population are now under communist domination. Communists mean it when they say they intend to bury us. They would destroy freedom everywhere and enslave all mankind. Complete world domination is their admitted goal. And make no mistake, they are working toward this end 24 hours a day, every day.

Now I may be naive but I believe a solution to our problems is within the reach of every American. We need only to grasp it.

What we need most is to rekindle in the hearts of Americans a burning, flaming, all-encompassing love of God and country. A love so strong that it will impel us to fight to restore the principles we hold dear.

Religion and patriotism! Yes, this is the double-barreled weapon to bring us victory. Religion which both preaches and practices goodwill to all men and a personal commitment to do one's best. Patriotism which reaffirms our pride and our faith in our nation, in our fellowmen and in ourselves.

We can find hope and courage, inspiration and salvation if we but turn our thoughts to God and our eyes to the flag of our country.

We must become involved to assure that our schools return to a teaching of Americanism as it was conceived by the founding fathers.

We must demand obedience to the laws of God and the laws of man.

We must actively crusade against the poisonous filth which now contaminates our mail and which we find in our book shops, at our movies and on television.

And yes, we must pray. As never before we need to share our problems with almighty God and to seek His guidance and help.

The power of God can change the hearts of men. And God knows the hearts of men everywhere need to be changed.

#### MORATORIUM FOR PEACE

### HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, today the people of the United States are witnessing the most powerful, concentrated, determined attack on

the basic individual freedoms that have sustained this country throughout its history. This attack, which I must assume is organized and directed by the White House and not as in the past by demagogic Congressmen or by lunatic fringe groups, has become manifested by the exertion of the great might of the Executive against the news media, against war protestors, and against Americans who feel that they must listen to the dictates of their consciences and act accordingly.

On Saturday, November 15, Washington, D.C., witnessed the greatest peaceful protest in the history of our great, free land. Estimates vary from the admitted modest minimum acknowledged by the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police of 250,000 persons to the much larger claim made by moratorium leaders of some 800,000 demonstrators. In any case, for those who marched, for those who came despite Nixon administration threats of mass violence, for those who arrived cognizant of the snide innuendos deriding their patriotism and sincerity, for all those, young and old, who came with a feeling of uneasiness and fear that Attorney General Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General Kleindienst so very efficiently aroused, Saturday was a very beautiful day.

The icy winds and freezing temperatures that chilled everyone to the bone and the long hours of waiting in line for one's turn to get into the march of Americans down Pennsylvania Avenue were minor inconveniences to be suffered by these citizens. They all seemed cognizant that their sacrifice was of little consequence when compared to the ultimate sacrifice being made by their contemporaries, their sons and brothers, their schoolmates and friends, who are dying in Vietnam. These protestors, these dissenters, were doing their part, their duty, to bring peace to America now.

Scattered throughout the multitudes that day were a few Vietcong flags and the banners of revolution and anarchy. Their presence angered many if not most of the marchers, but when they realized that this small minority, and it was a very, very small minority, of those present, had the same right to be waving those banners as they, the majority had to be marching, they did not attempt to stifle those voices or rip down their banners—for this was a peaceful march as anyone who was there that day or anyone who spoke to reliable persons who observed or participated will readily attest.

The administration appears expert in manipulating public opinion and using propaganda techniques to shape and mold public opinion for their own purposes. The mass violent confrontation that they warned of, the unnamed secret plotters and plots, the organized destruction insinuated to be about to engulf the Nation's Capital, all these did not materialize. And yet the Nixon administration would lead Americans to believe that the District of Columbia was engulfed in violence and that march leaders aided this violence through a combination of inaction and affirmative action. They continue in their charges that the

march on Washington for peace in Vietnam was to have been a vehicle for violence. By doing this, they seek to gag dissent and minimize the impact of the great outpouring of citizens from all walks of life who demanded an end to killing in Vietnam.

The President refuses to listen to the voice of the people, peacefully beseeching him to bring peace to our land now, before another year goes by and another 100,000 Americans, South Vietnamese, Vietcong, and North Vietnamese die.

Sure, there was some violence. Approximately 5,000 persons in an unauthorized move, provoked a confrontation at the Justice Department. This action occurred after the mass rally had already taken place. These individuals represented between one-half of 1 percent to a maximum of 2 percent of the number of persons who participated in the peace rally. And for this action of a minute and unrepresentative bunch of far-out radicals, Attorney General Mitchell attempted to play upon the fears of the American people and place emphasis on this relatively minor incident. The same was true of an even smaller clash the evening before.

Vice President AGNEW in his recent, threatening Des Moines speech asked why confrontations are built up and given wide publicity by the television media. He condemned this alleged overemphasis by the media on violence and confrontation.

Perhaps Attorney General Mitchell does not listen to the Vice President. Or perhaps political opportunism and Madison Avenue pressure and hard sell tactics are the modus operandi of the Nixon administration and speaking out of both sides of your mouth is an approved tactic if you can get away with it.

Mr. Speaker, I for one will not allow the administration to perpetrate the dissemination of half-truths and freely utter innuendos and snide comments aimed at polarizing the Nation into hostile camps and using the power of the Presidency to cloud the issue. It appears that a double standard is sought by the administration. They can play up and exaggerate violence while at the same time they decry the television networks for supposedly doing the same thing. They can acknowledge the legitimate rights of all Americans to exercise the basic freedoms of speech and assembly and yet do everything in their power to obstruct such an exercise of these rights. They continually call for law and order and yet obfuscate and undermine the law of the land and send the word forth to Government attorneys to go slow and that the "zealots" among them are not welcome.

Apparently zealots in the defense of law and order—that is, law and order for all citizens, of all races, in all geographical areas, is no virtue to the Nixon brand of government. With such thinking in the highest circles of the executive branch, the legitimate exercise of dissent must be vehemently protected or our whole democratic system can fall prey to the evils of a totalitarian form of repression.

Mr. Speaker, I call on the President to acknowledge the rights of Americans to lawfully assemble and to freely speak

out on the issues that face the Nation. I am sure that this he will do. But I also call on him to halt the attacks on these freedoms guaranteed by our Bill of Rights that his spokesmen have engaged in. I call on the President to speak with one voice when discussing constitutionally provided safeguards and to not allow further polarization and divisiveness to be encouraged by his Vice President and Attorney General. I call on the President to take cognizance that the silent majority is also the vocal majority, that Americans want peace and they want it now. I call on the President to speed up his efforts to end the war in Vietnam by withdrawing our troops now. Finally, I call on the President to fulfill his campaign pledge to try to bring Americans together again and to bind the wounds that have divided us.

#### LEADERSHIP INTO CALAMITY

### HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, after hearing all the commentaries and reading the many columnists and news stories concerning the Vice President's recent speech criticising the television networks, I cannot see how the administration can rectify the remarks made by the Vice President with the actions such as it has taken in further amplifying them.

In his most public outrage, the Vice President has taken on the television industry—more specifically the well-known commentators who did not, as the Vice President would like to have it—praise the President for his Vietnam address.

I have reread the Vice President's speech which stirred much of the controversy, and I find in it a paragraph which reads—and as stated by the Vice President:

Every American has a right to disagree with the President of the United States, and to express publicly that disagreement.

In this most recent outburst of the Vice President attacking our basic freedom, he has publicly threatened the press and news media. This is a threat that we, as Americans, should not take lightly whether we agree or disagree with the commentators on the television programs.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend to my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Record, a newspaper which has a wide circulation in the Ninth New Jersey Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent in Congress. The editorial which appeared on November 13, 1969, has much substance and should be brought to the attention of as many Americans as possible. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I include it as part of my remarks on the Vice President's recent attack on the news media:

#### LEADERSHIP INTO CALAMITY

The Nixon administration seems to have taken off on a planned campaign to divide the country into sheep or goats—persons who

are patriotic, sound, and members of the great silent majority versus persons who are critical, demonstrative, and members of a self-named intellectual elite unrepresentative of true national sentiment. The trend could be catastrophic.

It starts with Vice-President Agnew, who himself is gathering momentum as he goes. His speeches on young dissidents had some sense in them, read in their full text; but he then went on to imply that industries like television which depend on federal licensing had better keep themselves aware of where their own and the public interest lies.

The campaign moves on with Herbert G. Klein's widening the Vice-President's attack to include all news media. In an interview carried, one almost says of course, on television President Nixon's director of communications said:

"I include the newspapers very thoroughly in this, as well as the networks—if you look at the problems you have today and you fail to continue to examine them, you do invite the government to come in. I would not like to see that happen."

And then the drive on dissent is intensified by Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell, commenting on a remarkably peaceful Washington demonstration by at least a quarter million persons, most of them young: "I do not believe that over all the gathering here can be characterized as peaceful." He was referring, it appears, to scattered incidents in what is called the largest peace demonstration in history.

The point in all of this is not that the dissenters, including television commentators, are right. A discussion of the question whether they should be able to express themselves has nothing to do with whether they are right or wrong. The point is that the Government itself, through men as highly placed as Mr. Agnew, Mr. Klein, and Mr. Mitchell, resents their dissent so angrily that it sets out to divide the people of the country.

The Administration attitude is exactly wrong. Instead of haranguing its critics in threatening language it should be expressing its delight that the people of the country are finding ways under Mr. Nixon to make their views known. It should be welcoming adverse criticism as one of the soundest ways to form and amend policy. It should be emphasizing the President's own determination to end the war in Vietnam, welcoming the public pressure that furthers his end.

Instead of taking such a constructive course the Administration is raising questions concerning patriotism, sincerity, and intent. The Administration, however right it may be in its course on Vietnam, is deadly wrong to exacerbate national dissent in ways that can lead only toward disaster.

#### ARROGANCE HAS MANY FACES

### HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, other voices are being heard in alarm at the sudden, but clearly well organized and coordinated attack upon press freedom which this administration is mounting.

On November 19, the President of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Mr. Norman E. Isaacs, speaking at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, expressed his concern over the "open campaign of the administration to discredit" the news media.

Like others who have sought to defend the first amendment against this most recent assault, Mr. Isaacs does not assert that the press is perfect. He insists only that it be allowed to be as free as the authors of the Bill of Rights meant it to be.

Mr. Isaacs is franker about the faults of his profession than the vocal critics of the press have been about their own shortcomings. But that very frankness lends his words an even greater credibility.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand by the side of the editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal in this effort to protect the first amendment. I insert his speech in its entirety at this point in the RECORD:

#### ARROGANCE HAS MANY FACES

(Address by Norman E. Isaacs at the University of Michigan)

This is a sensitive period for the communications media of the United States.

The newspaper and broadcast arms of communications are rivals. For years they have been openly contemptuous of each other. Yet whatever their differences, they are now driven together as the co-targets of what can only be described as an open campaign by the national Administration to discredit them—and, more importantly, to seek to bring them under some form of covert control.

The Vice-President of the United States was merely the spear-bearer of this attack with the speech before a party conference in Des Moines. It was cleverly timed and cleverly written and the Vice-President followed the text with unusual skill.

It has been given the imprimatur of the White House. Press Secretary Ron Ziegler has said that the President saw the telecast and twice has added: "The President has great confidence in his vice-president and he supports the vice-president in his office." More, we have the direct statement of the President's special counsel, Clark Mollenhoff, who has said Mr. Agnew's speech "reflected the views of the Administration."

We have had a seconding speech at the same party conference by George Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, denouncing the news media as "dominated by the thought centers of New York and Washington and by thought critics there who are of the new culture."

If there were any newspapermen who took gleeful satisfaction over the Agnew attack on TV, it must have been a short-spurred emotion. For the hypocrisy of the attack on TV becomes quickly evident when one even glances at the record.

The Vice-President's text at Des Moines went to rather elaborate pains to separate newspaper from television—about news in one compartment, editorial views in another. But only days earlier in an interview with *U.S. News & World Report*, Mr. Agnew wasn't concentrating on TV. His major target was newspapers.

He was saying his speeches had come about because he couldn't find a "balanced expression of opinion in the news media" and that, "I don't consider the people who write for the news media intellectually elite. Sometimes I think they're about the most superficial thinkers I've ever seen."

In his interview with *U.S. News*, the Vice-President made it clear he was talking about what he terms the "big-city, liberal media," because he commented that he felt he was doing "reasonably well" with editorial writers in what he called "the hustings."

It isn't hard to draw from this the interpretation that if you agree with the Administration you may be an intellectual; if you don't, you are superficial.

There are other members of the Admin-

istration participating in this attack. At a newspaper meeting in Bermuda Attorney General John Mitchell was asked about the Haynsworth nomination and replied bluntly to the editor's query: "You sons of bitches are responsible." Mr. Mollenhoff has taken a leading role in attributing "fraud" in the reporting about Judge Haynsworth.

Of course, neither the Attorney General nor Mr. Mollenhoff are quite so free in denouncing the 40 United States Senators who have publicly announced they are unable to support the Haynsworth nomination. Some of these Senators have made strong comment about Judge Haynsworth's judicial record and his financial affairs. Are we to assume it is one thing for a United States Senator to attack Judge Haynsworth and entirely something else for the press to report such a position?

I am not one easily upset by the attacks of political office-holders. From youth, I have known precisely what it is they want: To use us for their purposes.

This new attack, however, is deeply disturbing. It is an attack not merely on our mistakes of judgment—and which many of us admit—but on the basic principle of free speech.

Many of our political leaders—going back even to George Washington—have been angered by the press. But I cannot recall a drive mounted by a national administration containing the threat of retribution—and this one certainly is that, Mr. Agnew's text was a blunt reminder of broadcasting's dependence on government licensing—and we can only grow more frightened when we read that Dean Burch, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, has voiced direct support of the Vice-President's remarks. Moreover, it should be pointed out on November 5th, Mr. Burch took an unprecedented step in telephoning the networks to ask for the transcripts of the remarks of the reporters and commentators on November 3rd, following President Nixon's speech. It is the first time an FCC chairman has departed from the protocol normally followed by that regulatory agency in dealing with complaints. The usual procedure has been a written notice by the FCC secretary, with the complaint in written form, and 20 days given for reply.

I am about to make a comment with a good deal of reluctance because it is the kind of thing so often used loosely. I do so because the parallel seems obvious.

I have been back from the Soviet Union only a few weeks. I wrote at length about the trip. There were many things in the Soviet Union this time that surprised me—the striking advances in the way the average Soviet citizen is faring, the impressive gains in housing, the general air of substantial progress, the willingness of Soviet officials to talk frankly about domestic affairs and the shortcomings in the system. I wrote, too, that the one big disappointment was in the posture of our colleagues, the leading editors in Moscow. It may be unjust, but it did seem to me they were the "true believers" of the system, duty-bound to maintain un-deviating loyalty to the Soviet government's policies. Government officials turned us off gently, but firmly, without a chip on their shoulders, when we tried to probe for feelings about Vietnam. Mention the same subject to editors and we got abusive explosion. Later, I speculated that this was probably a necessary stance if one wanted to hold one's post as editor or newscaster since, after all, they were obviously operating under a form of license—a license that, subtly or not, says that you support government or you go.

When the Vice-President of the United States and the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission deem it proper to co-relate their complaints about what

they term "balance in the news" with FCC licensing, I cannot help but wonder what the substantive difference is between their position and that in practice in the Soviet Union?

I know that many people in the country are upset and angry, but I wonder, too, if they know what quicksand they are stepping into when they rush to support the Government's attack on television?

Do they really want organized campaigns mounted in their cities to challenge the radio and television licensees?

Do they welcome the idea of government officers passing judgment on what they are to read and see and hear?

The Vice-President's text disclaimed any intent to legislate against the communications media. But he did appeal openly for public control—and what other interpretation can be drawn than Administration support for such challenges? And with a Chairman of the FCC who openly adopts a welcoming stance to such challenges?

You have one of two options in analysis of the motives. One is intimidation, the other is control. But is there any essential difference, so long as you succeed? The end result is muzzling of some kind.

There are many faces to arrogance. And in the spirit of Thomas Jefferson, I much prefer the arrogance of an independent news media—however much I may deplore some of it—to the arrogance of government.

Speaking of this I submit that my credentials in this field of communications, and those of my colleagues, are somewhat better than those of Mr. Agnew and his associates in the national administration.

Herbert Klein, the President's director of communications, can give ample testimony to this. He knows how many of us have been open critics of journalistic practice over the years—and how many gains we have made in improving our various techniques and our products. We were being hairshirts for our profession long years before Spiro Agnew started courting their favor in Maryland.

Let me explain myself to this extent—and I suppose it applies to many other of my colleagues. I have consistently attacked all the forms of journalism because of what I have called a love-hate relationship. I am totally, absolutely, passionately devoted to journalism as a way of life. I sometimes hate it because it has not always lived up to its promises and ideals, and in some cases not even up to its duty. As a result, some of us who share this dedication often wind up sounding like common scolds about something very dear to us.

This past week, APME News—issued by the Associated Press Managing Editors, an organization I served as President 16 years ago—returned a needle. It called me the most consistent man in newspapering. "Every time he speaks," it said, "he very willingly tells us of our shortcomings."

It seems to me that the fact that a well-established critic can stand before you as President of the American Society of Newspaper Editors is evidence that the men in communications are not in panic over the problem of criticism or self-examination.

Weeks ago, before this attack on the news media surfaced, Herb Klein shared the platform with me before the Colorado Bar. He can give testimony to the fact that it was made clear that it was the press of the United States which was leading the way to peaceful, intelligent solution of the long-running conflict between Press and Bar over what is properly called "Free Press and Fair Trial."

He is also aware that the members of the Board of Directors of the American Society of Newspaper Editors held their full meeting in England in order to study first-hand the workings of the British Press Council. He knows, too, that the Society is deep into

study of the problems involved in establishing a Grievance Committee to receive complaints about the performance of the daily newspapers of this country.

I should add the significant point that long before we had any intimation of the Administration's bitterness about the press, we had decided it absurd to even contemplate ever considering a complaint from a political figure.

Those of us who have spent our lifetimes in journalism know full well how ephemeral a politician's thanks for newspaper support, or his fulminations for what he considers journalistic duplicity.

It was only seven years ago that Mr. Nixon was saying, "I can only thank God for television and radio keeping the newspapers a little more honest."

Now, however, we are told of the President watching approvingly as his vice-president berates television and urges it to follow the more honest way of separating news from editorial comment. Or, at least, follows the text which urged it—because, obviously, he feels otherwise—or can we not believe Mr. David Lawrence's *U.S. News* either?

We don't have to go back seven years to trace the mercurial changes in political temperament. After all, it was in his inaugural speech that Mr. Nixon proclaimed his administration would speak with lowered voices.

Is Mr. Agnew's voice a lowered one? Or Attorney General Mitchell's? Or Secretary Romney's? Or Commissioner Burch's? Or Counsel Mollenhoff's? This is the same Clark Mollenhoff, who as newspaper reporter wrote the book, "Washington Cover-up," an attack on the government's secrecy.

For me, the only comforting note in all this turbulent scene has been Mr. Barry Goldwater's pronouncement that Mr. Agnew is expressing "the sentiment of the vast, overwhelming majority" of Americans. Mr. Goldwater's past accuracy in measuring what the "vast, overwhelming majority" wants gives me at least a small feeling of security about America.

As said earlier, arrogance has many faces. I did not come here today to attack the Administration's brand of arrogance and enter a blind defense of all that it is we do in communications.

Those of us who take pride in our critical postures—and this includes good professionals in newspapering, radio and TV and good professionals in the universities—have been warning all the media that they must lift standards and must examine public dissatisfaction with our performance—and then do something about those expressions of protest which are of a substantive nature.

There are newspaper publishers and editors and broadcast newsmen who have recognized these problems and who have been trying to meet them forthrightly and intelligently. Unhappily, this honor roll—like all honor rolls—is not large.

Below this level, I am sorry to say are fairly large pockets of resistance.

There are arrogant publishers who beam over the current affluence of their journals and who refuse to see that their newspapers are not performing an adequate public service.

There are arrogant editors who shrug away protest about errors and misstatements and who continue to put out their newspapers as if they were still fighting headline-competition on the street corners.

There are the arrogant TV executives and managers who boast of being dominant in reaching the public and who drag their feet in ordering reform in media news practices.

The most dangerous of all the arrogances at this moment are those of the new, young newsmen in all branches of communications who have not yet realized the responsibilities that go with our calling and who so often seem determined to do precisely what the national Administration charges us with do-

ing—advancing their own ideas in print or on the TV screen.

I am among those who openly admires the new generation—for its idealism, intelligence, social courage, and determination to make something decent of the society. The young communicators can do wonders in bringing newspapers, radio and TV to new high ground. They have the talent to do it. They must also have the desire to learn and accept the necessity of using professional, skilled judgment.

Mr. Agnew's text in Des Moines put great stress on a return to objectivity. Whoever prepared the text certainly won't qualify for the "intellectual elite," for of all the "superficial" comments in that speech, this was, to me, the clearest evidence of superficiality.

We in journalism have been struggling with the complex issue of so-called objectivity from the very days we began in the profession.

The basic problem was outlined for us years ago by one of the truly great men of our calling, Elmer Davis. He had experience in all of the form of communication. A Rhodes Scholar, he was with *The New York Times* for a decade, then news analyst and commentator for CBS, director of the Office of War Information, and again a network commentator for ABC. Three times he won the Peabody Award for radio news reporting and interpretation.

Here is Elmer Davis' outline:

"The good newspaperman and the good news broadcaster must walk a tightrope between two gulfs—on one side, the false objectivity that takes everything at face value and lets the public be imposed on by the charlatan with the most brazen front; on the other, the 'interpretive' reporting which fails to draw the line between objective and subjective—between a reasonably well-established fact and what the reporter and editor wishes were the fact."

Eric Sevareid has said much the same thing more bluntly:

"Our rigid formula of so-called objectivity, beginning with the wire agency bulletins and reports . . . our flat, one-dimensional handling of the news, have given the lie the same prominence and impact that truth is given; they have elevated the influence of fools to that of wise men; the ignorant to the level of the learned; the evil to the level of the good."

In these two admirable statements you have the heart of the dispute—and the core of all of our troubles.

In a time when the public need is for full information about the significant issues of life—economics, education, the legal system, poverty and welfare, labor-management relations, the desperate problems of the cities, the strains on the Negro struggling for equality of opportunity—we require more than ever trained interpreters.

And what is this interpretation? It is simply an honest effort to reach objective appraisal. It has to be based on a newsman's training in the field, on his knowledge of the situation at hand, on his examination of the primary and related facts. It differs from editorial opinion because editorial comment is subjective judgment—the taking of sides.

We have always known that many people do not like to read material which disagrees with their prejudices. Cover a strike and you promptly find bitterness from both management and union—the management for publishing the union leader's denunciation, the union for publishing the management's assertions.

In Russia, the loudest shouting match occurred when the editor of Pravda accused us of printing lies. The lies were contained in statements of the Red Chinese government under Peking datelines. "We have the truth," he shouted. "Those are lies. Why do you print lies?"

