

INDIANA STATE TOTAL—Continued

	Students—							Weight: 1.0— grades	Teachers—						
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish- American	Minority total	Other	Total		American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish- American	Minority total	Other	Total
Park Place School (7)...	0	2	2	0	4	450	454	011111110000000 (0.9) 00000001110000	0	1	0	0	1	13	14
Madison Heights Junior High School (1).....	0	6	0	0	6	732	738	(0.8) 011111110000000	0	0	0	0	0	37	37
Washington (12).....	0	3	0	1	4	668	672	(0.6) 011111110000000	0	0	0	0	0	23	23
Forest Hills School (25)...	0	4	0	0	4	690	694	(0.6) 011111110000000	0	0	0	0	0	21	21
Lindbergh Elementary School (22).....	0	2	0	0	2	449	451	(0.4) 011111110000000	0	0	0	0	0	14	14
7th Street (17).....	0	1	0	0	1	318	319	(0.3) 011111110000000	0	0	0	0	0	10	10
Meadowbrook School (21).....	0	1	0	0	1	370	371	(0.3) 011111110000000	0	0	0	0	0	13	13
25th Street (14).....	0	1	0	0	1	459	460	(0.2) 00000001110000	0	0	0	0	0	14	14
North Side Junior High School (10)....	0	1	0	0	1	1,098	1,099	(0.1) 001111110000000	0	0	0	0	0	51	51
10th Street School (15)...	0	0	0	0	0	416	416	(0.0) 001111110000000	0	0	0	0	0	14	14
Edgewood (26).....	0	0	0	0	0	300	300	(0.0) 011100000000000	0	0	0	0	0	10	10
Hiawatha School (23)...	0	0	0	0	0	192	192	(0.0) 011111110000001	0	0	0	0	0	6	6
Roosevelt Elementary School (18).....	0	0	0	0	0	366	366	(0.0) 011111110000000	0	0	0	0	0	14	14
North Anderson Elementary (20)....	0	0	0	0	0	515	515	(0.0) 011111110000001	0	0	0	0	0	18	18
Southview School (16)...	0	0	0	0	0	434	434	(0.0) 011111110000000	0	0	0	0	0	14	14
Franklin Elementary School (24).....	0	0	0	0	0	520	520	(0.0)	0	0	0	0	0	14	14

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 O'CLOCK 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 order of yesterday, November 24, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 26, 1969, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 25, 1969:

IN THE NAVY

The following named officers for permanent promotion to the grade of captain in the Navy in accordance with Article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution:

- Comdr. Charles Conrad, Jr., U.S. Navy.
- Comdr. Richard F. Gordon, Jr., U.S. Navy.
- Comdr. Alan L. Bean, U.S. Navy.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 25, 1969:

U.S. ATTORNEY

Stanley B. Miller, of Indiana, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Indiana for the term of 4 years.

U.S. MARSHALS

Andrew J. F. Peeples, of Florida, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Florida for the term of 4 years.

James W. Traeger, of Indiana, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Indiana for the term of 4 years.

Anthony E. Rozman, of Michigan, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Michigan for the term of 4 years.

Lloyd H. Grimm, of Nebraska, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Nebraska for the term of 4 years.

J. Keith Gary, of Texas, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Texas for the term of 4 years.

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Maurice B. Mitchell, of Colorado, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

Stephen Horn, of California, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

Howard A. Glickstein, of New York, to be Staff Director for the Commission on Civil Rights.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE VICE PRESIDENT—VALID CRITICISM

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, Vice President AGNEW has hit a responsive chord in the hearts of most Americans. Most of the people I have talked to about his speeches are not only in agreement, but they say he does not go far enough.

Last week the Arizona Republic published an excellent series of editorials written by Edwin McDowell, who is no stranger to the preparation of material

for national media. This is one of the most careful and reasoned series that I have seen on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that the entire series of three articles be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arizona Republic, Nov. 16, 1969]

WERE SPIRO AGNEW'S CRITICISMS VALID?

COLUMNIST SAYS YES, AND TELLS WHY

(By Edwin McDowell)

Vice President Spiro Agnew will not win an Emmy for his recent speech in Des Moines, charging that the TV networks are abusing their unprecedented concentration of power over American public opinion.