Mr. Agnew's text added still another dimension to the issue. He complained about

"the expression on their (the TV commentators') faces, the tone of their questions, and the sarcasm of their responses."

Mr. William Buckley is both a newspaper columnist and a TV commentator. His positions, I believe, often match those of the national Administration. I wonder if Mr. Agnew finds fault with Mr. Buckley's facial expressions, the tone of his questions, and the sarcasm of his responses?

My point is that for all our shortcomings—and they are many—and for all of our arrogances—we are growing in our skills as communicators—we are learning from each other. We are doing it the democratic way, in a free society, fumbling our way towards the goals. The one thing we don't need at this point is the bombast and the fumbblings of a political machine, be it of Republican persuasion or Democratic. Lyndon Johnson had no love for the communications media, either. May I ask what those who now support Mr. Agnew would have said if Mr. Johnson had made the same charge and statement?

One ought always to work on a pattern of priorities. There are probably a hundred things which could be listed which the various branches of communications ought to be moving on with all deliberation and speed. Right now, I'm going to focus on only four of them.

The first is speed. If there is one thing all of us suffer from, it is the inheritance of the past—the passion of newsmen for the scoop.

Bob Farquharson of *The Toronto Globe & Mail* summed it up best years ago: "There are scoops and scoops, but the trend which has put the emphasis on being first, right or wrong, has been the most dangerous single road to irresponsible newspaper work."

James B. Reston has shaken his head over this aspect, too. I give you his wonderful quote: "The American newspaperman would rather break a story than understand it."

All of us have to hammer away at this failing. We have to educate reporters and sub-editors out of their wild drives to get stories in print. Let us miss an edition, or two editions if we must. But let us get into print stories that are correct, complete and significant.

Television has copied newspapering in this regard—this often senseless drive for speed—to be first. On top of that, it has inherited a profound weakness of its own—the inheritance of show business. It has made for a tangle which is of deep concern for its ranking executives and one they have failed to move in on with the necessary determination.

There have been too many instances where both newspapers and television undoubtedly provoked violence by this burning desire for speed—and by what both consider a necessity to focus on action—even though this action may not be representative of what is actually transpiring.

The TV networks have recognized some of these deficiencies by adopting guidelines. But guidelines in themselves, or strong statements by network executives, mean nothing unless there is intent to enforce the spirit of such guidelines, if not the letter.

My second priority would be for newspapers and television alike to be more clean-cut in separating news and interpretation. None of us have solved this one to our satisfaction. We on newspapers have gone to such devices as marking some columns as "news review" or "commentary," but even this leaves something to be desired. Newspapermen tend to read their journals as professionals. They understand what is meant. The readers don't. We simply have to work out some pattern that gives the readers clear signals as to what it is we are presenting—straight news, interpretation, or commentary.

Television is in worse shape on this than we are. One is never certain at what point the TV newsmen is reporting or being com-

mentator. On local stations, the trend is to the straight editorial designation. This is fair enough. But the network shows are fuzzy on this score and the top executives ought to be doing something about clearing it up.

My third priority has to do with opening ourselves to examination of what it is we do, and why—and the corollary of adequate correction of error. As I said earlier, the American Society of Newspaper Editors is engaged in sober assessment of a national Grievance procedure. If it comes about, as I hope it does, it won't be a Press Council. But it could well be an intelligent means of appraising substantive questions about the performance of daily newspapers. If it worked, it could lead to the broadcast media following suit.

In this connection, all of us must be more alert to the need for swift and honorable correction of misstatements—and minus the defensiveness which is so much a curse of all the news media.

And my fourth and final priority of the moment is for some emphasis on our manners. On this facet, I maintain that television is by far more errant than newspapers. Only in the field of photography are newspapers often openly guilty. Our photographers have improved markedly over the past decade, but there is still a disposition to shove and push and be arrogant. But it is when you get to reporters that all of us wince over the aggressive, bullyboy tactics of so many TV reporters.

You have on the one hand the courtliness and grace of men like Walter Cronkite, Harry Reasoner, David Brinkley, Edwin Newman, and others—and the abrasiveness of those who act as if they were portraying District Attorneys pouncing on some villain on trial for multiple rapes and murders. It ill fits our claims to being professionals. We can't have it both ways. We can't claim to be responsible, even-handed, judicious reporters and interpreters and give public display of being boors—and arrogant boors, at that.

These improvements will come because they have to come. And even when they do, and we have few apologies to make for the way we serve the American public, you can bet on it that we'll still have the politicians applying their pressures.

The Administration's attack, however, has added some new dimensions.

If I read it all correctly, it is not merely what they call "constructive" reporting which is being asked—it is tantamount to the suppression of analysis or interpretation.

Senator Griffin read a parallel between Justice Abe Fortas's situation and that of Judge Haynsworth. In the view of Attorney General Mitchell, we are "sons of bitches" for examining Judge Haynsworth's record precisely as we did Justice Fortas's.

In 1957, testifying before a Senate committee, Clark Mollenhoff took the firm stand that he wasn't going to be limited in his reporting of self-serving statements from government officials. Later, in his book, he called the Eisenhower administration "smug in its popularity." Today, as a White House counsel, he is indignant about reporters who decline to be limited in their reporting of self-serving statements.

I recall the use of the term "one-party press" by a Democratic candidate for the Presidency in describing the newspaper lineup against him. It was lop-sided. But while many of us didn't care for it, we had to concede it was the free expression of publishers and editors.

What we're facing now is a drive for a real "one-party press"—not through free expression, but through open intimidation by the top officials of our government.

A pretty pass!

And then I have to listen to Mr. Agnew calling other citizens un-American!

## THE SILENT EPIDEMIC

### HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the problem of lead poisoning in children has reached epidemic proportions in the urban slums of this Nation.

Caused when young children eat lead based paint which has peeled from the interior surfaces of housing, this disease is rarely detected until it has reached its most serious stages. When lead poisoning becomes acute, it results in death, mental retardation, permanent brain damage, cerebral palsy, and epilepsy.

It is estimated that between 225,000 and 400,000 American children between the ages of 1 and 6 are afflicted with lead poisoning.

The problem is not that the causes and cures of this disease are not known, but that there are little or no screening programs to detect and treat the disease.

Because of my concern about this problem, I have introduced—with 19 cosponsors—three bills aimed at combating and alleviating this disease.

Last week, I sponsored a lead poisoning breakfast at which close to 100 Congressmen, congressional staff members, and other interested persons listened to experts discuss the lead poisoning problem.

Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, who cosponsored the breakfast, plans to introduce similar legislation in the Senate.

I include in the RECORD, an article which appeared in the November 8 New Republic. Written by Joseph Featherstone, "The Silent Epidemic" discusses this serious health hazard.

I urge my colleagues to read this article and to support this vital and needed legislation. The article follows:

#### THE "SILENT EPIDEMIC"

(By Joseph Featherstone)

The old, cracked paint flaking onto the floors of dilapidated houses and tenements is one visible sign of the decay of our cities. It is also the source of what, if infections are excluded, may be America's most common childhood disease. Lead poisoning is a disease of small children who eat chips of leaded paint; it is especially common among children with a tendency toward pica, a rather vague term for indiscriminate eating named for the dietary habits of the magpie, who has a reputation for not being too choosy about what he eats. Two-year olds account for half the deaths from lead poisoning; most reported cases involve children between one and three. Lead poisoning is peculiarly an affliction of the poor—middle-class children get pica, too, but usually don't have sweet-tasting chips of leaded paint to chew. Since the 1940s, paint with a titanium dioxide base has replaced leaded paint in most decent American housing. Many cities have ordinances banning leaded paint from interior surfaces. (How well the ordinances are enforced is another matter.) In most cases, though, no one has undertaken to remove the ancient layers of lead pigment from the walls and woodwork of old slum buildings.

Nobody knows the total number of victims across the country; one fairly cautious estimate suggests 225,000 children. Spot tests in New York, Chicago, Rochester, Baltimore and other cities show that five to ten percent of slum children below the age of six have dangerously high levels of lead in their blood.

In New York, a group called the Scientists' Committee for Public Information says there are between 9,000 and 18,000 poisoned children; other health officials put the figure much higher.

Whatever the exact figures are for New York and other cities, a large and on the whole unacknowledged epidemic of lead poisoning is raging, yet the number of cases detected and treated is terribly small: something like 600 a year in New York, for example. This is partly because of incompetence and the general deterioration of medical services for the poor: one big New York medical center dealing with slum residents failed to report a single instance of lead poisoning in a three-year period. Knowledgeable doctors say that lead poisoning is hard to spot unless you're expecting it: you have to test, and a good rule of thumb for the ghettos is that the more doctors test, the more cases turn up. Chicago is the only city with mass testing.

Early symptoms are vague and can be easily mistaken for the flu or any of a dozen common childhood ailments: loss of appetite, lethargy, anemia, stomach pain and cramps, constipation. By far the greatest number of cases crop up in the warm months between July and October, perhaps because lead in the intestines is more readily absorbed by the body in sunlight and higher temperatures. Like other metals, lead accumulates in the body over time: a child who eats two or three paint chips a day may go several months without showing definite symptoms. In the meantime he can be building up a severe and maybe fatal dose. In late stages of poisoning children vomit; they may have convulsions or go into a coma. Treatment consists in getting the child away from the source of lead so his system can work off the dosage. In recent years, advances in techniques of treatment have cut down the number of deaths from severe poisoning; there are chelating agents that can bind the lead ion and remove it from the body tissue. With these and other advances, the death rate from severe poisoning can be cut from 66 to five per cent. At least a quarter of the survivors, however, will suffer lasting effects such as chronic nephritis, epilepsy, cerebral palsy, mental retardation.

Doctors who deal with lead poisoning stress that while it can be treated, it is pointless to cure a child and then send him back home to be poisoned again. The leaded paint has to be gotten rid of. This is the nub of the problem. Even with mass testing and better techniques, doctors are likely to see the same children and their brothers and sisters coming back again and again for treatment; each time there will be more and more evidence of residual brain damage.

A wide assortment of publications has begun to call attention to the lead poisoning epidemic, and to the wholesale lack of concern on the part of health officials in most cities. Citizens' Committees to End Lead Poisoning are forming. In Minneapolis, the first order of battle has been revision of city ordinances. In New York, the first concern has been to pressure complacent health officials to undertake mass testing. Some fairly typical concerns of these citizens' groups are reflected in a report on New Haven's administration of its paint ordinance. The report, drawn up by a legal assistance group, attacks the city's inertia and then lists recommendations: inspection programs, clear lines of authority among city agencies empowered to order peeling paint removed, more stringent code enforcement, 48-hour notices to landlords at least to scrape and repaint, and in special cases to repanel, walls with plaster or wall board, temporary housing for families whose children are poisoned, more staff for inspection, use of courts to appoint a receiver of rents when a landlord has failed to shape up. Nationally, a great step forward would be passage of three bills first proposed by Rep. William F. Ryan (D, N.Y.) and now sup-

ported by 19 other congressmen. The bills provide federal money to treat victims of lead poisoning and to get rid of leaded paint; one would require that any locality getting federal funds for code enforcement or rehabilitation draw up and carry through a program to end lead paint poisoning. Presumably some of this money could be spent developing cheaper types of wall- and plaster board, as well as making commercially available vinyl wallpapers and varieties of adhesive paints not yet on the market.

This "silent epidemic," as it is called by Dr. Rene Dubos, offers an exceptionally clear illustration of the twisted priorities in our whole system of health care. It is representative of a growing number of public health and environmental problems that cannot be solved in the clinic alone, problems that will inevitably involve doctors' and citizens' groups in politics. Where authorities refuse to undertake universal testing programs for lead in children, and where they continue lax enforcement of codes, demonstrations and disruptions are appropriate. Depending on local circumstances, doctors should also consider giving public support to tenant unions in both legal and illegal rent strikes to force landlords to act.

**ATTORNEY GENERAL MITCHELL  
SPEAKS ABOUT CYNICISM IN  
AMERICA**

**HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, in a recent speech in Milwaukee, Wis., Attorney General John N. Mitchell spoke about the problem of "cynicism in America" and the danger posed by it to the democratic process.

The Attorney General also spoke of the overinflated promises of the previous administration and the role played by these false hopes in undermining the American people's faith in their institutions.

I think the remarks of the Attorney General are most thoughtful and relevant, if I may use that thoroughly overworked word, and I include them in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN N. MITCHELL, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

I. INTRODUCTION

I would like, for a few moments, to address you on a general topic that is causing me increasing concern. It is the problem of cynicism in America. This is an attitude which I think encompasses many other problems—such as crime and civil disorders and Vietnam and inflation—and which is rooted in the nature of our society.

We are, as you know, a pluralistic nation and we are proud of it. Since 1820, nine foreign nations have each sent us one million or more immigrants. Our citizens belong to at least 80 separate religious groups which have memberships of 50,000 or more.

But this easily identifiable pluralism—by religion and by national origin—is cross-cut by geographical regionalism (such as the north and the south); by economic classification (such as blue collar worker and white collar worker); and by area differences (such as the city dweller, the suburbanite and the rural resident).

But perhaps most importantly, we boast the pluralism of ideas—of permitting opinion which ranges from the extreme right to the extreme left; and of assimilating these ideas on national issues into two large areas of agreement which are then reinterpreted

into the two-party national political system.

The strength of our form of government was immediately recognized very early in our history. A late 18th Century French political analyst commented:

"It is in the enjoyment of a dangerous freedom—the freedom of ideas—that Americans have learned the art of rendering the danger of freedom less formidable."

2. DISEASE OF CYNICISM

And yet, an excess of political diversity can be as dangerous as the absence of it. In our representative system, national government cannot act decisively without a national consensus. This continued inaction by government breeds the disease of cynicism which seems to be so alarmingly prevalent in our nation today—a cynicism that duly elected government, particularly the federal government, has lost its relevance to the aspirations of our society.

There are the underprivileged minorities, especially the poor and the black, who had relied on Utopian promises and now distrust the government's ability to act on their behalf.

There are the middle-class working man and housewife who had unquestioningly accepted the government's ability to control the economy and then found themselves caught in increasing inflation.

There are the dissatisfied youth who reject the established political processes and who turn to violence and confrontation.

And then, of course, there are the rich and the poor, the black and the white, the city dweller and the suburbanite who are frustrated and terrorized by the inability of government to immediately solve the crime problem in the streets and the Vietnam War on the other side of the world.

A recent survey conducted by the National Violence Commission proves the point.

In 1952, 81 percent of the persons surveyed said they thought that voting was the most efficient way to influence governmental action. In 1968, only 55 percent felt that way.

In 1952, 35 percent said that government officials did not pay much attention to them. In 1968, 43 percent felt that way.

How have we come to this state of affairs? How has the most prosperous nation in the world come to the point where many of its citizens doubt the ability of its governmental institutions to solve pressing issues?

I believe the fault, in great part, lies with the deception which was practiced over the last few years.

The prior Administration attempted to solve problems through the illusion of words—through the projection of succeeding images of impossible dreams which were replaced by more impossible dreams when previous commitments could not be met.

This rhetorical device worked for quite awhile, mainly, I suppose, because the human mind likes to dramatize. Men are, by their very nature, intellectually attracted by the bright uniforms and loud trumpets of new ideas.

But what does one have after the parade has passed—an empty street littered with handbills and the memory of what might have been. Of course it is healthy, ever so often, to have a burst of color and imagination. But this is no replacement for well conceived and well funded programs.

It is for this reason that this Administration has been purposely low key in its public statements and in the presentation of its new programs. We do not want to offer more hope than we can realistically deliver. We do not want to create expectations based on mere words.

In evaluating the methods that this Administration should use, we came to the conclusion that we ought to emphasize some of the simple precepts of American government about which most citizens agree—fundamental concepts of governmental action which this Administration believes should be retained.

The methods that we are using to achieve social and economic progress are the methods which I think this mid-west audience understands better than most. We believe in common sense, in hard work and in quiet diligence. We believe that individuals and government should carefully plan and finance each step of the way.

We believe in consistency and in that great American genius for compromise. We believe that the extremists on both ends of the spectrum will be isolated by the great majority of Americans and that the middle course is generally the best course for this nation to pursue.

And finally, we believe that the Republican Party can prove to doubting citizens that government can be relevant to their aspirations and can produce a stable and prosperous society.

In the next few minutes, I would like to give you some examples of current problems and explain to you how we are attempting to solve them.

3. VIETNAM DEMONSTRATIONS

This week we expect upwards of 100,000 persons to appear in Washington to stage demonstrations against the war in Vietnam. The announced purpose of this group is to exert pressure on the President in order to achieve the immediate unilateral withdrawal of American troops and the abandonment of the government and peoples of South Vietnam.

This Administration clearly recognizes the right of these people under our First Amendment to peacefully congregate in Washington and to petition the government with respect to their grievances—assumed or otherwise.

But it is the responsibility of government to see that such congregations are conducted in a peaceful and orderly fashion, uninterrupted by militant factions who would use such an occasion to foment violence.

We propose to honor our obligations in both directions. We will support the peaceful assembly and we will likewise curtail the militant factions whose sole aim is the creation of a violent confrontation.

The foreign policy of this government cannot—and will not—be formulated in the streets of Washington—or in any other street of this nation.

The President in his talk to the nation of November 3rd has reviewed the Vietnam problem with the American people and has received the backing of a substantial majority. The President does have a plan to end our involvement in the Vietnam war and it will work. This twofold plan will produce more rapid results if our peace negotiations with the other side—which will continue—are fruitful. In any event, the second part of the plan—Vietnamization of the war—is already underway with the withdrawal of American troops. This process will continue, as circumstances permit, and end with the South Vietnamese handling their own security.

The negative cynicism of demonstrators cannot be allowed to replace the affirmative programs of those in government charged with conducting our foreign policy and carrying out our national security.

4. CRIME

Of course, I am a lawyer and not a political philosopher. But today, even the law is beginning to suffer from the popular cynicism about governmental institutions.

More particularly, there is the criticism that our system of law enforcement and criminal justice has failed to meet the problems of crime in our society.

The seriousness of the problem cannot be doubted.

The latest FBI Uniform Crime Reports show that in 1968 there were 4.5 million serious crimes committed in the United States, a 17 percent increase over 1967.

From 1960 to 1968, the volume of serious

crime has risen 122 percent, while the population has increased only 11 percent. The citizen risk of becoming a victim of a crime has nearly doubled from 1960 to 1968.

In recognition of this national tragedy, we launched a comprehensive anti-crime program last January as a first priority of the Administration.

It is a program which stresses the practical aspects of criminal justice—apprehension and arrest, the prosecution of suspected criminals and the rehabilitation of convicted persons.

It is a program which stresses obtaining results as soon as possible. For while crime may or may not be solved a generation from now by the implementation of enormously expensive and radically new social concepts, the nation cannot afford to wait.

We must start and start now to get down to the dry mechanics of fighting crime on a practical level. We need more and better trained police. We need more efficient court systems. We need new corrections facilities and more rehabilitation programs.

#### 5. AID TO STATES

President Nixon has said that "The public climate with regard to law is a function of national leadership."

Basically, the federal government has very limited legal jurisdiction over street crime—the type of crime that affects most of us more directly than others. We can set the tone for leadership. We can initiate pilot projects. We can offer financial and technical assistance. But the primary responsibility is still with the state and local governments.

Our most ambitious program to combat local street crime is the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the Department of Justice. LEAA is the federal government's major commitment to help states and local communities to improve their police, their criminal justice systems, their juvenile programs, and their correctional institutions.

For the current fiscal year, we may receive as much as \$275 million for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. If appropriated, \$225 million of this is scheduled to go to cities and states for action programs.

The greatest single emphasis in the LEAA program has been and will continue to be the funding of police efforts to decrease street crime.

But police action alone cannot solve the total problem. We must bear in mind that about 45 percent of the persons who serve prison terms are subsequently arrested for additional offenses; and that more than half our crimes against property are now committed by youths under 21.

Accordingly, the LEAA action programs also contain substantial plans to increase the efficiency of the criminal courts, to improve rehabilitation efforts in our prisons and initiate and expand corrective programs for our youth.

I hope that Congress will pass the \$275 million appropriation. Law enforcement agencies in this state and in every state must have sufficient funds. If not, the national effort against crime will merely be another rhetorical ruse.

#### 6. NARCOTICS

Another area in which the federal government has substantial jurisdiction involving street crime is the battle against illegal narcotics and dangerous drugs. Between 1967 and 1968, there was a 64 percent increase in arrests for narcotics and marijuana. Half of those now being arrested for drug abuse are under 21 years of age.

The battle against narcotics is an integral part of the Administration's anti-street crime program. A narcotics addict may need \$70 or \$80 a day to satisfy his habit. Thus, he turns to robbery, mugging and burglary in order to obtain money. A reduction in

addicts will result directly in the reduction of crime.

One of the most significant parts of the program so far has been a landmark proposal called the Controlled Dangerous Substances Act of 1969, which would consolidate and reorganize all the existing drug laws—some of which date back to 1914. It would expand federal authority to control not only narcotics and marijuana, but also many new drugs which come on the market. It would also substantially expand federal law enforcement power to search for illegal narcotics and to arrest suspected violators.

In addition, we have launched the first major search and seizure border operation in history aimed at stopping the importation of illegal drugs from Mexico.

It is estimated that the Mexican border traffic accounts for 80 percent of the illegal marijuana in this country, 20 percent of the heroin and large amounts of other dangerous drugs. So far this operation has been highly successful. We have evidence to indicate that Mexican marijuana is in very short supply in many areas of the country and that the price of Mexican marijuana, where available, has risen substantially.

We have also stepped up our narcotics enforcement program and we are in the process of training 22,000 state and local law enforcement officers to combat the local narcotics operations.

#### 7. ORGANIZED CRIME

Another aspect of crime where the federal government has broad jurisdiction is organized crime.

Relying on the hopelessness of ghetto residents, organized criminals sell heroin and cocaine; playing on insecure credit, they loanshark the honest working man; recognizing elector indifference, they corrupt labor unions and political leaders.

The core of the federal effort against organized crime has been to reorganize the Strike Forces. They are interagency teams designed to throw a whole net of federal law enforcement over an organized crime family in a particular city. We have expanded the number of these teams and we plan to reach 20 Strike Forces by the end of fiscal 1971.

In addition, we have set up an experimental federal-state racket squad in New York City. If this joint venture proves to be successful (and current activities indicate it will be), we plan to organize others in an effort to cooperate with state and local authorities in our Strike Force assault.

We have also asked for additional legislation to help us in the battle against the organized gangster.

Among the bills we have proposed or supported are laws designed to offer a broad immunity for many potential witnesses against organized crime; to expand our current ability to prosecute gambling; and to make it a federal crime to corrupt local police and other public officials.

In order to mount this broad attack on organized crime, the Administration has asked for a record \$25 million increase in funds for all government agencies involved in this effort—a 40 percent increase over the previous Administration request.

The result of our activities so far has been promising. A total of 71 organized crime figures were either indicted or convicted in the last fiscal year, as compared with only 48 the previous year.

Furthermore, we have arrested a number of crime figures who are members of the ruling commission of the organized crime syndicate in Buffalo, in Newark, in New Orleans, in Rhode Island and in Chicago. We think that this new assault shows great hope of success against this difficult problem.

#### 8. CONCLUSION

This is just a brief outline of three of our major proposals, three which we believe are most promising.

This Administration has presented a great many other anti-crime proposals. They range

from a comprehensive program for the capital City of Washington to some highly technical but very important legislation aimed at utilizing antitrust laws against organized crime.

We have also taken a number of important executive decisions. We have authorized court approved wiretapping against organized crime. We have authorized the admission in evidence of voluntary confessions complying with the guidelines approved by Congress. We have proposed pre-trial detention for dangerous suspects.

I know, and you know, that we must solve our crime problem. Economic prosperity and political stability have little meaning if our citizens are afraid to freely move about their neighborhoods. As this Administration's anti-crime program moves forward through Congress and into operation, the mood of the nation will change from cynicism to optimism and confidence in the law will be restored.

This Administration is committed to the success of its program. We are going to restore civil tranquility to the streets of this nation. We are going to restore confidence in elected governments' ability to act—and to act now.

### BRIGHT BROTHERS SUCCESS IS INSPIRATION TO AMERICANS

## HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 21, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there is a widespread feeling in this country today that the small entrepreneur with a good idea can no longer make a success of business. The prevalence of large corporations with far-flung operations seems to have squeezed the little man. In other words, there is no place in America for Horatio Alger.

This notion is simply not correct. While it is true that many enterprises require large amounts of capital and a highly trained corps of workers, there are many examples of successful businesses being built on the ingenuity, determination, and hard work of people with more limited assets.

Such a business is now thriving in West Virginia. It is the product of the dedication of two young men, John and Bill Bright, who chose to remain in their hometown rather than follow the masses to the big cities.

Mr. President, I recently was asked to write an article about the Bright brothers for Success Unlimited, a quality magazine edited and published by W. Clement Stone and circulated nationally. The values these young men possess are an inspiration. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD, so that thousands of readers will, through this journal, realize that resourcefulness and responsibility can be coupled to produce worthwhile achievements.

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

BRIGHT OF AMERICA

(By Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH)

Summerville, West Virginia, is proud of John and Bill Bright. It is a pride which took root ten years ago when, in an upstairs bedroom of their family home, these two young men made their decision to go into busi-

ness. Since then, Summerville has observed and participated in making "The Great American Dream" a reality and Bright of America has taken its place among this country's fastest-growing greeting card companies.

At the time, John was 28 and home for a visit from New York where he worked as a photographer for another greeting card company. Bill, 21, had just graduated from West Virginia University with a degree in commerce. The elder brother had graduated from the same school and also earned a Master's Degree in Cinematography from the University of Southern California. Between them, they had \$500.00 cash. More important, however, was their belief in themselves and belief in their dream.

And so the partnership began under the name of Church-Graphic Productions and the bedroom became their office. Meanwhile, their operating funds had increased to \$3,000 due to the farsightedness of a local banker.

Commenting on these beginnings, Bill recently said: "Under the name of Church-Graphic Productions, we took pictures of church interiors all over the country. I guess each of us would travel 75,000 miles a year. We would take photographs at Christmas, or during the summer and we would carry on our work using artificial poinsettias and other Christmas decorations."

The miles were exhausting but they kept it up, because their marketing ideas continued to gain acceptance and use. John and Bill knew that the competition in the greeting card industry was fierce and they recognized their own physical and monetary ineptness to compete. Instead, they hit upon using Christmas cards, photograph accented, to fulfill a need; namely, that of fund raising.

They found that many, many organizations and particularly churches were constantly looking for new methods of acquiring revenue. Using greeting cards with a picture of the church promoted more local interest and thus more sales.

In 1963, the company was involved in developing a number of new product lines, the most widely accepted of which is the note paper highlighting scenery in a particular state. In many cases, reception of their note stationery has been so outstanding that they have had to prepare up to three different sets per state.

This rapid growth and diversification prompted them to bring their operations under a new corporate name: Bright of America. The bedroom headquarters were no longer practical and the rapid expansion soon made their new offices in downtown Summerville obsolete.

In 1966, they received a \$360,000 loan from the Small Business Administration to build new offices and a plant on a twenty-five acre tract of land outside of Summerville's business district. Even as the construction began, the expansion plans became obsolete for John and Bill discovered that Christmas cards depicting winter scenes were becoming popular in a great many states.

The development of ideas did not stop here, however, for they soon hit upon the production of placemats laminated in plastic for each state. It was still an offshoot from photography, and even though it was something quite different, they pursued it confidently.

Bright of America is presently adding more space to its operation. The over-all plant will soon cover approximately 88,000 square feet. Manning this space and its various operations are more than 140 full-time employees and in the pre-Christmas months the number exceeds 250 people. John and Bill are devoting more time and effort to administrative problems, leaving production and traffic to a team of highly qualified and hand-picked executives. The top three in this group are former fraternity brothers of Bill.

Always looking for new horizons to con-

quer, John and Bill founded America's Bright Corporation less than a year ago. Its first production endeavor is to find a means of attractively packaging and profitably marketing highway safety flares. Although this undertaking is completely different from their other interests, Bill in particular believes that this move is a sound one. He envisions federal sanction of a law requiring the possession of such equipment as early as 1970. This could catapult them into the role of a leader in the field and they plan to be ready.

John and Bill Bright gave much thought to their decision of remaining in their hometown of Summerville, West Virginia, instead of migrating to a more success-oriented location; logically, New York City. They concluded that wherever they were, their dream would be the same and they have proved both that it doesn't take an eyebrow-raising address to become successful, and also that it is still possible in America to achieve individual wealth even though you start with virtually nothing.

John at 38 and Bill at 31 have come to this conclusion about the business community today: "We feel that too many young people, especially college-trained ones, are too eager to accept the good \$7,000-\$10,000 a year jobs and not take the risk of failure or the inconveniences of a year or two at a low income to start a business venture. Realistically, this nation, in fact the whole world, is a marketplace and the opportunities are boundless."

Dig back into your subconscious mind to that idea you discarded as being useless. Dust it off and take another long, hard look at it. Perhaps all it needs is a generous amount of belief and elbow-grease. The Bright Brothers are proof that what the mind can conceive and believe the mind can achieve. Ask yourself two questions, (1) Where do I want to be ten years from today and (2) Where will I be ten years from today?

## POSTAL REFORM

### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is continuing its executive sessions on markup of meaningful postal reform legislation.

In today's productive session, we completed action on a major segment of title III dealing with transportation. This is important progress. We are recodifying the present postal laws as we go along in our reform bill. Many of these reaffirmations are necessary to put them into proper context and to simplify postal law.

The need for postal reform is clear and our committee is acting responsibly to effect the changes which were pointed up as necessary during our 4 months of public hearings earlier this year.

Unfortunately, there has been a lot of misinformation put out by the administration and a well-heeled lobby implying that postal reform can be accomplished only by conversion of the Department to a public corporation.

This is ridiculous on the face of it. As time goes on, more and more people are coming to realize the shallowness of that argument.

Our committee is marking up my bill,

H.R. 4, which accomplishes all of the recommendations of the Presidential-Kappel-Commission within the framework of the Department.

My attention has been called to two city councils in Pennsylvania which have adopted resolutions in support of the concept of H.R. 4. I appreciate very much the support of the legislative bodies of Philadelphia and Erie. Following is the text of their resolutions:

RESOLUTION NO. 170 OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA

(A resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt H.R. 4 in its entirety, which provides for the modernization of the postal service and continuing it as a regular government agency)

Whereas, The Postal corporation idea contained in H.R. 11750 considers the Postal Service a business and not a service to the American people; and

Whereas, H.R. 4, introduced by Congressman Dulski, Chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, will by law provide for modernization of the Postal Service, thereby improving postal service to the public by continuing the department as a regular governmental agency with the Post Master General a Cabinet Member; and

Whereas, Adoption of H.R. 4 would establish a better transportation system for handling mail; establish a building program; establish a Commission on Postal Finance and set up employee labor-management procedures; therefore

Resolved, By the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to adopt H.R. 4 in its entirety which provides for the modernization of the Postal Service, continuing the department as a regular governmental agency; and

Further Resolved, That we declare our opposition to passage of H.R. 11750 which would create a Postal Service Corporation.

Resolved, That certified copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President Pro-Tem of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the United States Senators from Pennsylvania, and the entire Congressional Delegation from the Commonwealth.

CERTIFICATION: This is a true and correct copy of the original Resolution, adopted by the Council of the City of Philadelphia on the sixteenth day of October, 1969.

PAUL D'ORTONA,

President of City Council.

Attest:

CHARLES H. SAWYER Jr.,  
Chief Clerk of the Council.

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF ERIE, PA.

Resolved, by the Council of the City of Erie, That

Whereas, the Council of the City of Erie, Pennsylvania does herewith officially endorse H.R. Bill No. 4, introduced into the House of Representatives of the United States under the sponsorship of Thaddeus J. Dulski, because they are of the firm opinion that the necessary adjustments and modernizations of the Postal Services can best be effectuated by the provisions of the said act, and

Whereas, the Council of the City of Erie, Pennsylvania does further note that workers of the government in such borderline areas, postal retainers require and are entitled to direct contacts and negotiations with their employers to arrive at fair working standards with proper and adequate recompense, so therefore, be it.

Resolved, that certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to Mr. Frank Pruvea-denti, President United Federation of Postal Clerks, Local 269, Erie, Pennsylvania; Mr. Jo-

seph Travers, President National Association of Letter Carriers, Branch 284, Erie, Pennsylvania; Mr. Edward Cassano, President National Association of Mailhandlers, Local 239, Erie, Pennsylvania; and the Honorable Thaddeus J. Dulski, Member of Congress.

JOSEPH A. WALCZAK,  
President, City Council of Erie.

Attest:

EUGENE GRANEY,  
City Clerk.

A CONSTITUENT WRITES

Our colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. GALIFIANAKIS) has referred to me a copy of a letter on this matter which he received from one of his constituents, as follows:

HILLSBOROUGH, N.C.,  
June 2, 1969.

HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GALIFIANAKIS: I have been interested in the discussion of what to do about the Post Office Department. I realize the great difficulty of withstanding the lobbying that it is able to do. Possibly one solution might be to repeal an old law which forbids private organizations from carrying mail which the government might carry, even when such an organization can do a job which the government is unable to do. You may not happen to know that in the 1850's a private mail company was set up in New York which carried the mail at a much lower cost than the government and which forced the government to reduce postal rates by nearly two-thirds. For example, in those days postage, even first-class mail, depended on distance. If I remember correctly—and I am pretty nearly right—the postage for a single letter between Massachusetts and North Carolina was 45¢ before and 18¢ afterward.

It has also occurred to me that the movement of mail over short distances could be greatly speeded up if each post office had a motorized tricycle—something like that used by the Chapel Hill police force—which would be used to deliver mail to each post office within a radius of 15 miles or so. The driver would not pick up any mail; he would merely deliver it, but in most cases I suspect this could be done twice a day.

Sincerely,

CHARLES H. BLAKE.

LETTER TO FOUR EDITORS

My attention also has been called to a letter to the editor which appeared recently in four newspapers in Westchester County in lower New York State. These papers are: The Standard-Star, New Rochelle; the Daily Argus, Mount Vernon; the Herald Statesman, Yonkers; and the Reporter Dispatch, White Plains. Following is the text as it appeared in the New Rochelle paper on November 1:

POSTAL REFORM CAN BE DONE WITHIN  
GOVERNMENT FRAMEWORK

To the STANDARD-STAR:

During recent months reams of prose have been written in newspapers and magazines throughout the country about what is wrong with the Post Office. Most of those publications, including your own, favor the postal corporation concept that has been proposed by President Nixon. This proposed postal corporation is to be operated on similar lines as is the Tennessee Valley Authority with the floating of a \$10 billion bond issue to get it off the ground. This proposal has gained widespread appeal among the American public and business. Only one side of the coin has been shown by the powers who are advocating a postal corporation. Let us present a good case against this proposal.

Bonds issued by a postal corporation would

have to draw the same rate of interest as Tennessee Valley Authority bonds do. The current interest rate for TVA bonds is 8.47 per cent. A postal corporation operating with a \$10 billion bond issue would have to pay at least \$847 million annually on those bonds. That would increase the cost of operating the proposed corporation by that amount. Who would bear this cost? The users of the United States mails would with business bearing the brunt of increased postal rates caused by this factor, as approximately 85 per cent of all mail is business mail. Under this concept it is conceivable that it would cost 10 cents to mail a first class letter with all other classes of mail being raised to double the present rates. Is this what the American public wants?

We as postal supervisors favor postal reform. We believe that reform can be effectuated from within the present framework of a full government agency.

Legislation has been introduced into the Congress of the United States by Congressman Thaddeus J. Dulski of Buffalo, N.Y., chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the form of H.R. 4 that would bring about postal reform while maintaining the present Post Office Department. This bill enacted into law would give us the tools with which to modernize the Post Office and give the American public the postal service it deserves with a minimum of rate increases. We have the men at all levels of the postal scene, national, regional and local who know the mails and how to move them. All we need are the tools and those can be provided by the enactment of the Dulski Bill, H.R. 4 into law.

MICHAEL J. DIGLIO,  
Legislative Director, Westchester Branch  
336, National Association of Postal  
Supervisors.

U.N. APPEAL OF 18 JEWISH FAMILIES FROM SOVIET GEORGIA

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a recent New York Times article carried a report of a letter from 18 religious Jewish families who wish to leave their home in the Soviet state of Georgia and to become resident citizens of Israel. So far, they have not received permission from the Soviet Government to leave, and so they appealed their case in a letter to Her Excellency, Mrs. Golda Meir, Prime Minister of Israel, with a request that she transmit their letter—with signatures—to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

I found the New York Times report so interesting that I requested a copy of this unique document, which has now been submitted by the Israeli permanent representative at the United Nations, Ambassador Yosef Tekoa, to the Secretary General. It is a most inspiring letter from a very brave and dedicated group of people. It reveals a great deal about the lives of Jews in the Soviet Union.

A number of Members of the House have joined me in signing a letter which we are sending to Secretary of State Rogers urging the United States to support the request of these 18 families, and of Israel on their behalf, that the U.N.

Human Rights Commission take up, investigate, and debate their plight.

The letter from 18 Soviet Jewish families and the New York Times article to which I referred describing the submission of their case to the Secretary General, follow:

TO THE HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION, UNITED NATIONS, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

We, 18 religious Jewish families of Georgia, request you to help us leave for Israel. Each one of us, upon receiving an invitation from a relative in Israel, obtained the necessary questionnaires from the authorized U.S.S.R. agencies, and filled them out. Each was assured orally that no obstacles would be put in the way of his departure. Expecting to receive permission any day, each sold his property and gave up his job. But long months have gone by—years, for many—and permission for departure has not yet been given. We have sent hundreds of letters and telegrams; they have vanished like tears in the sand of the desert. All we hear are one-syllable oral refusals. We see no written replies. No one explains anything. No one cares about our fate.

But we are waiting, for we believe in God. We 18 religious Jewish families of Georgia consider it necessary to explain why we want to go to Israel.

Everybody knows how justly national policy, the theoretical principles of which were formulated long ago by the founder of the state, V. I. Lenin, is in fact being carried out in the U.S.S.R. There have not been Jewish pogroms, pales or quotas in the country for a long, long time. Jews can walk the streets without fear for their lives; they can live where they wish, hold any position, even as high as the post of minister, as is evident from the example of V. Dymshits, deputy chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers. There is even a Jewish deputy in the Supreme Soviet—A. Chakovsky, editor-in-chief of *Literaturnaya Gazeta*.

Therefore, it is not racial discrimination that compels us to leave the country. Then perhaps it is religious discrimination? But synagogues are permitted in the country, and we are not prohibited from praying at home. However, our prayers are with Israel, for it is written: "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, may my right hand forget its cunning." For we religious Jews feel that there is no Jew without faith, just as there is no faith without traditions. What, then, is our faith and what are our traditions?

For a long time the Roman legions besieged Jerusalem. But despite the well known horrors of the siege—hunger, lack of water, disease, and much more—the Jews did not renounce their faith and did not surrender. However, man's strength has its limits, too, and in the end barbarians broke into the Holy City. Thus, a thousand years ago, the Holy Temple was destroyed, and with it—the Jewish State. The nation, however, remained: Although the Jews who could bear arms did not surrender to the enemy and killed one another, there remained the wounded, who were bleeding to death; there remained the old people, women and children.

And whoever could not get away was killed on the spot.

But whoever could, went away into the desert; and whoever survived, reached other countries, to believe, and pray, and wait.

Henceforth they had to find a way to live in alien lands among people who hated them. Showered with insults, covered with the mud of slander, despised and persecuted, they earned their daily bread with blood and sweat, and reared their children.

Their hands were calloused, their souls were drenched in blood. But the important thing is that the nation was not destroyed—and what a nation.

The Jews gave the world religion and revolutionaries, philosophers and scholars, wealthy men and wise men, geniuses with the hearts of children, and children with the eyes of old people. There is no field of knowledge, no branch of literature and art, to which Jews have not contributed their share. There is no country which gave Jews shelter which has not been repaid by their labor. And what did the Jews get in return?

When life was bearable for all, the Jews waited fearfully for other times. And when life became bad for all, the Jews knew that their last hour had come, and then they hid or ran away from the country.

And whoever got away, began from the beginning again.

And whoever could not run away, was destroyed.

And whoever hid well, waited until other times came.

Who didn't persecute the Jews! Everybody joined in baiting them.

When untalented generals lost a war, those to blame for the defeat were found at once—Jews. When a political adventurer did not keep the mountain of promises he had given, a reason was found at once—the Jews. Jews died in the torture chambers of the Inquisition in Spain, and in fascist concentration camps in Germany. Anti-Semites raised a scare—in enlightened France it was the Dreyfus case; in illiterate Russia, the Bellis case.

And the Jews had to endure everything.

But that was a way that they could have lived tranquilly, like other peoples; all they had to do was convert to another faith. Some did this—there are cowards everywhere. But millions upon millions preferred a life of suffering and often death to apostasy.

And even if they did wander the earth without shelter—God found a place for all.

And even if their ashes are scattered through the world, the memory of them is alive.

Their blood is in our veins, and our tears are their tears.

The prophecy has come true: Israel has risen from the ashes; we have not forgotten Jerusalem, and it needs our hands.

There are 18 of us who signed this letter. But he errs who thinks there are only 18 of us. There could have been many more signatures.

They say there is a total of 12 million Jews in the world. But he errs who believes there are only 12 million of us. For with those who pray for Israel are hundreds of millions who did not live to this day, who were tortured to death, who are no longer here. They march shoulder to shoulder with us, unconquered and immortal, those who handed down to us the traditions of struggle and faith.

That is why we want to go to Israel.

History has entrusted the United Nations with a great mission—to think about people and help them. Therefore, we demand that the U.N. Human Rights Commission do everything it can to obtain from the Soviet Government in the shortest possible time permission for us to leave. It is incomprehensible that in the 20th century people can be prohibited from living where they wish to live. It is strange that it is impossible to forget the widely publicized appeals about the right of nations to self-determination—and, of course, the right of the people who comprise the nation.

We will wait months and years, we will wait all our lives, if necessary, but we will not renounce our faith or our hopes.

We believe: Our prayers have reached God. We know: Our appeals will reach people.

For we are asking little—let us go to the land of our forefathers.

## SIGNERS

Elashvili, Shabata Mikhailovich, Kutaisi, 53 Dzhaparidze St.

Elashvili, Mikhail Shabatovich, Kutaisi, 33 Dzhaparidze St.

Elashvili, Izrail Mikhailovich, Kutaisi, 31 Kirvo St.

Eluashvili, Yakov Aronovich, Kutaisi, 5 Mayakovsky St.

Khikhashvili, Mordekh Isakovich, Kutaisi, 19 Makharadze St.

Chikvashvili, Mikhail Samuilovich, Kutaisi, 38 Khakhanashvili St.

Chikvashvili, Moshe Samulovich, Kutaisi, 32 Tsereteli St.

Beberashvili, Mikhail Rubenovich, Kutaisi, 9 Klara-Tsetkin St.

Elashvili, Yakov Izralovich, Kutaisi, 54 Tsereteli St.

Mikhelashvili, Khaim Aronovich, Poti, 57 Tskhakaya St.

Mikhailashvili, Albert Khaimovich, Poti, 57 Tskhakaya St.

Mikhelashvili, Aron Khaimovich, Poti, 18 Dzhaparidze St.

Tetruashvili, Khaim Davidovich, Kutaisi, 5 Shaumyan 1st Lane

Tsitsuashvili, Isro Zakharovich, Kutaisi, 5 Shaumyan 1st Lane

Tsitsuashvili, Yefrem Isrovich, Kutaisi, 6 Shaumyan 1st Lane

Yakobishvili, Bension Shalomovich, Tollisi, 4 General Delivery (formerly lived at 91 Bar-nov St.)

Batonlashvili, Mikhail Rafaelovich, Kutaisi, 53 Dzhaparidze St.

Tetruashvili, Mikhail Shalomovich, Kula-shi, 114 Stalin St.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 11, 1969] ISRAEL SUBMITS TO U.N. AN APPEAL FROM 18 JEWISH FAMILIES WHO SEEK TO EMIGRATE FROM SOVIET GEORGIA

(By Henry Tanner)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., November 10.—Israel submitted to the United Nations today the question of the treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union.

Yosef Tekoah, the Israeli delegate, called on Secretary General Thant this morning and handed him a signed document that he said had been received from 18 Jews living in Soviet Georgia. The document accused Soviet authorities of preventing them from leaving the Soviet Union and settling in Israel.

Mr. Tekoah asked Mr. Thant to use his "good offices" to help the 18 petitioners and "to alleviate the situation of Soviet Jewry" in general.

The Israeli asked that the appeal and a covering letter be distributed as an official document of the General Assembly and he made it clear that this was the first time that Israel had brought the question of Soviet Jews into the United Nations.

The appeal was addressed: "To the Human Rights Commission, United Nations, New York, U.S.A." It began: "We, 18 religious Jewish families of Georgia, request you to help us leave for Israel."

It went on to say that after having received the required invitations from relatives in Israel, each of the signers had petitioned Soviet authorities for exit visas. After having been told that the petitions would be granted, each "sold his property and gave up his job."