Already commentators are joining the network executives who widely condemned the

speech as an attempt to intimidate and interfere with press freedom.

But the public opinion polls will no doubt show, as the early returns have already shown, that the large majority of Americans agree with the vice president.

I also want to go on record in support of Mr. Agnew's criticisms.

Frankly, I am uneasy that the criticism was lodged by a high-ranking government official.

I see no reason to doubt the vice president's opposition to any government censorship, nevertheless my reaction is to recoil whenever a government official says anything that smacks of media censorship.

But Mr. Agnew was right to ask whether a form of censorship already exists. And the answer, in my opinion, is that it does.

It is not as pernicious as government-imposed censorship, yet it is still widespread, it is blatant, and it is a repudiation of the

very values that the media in a democracy are charged with upholding—namely, free and equal access to various shades of opinion.

In his rebuttal to Mr. Agnew, J. W. Roberts, president of the Radio, Television News Directors Association, said that broadcast journalists "are not and will not be a propaganda agency for any government's policies or for any government officials."

Correct . . . as far it goes.

But what Roberts did not say is that network broadcast journalists are too often propagandists for particular ideological policies, and it is this commitment which effected the imbalance about which the vice president complained.

Let me be very clear on this point: Arizona radio and TV stations, particularly Phoenix radio and TV with which I am most familiar, do a uniformly excellent job.

They broadcast the news fairly and impartially, are careful to label editorial opinions, and, as far as I can discern, grind few if any ideological axes.

But the networks are something else.

Obviously, most of the news they report is accurate and objective.

There is, after all, only a tenuous connection between ideology and the fact that Apollo 12 is in orbit . . . or that Russia and Red China are at each other's throats . . . or that the cost of living rose another percentage point the previous month.

But in those many grey areas where news touches upon ideology, and in virtually all the areas of comment and analysis, the sentiment is overwhelmingly liberal.

Let us not argue semantics. Unless one is interested solely in scoring debater's points, the term liberal describes the ideology which believes that social welfare, equality, and justice can best be attained through the efforts of the federal government.

Conservatives, on the other hand, are generally wary of a strong federal government, believing with Teddy Roosevelt that a government big enough to do things for you is big enough to do things to you.

Conservatives, therefore, generally believe in the Principle of Subsidiarity—the notion that no large government agency should undertake to do what a smaller government agency can do, and no government agency should do what a nongovernmental agency can do.

Both liberalism and conservatism are eminently respectable, and each ideology is endorsed by men of unquestioned integrity and intellectual acumen.

Yet it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than it is for the conservative position to receive a fair hearing on network radio and television.

Who says?

Many people, as a matter of fact.

ABC's Frank Reynolds admitted last year that there is an Eastern, liberal bias on network television.

NBC's Fred Freed is quoted by TV Guide (Sept. 27) as attributing the imbalance on TV to the newsmen's own liberal ideology:

"This generation of newsmen is a product of the New Deal. These beliefs that were sacred to the New Deal are the beliefs that news has grown on. This is true of the networks, of Newsweek, of the New York Times, of all media."

In a speech delivered in Detroit on Sept. 26, Frank Shakespeare, Jr., director of the U.S. Information Agency, charged that "reporters and commentators entering television leaned to an excessively liberal point of view" and he said it was the responsibility of news directors to assure a better conservative balance.

Finally, in the Nov. 6, 1965 issue of the Liberal New Republic, former Time staffer John Gregory Dunne wrote:

"I think it can be argued that the three major networks are indirectly responsible for

the proliferation of paranoid (rightwing) broadcasters.

"The reason is that there is nothing on the air today remotely passing for responsible dissent. The news departments of all three networks are in the hands of an Establishment consensus, bounded on one side by Eric Sevareid, on the other by Howard K. Smith."

The frequency with which William Buckley graces the airwaves does not invalidate this description, Dunne said, because, "as Proust was the pet Jew of the anti-Semites, so Buckley is the pet conservative of the Establishment."

Dunne cogently argued for more conservatives on radio and TV, which would have the effect of inducing Americans to consider "whether opposition to Medicare can be dismissed simply as hostility to old people, or support of the bracero program only as an excuse to exploit Mexican wetback labor."