"But long months have gone by—years for many—and permission for departure has not yet been given," the petitioners continued. "We have sent hundreds of letters and telegrams, they have vanished like tears in the sand of the desert. All we hear are one-syllable oral refusals. We see no written replies. No one explains anything. No one cares about our fate."

The document bore the names and addresses of the petitioners.

It was read in Russian and English at a news conference this afternoon by Mr. Te-

koah, who served as ambassador in Moscow from 1963 to 1965.

Mr. Tekoah said the petitioners had sent their appeal to him personally, with a covering letter, for transmission to the United Nations because "I am not a stranger to them and they are not strangers to me." Mr. Tekoah refused to discuss the appeal and the petitioners had used to get the appeal and the letter to him.

## THE 1965 VISIT IS RECALLED

He recalled with emotion how he had gone into the petitioners' villages in 1965 and how at each stop in neglected synagogues and in courtyards behind them, the same scene had repeated itself.

"As I spoke, upon hearing the first words in Hebrew, the entire community raised their hands in a kiss to heaven," he said. At the end, he said, he started to wish them happiness for the next year and the crowd would chant "Next year in Jerusalem."

As he moved through the crowd, the throng would be whispering a single word, "Salvation," in Hebrew, and the whisper would turn into a cry, Mr. Tekoah said.

The appeal reached Mr. Tekoah last Thursday and was transmitted to the United Nations as rapidly as possible, informed sources said. The timing thus was not controlled by the Israeli government and had no special meaning, they said.

According to the text distributed by the Israeli mission, the covering letter asked Mr. Tekoah not only to take "immediate steps" in the United Nations, but also to have the appeal "published in the press with the complete list of signers—names and surnames and, if necessary, addresses." Thirteen of the 18 petitioners are from Kutaisi, a town in western Georgia.

In the past, informed sources said, Israel refrained from taking such public action in behalf of Soviet Jews because it never had received this kind of signed request and feared reprisals. In this case the petitioners themselves had decided to discount or ignore the possibility of reprisals, the sources added.

A few dozen Soviet Jews a month have been permitted to leave the Soviet Union to go to Israel in the last few years, specialists not connected with the Israeli mission said here today.

The limited movement stopped at the time of the six-day war in 1967, when diplomatic relations between the two countries were broken off, the specialists said. Last January, there was a spurt in exit permissions and until early April about 200 persons reached Israel each month, the specialists added. Since April the number has been back to a small handful a month.

There are some three million Jews in the Soviet Union. Curbs on unrestricted emigration, without special permission, apply to all Soviet citizens.

The principal grievances of Soviet Jews include the following, according to specialists:

There is no public instruction in Yiddish even though, according to Soviet law, such language classes have to be held wherever 10 or more parents demand it, the specialists said.

The Jewish State Theater, which performed in Yiddish, was closed in 1949, and only an amateur Yiddish theater was permitted to open a few years ago, the sources said.

Few books and only one major periodical, the monthly Sovietish Heimland, appear in the Soviet Union, according to these sources.

Religious Jews are more deeply affected, the sources said, because the religious community has no central institutions. The Orthodox Church, Moslems and Protestants all are affiliated with international religious organizations abroad, but not the Jews, the specialists added.

ADDRESS BY FORMER LT. GEN.  
ARTHUR TRUDEAU

### HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 21, 1969

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, one of America's greatest spokesmen and a man who has dedicated his life to the defense of this country, former Lt. Gen. Arthur Trudeau, spoke in New Orleans on October 23.

Because his speech is so cogent and to the point and contains so many things which Americans could well ponder, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

REMARKS BY LT. GEN. ARTHUR G. TRUDEAU, USA, RETIRED, UNITED STATES DAY, NEW ORLEANS, LA., OCTOBER 23, 1969

We join today to think about our great country—past, present, and future—from a glorious past we have migrated to a hazardous present and perhaps a doubtful future.

I congratulate you on your celebration of United States Day. Americanism and patriotism are almost silent issues today. You are considered a bit queer if you want to defend and advance our country's interests along the lines our forefathers laid down. True—we still have Washington and Lincoln's birthdays, Decoration and Veterans Day—and the Fourth of July is still intact. Some figure that any other day in early July would be just as good as long as you can get away for a "long week-end." In a few places, some villages even celebrate Flag Day. Can you imagine that? God bless them. Let me say to you as one of my military associates remarked, "If any business adopted this philosophy to advertise and sell its products, like we sell ourselves short, it would be out of business."

I am most pleased to be in New Orleans again for both personal and business reasons. During World War II I had numerous occasions to come here in connection with transportation corps training for ports overseas and for the production of landing craft we assembled in Australia.

A very few years ago, my interests had turned to the oil wells, refineries and chemical plants of the Gulf Oil Corporation, when I was president of their research and development company.

Presently, I am watching with you to see what the follow-on programs in space and oceanography will bring. North American Rockwell, as you may know, has provided 170 booster engines for the Saturn 1-B rocket and about 70 to get Saturn V rockets off the ground, so the fine facilities at Michoud, where we were in support of the Boeing and Chrysler efforts, are well known to us. Of course, we are also mighty proud of our Apollo space capsules and the rockets to get the lunar landing vehicle off the Moon. The firing of Apollo XII is scheduled for November 14, 1969.

Along with others, I am concerned over any serious cutback in research and development since it serves as a major stimulant to industrial progress as well as being a keystone of national security.

As Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., director of defense research and engineering, recently said: "We must have technological superiority in order to know more about what nature has to offer, to know about the kinds of

things that another country could do and to move quickly and effectively if a new danger seems near. Note that I am talking about research and development.

"The Soviets have been expanding their research and development efforts for space, defense and atomic energy during the past few years by an average of about ten per cent a year. During the same period American defense R&D spending has gone up about four per cent a year, not quite enough to cover the inflation rate for technology: And atomic energy and space spending, together, actually have diminished. If the current critical attitude toward research and development continues, then the U.S., for the first time in its history, will lose its technological superiority."

As Aviation Week recently stated:

"There is a certain breed of cat in this country that constantly deplores the spirit of fierce competition between the U.S. and USSR that has resulted in such tremendous progress in the first decade of space exploration. If these philosophers had their way, the U.S. and the USSR would join in some vaguely cooperative effort aimed at some dimly perceived goals in the interests of saving money and improving international relations. "They fail completely to understand how space technology has become a basic sinew of national power, a dynamic spur to the economy and an important yardstick by which to measure competing systems—in short the techno-politics."

Perhaps the orbiting of the several components for a Soviet space station last week will awaken us in time.

A decade has passed and fantastic accomplishments have been witnessed since those early days when the Army led the way into space with our explorer program, but those of us then involved still feel the pride of great achievement.

While NASA was founded on the Army's breakthrough in space, many of us have deplored the national policy to deny the military importance of the exo-atmosphere. Now, after ten belated years, the urgency to establish a capability to ward off disaster is becoming all too clear. We can no longer delude ourselves as to the critical military importance of space if we are to survive. The orderly progression from our proven capabilities for manned atmospheric flight to manned space operations must be pressed until adequate international agreements have been positively achieved and demonstrated—words are not sufficient. I encourage all of you to urge your legislators to hold the line as powerful forces continue to work within our Government to degrade even further, the relatively declining balance of our military power.

I shudder to listen to the devious and sometimes unsupportable reasons given by the doves to prevent us from building an anti-ballistic missile system to defend our homeland. Remember, not a single proponent of the Nike system was called upon to testify before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, yet we have proven our ability to destroy incoming missiles for at least five years.

The scientists who oppose giving us a defense have much to answer for, in my opinion. Some have seen their own brainchild fail and hence conclude that no defensive system has any value. Others have been inhaling the alluring perfume of Communist appeasement emanating from pugwash conferences. Some honestly feel that since all missiles may not be destroyed, the system is a failure. Unfortunately, no offensive or defensive system ever devised was, is, or will be, perfect: Hence the need for the best mix possible. They have said, "You may knock down nine, but the tenth will get through." Granted, but the added deterrent power in

forcing an enemy to multiply his arsenal ten times with greatly sophisticated missiles before he dares to attack probably exceeds our measured deterrent power today.

Even if the scientists who have blasted our defensive efforts are half right, in my opinion they have displayed so narrow a view of the non-technical factors involved as to question the validity of their general conclusions.

No matter how the system is explained, be it Sentinel or Safeguard, it still is an outgrowth of Nike-type missiles going back nearly two decades. The same arguments were given to delay Nike Ajax, an anti-aircraft missile in the early fifties.

Finally, Mr. K. T. Keller, grand old engineer and great American, summoned to the Department of Defense during the Korean war, said, "There is a time when R. & D. has to pause and production and deployment begin. We learn by doing." And we did. Ajax was a great success. By 1960, Hercules, Ajax's more powerful brother, was deployed to knock down anything that could fly. It is still on station in and around the country, ready to go, and none of the nuclear accidents the Caspar Milquetoasts envision have ever occurred.

On April 1, 1958, I assumed the Office of Chief of R. & D. for the Army. More importantly, that same day saw the birth of the Nike Zeus system to knock down incoming and orbiting missiles. Again, the opposition raved and ranted, but in less than five years, this bigger brother to Ajax and Hercules was ready and able to knock down missiles.

In 1960, against opposition, I, personally, directed the use of an Ajax missile to knock down another missile. The reaction time available, 17 seconds, was much less than Sentinel would have against an ICBM, but down it came.

By 1961, President Kennedy appeared favorably disposed to early production. Pre-production funds were appropriated by the Congress in 1962 but withheld by Secretary McNamara and his whiz kids. This sad story of procrastination and delay continued until now.

While the latest decision is limited, it is encouraging. If urban areas wish to remain exposed, let us at least protect our vital installations. Every year our technology advances, but to hold up deployment until perfection is reached is unreasonable since perfection is not for man to attain. Let's build what we need to defend America. As I have said before, "We are the world's greatest nuclear nodule colony today."

I suppose the accomplishments of the Apollo flights, too, are anathema to the yuppies and hippies. The fabian socialists, non-students and caspar milquetoasts who decry our industrial strength and military capabilities. Yet, behind these flights lie years of work of thousands of people, or great industries with brilliant management, of tough-minded, disciplined men proud to wear their country's uniform. Is this what we need to reject? For what? Reject, no: Improve, yes. And how about an educational system that develops the engineers, astronauts, scientists, technicians and others to accomplish human flight to the moon? Shall we close our schools and campuses until the new leftists, students for democratic action, hippies and just plain bums tell us how to do it?

Oh, America, and each of you who are proud of being her sons and daughters, rise up and tell your government at all levels, and the agencies of the law, and the mass media—and each other—to stiffen our spines and cease permitting a cunningly and well-organized minority to create chaos and anarchy. Much of the history of this world revolves around the victory of violent, ruthless minorities subjugating the peaceful, more affluent majorities in blood baths. It

can happen here: Toynbee has written that nineteen of the world's twenty-one great civilizations have been destroyed from within. Let us not be the twentieth.

I know you share the concern of all good Americans for the future peaceful progress of our country—and the whole world. That day is not in sight, however, and won't be as long as the men in the Kremlin persist in their frequently asserted determination to destroy the free world and impose their insidious and brutal ideology on us. Their denial of a supreme being and rejection of the dignity of man are even more critical aspects of their doctrine than their determination to change the economic structure of the world.

If the Nixon administration has one mission with two parts, it is (1) maintain the determination and the actual power to rebuff the Kremlin in every major challenge: Berlin, the Balkans, the Middle East, the Far East and Latin America. The Bamboo Curtain in Southeast Asia is second only in importance to the Iron Curtain in Europe and control of the Mediterranean. (2) The betterment of our people at home can only be accomplished in a more placid atmosphere devoid of riots, chants, burning, murders, narcotics, crime and godlessness. Order must be restored. Confidence in our courts and in the forces of law and order must be restored. Our children must be less subjected to narcotics, pornography, riots, disorders, and hoodlumism.

As our President so well said, "we must speak softly, so we can hear ourselves." Amen. And we must be able to walk our streets in a pensive mood at night, without danger of theft, rape or violence. There must be peace in our land. Patience is a virtue, but if you could have seen the motley, filthy crowd who harassed and insulted our President and all good Americans at the Inaugural Parade last January, you would agree that there must be an end to such patience and that the freedom and dignity of good men demand stringent action against these despoilers of America.

The Kremlin defines peace as a condition that can only exist in a classless world and hence approves any action, no matter how violent and brutal, particularly "wars of liberation," as a justified means to achieve their goal.

I define peace as a condition that can only exist when a people are generally free from subversion, crime and disorder from within and from the threat of violence and aggression from external sources. There is one major culprit involved here and you know who and where it is.

Unlike the America of 1945, which stood united as the bulwark of free people and free nations, today we stand confused and bewildered with questionable morale, degenerating morals, a growing crime rate, a disturbed economy, an insufferable resort by tough minorities to violence and anarchy in our cities and our campuses, while our efforts to stem the tide of communism and chaos are derided in high places, challenged by beatniks and peaceniks and hamstrung by indecision. I thought the rape of Czechoslovakia would awaken us again, but our memories are short and the time is very late. The elixir of comfort and complacency among the loyal majority of our people of all colors has permitted a small but well-organized minority, backed by powerful subversive interests, to threaten all that you and I and our forefathers have managed to create and build over more than 190 years.

It is time to rally America to her terrible danger and you dare not sit idle any longer. We need to be alert.

I suppose the word "moratorium" while it means "delaying" was a reasonably acceptable term for the obstructionist tactics of a week ago. Thanks to the brashness of the

North Vietnamese Communists and the better judgment of the mass of our people, however, it was a failure, albeit a brief but noisy one. Many of its supporters are now seeking cover as the more considered statements of the President and others are clearly the indicated paths most Americans want to follow. Sound national policy cannot be evolved on the campus or city streets, and I hope we will soon end the stupidity of such disorderly efforts.

The new strategy being considered by the anti-war leaders are outlined in a memorandum now being circulated within the group. It states, in part:

"The resistance must grow and take tougher forms. These facts were purposely not made clear in the October 15 protest talks because we wanted to involve as many persons as possible in the initial demonstrations.

"The October 15 moratorium was designed to make people comfortable in their new roles of resistance. It made opposition to the war socially acceptable, perhaps even stylish. It was organized to help people shake the feeling that resistance to war is a form of treason.

"The point now is that if there is to be a truly revolutionary peace movement there must be a change in strategy. There must be direct confrontation with the Government and even violence."

Of all the amusing and out-of-place moratorium skits I saw in New York were about a dozen dissenters with heads shaved and the saffron robes of Buddhist monks trying to get attention while the fantastic Mets were closing their grip on a remarkable world series. As the ticker tape came down, the monks could have been panhandlers for all anyone cared.

But the Mets. Why did America go wild? After all, it was only a ball team. Isn't there a lesson for all of us here in courage, tenacity and teamwork? Isn't this how we arrived at the America we have today? Along with the accomplishments of brave men in peace and in war, in medicine and in space, in numerous other areas where courage, physical and intestinal, together with teamwork, is vital to success, the story of the Mets will have people shaking their heads for a long time to come. As someone said about our forefathers who crossed this great continent over 100 years ago, "The cowards never started and the weak never arrived." But strong men did and built a nation from "sea to shining sea."

There are still uncharted seas and strange lands to be conquered and a strong and courageous people were never more needed than now. Love of God and country and family could again make us the Mets among nations. As the oldest republic in this world we still have the obligation to stand tall as the symbol of freedom everywhere.

Twenty-five years ago today we were crossing the beaches of Leyte in the Philippines and Asian people rallied to MacArthur's challenge. How about Iwo Jima and Okinawa? Were we wrong in going back then? Perhaps we should even have let Australia and Southeast Asia go under then? Or Britain as well as France in 1940? What do we stand for and when do we stand for it? Are these decisions for the uninformed to make based on emotions or fear, or shall we trust our leaders to do so based on comprehensive knowledge and adherence to the philosophy on which this Nation and our civilization was built. I have faith in our system and the Republic which it supports. If democracy is only going to be the triumph of mediocrity, however, God help us!

The restoration of individual pride by upgrading our code of morals and ethics and by fostering greater freedom of enterprise, better and more responsible State and local governments, and more severe punishment

for criminal actions within just laws is essential if public safety is going to be improved and any sense of personal responsibility for government is to persist. No man, whose words and actions beget violence and destruction, is entitled to freedom. He is a menace to any society.

Abroad, we suffer from a lack of any positive policy today (or at least observable objectives), plus a constantly shrinking image. Our strategy is obscure and ineffectual, while the military challenge to our survival grows apace. Some men in high places suggest we retreat to a position of parity with an avowed enemy who constantly vouches to bury us and has the greatest clandestine capacity to destroy us politically and militarily. Yet, we seek by appeasement or convergence" to win him over. This is like feeding meat to shark.

While Russian ascendancy in the missile field, including submarines lurking off our coasts, is admitted, we have refused for eight years to build an anti-ballistic missile system that would greatly decrease damage from attack, save tens of millions of lives, and also greatly increase our deterrent power. Nuclear parity, in truth, could only result in complete inferiority for us in meeting threats of conventional war and so-called "Wars of Liberation." Today, we have no significant combat forces in the United States really ready to go, and they will be fewer as we are forced to disband those returning from Vietnam. Our depots are depleted and no new major weapons system has been successfully deployed in years. We have suspended our latest combat aircraft from operational use and are only now about to place a new one under development. Don't just take my word. Stalwart Democrats like Senators Russell, Stennis and Jackson have gone on record to this effect and fought hard to preserve our power. So much for our military position, to say nothing of all the other factors adversely affecting our international position, and the increase subversive and treasonable activities to which we are being subjected.

Even when we have the advantage, we seem to temporize. If we hadn't stood in Korea, Japan might be gone today. If we had carried the fight to victory beyond the Yalu and not given the Chinese forces sanctuary, we might not have had to be in Southeast Asia today. Ponder a moment when things look dark and some people run for cover, over what tenacity, fortitude and courage mean. Think about the Mets.

Because of our determined stand in Vietnam, 110 million Indonesians are back on our side, as well as Singapore, and Malaysia and the Philippines, and Australia and New Zealand can breathe freely again. Thailand stands sturdy as she has since Korea. Who mentions this accomplishment? Who had told you there are more Asians fighting for freedom in Vietnam than there were in Korea? These are significant gains for the free world. The routes to India are at least open from the East, even though the Suez is closed from the West. But all this gain can be lost quickly if we turn tail and run for cover now.

As the Paris talks drag on, remember the negotiations in Korea were fruitless and frustrating for two full years. The current ones could be worse. Even in the final three weeks of negotiations, as the armistice was about to be signed in July, 1953, my own division, the 7th Infantry of 18,000 Americans, lost more in killed and more in wounded during Chinese attacks at Pork Chop Hill and throughout my sector than our total forces of 500,000 men have ever suffered in Vietnam in any similar period except during the TET offensive of the summer drive, to say nothing of heavy Turkish, Ethiopian, Colombian, and Korean losses in troops then under my command. The key to peace is in the Kremlin, not in Hanoi, but we refuse to face

up to it and grow relatively weaker day by day. The American eagle is being replaced by an ostrich with its head in the sand—and some doves.

With regard to Western Europe, the threat of future conflict remains serious and unresolved. The significance of the Russian seizure of Czechoslovakia is yet to be fully realized. She has opened a new gateway through Southern Germany. The Russian outflanking of Western Europe in the Mediterranean along the North Coast, from Egypt to Algiers, now supplemented by a growing Russian fleet seeking bases in the Mediterranean and abetted by France's intransigence, has raised another threat of new and serious proportions. The total failure of Western intelligence to evaluate correctly the Soviet design on Czechoslovakia doesn't augur well for the future, either. We must maintain a balance of power in conventional forces, strategic missiles and in space so favorable to the free world that the Soviet can't afford to launch an "atomic Czechoslovakia" against either our European allies or ourselves.

As for the Middle East, the Russian thrust to take over the Arab countries remains unabated and intensifying. Israeli casualties during some periods are reported as heavier than those in the Six-Day War of 1967.

While the rearming and reorganizing of the Arabs is proceeding under the direction of more than 2,000 Soviet officers and technicians, the conquest of Yemen at the southern entrance of the Red Sea continues. Therefore, access to the Gulf of Aqaba for the Israelis may soon be meaningless if Yemen falls to Soviet control. Somalia, Aden and the Horn of Africa are likewise under increasing Soviet pressure.

With the gates to the Indian Ocean being threatened in the Red Sea to the west and Singapore to the east, access to the Persian Gulf and India is increasingly challenged. Distances between available airports and problems in flying over hostile or neutral lands even threaten to stop jet air traffic between Europe and the Pacific. The availability of essential Middle East and Libyan Oil to the free world (both Europe and the Far East), hangs in the balance.

Yet, despite all this, the indifference and even hostility of Britain and the United States toward South Africa, Rhodesia and the adjacent areas is such that our last route of access around the Cape of Good Hope to the so-called "soft," but vitally important, underbelly of Asia lies unsupported and even boycotted in part. How the Soviet must gloat over a U.S. policy that is of direct assistance to them based on our national misconceptions, meddling and misunderstanding of problems peculiar to the area! How Cecil Rhodes who attempted to find an empire in the vital area of Africa south of the tropic of capricorn, would turn over in his grave if he could view the actions and attitudes of Britain and of some Americans who have benefited by his scholarships:

You can expect to see the will of the west tested again in Berlin, the Balkans, or the Middle East. You will recall the surge of the visigoths through Western Europe in the fifth century, the Moors in the eighth, the hordes of Genghis Khan in the thirteenth, and the Ottoman Turks in the sixteenth, when they were turned back at the great naval battle of Lepanto in the Adriatic in 1513. Shall we see its counterpart off the Albanian coast in the twentieth? It could be.

Or will the mills of Megiddo, the Armageddon of the Bible, ring again to the clash of combat in the Middle East as they did in the earlier days? Whenever I think of the strategic importance of the Middle East, my mind turns back to a statement made by one of our diplomats over a hundred years ago that still may be prophetic.

In May of 1861, as our unfortunate War

Between the States was breaking out, Ambassador Cassius Clay at the Court of St. Petersburg, Russia, wrote to Secretary of State Seward in Washington and I would like to quote one paragraph from his letter. He said, "Russia and the United States will each circumnavigate half the globe in opposite directions until they meet and greet each other in the regions where civilization first began."

He apparently recognized these two great focal points of coming world power. What he envisioned in the way of how we would greet each other remains for all of us to contemplate, but certainly the area he spoke of was the hills of Megiddo, the Armageddon of the Bible.

Here in the Western Hemisphere is Cuba, armed to the teeth and subverting Latin America in a constant and deliberate manner. Even mobile missiles there could reach the southern arc of our country bounded by New Orleans, Nashville, and Norfolk, at least. And your daily reading of unpleasant events in the lands of our neighbors to the south must certainly give you pause to reflect.

Let's revitalize this wonderful Nation of ours with faith, not fear; with courage, not complacency; with selflessness, not selfishness; and with patriotism, not patronage. Let the spirit of the men in Apollo XI and the Mets symbolize an awakened America.

While I regret all the unhappiness in the world, I refuse to be brainwashed by those who seek to instill in us a feeling of guilt by association for every maladjusted and unhappy person who exists or every unfortunate incident that occurs. Forget this guilt complex. Life will always be a struggle. The Man on the cross said so 2,000 years ago. Let us build up pride by association instead—pride to be countermen of leaders like Washington and Lincoln, Tom Marshall and Oliver Wendell Holmes, Teddy Roosevelt and Douglas MacArthur, Longfellow and Will Durant, Victor Herbert and Gershwin, Edison and Henry Ford, and a host of others, big and little, who lived (and a million who died, including many of my comrades) to give us the United States of America we honor today.

#### A VIETNAMESE LOOKS AT THE MORATORIUM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, so that our colleagues may know what our allies in South Vietnam think about the moratorium activities in the United States, I include a speech by Deputy Tran-Quy-Phong in the House of Representatives of the Republic of Vietnam Congress on October 23, 1969:

SAIGON,

November 10, 1969.

Honorable JOHN R. RARICK,  
Member of Congress from Louisiana,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RARICK: It is a great encouragement for us when receiving your letter of 23 October 1969.

We, Vietnamese, know that we are not lonely in this fighting for our beloved Fatherland and for the Mankind's civilization against the cunning communist aggressors. We are sure that the oppressed people must recover their liberty some day, if not the collapse of the Mankind will be unavoidable.

We share with East Europeans the unhappiness under the terrorist regime of the Communist and hope for some day we may live

happily and enjoy Freedom and we think that such day is a sure thing.

Please believe that in this bank of the Pacific Ocean, there are people who always think about their unlucky brothers who are fighting for Freedom of their Country and survival of the World and they are not alone.

Once more, please accept our sincere thanks and best wishes to you and your compatriots who are enduring the same suffer that we are.

Sincerely yours,

TRAN-QUY-PHONG.

Attached herewith is my Briefing at the Congress on 23 October which I send to you for documentation and dissemination, if possible. Thank you.

#### U.S. ANTIWAR MOVEMENTS AND THE AMERICAN MULTIFACED POLICIES

(By Deputy Tran-Quy-Phong)

Mr. Speaker, Honorable Members, first, we would like to thank all of you, our colleagues in this House, for your favorable and quick response to our proposal to put into debate the question of "US Anti-war movements and the American Multi-Faced Politics."

Your warm response to this matter speaks out by itself the indomitable will of the Vietnamese people against all conspiracies that try to force us to surrender to the Communists.

Bringing forward this matter at today's plenary session, we intend to clarify it, and make the people know about the true nature of the current developments affecting the fate of our nation.

Also, through the forum of this House we want to speak to the people of the United States and world opinion that the Vietnamese people with a quarter of century at war, are more conscious than any other people in the world of the real value of peace.

We also want to clarify that as a traditional peace loving people, we are in full respect for the principles of expression of opinion of all citizens in a democratic country which could never be permitted to exist behind the Iron curtain. We agree that the war must be ended, and as anti-war persons in US are doing, we are opposed to the war, we are opposed to killings, we love humanity, we are eager in exercising principles of freedom and democracy.

In a realistic face of the events, however, we realize that US anti-war movements are "knocking a wrong door."

The facts are that:

1. We oppose the war. But, to oppose the war, we must oppose to the ones who make up the war, not the ones who are victims of it.

The war-mongers are not other than Russia, Communist China, and North Vietnam. To put the war to an end, we must urge the war makers to stop their aggression, not their victims to lay down their weapons for a war settlement.

2. We oppose the killing because we are men. As a poet says "I am a man, if I kill men, with whom would I live." Really, we want to end slayings. But how do ostriches with their heads in the sand cease the killing? The Communists must stop causing death. Please don't ask us to stop killing, because we kill nobody. We only defend ourselves.

3. In 1944, when U.S. and allied forces landed on Normandy shore, flames and bloodshed went on in a terrible manner between allied and Nazis troops.

Suppose that if the embarkation did not take place, so many lives would not be taken, massacre in the battle field would not happen. But then what would happen? If not the entire Europe would fall to Hitler and so many lives would be pushed into slaughterhouses.

Night by night thousands of bombers bombed Germany, so many innocent Germans were crushed under debris, but was

there anyone who had ever voiced his protest against such a war?

Mankind was represented to step up the war against the Nazis and mankind itself applauded the righteous cause of this war.

Ridiculously, the Vietnamese people in resistance against aggression is being condemned. That is really an unfair thing and a contradiction. Is it right the good cause of Europe in the world war II turned to the "false" one when it is applied to this self defense war in V.N.?

If we are forced to stop our anti-aggression war for the sake of humanity, it is similar to an action of giving a hand to the Communist conquest, a form of the most inhuman domination in the history of mankind.

4. We are in an eagerness, more than anyone else of ideals of freedom and democracy. We are hungry of them as the lungs need air. And by that, we are fighting in bitterness and sorrow throughout 25 years long. If we don't love Freedom and Democracy, we should have allowed ourselves to surrender to the Communist aggressors and accept a life of slaves, prisoners; of mortal liquidation and terrorism in which the Russians, Communist Chinese, Eastern Europeans now are living. Ones who survived in such regime are dragging a life not of a man.

To escapists who are in an urgent demand for the end of the VN war by an unconditional giving up, we would like to quote a Vietnamese writer as saying:

"Vietnamese's tears are pouring, and will pour a long time.

"Vietnamese are bleeding, and bleeding unceasingly.

"Our people is a tiny one, but suffers great misfortune.

"Our endurance is a giant one.

"If bitterness and hardship are to be measured:

"Vietnam is invincible.

"Vietnam stands first in bodies counting and corpses gathering.

"During 25 years, V.N. condoleces—V.N. makes burials endlessly."

We are tearing and bleeding since a long time, our people are much unfortunate, excessive of sorrow. Count bodies, pick up dried skeletons: We win championship and keep on counting and burying until unspecified time.

Recently, we have just counted from the bottom of spring Suoi Da Mai in Thua-thien Province another thousands of skulls, pieces of bones of innocent people massacred by the Communists.

We are plunged in grief, in indignation. Through years of war no family has not received bad news of their sons, their brothers from every corner of the country.

So, we hate the war, and we are in hatred of it. We want peace but we still have to keep up fighting for our self-defense. If one cannot blame a man who nearly dies of thirst that "Is it not enough for you in such a thirst?"

"Why don't you stay lying down like this but waste your force to crawl away for water?" so he cannot accuse us of being warlike. We know that as long as the war goes on, we still face long sufferings, but we still have hope for preserving freedom for our next generations, and also for youngsters of free nations that have not been yet under direct Communist threats, rather than a surrender to the Communist aggressors.

In conclusion, we want anti-war persons to ask war initiators for an immediate stop of their aggression, and not to ask us to surrender. Someone had complained: "Oh, Liberty! On behalf of you, they are making so many crimes!" We also want to follow in this way to say "Oh, Peace, on behalf of you, they are encouraging aggressors."

Mr. Speaker, and Honorable Members, in a one-faced judgment, we can say the anti-war movements are launched because of the

presence of over a half million of U.S. soldiers in Vietnam.

Therefore, before going into full particulars of Anti-War Movements and True Picture of the Multi-Faced Politics in the U.S., we think we should have a look back to the past to see from when and how the Americans are present at this outpost of Freedom, and to know that a U.S. retreat from this common defense line is very dangerous and will never happen.

The independence of this country was recognized by the United States since 7 Feb. 1950. In a first move to support V.N. President Truman announced June 27, 1950 that the U.S. was sending a 35 man military assistance advisory to V.N. On December 23, the U.S. signed a Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement with Vietnam, and on September 7, 1951, the U.S. agreed to provide direct economic assistance to V.N.

After the Geneva Conference, President Eisenhower declared October 24, 1954 that U.S. economic aid to V.N. was being increased, and on February 12, 1955, the U.S. agreed to train Republic of V.N. Armed Forces. On February 19, 1955, SEATO, in which the U.S. is playing a vital role, extended to offer protective cover of South Vietnam.

On October 26, 1960, President Eisenhower pledged solemnly U.S. continue assistance to V.N. for its defense.

On April 3, 1961, President Kennedy's Administration signed the Treaty of Amity and Economic Relations with Vietnam, and by the end of this same year (December 14) President Kennedy declared U.S. prepared to help R.V.N. preserve its independence.

After the revolution that overthrew President Ngo-dinh-Diem, U.S. forces in V.N. numbered 15,000 in December 1963 and then were being gradually stepped up to more than a half of million by the end of 1968.

On February 7, 1966, President Johnson and Premier Nguyen-cao-Ky in their joint communique declared at the end of Honolulu meeting that the two countries would continue to resist aggression.

Another fact that is necessary to be considered is that on August 7, 1964, after North Vietnamese fleet attacked U.S. destroyers *Maddox* and *Turner Joy* in Gulf of Tonkin, all U.S. legislators, (except two) voted the "Gulf of Tonkin Resolution" empowering the President of the United States to exercise all necessary measures to repel any armed attacks against U.S. forces and to prevent any further aggression.

This fact evidences that U.S. engagement in the war against Communist aggression in V.N. was a work which has been favored by a majority of the American people, it is not a work of an individual or a party.

In reviewing all of the foresaid facts, we come to realize that U.S. engagement and pledge to safeguard S.V.N., an out post of the Free World, were unquestionable, and they were initiated by 5 successive U.S. Presidents, from Truman to Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and now Nixon, of both the two big parties of the U.S. It was a commitment that was calculated and prepared carefully, not the one that was decided in a hurry, and so, it is not easy to be given up over a night with no regard to honor and existence of the United States herself.

#### U.S. BIPARTY POLITICS

Present anti-war movements in US are noisily launched by a number of congressional democrats criticizing the Nixon administration's VN war policy.

They are doing as though the one who caused the war and made US troops pinned down in VN is President Nixon and his Republican Party.

Everyone is well aware that pouring US troops into VN was the work of the Johnson administration of the Democratic Party. But, it is so ridiculous, the ones who seem

to be strongly demanding for an end of the war and immediate withdrawal of US troops from S.V.N. are leaders of the Democratic Party.

Why? The answer is really simple. It is a dispute of power between the two parties.

Mr. Nixon's winning in the 1968 presidential election not only kicked out Hubert Humphrey but also his Democratic Party from the US administration. So, accusations against Nixon and anti-war activities are looked only as an oral battle of Democrats against Republicans for their purpose of winning more votes in coming elections opening way for Democratic Party to return to power.

The Democrats have sent troops to VN, and once held command of the VN war until 1968. If the democrats really want a disengagement of US forces from VN, why didn't they do that during the whole time they were in power!

So is the picture of US political life, and it is only a dispute between the Democratic Party and Republican Party.

Now suppose that the Democrats return to power in the coming election, the VN war policy of the US will remain unchanged, and then the Republicans will take their turn to attack the ruling party. All are for obtaining votes; US policy under either party never changes its major and common objectives.

On the other hand, stopping Red China from expansion as far from the US as possible is still an unchangeable strategy of US policy.

Pulling out a large number of US forces from VN is necessary when the US achieves its strategic goals here.

The US Democratic leaders also understand that fact and their loud for US withdrawal is considered only as a move to "push an already open door."

The Democrats were making great efforts, even sacrificing their presidential seat, to fulfill U.S. strategic objectives in VN for the sake of the U.S. interests. These objectives were accomplished and the Communists have been defeated. This is a work "well-done" mostly by hardworking Democrats. The Democrats, however, do not like to witness the Nixon Administration and the Republican Party inheriting their glorious achievements, and nor do they want to see Nixon winning hearts of the American citizens when he is calling home an increased number of U.S. soldiers from VN that the Democratic governments could not do during their tenure of power.

In doing something to recover sympathy from the Americans, the Democrats are noisily criticizing to withdraw U.S. troops from SVN even though they have known better than anyone else that their demand is not necessary because Nixon did withdraw U.S. troops, and will do that when he feels it is necessary. As I mentioned in foregoing analysis, U.S. pullout is mandatory when U.S. goals are achieved. However the Democrats want the American people to know that withdrawal of U.S. forces from South Vietnam is an accomplishment of their party, by pretending that they have forced Nixon and his Republicans to do.

Doing by such a way the Democrats hope they will obtain more votes from the American public in the coming elections as result of their present efforts.

#### REPUBLICANS ALSO WANT TO PUSH ANTIWAR MOVEMENTS TO CLIMAX

The Democrats are acting for votes. But the Republicans are not staying still. The fact is that the Republicans also want to push antiwar wave up to a climax. For what? To make the enemy (North Vietnam, Red China and Russia) understand that they will have no reasonable hopes that escapists and defeatists in U.S. will be capable of forcing Nixon's administration to surrender in Vietnam.

At the peak of those anti-war movements, President Nixon announced determinedly that he is not going to be the first President presiding over a US surrender. He wanted to say that the Communists had better be reasonable, enter quickly in serious negotiations. And everything has been made clear that anti-war movements cannot make President Nixon change his mind.

That is the true picture of anti-war activities in US. We also understand, however, that there have been not only those Americans who are opposed to the VN war, but a majority of the American people are giving full support to the resistance of the Vietnamese people against Communists because they are conscious that they are fighting for the US itself.

Through anti-war activities in US, we have some particular remarks: First, political opposition in a democratic system like the one in US is a very normal thing. Second, not all American citizens voted for Nixon, but nearly a half of them were voting for Humphrey. However, the most remarkable happening is that according to democratic procedures, political opposition should logically be expressed through elected representatives in the Congress forum, not by taking to streets or violence.

The Democratic Party now has a majority in both Houses, if the Democrats really want a US retreat from VN, why don't they put the VN problem to the vote by their majority to force Nixon to do way they want?

They don't do that, but they do incite students to act the way as "Do the thing I say, not the thing I do". They know better than anyone else that they have to serve interests of the USA, of their party and of their own. These interests so important that a hurry retreat from VN is somewhat impossible. It is a ridiculous thing when Vietnamese students were abused by political profiteers in 1965. Now American students are taken advantage of by a group of political opportunists.

Anti-war movements in US are reflecting a mood of living with full conditions of democracy in conformity with US democratic tradition. These movements prove that even a minority has the right to voice its impression, its attitude.

However, people like Pham van Dong and others, who are used to do the way of the Communist dictators, cannot imagine and be conscious of such an opposition and quickly sent greetings to pacifist leaders. This act gives no advantage to the Communists themselves, but it unmasked their dirty faces to world opinion.

#### GRASPING INITIATIVE IS NECESSARY

Now we know well about the true picture of US politics and anti-war movements, and we have no reasons to be confused about demands for US pullout and about escapist acts of a group of Americans.

The only complaint is that we don't grasp firm initiative.

We forget that anti-war movements in US are only a "magic show" of both sides in a power dispute in a democratic regime.

We sincerely think that our current problem is not the one of worry about anti-war activities in US that can push the Nixon administration's sellout of RVN, but the one of how we must show initiative in determining our own peace and war policies.

It is because we have not grasped yet our initiative, we are still under a permanent delusion by this movement to that movement from some remote country, completely far from our homeland.

We don't blame anyone, we don't blame ourselves either.

We must understand that the Americans have their own problems and we also have our own.

Therefore, although the Vietnamese and the Americans are allied peoples, each side has some problems and interests that some-

times contradict each other. The problem is we have to grasp initiative in all matters regarding peace and war which presently are our vital interests we should be fighting for at any cost.

Mr. Speaker and Honorable Members, I think we make our own voice and clarify our position today not because we are worried about anti-war movements in US which would possibly force President Nixon to give up this country. On the contrary, we feel necessary to voice loudly, clearly, and frankly before both friends and foes of ours that we will never be affected by their maneuvers, that we are well aware of their international conspiracies.

We also know very well in what position we are staying, and we have to determine that we will never accept to be played in any game of any of our friends or foes.

We wish that our drafted resolution be discussed and favorably passed in an effort to contribute some of our part to the present glorious struggle of our people. We thank you all.

#### AVIATION ADDRESS

### HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 21, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, an exciting age is dawning for our commercial aviation industry. In the next few months, the introduction of the Boeing 747 into the air lanes of the world will revolutionize air travel. This second generation superjet, capable of carrying more of our citizens safer, higher, faster and more economically than any aircraft ever before built, should herald a second travel revolution in our jet age.

However, in this very rosy sky, storm clouds are gathering. Rising operational costs, greater labor costs, increased subsidized foreign competition from without, and unregulated competition from within, have placed our airline industry into a real economic plight.

Mr. Najeeb Halaby, president of Pan American Airways, and a former Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, is deeply concerned about what is happening to our commercial air carriers. His recent address entitled "The Great Airline Dilemma," which Mr. Halaby delivered before the International Aviation Club in Washington, is timely indeed. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, and that the questions and answers which follow also be included.

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

#### THE GREAT AIRLINE DILEMMA

(By Najeeb E. Halaby)

Selecting a subject for so sophisticated an audience as this is not easy, and certainly civil aviation has enough things to think about these days. The aviation community has its full share of concerns: fare warfare; the introduction of the 747 and other wide-bodied jets; supersonic projects in the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States and France; inflationary wage settlements; skyjacking rampant until some of the recent vigorous efforts produces some control; skyrocketing fees for landing and handling around the world; airport, airways and ground access; foreign-flag airline de-

mands for still greater access to the richest market of all here at home; confusion, to say the least, over the proper role of the supplementals; the sound of speed and, I have named only a few of the hottest and noisiest. It is only natural and proper that the new Administration has started a new international air policy review to update the last one published in 1963.

A number of us here participated in that review which President Kennedy directed in September 1961 and published in April 1963 after numerous inside and outside studies, extensive consultation within the aviation industry, and months and months of discussion and debate amongst the departments and agencies. Some of us have moved from academia to panacea. Some have gone from high corporate or banking life to high policy life in Washington. And, I guess if you got them all in one room this would certainly be the world's most experienced study group. What this exchange of roles dramatizes and what I'll try to emphasize is that each of us has a role to play in a comprehensive U.S.-flag international air transport system. As I see it, the current review should be oriented toward the analysis of this system—its performance, both qualitative and quantitative, past, present, and future.

The 1963 policy survived and served the nation rather well until it was shattered by the decisions in the Transpacific and other recent route cases. And, I guess, the lesson from this, which we should have known all along, is that national policies mean something only so long as our rulers and regulators have convictions about them and hold to them.

Now this new Presidential policy is welcomed by those who have been asking for decisions on merits, who are desirous of policies rather than pressure as determinants of the course of international aviation. Naturally all of us want "to be helpful." That is, "participate" in some way in such a study.

And as we found in 1961 and 1963, I hope the policy formulators of 1969 and 1970 will find, it is desirable to have independent, non-governmental sources of enrichment of these studies. It would, it seems to me, be desirable to have seasoned sources of systems analysis provide inputs into this study unfettered by either commercial or bureaucratic bias. And I assume—I guess we all assume—that in addition to answering questionnaires and submitting data for the record, that the Administration will call upon private leaders of U.S. international aviation, jointly or severally, to comment upon the proposed policies in the late stages of their development before they've been presented to the President for decision.

#### COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM

This kind of dialogue proved extremely valuable to President Kennedy in early 1963 and could well serve President Nixon as he pilots U.S. into the turbulent '70's.

The 1963 study sought: "A well reasoned policy for international air transport . . . (that) will carry us far toward the primary objective of U.S. international air transport policy; to develop and maintain an expanding, economically and technologically efficient international air transport system best adapted to the growing needs of the free world, and to assure air carriers of the United States a fair and equal opportunity to compete in world aviation markets so as to maintain and further develop an economically viable service network wherever a substantial need for air transportation develops."

I emphasize the word "system" and you should know what I am assuming about that word. It is really defined in Section 102 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958—the same as the 1938 Act—and when the references are made to the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, the postal service, the

national defense—and you are, of course, familiar with the background and the interpretations of that Act.

I'd like to try a fair translation of what the system should mean today. The U.S.-flag international air transport system should, in my judgment, make it possible for the American traveler and shipper consistently to conserve ever more time at reasonable prices. And along with the State, Defense and Post Office departments, travelers and shippers should have access to U.S.-flag service almost anywhere in the world—service assured by professional management and regulated by our own government in terms of both safety and adequacy.

It should contribute to the gross national product of the United States; that is, create growing employment opportunities and demands for domestic goods and services.

(Incidentally, it should provide a market for American-built transport and accessories—and by operating these competitively throughout the world, create corresponding export markets abroad.)

It should improve the U.S. balance of payments by saving foreign exchange through providing U.S.-flag airline service for Americans which would otherwise have to be bought from foreign lines. And so long as the American market forms roughly two thirds of the world market, this is most important and growing in importance.

Further, it should gain foreign exchange by attracting the patronage of foreign travelers and shippers to U.S.-flag service, that is, exports of American air services, and by helping to create foreign markets for American aircraft, engines, and accessories.

And, finally, it should keep a civil air transport system in being, ready for a national emergency, supported by commercial trade in peacetime.

#### WELFARE OF CARRIER

I think the Act without question contemplated the continuation of American democratic capitalism and that this kind of system should be built with private capital, and therefore the system must operate profitably if it is to raise the new capital in the private market—the capital essential to continued growth in both size and quality.

Therefore, when I talk about a U.S.-flag system, I am not talking about lines on a map or even of traffic. I am talking not about the system in the narrow sense of the regulatory process, but of a subtle complex of technical skill, the marketing ability, sound earnings and strong capital positions, all moving with a constantly changing global environment.

Now if that's comprehensive enough for you, it seems to me we should study the performance of the system under the existing U.S. policy. In other words, since 1963 have we gained or lost ground in the pursuit of our objectives? And, no less important, what are our prospects for the future? Only on this basis, I believe, can we find out whether our government policies have served the system well or badly. If these policies have served the national interest and the public interest badly, then they need amending, and this should be done systematically and comprehensively, not just case by case.

I am emphasizing the performance of the system as a whole because of one obvious peculiarity in our regulatory system compared with those of other nations. Of course, I am not the first to observe that the statute imposes on the members of the Civil Aeronautics Board an adversary case-by-case system, shifting the greater part of the initiative to the adversary rather than to the planner or engineer of the system.

Even in a very large and complex case covering a broad area, it is hard for the Board to gain a true and timely over-view of the probable consequences of its decision. Still less—as far as I know—is there any estab-

lished way of reviewing, year by year, the way in which the decisions of the Board have worked out, *cumulatively* in practice within the perspective of the total system.

Perhaps there should be assigned in the Board staff a kind of "policy keeper" whose job would be to advise in each case, and on a semi-annual basis, the extent to which the President's announced policy is being carried out.