Those points—and Vice President Agnew's—are well taken. I propose to deal with them at greater length.

[From the Arizona Republic, Nov. 17, 1969]
IDEOLOGICAL IMBALANCE ON NETWORKS PRESENTS BALANCED TREATING OF VIEWS

(By Edwin McDowell)

Vice President Spiro Agnew contends that network television gives a distorted view of events.

I concur, although I would extend that to include network radio as well.

And it is distorted because in those many areas of news which brush against ideology, the networks have stacked the deck in favor of the liberal position.

They have not provided us with that "multitude of tongues" of which the late Justice Learned Hand spoke.

Instead, they have been content largely to offer only one viewpoint, a viewpoint which is not monolithic, to be sure, but which—by dismissing or misshaping other viewpoints—makes it more difficult for viewers to formulate intelligent opinions.

This is not the result of any "conspiracy," as some no doubt believe.

Nor is it that network officials and broadcasters deliberately try to deceive their 40 million viewers.

On the contrary, these men are often intelligent, and usually deeply concerned with the events they report.

But the weakness of their position is that, by concentrating almost exclusively on the positions they support on important political, economic, and social issues, they are failings in their duty to inform the public.

CBS's Eric Sevareid, in Phoenix several days ago, said that Mr. Agnew's complaint that the TV networks are dominated by liberals was illogical.

If the President can claim the majority of people support his Vietnam policy, which is at odds with the liberals' views on Vietnam, then, he said, the networks "must be very ineffectual—so ineffectual, I don't know why Mr. Agnew's so upset."

But Mr. Sevareid missed the point by confusing the hold network TV has on viewers with the entirely separate issue of basic fairness.

If the TV-viewing public does not believe as the network commentators believe, it is certainly not for lack of trying on the part of the network commentators.

The fact is that liberalism, like conservatism, commands the allegiance of only a small segment of the American public.

Most Americans are, as the articulate liberal Steve Allen once wrote, both liberal and conservative. They pick and choose between those ideologies.

Yet on issue after issue, only the liberal point of view is given the thorough, balanced treatment on network radio and television which both points of view deserve:

Red China's admission to the U.N. . . . conditions in Castro's Cuba or in Soviet Russia . . . East-West trade . . . the U.N. boycott of Rhodesia . . . crime and violence in American society—on all these matters, and many more, it is the liberal viewpoint which predominates.

When the conservative position is given at all, it is most often represented not by the many thoughtful conservative scholars or intellectuals, but by some quasi-reactionary whose very presence seems designed to discredit the position he is ostensibly upholding.

To present Billy James Hargis as the voice of conservatism is as intellectually dishonest as to present Madalyn Murray as the voice of liberalism.

Arthur Schlesinger Jr. has written: "If television and radio were to become the instrumentality of a single opinion, this would constitute an obvious misuse of the air waves and defiance of the Constitution."

Yet, as Vice President Agnew and others have said, they have become the instrumentality of a single opinion.

It is true that radical leftists—one immediately thinks of Noam Chomsky and Susan Sontag—also feel that the media ignore their positions, that the media are too "conservative."

But the purpose here is not to argue whether the left and right zanies should have equal access to the TV and radio networks.

It is to ask whether by denying equal access—and much of the time, any access—to respectable conservative opinion (that is, opinion as far to the right of center as network TV opinion is to the left of center), the marketplace of ideas to which both liberals and conservatives affirm allegiance is effectively shut down.

I believe it is. And I believe the networks have a moral obligation to reassess their position on the matter.

Why during the orgy of self-incrimination that the networks fed us after the assassinations of the Kennedys and Martin Luther King, were viewers subjected to an unremitting string of commentators and consultants who battered us over the head with the club of collective guilt?

Why was not equal time given to those who believe, as did Edmund Burke and as do many intellectuals today, that collective guilt is a harmful and erroneous doctrine?

Why was not equal time given to those intellectuals who deny the Kerner Commission Report's contention that ours is a white racist society?

Why, at the political conventions, do the networks feel compelled not just to report the news but to manufacture the news by repeatedly attempting to foist off their preferred candidates . . . and then complain that the "will of the people" (in reality, the will of the network officials) was thwarted by the electors?