To those who would have us steer by the stars rather than the lights of each passing ship, we pledge our full support, and, in fact, I guess most of us are praying for success of this latest in a series of searches for national air policy.

I think it is most important at this moment in aviation history, however, that the Administration explicitly state its intent to preserve a strong, regulated, U.S.-flag air transport system which enjoys the full confidence of the public and the financial community on which the industry depends.

#### HIGH LABOR COSTS

In this respect, the 1963 policy was both wise and practical, when it said that consideration must be given "to the welfare of the carrier," recognizing that that welfare must be thickened by the warm summer fare as well as thinned by the cold winter diet of empty seats, strengthened by the routes they have pioneered and improved as well as weakened by the effort of developing new routes and struggling with the foreign flags and their cartels, for all the ethnic markets that exist within our country and elsewhere.

Coming back to the analysis underlying this new policy, I think the result must be clear that the system envisaged in 1963 has been thrown out of balance by costs, competition and the complexity and uncertainty of the regulatory system. We now face a situation in our great industry where:

Costs are rising steeply with no corresponding improvement in revenues.

Competition is excessive and increasing, and,

Complexity and unpredictability of the regulatory system involving both the U.S. and foreign governments is limiting and undermining management's best efforts in forward planning.

Problem number one, the rise in costs, will continue to plague the airlines. Labor costs are particularly worrisome. To give you one example, Pan Am had a net income of \$49 million in 1968. That was before we signed contracts with five unions representing 25,000 employees in mid-1969. Had the 1970 to 1972 wage level, as provided in these contracts, been in effect in 1968—in other words, projecting backwards to 1968 the 1970-1972 labor cost—our costs for that year would have been \$100 million greater than they actually were. In other words, our operating profit for all of 1968 would have been more than wiped out.

The increased level of wages since the new contracts will exert heavy pressure on the profitability of all the carriers in the future, even the supplementals as they become organized by the same or similar unions. The financial analysts are perhaps right when they say we in the scheduled industry are enjoying "profitless prosperity." "Enjoy," however, is not the right verb, despite our dogged optimism in the face of adversity.

The unions, as you know, have a specially tight grip on the airlines. True collective bargaining, historically and properly designed to equalize labor's role, is becoming a myth, a remnant of "the folklore of capitalism." Collective bargaining assumed that two sides would be more or less evenly matched. Today the unions have overwhelming economic strength, and are applying it with fewer scruples and more muscles while the public responsibilities of common carriers as public utilities make them particularly susceptible to union techniques.

#### REASONABLE COMPETITION

Rivalry among unions presents an enormous impetus to the spiraling costs, and nowhere in sight do we see a process of balancing the relative powers of labor and management to serve the general public.

This, of course, is a problem for all transportation, not just all airlines, and I am certainly not wise enough to stand and say that I have a pat solution nor that I want to propose a crackdown or rigid wage controls or other oversimplified answers. But, the process for setting labor cost has become at once the least controllable and most significant part of the management of the air transportation system we seek. It requires the urgent attention of government and airline labor and management.

Moving to the subject of competition, my view is rather simple, perhaps too much so. Competition in and of itself is neither good or bad. It is a very powerful public policy, a means to an end. It can be good for the consumer as in the soap business or very costly as in the telephone business. In the airline business—even though it is a public utility and would expect to be treated like a public utility, free from competition because of regulation—we can and should have competition. We should have that level of competition that promotes growth and assures safe, convenient, necessary service at a reasonable price. But in the international environment—where the American regulator cannot control all that happens in the market—one kind of competition that is, the addition of new U.S. carriers, must be weighed against the consequences it often brings.

First, it brings increased reciprocal services to the United States by foreign carriers—frequently higher cost, higher fare carriers.

Second, it brings limitations on the ability of the U.S. carriers to offer increased capacity.

Third, it frequently brings serious limitations on the U.S. carriers' use of the most efficient equipment at optimum frequency.

Does all this really help the passenger and shipper? I think not, and I think we ought to stop assuming that multiplying the number of U.S. flags will automatically mean better service for the consumer whom the carriers and the Government exist to serve. It has not been true historically that there is automatic improvement. For example, examine our experience in South America. And, certainly there is no reason to believe it will be true in the future.

I know that you know that I speak for a "have" carrier, one that has a lot of international routes. But none of them is a monopoly, and competition is already at work and there are other means to spur improvement of the U.S.-flag carriers where needed.

I hope, however, you won't disqualify me for having this conviction about the balance and multiplicity of competition. This is a conviction about an industry to which I have devoted much of my life. More importantly, I hope you will not be deterred from asking whether the point I make does not have objective merit for all of us in assessing civil air transport in the Seventies.

#### ROUTE SECURITY

The 1963 Air Policy Statement wisely warned that "neither the interest of the air transportation system nor the countries involved are served when a route with little traffic is burdened by a number of carriers greater than is economically justifiable."

Violation of this policy within the protected domestic market is perilous. To ignore it on the international routes is potentially catastrophic. A careful review of negotiations with foreign governments since 1963 will, I think, show that the presence of two or three U.S.-flag carriers increasingly forces many foreign governments concerned to do two things: first, to seek additional reciprocal

rights in the United States for their own flag carriers; second, to try to limit the frequency of the U.S.-flag carriers. What's more, the new rights granted to the foreign-flag carrier frequently result in not only restrictions but in pressure for upward revision of fares.

Finally, the efforts of the American-flag carriers are fragmented, the dollar outflow is increased, and neither can offer the full spectrum of service required to compete fully in the market.

There has recently been a suggestion from the Department of Transportation that the route structure from the East Coast to Europe be revised to permit more U.S. airlines to offer one-plane service to the Continent from U.S. inland cities. The present assignment of routes which was designated to remain in force until 1973 has two U.S. scheduled combination airlines (and one cargo carrier) competing against 20 foreign airlines, six U.S. supplementals, and nine foreign supplementals based in Europe, a total of nearly 38 carriers, depending on the month and the mood of their promoting governments.

This suggestion to add more is not going to make things merrier, and the going greater, except possibly for the plane makers. A reasonable degree of route security has been the cornerstone of the Federal Aviation Act and the regulatory process. The scheduled airlines must plan for the use of billions of dollars worth of equipment well in advance. Pan Am's own public service improvement program alone adds up to a billion dollars.

Therefore when a major route case is opened or even when it's completed, the scheduled airlines need to receive some assurance that the flight carpet will not be pulled out from under them in mid-program. The carrier is entitled to benefit over a reasonable period of time from use of its equipment in markets it has developed. Assurance of tenure, when the competitive balance is preserved, leads ultimately to better public service.

#### COMPETITIVE BALANCE UPSET

We feel at Pan Am we can discuss competition with some authority and experience. I guess it's fair to say we face more competition than any other airline and perhaps more than any other private corporation in the world. Pan Am's transatlantic services are in direct competition with 37 other airlines. We compete with 49 operating to and from Latin America, and 15 to and from the Pacific area. Of course, most of it has been enthusiastically bestowed upon us by our own government, by the Board and by the State Department, and both of these agencies pay us repeatedly a high compliment of thinking that we are resourceful enough to absorb an infinite amount of punishment all at once.

These same agencies apparently have a lower opinion of some other of our friendly competitors, foreign and domestic, whose competitive opportunities seem to be widening. The Government at times seems to feel that it owes a living to the nonscheduled airlines, and almost enthusiastically gives them preferential treatment. The Government grants foreign-flag airlines access to the great American market in a manner not always commensurate with the value of U.S. rights abroad.

For example, our Government has jealously safeguarded the privilege of Irish Airlines to operate from New York, Boston, Chicago, but has confessed in the past an inability to persuade the Irish government to permit Pan Am, the selected American-flag airline a comparable opening to serve Dublin.

One must ask whether the reason is governmental indifference or governmental inability to moderate political preference with economic prudence.

And, of course, the government has authorized every domestic trunk line to compete with Pan Am outside the mainland

while denying Pan Am supporting routes at home. Why, ask some of the government's top officials, doesn't Pan Am apply for domestic routes? "Well," we have patiently explained, "they had upset the balance of civil air power prescribed in the 1963 U.S. Air Policy but had not rebalanced the competitive opportunity at home for the U.S.-flag carriers designated to take on the foreign-flag carriers worldwide."

On reflection, we doubt that many were fully aware of all that had been involved in this most unmanageable case in the world's aeronautical history. Our recent, very limited application to carry fill-up traffic on our nearly empty aircraft serving only international destinations across the United States via New York, California and Hawaii, will not cure our weakness in the heartland of our own market, but it will provide us with a transfusion while a cure is found.

As far as the supplementals are concerned, the recent leadership of the CAB must now recognize that it has produced what amounts to ambivalence in regulatory policy. Accidentally or intentionally, the Board has created two transport industries: the scheduled one which it regulates, and the nonscheduled one which it can regulate in theory—but does not in practice.

The result is an industry that is half slave and half free. Why is the slave part regulated? The answer is that airlines like TWA, Northwest, Braniff and Pan Am are charged with a public interest responsibility and with a national defense obligation. And they should be.

#### REDEFINE NONSKEDS ROLE

However, in the course of executing these obligations, these airlines are compelled by definition to operate at relatively low load factors. And this means that the fares they charge must be sufficient to cover the costs of total public service, including the empty seats and empty cargo space represented by the relatively low load factors.

Now there is, of course, a place for the supplemental air carrier. That place is the market for charters—military and commercial—where the scheduled carriers cannot provide the capacity and that do not divert individually ticketed passengers from the scheduled carriers.

I am convinced that, as they are now preferred and policed, the supplementals do divert from the regular industry more than they generate new business. I believe that analysis will demonstrate the following four conclusions:

1. The majority of passengers traveling on charter flights from the U.S. to Europe have flown abroad before on scheduled airlines;
2. About 70 per cent of them would have gone abroad on regularly scheduled flights if there had been no charter flight;
3. At least 80 per cent of the charter passengers travel individually in Europe rather than in a group; and
4. The majority consider the charter sponsoring organizations as nothing more than an air travel booking agent who can provide them with cut rates for travel abroad.

If these conclusions are demonstrable, then the air policy makers clearly have the opportunity and the obligation to re-establish a single system of regular service and re-define an enforceable role for the non-scheduled carriers to supplement rather than supplant the public utility carriers. In other words, they should be regulated again and strictly limited to charters and military airlift. Careful thought could also be given to the public service the supplementals could provide in association or consolidation with regional service carriers and air taxi operators where the extraordinary ingenuity and resources of the supplementals could prove their ability to generate new markets and fulfill public demands.

In addition to all the other problems that seem before us, the international airlines

are faced with a most serious fare crisis in about six years. Now, at Lausanne, the fare men are again seeking agreement, surrounded by an unprecedented number of fare filings at below cost figures. The scheduled air carriers of IATA react to the large new capacity increases of 1970 (some 45,000 additional seats will be added in 1970 alone) and react to the frightening diversion of their traffic by the charterers in 1969, estimated between 750,000 and 850,000 passengers across the Atlantic by the supplementals alone.

#### SIMPLIFY FARES

In this situation, what should our fare policy be and what should be our method of setting fares around the world? First, to discuss the method of setting fares, there has been over the years a conflict between the U.S. antitrust philosophy with its emphasis on pricing in the open market in response to the interplay of supply and demand, and, on the other hand, the widespread pooling and cartel practices of the rest of the world.

The result has been the development of the International Air Transport Association as a vehicle for establishing fares in the international market. From 1961 through 1963, American policy makers labored diligently to find a superior alternative. These alternatives ranged from free market pricing without any restraints to fare fixing by governments themselves.

In the end, after the most thorough discussion, no one could come up with a better method than that which is still in effect; namely unanimous agreement among scheduled carriers servicing the region followed by government reviews and government approval, disapproval, or proposed government variation of the agreed upon fares. Despite all of its shortcomings, its frustrating slowness and the difficulty of achieving unanimity, the IATA machinery is still the best practically available to us.

What should the U.S. objective in these conferences be? It seems to me that the first objective is to serve the passenger and the shipper with lowest fares at which the carriers can recover costs and a fair return on investment. Obviously this kind of fare must create additional opportunities; that is, it must generate business. The fares must also balance out the system revenues, so that from a cold, poor season of deficits the carriers can recover to the warmer, happier season of profits.

The second objective should be to reach agreement and avoid, if you will, a devastating price warfare such as led to the near destruction of the world's maritime shipping system not too many decades ago. The third is to support and preserve the position of tour operators and travel agents who feed and stabilize the air travel business. Finally, and this is far from the least objective, we should seek early and thorough simplification of the fare structure. It is now possible for passengers traveling in the Economy section on an Atlantic flight, New York to London, to be traveling on 18 different fares. Not only does this confuse the passenger and agent, but requires the most difficult and expensive training of airline people themselves, results in numerous mistakes and opportunities for violation of the rules.

So, as we anxiously await the outcome of deliberations at Lausanne, I believe we would have to say the IATA machinery is the best currently available or in sight and that it will probably ultimately lead to agreement on Atlantic fares through 1971. And miraculously these fares will continue to be relatively lower in cost than any other comparable service you can buy anywhere in the world!

#### HIGH TECHNOLOGY

I have discussed the problems confronting the industry: costs, competition, complexity. My remarks thus far hardly reflect the reputation of airline executives for sparkling optimism in the face of adversity. However,

there are positives as well as negatives, clear skies as well as clouds. It's ironic that the industry faces so many problems on the very eve of what promises to be a revolution in technology and public service.

Symbolic of this superjet age, of course, is the Pan Am 747, soon to be followed by the DC-10 and Lockheed 1011. Of course, this is the logical, high technology choice for airline management in its quest for an economically sound and efficient system of air transportation.

In 1965, when we and Boeing decided to go ahead with the 747 for airline use, there was a sound basis of national policy and very sound economics on which to place the \$600 million order for 25—the largest single forward commitment in aviation history. And, as in the past, a U.S.-flag carrier would lead the world into this new era of mobility.

The public thinks of the 747 as the biggest, but for the industry it's the most spacious and the most highly qualitative airplane of all—a compendium of everything we've learned in over 40 years of building aircraft. And it will be without question, the best commercial aircraft ever produced, best not only in terms of passenger comfort but best in terms of operational reliability, aerodynamic efficiency, flight safety, economics, and airworthiness in general.

Despite current problems, that is our prediction, and of course new technology does indeed mean better service. It also means increased efficiency and economies of operation. These economies in turn enable us to introduce and retain fares which broaden the market and provide the earnings needed to re-invest once again in new technology. You are all familiar with the pattern. It has been the cycle of progress for the civil air transport industry.

Now the cycle has been thrown out of balance by the problems which I've discussed with you today. However, we have every confidence that the 747 will go a very long way towards solving some of these problems, improving earnings, and restoring balance to the cycle of progress.

Against the darker background which I've painted, there are other bright spots in the foreground. The world air travel market is still growing and we can remind ourselves that only about two per cent of the world's three and one half billion souls have ever flown in an airplane. And amidst all the fears and frustrations that have recently beset us, we can be encouraged that the record of the scheduled U.S. carriers for safety, reliability, and quality of service continues its upward course.

#### NEED NEW PUBLIC POLICY

Finally, I think we can afford to enjoy a renewed sense of confidence in our governmental leadership at State, Transportation, and CAB. We are most fortunate in the midst of these stormy skies that President Nixon has put in the Washington cockpit both experienced and intellectual men of great integrity and responsibility.

In closing, I would suggest that we rededicate ourselves to the community of interest we all share in an economically sound and technologically efficient and dynamically competitive civil air transport system.

I think we can navigate between the thunderstorm of "the more the merrier" and "Mt. Monopoly" on the other side. I think we can and should abandon the recent tendency toward multiplication of carriers and the inevitable addition of deficits.

I think it's only fair to say that the world does not owe the supplemental a living, nor does it owe the scheduled carriers a sanctuary, but it does owe the traveler and the shipper a door-to-door, dock-to-dock system of safe and efficient common carriage by regulated public utilities. I think it's true, and certainly recent negotiations in Japan and Malaysia have been good examples, that the international carriers of the United States

should be assured a fair, full and equal opportunity to compete with our friends abroad, whether as individual carriers or in pool.

And, I do think, despite the current squalls, that we can pull out of this current descent and ascend to higher heights of public service and economy on the wings of a strong new, public policy.

#### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

*Q. Can you please comment on mergers?*

HALABY. The subject of mergers has been covered recently in two public statements, one by the Assistant Secretary of Transportation, who stated that there was under development within the federal government a policy regarding mergers. I'm sure that all of you in this room are as curious and as anxious about this proposed policy as we are. We await that with great interest.

The other was a statement by the Chairman of Pan Am to the effect that Pan Am was considering the subject of mergers. I think it is fair to say that as a result of the very great proliferation of additional carriers, both domestic and international, this is one of the most active studies among almost all of the managements, particularly of the trunks.

There have been discussions with one or two carriers, and I'm sure there will be more. We have no merger under negotiation or in prospect. We do, however, feel that this may be one way to strengthen this international air transport system and assure a greater U.S. share of it.

*Q. I wonder if I might ask if you have any comments about recent reports of Pan Am interest in the TU-144?*

HALABY. I guess anyone who goes to Moscow these days comes back with something in addition, perhaps, a bottle of vodka and a tin of caviar. I came back with a story that's followed me all around the world, and it seems to be the only thing of sharp interest, particularly to foreign journalists. That was, why did we go to Moscow to look at the TU-144? You recall a couple of months ago, we in the Paris Air Show agreed with the Russians that they could see the 747, and we would like to see the TU-144, which had only been briefly shown to journalists in Moscow one afternoon in the Spring.

We got together a balanced team including the Chairman of the Airline Supersonic Advisory Committee, a Pan Am test pilot and engineer, and the Vice President in charge of Development at Boeing, and we went over and had several days of very interesting observations and discussions with the Russians. They didn't offer us the sale of a TU-144 and we didn't offer to buy one, but it raised speculation that we might be there as a purchasing mission rather than as a technical evaluation group.

I said then and have repeatedly said we are fortunate that there are three supersonic vehicles under development; four, if you count the Concorde twice, because of the two national industries developing it. And, out of this competition, we will get another burst of speed which is what we've been selling all these years, the conservation of time.

When I hear that we aren't conservationists, I get pretty mad. There is no more conserving group of people in the world than the airline industry, in terms of safety and research into measuring noise, in terms of compressing the world, in terms of conserving time. Now there can be visualized a situation in which Pan Am and other carriers would consider the purchase or lease of a TU-144. And those conditions are that either for political or technical reasons the Concorde or the Boeing SST does not go forward into full economic development—and Aeroflot puts the TU-144 on the world's routes.

We would certainly not sit comfortably watching even on a thin route like the Moscow-New York route Aeroflot flying the Atlantic in three and a half hours while we

continued to fly it in eight hours. That's a long answer but I think it's a fair one.

*Q. Can you please comment on discount fares?*

HALABY. Well, I've been called from this podium Captain Ahab, and, as I remember it, he was out to harpoon the white whale. I certainly have no such aim, no matter how fat these fish get, I don't have any desire to harpoon them. I would like to see them swim and feed in protected water, you might say, in an area that's well defined, rather than swallow up the whole ocean. Now our primary aim is to fill the seats of a fleet of about 160 jets—25 of which will be 747s by the end of next summer—and to fill those seats we want regular fares, First Class and Economy that are largely designed for business and some pleasure travel.

Second, we want some kind of bulk fare, some kind of wholesale fare, if you will, bought in advance, that will stimulate new travel that might otherwise have gone to our own charters or the charters of others. And third, since it's always been our policy in Pan Am for 30 years now to offer the lower fare whenever we can, we want a lower individual excursion fare that will generate as much new business in the pleasure travel market as possible.

But having said that, it's much easier to say than get agreement in IATA on such a fare. I don't want to be ex parte—but I just hope that early next week while the deliberations in Lausanne are at a critical point; that is, whether to reach agreement or to go into a devastating, chaotic kind of fare warfare—I hope that it will be possible for them to hear a clear voice from Washington which says that at least for 1970, the bulk-inclusive tour is acceptable to the United States Government, knowing that we'll go forward into more simplified fares in the future.

*Q. Is Pan Am starting its own supplemental airline?*

HALABY. I think non-sked and supplemental originally had a meaning. Now they're in doubt. We have a charter service in Pan Am and have had for years. It's been severely inhibited and limited by CAB regulations and by the diversion of aircraft, as many as 17 out of our fleet, to support the government in Vietnam—the R&R and the regular MAC lift. So we've always had in that sense a supplement to our regular scheduled service, and this summer we offered more charters than last summer, and next summer I think we will offer still more charters. But the idea of buying or setting up a unique sort of supplemental airline within Pan Am is not envisaged at this time.

How much more charter capacity we offer will depend upon market conditions.

*Q. Is it your impression that the Russians have more than one prototype of the TU-144?*

HALABY. Let me tell you the real significance of that visit that we made to Moscow. I found a whole new attitude among the Russian aeronautical experts, one of confidence and candor and openness that I had never previously experienced in about eight years of dealing with them as a government official and as an airline executive.

They told us more, they gave us direct, full answers. We sat for an hour or so in the cockpit with a very competent test pilot. And there was nothing sacred or secret. On the other hand, they don't have all the data at their fingertips that the British, French and American test pilots and engineers would make available. When we asked them whether there was a second prototype flying, they said that there was not at that time.

Now whether there is or not, is another matter, but all of the other answers that they gave us were direct and plausible, and it's a rather remarkable technological tour de force to have gone supersonic at the end of 25 hours of flight time. As you know, the Concorde has, I think, reached about

1.15 or 2 after almost 200 hours. Now again this could be part of the promotion, but according to the pilot and the engineers, the airplane was taken through the transonic into the mach 1.35 supersonic range with confidence and with predicted results.

What the economics of the airplane will be, there is a shaking of the head because they don't have the kind of data required for airline economic analysis. And of course the Concorde doesn't either, and it will be very, very important to the operators of any of these airplanes to know that there are many many hours—many, many missions, you might say, and certainly tens and maybe hundreds of hours at supersonic cruise before we have to buy.

We do not want any of these overlapping programs where with a half finished flight test program, production commitments are made on an airplane as costly and important as this one. So whereas I'm still a supersonicophile, I must say that I have never felt that we should rush into the production phase. We should move very rapidly through the flight test phase, and I'm glad to see we are at least taxiing away from the development ramp at this point.

Thank you very much for my opportunity to be here and for your kind attention.

#### ZULUS CANNOT SEE "ZULU" IN SOUTH AFRICA

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, once a society begins drawing invidious distinctions between its citizens, wonderland is entered. The following story would be humorous if it were fiction. But it is about South Africa and real people are being subjected to these remarkable movie regulations.

As usual the South African whites say:

It is we, the people of South Africa, who understand the Bantu.

Few whites in South Africa ever think to ask the black South African what he wants.

The article from the New York Times, November 17, 1969, follows:

ZULUS CAN'T SEE "ZULU" IN SOUTH AFRICA

JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA, November 16.—Five hundred Zulus waving property-room assagals—or spears—helped make a movie called "Zulu" on location in South Africa a few years ago. It dealt with the battle of Rorke's Drift where about 80 British soldiers held out against an overwhelming force of Zulu impls, or battle divisions, on Jan. 22-23, 1879.

But not one of the 500 extras nor any of South Africa's 15 million blacks has seen the movie although it has made the circuit of local theaters twice.

South Africa's Publications Control Board, an autonomous body, decided that the movie was not fit for black African consumption. Presumably the censors felt it might give the now docile Zulus the idea of taking up their assagals again.

In South Africa apartheid policies are as strict on movie-going as they are on living areas, jobs and the use of public transport.

#### MOVIES ARE LIMITED

Movies banned to nonwhites have included "The Incident," "Sweet Charity," "The Detective," "Prudence and the Pill," "The Boston Strangler," "Rosemary's Baby," "West

Side Story," "Africa Addio," "The Mercenaries," "Valley of the Dolls," and "Che!"

Black Africans, but not coloreds or Indians, have been forbidden to see "Tom Jones," "The Dirty Dozen," "Darling," "The Magnificent Seven," "From Russia with Love," "Spartacus," "A Farewell to Arms," and "One Hundred Rifles," which starred a Negro actor, Jim Brown.

A black African recently complained in a letter to a nonwhite weekly newspaper that black Africans are allowed to see only "second rate secret-service films and rather low-type Westerns."

Recent titles at Johannesburg theaters for black Africans included "Booted Baby," "Busted Boss," "Glory Guys," "Track of Thunder," "Long Ride from Hell," "Stage Struck," "Kiss the Girls and Make Them Die," and "Tarzan and the Huntress."

Film makers here estimate that only 7 per cent of the black African population has ever seen a movie. This is due in part to a shortage of theaters. Soweto, a sprawling African township outside Johannesburg with a population of 600,000, has just opened its second movie theater. Curfews, township crime and inadequate transport limit movie-going.

There are a few multiracial movie theaters in the larger towns and cities.

#### DEMAND INCREASING

"Not for Bantu. No children 4-12" is the notice frequently displayed outside box offices.

As black Africans become more urbanized and better educated and as their importance as consumers grows, the demand for better movies increases.

Mrs. D. Mabiletsa, director of a welfare center in Alexandria Township—a shanty town outside Johannesburg—says: "Cinema-going is an aspect of our new township culture. Standards and aspirations are rising. More and more Africans have radios and they are asking: 'If you can hear why not also see?'"

Johannesburg's Urban Bantu Council recently attacked the Publications Control Board's restrictions. "The judgment of a particular group is being imposed on the freedom of choice of the whole African community," it said.

Censorship has become harsher as the attitudes of international film-makers have changed. The freer use of sex, the appearance of Negroes in dignified and leading roles and the growing emphasis on civil rights makes movies increasingly unacceptable to the South African censors.

One certificate issued by the censors said: "No bantus. No persons 4-12. Excisions: eliminate shot of white man kissing colored girl. Eliminate whole of bed scene."

#### LOCAL MOVIES PLANNED

It is estimated that eight times as many films are banned to Africans as to whites.

South Africa's small movie industry is planning to cash in on this movie starvation. Encouraged by a recent Government decision to increase subsidies for films in Afrikaans—the language of most of South Africa's whites—two groups have announced plans to make films specifically for African consumption.

Thirty-year-old Andre Pieterse, who built up a massive chain of drive-in movies, has set up a new organization called Film Trust. "South Africa has a responsibility toward its Bantu people," he says. "My plan is to develop a Bantu film industry with an estimated annual turnover of 25 million rand (about \$35-million)."

"The choice of imported films is becoming increasingly difficult since liberal and permissive thinking seems to predominate in most overseas films," he says. "I intend to make South Africa the Hollywood of Africa. It is we, the people of South Africa, who understand the Bantu. We are better able to

produce films to their liking than Hollywood, Moscow or Peking."

Mr. Pieterse is starting with a James Bond-type series of films. Another local movie-maker, Anthony Handley, has already begun filming "Knockout," the first of a projected series of movies. The theme is boxing instead of espionage.

#### ANALYSIS OF PRESENT-DAY ISRAEL

### HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 21, 1969

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, Robert Mason, the editor of the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot, has written an illuminating analysis of present-day Israel, based on a recent visit to that country. Mr. Mason gives clear insight into the thinking of Israel's leaders today. I ask unanimous consent that his article, entitled "War and Peace in Israel," published in the Virginian-Pilot of November 16, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

"A PATIENT PEOPLE"—WAR AND PEACE IN ISRAEL

(By Robert Mason)

JERUSALEM.—A joke here is that Israel is the most peaceful of nations—that she has a piece of Egypt, a piece of Jordan, and a piece of Syria. If the humor is grim, the spirit is lively.

For at the borders there is the appearance of what Theodore Roosevelt called his Cuban excursion: a bully little war. Israeli soldiers on leave from it or preparing to enter it wear pride as conspicuously as they wear sub-machine guns. Girls being trained for back-up military duty clamor for paratrooper qualification. Hup! Hup! Hup! That is the motto of the Israeli youth—of the "secret weapon," in David Ben-Gurion's phrase, that won the Six-Day War of June 1967 and today is the world's most highly motivated fighting machine.

If older Israeli heads look more soberly toward Cairo, Amman, and Damascus, it is with no less confidence. There is much justification for this national attitude. The Sinai Peninsula, where President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Republic massed more than a thousand tanks in his ill-fated attempt to destroy Israel two and a half years ago, now is an Israeli buffer zone, occupied and fortified. Having been pushed westward to the River Jordan and the Dead Sea, Jordanians have lost still more of the territorial advantage that lent credence to the Arab threat to kick Israel into the Mediterranean. And the Golan Heights, from which Syrian guns scowled as witheringly on Israeli farmhand as the relentless sun, have been turned into a museum of arms wreckage under the Shield of David.

Israel therefore is geographically stronger tenfold than in 1967. The 13-power Arab Summit Conference, which Colonel Nasser has organized for next month, must face up to that hard fact. Although Nasserism has been resupplied with Russian weapons and is better prepared—by experience, if nothing else—than before, this question remains: does it dare risk a second and possibly fatal humiliation by extending its terrorist raids and other harassing tactics, including rocket fire and, just lately, naval shelling, into an all-out offensive?

The Israeli military establishment seems to think not. Both it and the diplomatic corps ask, indeed, how long the Arab states can maintain their current tactics without losing control of their armies and population. During the week that Colonel Nasser was bidding his friends to Morocco, an Israeli military official experienced in both combat and intelligence affairs said approximately this:

Israel holds the initiative especially in the air. Every Egyptian ground-to-air missile site along the Suez Canal has been silenced. There continues to be a military problem on the Suez and the northeastern borders, but it is a much simpler problem than in 1966: "We have taken a great leap forward, Israeli style." A part of the diminished problem is Russian hardware and influence; the 3,000 to 5,000 Russian advisers in Egypt and Syria engage in planning as well as training, down to the battalion level: "We fight an army of Russian brains, but fortunately of Egyptian pilots and Egyptian soldiers." The Fatah commandos are a nuisance—"a bloody nuisance"—but they have failed in limited objectives and the Arab leaders know they are incapable of destroying Israeli bases. Meanwhile, Israel is quite prepared to live with her military problem for as long as she has to—"and we are known to be, I think, a patient people."

A question that enters both military and diplomatic discussions of the border warfare is the durability of Arab patience. A high Israeli official said in the course of a morning's discussion:

King Hussein would like to settle Jordan's problems with Israel; "he doesn't dream the dreams that Nasser does." A fear of stigma among his Arab neighbors stays him. Lebanon, which did not enter the Six-Day War, remains relatively friendly. How long Nasser can feed his generals on defeats and his population on lies is anybody's guess—although in a place like Egypt it is easy to lie. Syria remains the most extreme of the Arab states; she is exporting terrorists into Lebanon, from where they hit and run and occasionally infiltrate into Israeli villages. But the Israeli Army is just 40 miles from Damascus and could march there tomorrow.

This official and a career diplomat emphasized that the basic political problem in the Middle East is to persuade the Arabs to recognize that Israel not only exists but is here to stay; all boundary issues will be meaningless until Israel's legality is acknowledged. "We want to make peace, but not by remote control," the official said. "There will have to be a direct confrontation at the peace table."

That is a sticking point, when Prime Minister Golda Meir visited President Nixon in Washington recently, she presumably was urged by him to accept some sort of mediation. But Mrs. Meir, busy these days at organizing a new Israeli Government following this month's elections that endorsed her strong middle course, in a two-hour interview a few days ago made it abundantly clear that she will yield neither to the Nasser-led demand that Israel surrender the grounds seized in the Six Day War nor to East-West pressures to bring about Big Power intervention.

Israel is ready to sit down with any of the Arab states, singly or collectively, she said. "We accepted our borders as they were in 1967," she noted, "but our neighbors made war. This only proves to us that those borders were not safe—and the Arabs taught us that lesson."

So while Israel will talk with the powers she overwhelmed and apparently will compromise, certainly as to the Sinai and the West Bank, she has no idea of weakening herself strategically. Most clearly she will not trust the United Nations to solve the Arabs' quarrel with her, the U.N.'s handling of the 1956-57 Suez shootout, and then

Secretary General U Thant's accommodation of Nasser in 1967 through removal of the U.N. Emergency Force from the Gaza, has left bitter memories. "International organizations are not popular here," Mrs. Meir mused in fine understatement.

Sometimes it is suggested that Jerusalem is the key to Middle Eastern harmony—that if Israel would give up control of the Old City and its holy places, all other pieces of the territorial puzzle would fall into place. But there is no reason to believe Israel will allow her capital to become again a divided city.

"We were prepared, with broken heart, to see internationalized Jerusalem according to the U.N. decision of 1947," said Mrs. Meir. "And then we lived for 20 years in a divided Jerusalem; and all the good people in the world think it terrible that we used force in the occupation of the Old City. I always want to know by what decree of the God Almighty did [King] Abdullah [of Trans-Jordan] get to Jerusalem in the War of 1948 when he attacked us."

"The difference is that when Abdullah occupied the Old City every single Jew, even those who had lived there for generations, had to leave, and during 20 years no Jew was allowed to go to the holy places. When we occupied the Old City of Jerusalem, it was thrown open to everybody; and certainly everybody there of the Arab population—60,000 or 70,000 of them—can go to any holy place that is holy for him, whether it is Christian, Moslem, or Jewish."

If Israel determination is solid, if Israeli confidence is monumental, if Israeli hopes are high, the Six-Day War and the two campaigns before it, plus the continuing aftermath, nevertheless are expensive, worrisome, and difficult. Although the border struggle is invisible in 90 per cent of the nation, it is felt everywhere. Israeli income taxes are the highest in the world, and so, at \$1,400, is the per-capita national debt. Defense is costing three times what it did in 1966—about 20 per cent of the Gross National Product, as contrasted to 9 per cent in the United States. Every boy and girl is drafted into the armed forces at age 18, the boys for three years, the girls for 20 months, and every man remains in the reserves until 55 (the maximum age having been raised from 50 this month). Reserves rob the labor force of 10 per cent of its total, and the Israeli labor force in a peaceful time would be lean enough.

Moreover, the occupation of captured territory, the West Bank especially, is militarily taxing and politically embarrassing. Along the Jordan and in the Sinai "acts of resistance are multiplying" and "repression is severe," the foreign editor of *The Times* of London wrote recently. "As yet the stage of heavy reprisals and collective punishments has not been reached. But eventually, if things go as they are now, it will come."

One who has just traveled through the West Bank and Gaza and Sinai to the Suez Canal is entitled to believe the British journalist exaggerated. Indeed, the Israelis over the past two years have undertaken diligently and intelligently to improve the West Bank Arabs' lot through industrial employment and modernized farming. The Israeli colonel commanding one of the West Bank's seven military districts said his relations with the 100,000 Arabs under him are excellent. A tenth of them are commuting into Israel for work that pays three times the Arab rate. "We are trying to convince Arabs that it is possible to live with Jews," he said. That is Israeli policy; Israel understands well enough that the West Bank is a show window for the Arab world beyond it.

Yet the colonel conceded that in 1969 there have been 30 terrorist incidents in his district that cost four Arab and two Jewish lives. (Most of the troublemakers come from

outside, he added—a contention parodically familiar to a Southerner's ears.) In reprisal the Israeli military has destroyed about 250 Arab houses—far fewer, its spokesmen insist, than *The Times* editor reported. The reprisals are a painful subject in Israel, yet the military justifies them as a discouragement to terrorism and contribution to civil stability. Jordanian law applies throughout the West Bank, under the administration of the Israeli military through Jordanian local officials. About a fourth of the punishment accorded the West Bank's 2,000 prisoners was by administrative rather than judicial process, and some of it may have been of a drumhead sort. Still, Arabs who fled after the fighting are returning to the West Bank in increasing numbers and now total upwards of 30,000.

Conditions in the Gaza Strip and the Sinai are not uniformly pleasant, if one may borrow understatement from the Prime Minister. Mrs. Meir's words on the subject are these:

"We are not taking it upon ourselves to solve the refugee problem that is 21 years old. Not only because we are not the ones who created this problem, but if this problem was not solved until now, it was because the Arab states refused to solve it. They wanted it to be as it is in order to use it as a weapon against Israel without any consideration as to the human factor. Another thing that is necessary to know is that in 1948, when the Arab refugee problem was created by the leaders of the Arab states, there was also another refugee problem. There were 250,000 Jewish refugees in Nazi camps those three years after World War II. . . . In addition, there were between 500,000 and 600,000 Jews who came to us from these very same Arab countries, from Iran and Yemen, Syria, Lebanon, Egypt, Morocco, Tunisia, and so on."

Is there revenge, then, in Israel's refugee policy? Mrs. Meir's reply is: "As long as we are responsible in the Western Bank and the Gaza for people's welfare—they have nobody else to go to, no other government will be responsible for their welfare—we will look after their health and education and their housing and development. That we are prepared to do, as it is our duty to do it—but not the solution of the refugee problem if it means resettlement within our borders."

A final question demands consideration. What is the future of a nation whose entire youth is militarily trained and alert—whose boy-girl army is gung-ho to a superlative degree? How does one distinguish between the Israeli youth grandly saluting through a tank's hatch from that goose-stepping youth of a generation ago? If the girl learning to fire a light weapon near Tel-Aviv is a national heroine, what of the girl who takes her ordnance lessons in Peking?

Avraham Harman, the former Ambassador to the United States who now is president of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, may provide an answer. Once the Israeli soldier takes off the uniform and returns to his studies, Dr. Harman noted, he will endure no regimentation and no flag-waving. He concerns himself with a few friends and his books, rejecting the Big-Man-on-the-Campus role. "The easiest way to break up a convocation is to present a speaker who orates about youth and country and duty," said Dr. Harman.

And a handsome general who wears both an aviator's wings and a paratrooper's badge, with whom this writer sat over Turkish coffee one evening, may have provided another clue. "History will examine us," he said, "as to whether we could win the war and could not win the peace."

A nation whose generals are also philosophers will not be forever comfortable in the hobbled boot.

## PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY

**HON. J. CALEB BOGGS**

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 21, 1969

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, in these times when many youths are characterized as working outside our political system, a group in Delaware has emerged that is working actively within the system to effect change.

A political science class at Wilmington, Del., College has undertaken a project to aid in attempts to bring about electoral reform. These ambitious youths have contacted Delaware Gov. Russell W. Peterson, members of the congressional delegation and State legislators in their quest for prompt action on electoral reform. Not only do they want Congress to pass the resolution pertaining to direct popular election but they want Delaware to live up to its name, the First State, by ratifying such a constitutional amendment first.

Their actions have attracted considerable attention in Delaware. I commend them for their great exercise in participatory democracy. I ask unanimous consent that a newspaper article written by Joe Distelheim, and published in the Wilmington Morning News of October 24, describing their efforts, be printed in the RECORD:

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

## SEEK END OF ELECTORAL COLLEGE—STUDENTS TO TEST POLITICAL SYSTEM

(By Joe Distelheim)

The students are doing the testing in a political science class at Wilmington College this fall.

They are testing the American—and the Delaware—political system to see if, and how, it responds to people who wish to use it.

The idea is to get the U.S. Senate to pass the proposed amendment allowing direct election of presidents, and then to see that Delaware is the first state to ratify it.

In this age of demonstrations, the 25 students in the class are willing to try working through channels.

The idea of trying to use the American political process came from the class instructor, Thomas L. Little, who, not coincidentally, is a state representative. The decision to concentrate on the proposed amendment was made by the class.

Little, R-Deerhurst, said he told the class at the beginning of the term that "if they take the time to learn the system, they can change anything they want to change . . . that it's more productive than demonstrating." So far, the students seem to have learned that not only learning but work, red tape and a great deal of waiting are involved.

The proposed 26th amendment, which would do away with the Electoral College system, currently is in the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee. The students have written to all three members of Delaware's congressional delegation, first to find out about the amending process, then to try to get the amendment to Delaware for ratification as soon as possible.

Other letters have gone to Gov. Russell W. Peterson, asking him to speed the amendment on its way to the General Assembly as soon as it arrives, and Little, chairman of the House Elections Committee.

The letter to the governor says, in part,

"considering that you won your election by such a slim margin of the popular vote, you should be able to realize the significance of a one-man, one-vote system." (Peterson won by about 2,500 votes last November.)

Yesterday during their 90-minute class in a small building at the college south of Wilmington, the students discussed going to Washington to present their case for the amendment, and Little filled a blackboard with their arguments for passage.

The present system is obsolete, and offers no guarantee that the Electoral College will vote the will of the people, one list said in part.

Under the heading which asked why Delaware should be the first to ratify the amendment, it was noted that Delaware was first to ratify the Constitution which set up the original electoral system, and that ratification here would help explode the theory that small states do not want to change the election process.

And, there was a list in which the students placed their criteria for a political system.

"If the system is so inflexible that it can't be changed to meet the needs of all people, regardless of age, then we need another system," Little wrote on the blackboard.

He stepped back and asked, "Is that too radical?" No one thought so.

Members of the class have done all the work on the project, although Little admits to having chipped in to help finance the copying of the letters.

"The hardest part was finding five pieces of letterhead stationery," he said. "I wasn't going to help them—it's part of the red tape."

The fall term will be over in January, but the students apparently intend to follow through on their project.

"I think it's going to work, but it may take a little time," said David Newberry, 25, of near Wilmington, "We'll work on it in the middle of the summer if necessary."

Newberry, Rudolph and Howard Strickler have been coordinating the project. Rudolph, 20, is from North East, Md., and Strickler, 21, from Long Island, N.Y.

## THE STATE OF ALABAMA

**HON. JOHN BUCHANAN**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents has recently sent me a list of some of the factors which make Alabama a truly valuable asset to the United States. Not listed, but most important of all are the 3½ million fine citizens who, like Mrs. N. H. Meeks of Adamsville, Ala., who sent me the following list, are working together to make our State an even fairer, better place for all its people. I am proud to serve as one of Alabama's Representatives and want to call to the attention of my colleagues a few of our beloved State's rich assets:

## STATEMENT BY MRS. MEEKS

Alabama is the only place in the Nation where iron ore, coal and limestone, necessary for the manufacture of steel, are found in the same area.

Alabama is the cast iron pipe capital of the world.

Alabama is one of the world's leading producers of boilers.

The Nation's largest exclusive manufacturer, in its line, of toys is in Alabama.

Alabama farms can produce enough foods on present acreage to furnish a daily menu, to all its citizens, of fancy and staple foods,

without having to repeat a menu for 30 days.

Alabama has over 500 square miles of lake water.

Alabama's mineral district can furnish enough coal to cover the whole of England three feet deep.

The world's largest steam electric generating plant is in Alabama.

Alabama is the home of the first apparatus used in the demonstration of the X-ray.

Alabama boasts 100 textile mills equipped with 1,701,000 spindles.

Alabama gave the world its first ice making machinery.

The first run of an electric street car was over Alabama streets.

Alabama has the distinction of having granted the first diploma ever issued to a woman by any chartered institution authorized to confer degrees.

Auburn University was the first southern college to establish a chair of electrical engineering.

The first railway track west of the Allegheny Mountains was laid in Alabama.

Alabama has over 1700 miles of navigable streams, making it the leading State in the Nation in miles of navigable waterways.

Alabama has more natural resources than any other area of its size on the face of the globe.

## A PROGRAM TO IMPROVE THE OPPORTUNITY OF STUDENTS

**HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Americans live in a dynamic, multiethnic society, surrounded by the wealth of cultural legacies brought to this Nation by our forefathers. Fortunately, they have left us many treasures from all parts of the globe—the vivid beauty of their music, drama, dance, and art; the distinctive flavor of their folklore, languages, and literature; the dignity of their values and beliefs. Today, these priceless heirlooms continue to nourish and grace the American heritage.

This Nation thrives on a deep sense of ethnic community. It flourishes on the pride of origin shared by its people, both as committed Americans and as devoted individuals with strong ties to their own indigenous neighborhoods and groups.

In the past century, however, our society has begun to deny the existence of these origins. We have been challenging the concept of ethnicity, eroding the delicate tendrils that link us with our past. Indeed, we have oversold the value of homogenization, sacrificing the diversity of our pluralistic society for the sake of uniformity.

Consequently, many of our ethnic groups have developed a profound sense of cultural inferiority—a feeling that they are second-best Americans because they have carefully preserved their original languages, their customs and traditions, and their unique styles of life. Some have even totally forsaken their ethnic bonds.

This problem pervades every city and State, every corner of our Nation. In Chicago, alone, it can affect the lives of at least 30 percent of the population, who

are foreign-born or second-generation citizens.

The most serious casualties of this quasi-cultural obliteration have been the young. Today, our Nation's youth are plagued by a sense of rootlessness. Many of them are caught up in a malaise of alienation and are channeling their energies to a search for identity.

In a very real sense, these are the "Forgotten Young Americans," with no feeling of belonging in our heterogeneous society.

Society's transmitters of cultural values, its primary and secondary schools, have taught these young people nothing of their own ethnic backgrounds, and this omission has led them to conclude that their heritage has no status in the value system of the society. Therefore, it is scarcely surprising that so many young people have failed to develop a positive self-image.

Typically, their school history lessons teach about one or two countries and remain indifferent to the rest of the world. Their art, music, literature, and language classes are equally narrow and exclusive, thus reinforcing a distorted picture of their environment and ancestry.

Such a pernicious educational deficiency warrants the attention of our entire population and of Members of the Congress, as its representatives.

To remedy this situation, I have introduced H.R. 14910, "The Ethnic Heritage Studies Centers Act of 1969." This act would establish a number of Ethnic Heritage Studies Centers, each devoted to the development of curriculum materials dealing with one ethnic group of one regional group of ethnic cultures, for use in elementary and secondary schools. Such materials would pertain to a particular group's history, geography, society, literature, art, music, language, drama, economy, and general culture, and to the group's contributions to the American heritage.

Each center would also train teachers to use these materials and would make them widely available to elementary and secondary schools throughout the United States. Teachers could utilize these curriculum packages as study units in their regular classes or as the basis for creating totally new types of educational programs.

An Ethnic Heritage Studies Center would be operated by public or private nonprofit educational agencies and organizations. To design and implement its programs, each center would draw on the existing resources of colleges and universities, the expertise of elementary and secondary school teachers, and the special knowledge of ethnic groups in local communities as well as foreign students pursuing their education in this country.

The bill would authorize \$10 million in fiscal 1970 and \$20 million in fiscal 1971 for these purposes.

As a major consequence of this bill, our young people would be able to develop greater awareness and appreciation of the importance of all ethnic civilizations to our national heritage. Every one of the 51.5 million students in the primary grades and high school could study, in

depth, about the ethnic culture of his own family and forefathers, and about their contributions to the American way of life. In addition, he could learn about many of the other readily identifiable ethnic groups in the country.

In this important effort I have been joined by my colleagues, Representatives JOHN H. DENT, AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, ADAM C. POWELL, WILLIAM T. MURPHY, GLENN ANDERSON, JOHN CONYERS, JR., EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, LEONARD FARBSTEIN, MARGARET M. HECKLER, SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, MELVIN PRICE, and EDWARD R. ROYBAL.

As H. G. Wells wrote in "The Outline of History," "Our true nationality is mankind." The time has come for our schools to teach about the contributions of all mankind to our nationhood, and the Ethnic Heritage Studies Centers Act of 1969 would contribute to this worthy goal.

For the information of my fellow Members, I am including the following bill in its entirety:

H.R. 14910

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as "The Ethnic Heritage Studies Centers Act of 1969."*

SEC. 2. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE IX—ETHNIC HERITAGE STUDIES CENTERS

"STATEMENT OF POLICY

"SEC. 901. This title is enacted in recognition of the heterogeneous composition of the Nation and of the fact that in a multi-ethnic society, a greater understanding of the contributions of one's own heritage and those of one's fellow citizens can contribute to a more harmonious, patriotic, and committed populace. It is further enacted in recognition of the principle that all students in elementary and secondary schools of the Nation should have an opportunity to learn about the differing and unique contributions to the national heritage made by each ethnic group. It is the purpose of this title to assist schools and school systems in affording each of their students an opportunity to learn about the nature of his own cultural heritage, and those in which he has an interest, and to study the contributions of these forebears to the Nation.

"ETHNIC HERITAGE STUDIES CENTERS

"SEC. 902. The Commissioner is authorized to arrange through grants to public and private nonprofit educational agencies and organizations for the establishment and operation of a number of Ethnic Heritage Studies Centers, reflecting the readily identifiable ethnic groups represented in the population of the United States. Each such Center shall carry on activities related to a single culture or regional group of cultures.

"ACTIVITIES OF ETHNIC HERITAGE STUDIES CENTERS

"SEC. 903. Each Center provided for under this title shall—

"(1) develop curriculum materials for use in elementary and secondary schools which deal with the history, geography, society, economy, literature, art, music, drama language, and general culture of the group with which the Center is concerned and the contributions of that ethnic group to the American heritage.

"(2) disseminate curriculum materials to permit their use in elementary and secondary schools throughout the Nation, and

"(3) provide training for persons utilizing

or preparing to utilize the curriculum materials developed under this title.

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"SEC. 904. (a) In carrying out this title, the Commissioner shall make arrangements which will utilize (1) the research facilities and personnel of colleges and universities, (2) the special knowledge of ethnic groups in local communities and of foreign students pursuing their education in this country, and (3) the expertise of elementary and secondary school teachers.

"(b) Funds appropriated to carry out this title may be used to cover all or part of the cost of establishing, equipping, and operating the Centers, including the cost of research materials and resources, academic consultants, and the cost of training of staff for the purpose of carrying out the purposes of this title. Such funds may also be used to provide stipends (in such amounts as may be determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner) to individuals receiving training in such Centers, including allowances for dependents.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 905. There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, the sum of \$10,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, the sum of \$20,000,000."

TERRENCE McCABE SALUTED BY  
WISCONSIN CHEESEMAKERS

HON. GAYLORD NELSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 21, 1969

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, earlier this month the Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association honored Mr. Terrence W. McCabe, Chief of the Import Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture, at their annual convention.

Mr. McCabe, a native of Wisconsin and graduate of the Wisconsin State College at Superior, has served with distinction in a variety of important positions in both the Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture as well as the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

In his position overseeing sensitive agricultural imports, he has served with fairness and discretion. He has been responsive to the feelings of the varied concerns of American agriculture while tending his duties according to the letter of the law.

Mr. McCabe's father fulfilled an important role in the Progressive movement of Wisconsin and was a friend and adviser of Senator Robert LaFollette, Sr.

It is in the best of this tradition that Mr. McCabe has executed his duties. The tribute that the Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association has bestowed upon him is greatly deserved by this fine public servant.

I ask unanimous consent that the citation accompanying Mr. McCabe's special honorary award be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

CITATION—SPECIAL HONORARY AWARD TO  
TERRENCE W. McCABE

(Read by Roland C. Behle)

Terrence W. McCabe received his Bachelor's Degree from Wisconsin State College

at Superior. He did advanced work at the University of Wisconsin where, as a graduate fellow, he served with the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture and Markets in the preparation of the legislation for the first fluid milk marketing law. He continued with the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture and Markets after receiving his Ph. M. degree from the University of Wisconsin. He also held the position of Statistician for the Wisconsin Agricultural Authority.

Mr. McCabe's career with the United States Department of Agriculture began in 1937 when he joined the Crop Reporting Service at Madison, Wisconsin. His tenure with the U.S.D.A. has included service as Midwest Regional Economist with the Surplus Marketing Administration at Milwaukee; Chief of the Program Development Division of the Milwaukee and Des Moines Regional Offices of the War Food Administration and Economist with the Food Distribution Division of the Agricultural Marketing Service.

In 1944-45, Mr. McCabe was Food Officer for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Mission to Greece. He also served as Program Liaison Officer at UNRRA headquarters. From 1947 to 1950 Mr. McCabe was an Agricultural Economist of the Economic Division of the United Nations.

Since October 1962 Mr. McCabe has been serving as Chief of the Foreign Agricultural Service's Import Staff, which is concerned with the control of imports of agricultural products. Immediately prior he was a Marketing Specialist and Economist with the Import Staff of the Livestock and Livestock Products Division of the Foreign Agricultural Service.

Mr. McCabe is married and has two daughters. He lives in Arlington, Virginia.

In the many years since Mr. McCabe joined the Import Staff of the Foreign Agricultural Service, representatives of the Wisconsin Cheese industry have found his courtesy unflinching, his integrity unquestionable, and his capability self-evident. We salute him as an outstanding public servant and as a credit to the Department of Agriculture and the career Civil Service. As a mark of our appreciation for his public service, the Board of Directors of the Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association has directed that this special award be prepared and presented to Mr. McCabe at this convention. Inscribed in a polished brass outline map of the State of Wisconsin, mounted on polished black walnut, is this citation:

"Presented to Terrence W. McCabe, Chief Import Division, U.S.D.A.—for his many years of diligent service and constant concern for the manufacturers of domestic cheese—by the Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association—78th Annual Convention—November 6, 1969."

Terry McCabe, on behalf of this convention, and on behalf of all of us, congratulations!

#### MARITIME COMMISSION CHAIRMAN CALLS FOR UNITY AND PRIDE IN THE UNITED STATES

### HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, since her appointment as Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, Mrs. Helen Delich Bentley has been honored by a number of groups in maritime circles and in other circles. When Mrs. Bentley has had the opportunity to speak at these affairs, her subject usually has been on maritime

matters, as would be expected from someone in her position.

Last night she was designated Woman of the Year by the Women's Advertising Club of Baltimore at a dinner in her honor. This is the second time this group has honored Mrs. Bentley as Woman of the Year, the last time being in 1957. This time she spoke, not on maritime matters, but on the need for unity among our people and a recognition of the many benefits and blessings we enjoy as citizens of this great country, privileges which citizens of no other country have to the same extent, if at all. She urged those responsible for publicizing the activities of our people, to stress the many wonderful things that happen daily, instead of the isolated, unpleasant occurrences which usually make the headlines.

Her remarks deserve wide publicity, especially at this time when the country has recently observed the second mobilization march by those who would govern the Nation by street action, instead of by lawful procedures, as provided by our Constitution. I encourage all of you to read these remarks. I am confident Mrs. Bentley has expressed your views, as she has mine, and I am sure, those of millions of our citizens.

The remarks follow:

#### REMARKS OF MRS. HELEN DELICH BENTLEY

Thank you so much for the wonderful honor you bestowed on me tonight.

I stand here before you in all humility and it is a privilege and pleasure to address the Women's Advertising Club of Baltimore. This is particularly so since I can look out and see so many friends and acquaintances from my days—not too long distant—when I was serving as the Maritime Editor of the Baltimore Sun.

In those halcyon days, I worked with many of you to advance the interests of the Port of Baltimore and the State of Maryland. Together, I feel that we were able to bring home to the People of Baltimore—and to our legislators in Annapolis—the importance of the Port to their daily lives.

And Baltimore is, of course, my home and—apart from my official regulatory responsibilities—dear and close to me. Indeed, it has been home to me for more than 24 years. It was in the Port of Baltimore that I first gained my first glimpse of the importance of the sea, not only to the City of Baltimore and the State of Maryland, but to the Nation as a whole.

It is from this recognition that I developed a growing personal awareness of the importance of the world's oceans to the Nation's trade and to its defense capability. And because I came to recognize the importance of the sea and of the ships that serve us upon the trade lanes of the world, I became a partisan of the American Merchant Marine.

In view of this and of my recent appointment to the position within the Nixon Administration of Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, I am sure that most of those present anticipate that I will devote the opportunity provided me tonight to the subject of American shipping.

I shall—but only to a limited extent—and that now.

In regard to the American Merchant Marine, we can at last say there is a program—there is a government policy—to reverse the downward trend of recent years and to build a merchant fleet capable of meeting the Nation's needs on the trade lanes of the world, capable of fulfilling its responsibilities in time of emergency.

Most, if not all of you, are aware of the fact

that President Nixon on October 23rd in a Message to the Congress addressed himself to the importance of reviving the American merchant fleet and called on management and labor within the industry to join him in that endeavor.

And thus, I repeat, at last there is a program from an Administration looking toward the Nation's future on the sea. It is the job of every one of us to see that this program and the hopes it carries with it come to fruition.

Congressman Edward Garmatz, Chairman of the Merchant Marine & Fisheries Committee, has promised legislation on the program by June 1970.

And now I would turn to my major subject for tonight, for—as important as that may be—it is not only the welfare of the Nation on the sea with which we must concern ourselves today but the well being of the Nation itself.

I can think of no more suitable audience to whom I could speak of unity—none in a better position to take action to advance unity among our citizens and the overall well being of the Nation—than that represented here tonight.

And so I speak to the purpose of calling upon you, the members of the Women's Advertising Club of Baltimore, and similar organizations representing your profession throughout the Nation, to join together in initiating a program of your own designed to unite us as a people. I call on you to use your expertise, your professional abilities, your advertising "know-how" in focusing the attention of our citizens—yes, and of the world—on what is right in this land of ours.

We have our problems, we have our failings, but compared to the rest of the world, as a Nation and as a people, we have much more on the credit side of the ledger than we have debits. What I am saying is that we should concentrate some of our effort in numerating our many blessings rather than spending all of our energies in downgrading ourselves as Americans.

Let's take a look at a couple of facts and compare some of our conditions in America to conditions in other countries who, from time to time, think they have a right to point a scornful finger at America.

Let's look at our educational system. The very basis of a great Nation is an educated mind. Here, in the United States, we have undertaken the proposition not just to educate a selected few but to educate an entire population. A few short years ago, even in our country, education was believed to be for men only. Thank goodness that our educators found out that when you educate a man you educate a single individual but that when you educate a woman, you educate a family.

Fifty years ago, in our educational system, only 10 percent of our children were graduated from high school. Today that figure is not 10 percent. It is 75 percent and that means that our boys and our girls number more than double the high school graduates in France, or West Germany, or Italy, or Britain.

We hear a lot about dropouts, and cop outs, and juvenile delinquents. Let's examine a few American statistics.

Fifty years ago only about four percent of our young people went to college. Today that figure is above 40 percent. Only 10 percent of the young people of Great Britain and France ever have the opportunity to step across the threshold into an institution of higher learning.

A few days ago our newspapers, our television programs, and our radio commentators informed us ever so fully about the peace marchers who invaded the Capitol of our Nation.

Do any of you have an idea of how many young Americans have enlisted in a single week to fight for this Nation?

Well, let me tell you that our Military Forces report that in a single week some 10,000 Americans voluntarily walk into our military enlistment centers, directed by the Pentagon, and volunteer their services and their lives for America.

It is a strange and unfortunate phenomenon of our society that those 10,000 first-term enlistments can't get a minute on television, not in the early news or not in the late news but a student carrying a sign, or a protestor wearing a beard, or an attention-seeker burning a draft card is brought into our living room and thrust into our consciousness on every news program.

It certainly seems to me that perhaps we should undertake an educational program for America's protestors.

The Sermon on the Mount called on us to love our enemies. I still believe we ought to approach some of these students who spit on our flag and burn it, and say to them:

Americans are the best fed people on earth! Americans are the best paid people on earth!

Americans are the best educated people in the world!

Americans are the healthiest people on earth!

In our country, deaths from dread causes have been cut in half in the last 50 years.

Life expectancy has doubled in the last 100 years.

Infant mortality has been halved in the last 30 years.

Measles have been retired from the pages of history.

Polio no longer plagues the mind of every mother in the land.

America has taken millions of immigrants to its bosom in the less than 200 years we have been in existence as a nation.

These people were poor, they were downtrodden, they were discriminated against and prejudice and hunger were their lot in the Old World.

Here, in the United States, we gave those people the greatest of gifts. We gave them liberty and we gave them opportunity.

Today, as part of our great country, those people are giving everything they've got to help this country.

I love my country and I love my flag.

As a Nation, we should get off the psychiatrist's couch and stop thinking of ourselves as a "sick" people.

Those of us who believe in our Nation should start standing up to be counted.

We should express our pride in accomplishment, and that ours is the highest standard of living in the world.

We should express our thanks for the very freedom as individuals that permits us the liberty of dissent.

We should compare that freedom with the lack of freedom of others.

We should compare the freedom to march and to assemble—the right to protest so long as we do not invade the rights of others—with the lack of such rights in the imperialistic Communist nations that call us "imperialists".

"Imperialists," indeed!!!

We should count the people to which we have voluntarily given their independence, the nations we have assisted—such as South Korea—and now South Vietnam—to retain their freedom from Communist aggression, and match that against the Estonians, Latvians, Poles, East Germans, Bulgarians, Czechoslovaks, of those who cry against us.

We should ask the militants who practice anarchy and advocate the destruction of this Nation point blank:

Where else in the world could they advocate the overthrow of government and attempt to practice it? Could they in Moscow? In Warsaw? In Peking?

I know there will be some who will claim that to speak out in this manner is to be chauvinistic. I do not see it in that fashion, but rather view it solely as a matter of comparison. As for my reasons for speaking out in this fashion on a subject that could be said to have nothing whatever to do with my present position, let me say that I feel it is a subject having to do and within the province of just being an American.

And in that regard, I will admit to being partial to my Nation. I will admit to believing that to be an American is a matter of the greatest good fortune, for which I am fully thankful.

And here, I must become more personal in my remarks, perhaps to provide a better understanding of why I feel so strongly as I do. It is a simple thing, in some respects tied to the virtues of this Nation which are today being scoffed at.

Those who fought to gain independence and maintain freedom on these shores were generous indeed, for they offered to those of other lands the opportunity to migrate to this land and to become a part of the Nation that they had carved out of wilderness and prairies, that they had built and were building as the people of America themselves migrated within and across the Continent. They welcomed others to cross the Mississippi and challenged the Continental Divide with them. They welcomed more who came later. No, the streets were not paved with gold, but opportunity was here for those who sought it and cared to work for it.

I can speak for this directly and personally, for at the turn of this century the man and woman who were to become my parents were emigres. They came to this country to escape the "System", if you will, of the "old country".

I am the child of such migrants. I am the child of parents who sought a place of opportunity for themselves and for the children to come of their union. For them, the United States of America was a promised land. For them, there was no other place on the face of the world that was its equal. And they were right then, and right today in that belief.

The daughter of emigrants, born, raised in a small Nevada town, my naturalized parents imbued within me a spirit of gratitude for the mere fact that I had been born an American. Against the background of their European past, they made me fully aware of the wonderful future that could be mine, that had become my birthright by the mere fact of my birth in the land of the High Sierras. Proud of now being Americans themselves, they imbued me with a similar pride in having been born here. A laborer himself in the mines, my Yugoslavian father, and mother with him, saw the opportunities for me and urged me toward them.

Child of an emigrant, I still had full advantage of the educational system that today is being damned. By means of scholarships and working to get through, I achieved my college degree. And because no one cared that I was a first generation American, I succeeded in getting jobs in my chosen profession.

By dint of hard work, I was able to advance in it.

And today I stand before you, a woman, that same child of emigrant parents, and the one thought that comes to my mind is this:

Where else would I have had the opportunities with which this Nation has provided me?

If it sounds naive to the ultra-sophisticated, it bothers me not one bit to say both publicly and privately, and in very simple words, that I love my country. I not only love it, but I feel a deep and abiding grati-

tude to those men and women who created it and made it what it is today.

And I add one other thing. I owe a deep debt to those who did so, and have a high sense of responsibility within me for its well being.

As President Nixon has said, no nation can defeat us and none can humble us except ourselves. For my part, I shall do all within my power, both now and for the rest of my life, to pass on to future Americans an America with a future!

Will you join me?

## VIOLENCE: THE PRICE OF EXCESSIVE LIBERALISM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 20, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I brought to the attention of our colleagues the seriousness of violent crimes occurring here in the District by "repeaters" who were being encouraged by the "soft on crime" attitudes of the courts.

Today's paper carries the headline that a District of Columbia man has been charged with the third murder in 6 months. He has not been tried on either of the first two counts. In fact he was free on a \$500 bond from the second murder charge when he committed the third murder.

Rehabilitation may be a pleasing expression to our liberal society, but it is certainly proving expensive to the innocent victims.

Malfeasance in office may soon find some sympathetic judges considered accessories. Certainly civilized people are not long going to suffer this type of justice.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the news report from the Daily News in the RECORD at this point:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MAN CHARGED WITH THIRD MURDER IN 6 MONTHS—MAN HELD WITHOUT BOND IN THIRD HOMICIDE

An unemployed truck driver was ordered held without bond yesterday after being charged with homicide for the third time in six months. He had been free on \$500 in the June slaying of a District woman.

U.S. Magistrate Arthur L. Burnett ordered Walter C. Powell, 30, of 1432 Girard-st nw, held for a preliminary hearings next Wednesday. Powell now has three homicide charges pending against him, but has not been tried for any.

Police and court records gave the following account of the past six months:

On June 28, Gloria Erwin, also known as Gloria Valentine, 28, was shot to death by three men in her apartment, 1815 18th-st nw.

On June 30, Powell was placed on three years' probation in an attempted auto theft case dating from 1968.

On Aug. 25, Leroy Gaskins, 76, was shot to death thru the window of his brother-in-law's house in the 3600 block of 10th Place NW., where he had been chased by three men trying to rob him.

On Aug. 26, Powell was arrested and charged with the slaying of Miss Erwin. He was ordered held on \$10,000 bond. Unable to raise that amount, he spent a week in jail.

On Sept. 4, on a petition by his lawyer, Powell's bail was reduced to \$5,000 with au-

thorization that he be released if he could provide 10 per cent of it in cash. The \$500 was posted and he was released.

On Nov. 3, a grand jury indicted Powell and two other men for the shooting of Mr. Gaskins. An arraignment was set, but Powell failed to appear. A warrant was then issued for his arrest.

On Nov. 15, while the arrest warrant was still outstanding, two men apparently attempted to rob William (Spearmint) Smith, 42, in his apartment at 1630 Corcoran St. NW. Mr. Smith exchanged shots with the intruders and one was killed.

Police identified the dead man as James Lee King, 23, and listed his address as 70

Bates St. NW. The other man, they said, was Powell.

District law holds that any person participating in a felony that results in a death may be charged with homicide. It is under this law that police placed the most recent charge against Powell.

## SENATE—Monday, November 24, 1969

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by Hon. HAROLD E. HUGHES, a Senator from the State of Iowa.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Eternal Father, bring us to the sacred shrine of Thine eternal love, that we may know the peace that passeth understanding. And being at peace with Thee may we pursue peace with our fellow man. We beseech Thee to remove from us and all men the pride, the anger, and the prejudice which breaks the family of man. By Thy reconciling grace bridge the chasm made by fear and resentment. Draw us close to Thee and keep us close to Thee hour by hour. In this time of strife let not the evil we oppose turn us from our purpose to achieve unity and concord within this Nation and among the nations of the earth, to Thy honor and glory. 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 24, 1969.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. HAROLD E. HUGHES, a Senator from the State of Iowa, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. HUGHES thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, November 21, 1969, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on November 19, 1969, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2546) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and

tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 14580) to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world to achieve economic development within a framework of democratic economic, social, and political institutions, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H.R. 3666. An act to amend section 336(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

H.R. 4284. An act to authorize appropriations to carry out the Standard Reference Data Act;

H.R. 11363. An act to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States; to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law; and for other purposes;

H.R. 13018. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13949. An act to provide certain equipment for use in the offices of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14195. An act to revise the law governing contests of elections of Members of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 121. Joint resolution to authorize appropriations for expenses of the National Council on Indian Opportunity.

### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 14580) to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world to achieve economic development within a framework of democratic economic, social, and political institutions, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

### LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### JIMMIE R. POPE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 545, S. 2566.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2566) for the relief of Jimmie R. Pope.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2566

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jimmie R. Pope, of Goldsboro, North Carolina, the sum of \$1,758.14, representing reimbursement for relocation expenses incurred by him in 1967 in moving from Hixon, Tennessee, to Goldsboro, North Carolina, for the purpose of accepting civilian employment at Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, North Carolina, Air Force personnel having erroneously informed the said Jimmie R. Pope that such expenses were reimbursable: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.