Whitney Young—or was it Roy Wilkins?—was absolutely right, in my opinion, when he charged that Stokely Carmichael has few followers in the black community, but has hundreds of votaries in the media who labor overtime to represent him as a legitimate spokesman for America's Negroes.

Additional comments are in order, and I shall deal with them in a final column.

TODAY'S QUOTE

From a letter in the New York Times Magazine by Dr. Edgar F. Berman, who was personal physician to Vice President Humphrey and a member of his 1968 campaign staff:

The press was almost schizoid during (the Chicago) campaign . . .

Humphrey, because of his association with Johnson and his refusal to repudiate him, from his announcement on, was unmercifully flayed by the press and TV. . .

However, in the "Crime of Chicago" the

press was a minor force, an accessory after the fact.

Television was the true agent of violence. . . From my observations, most of the "pencil press" could be found getting most of their "first-hand" reports directly from the tube.

After some reporters were manhandled by the police, the press and TV were a solid affronted front, and few writing journalists doubted the objectivity of the television camera.

[From the Arizona Republic, Nov. 18, 1969]

**MEDIA MAKE AS WELL AS REPORT NEWS;
NETWORK NEWS STRONGLY ONE-SIDED**

(By Edwin McDowell)

Nothing is more disheartening to a person than to have his views distorted or misrepresented.

Yet when distortion and misrepresentation occur year in, year out, in the one medium upon which most Americans depend for their news, it is more than disheartening.

It is inexcusable. . . and shameful.

Yet that is how the conservative viewpoint has been mistreated by network television (and by network radio).

For years now, intellectual conservatives have winced every time the network commentators have supposedly defined the conservative position on the major social, political, and economic issues.

And with good reason, for seldom have those positions emerged in recognizable form.

TV viewers would scarcely know that there are profound philosophical conservative positions on such issues as minimum wages, open housing, right-to-work, school bussing, federal aid, et al.

Most often, the "conservative" positions aired by the networks are those of malcontents, reactionaries, bigots, and Know-Nothings.

Liberal commentators who have never read a line by Hayek, Roepke, Hutt, Friedman, Jewkes, Dietze, Bauer, Palyi, Stigler, D. Jouvenel, and the hundreds of other conservative intellectuals, airily agglutinate those positions with the positions of rightwing crackpots (of whom there are many), and thereby presumably feel that they have faithfully discharged their obligation (as government-created monopolies) to be objective.

For years it was the conservative scholars who alone criticized the present welfare system and urban renewal.

It was conservative intellectuals who proposed the guaranteed annual wage and state-sharing of federal revenues.

It was conservative economists who argued the importance of the money supply as a regulator of economic activity.

Today each of those positions is endorsed by prominent liberals. And Milton Friedman, as the Wall Street Journal recently noted, has become perhaps the most influential economist in the land.

But until liberals began acknowledging that the current welfare system is debilitating, or that urban renewal was really Negro removal, the objections could be found only in conservative journals or in books which were ignored or dismissed by the media.

Even Friedman, like others of the brilliant Intellectual Brain Trust Goldwater assembled in 1964 to advise him on public policy, was depicted as an "extremist," a "reactionary," a "mossback" by network commentators who either were unfamiliar with his work or simply were not equipped to understand it.

It is one of the enduring myths of journalism—print and broadcast journalism—that the media do not make the news, but only report it.

Dr. John R. Rider, chairman of the mass communications department at Southern Illinois University, correctly said (Quill, Oct. 1969) "the words and pictures that flow from the instruments of news media do, without

question, structure the world for the beholder.

"The consumer of our products can only react to and accept or reject the material we allow him to read or hear or see.

"And so, in our editorial function, we make the world after our own image. The world is as we say it is."

Indeed.

And the world presented by the network TV and radio is a world of pseudo-reality.

In part because of the very nature of news (it is not news, for example, that each airplane landing and taking off at Sky Harbor does so safely; it is only news when one crashes or has a near-miss).

But in larger part because the networks run a closed ideological shop in which there is an almost total absence of viewpoints which run counter to the dominant liberal viewpoint.

That is why, as liberal author Theodore H. White recently noted, while we were given every detail about every extreme rightist individual or organization in the land, we were unprepared for the widespread assault on our traditions and institutions by the extreme left . . . which we were led to believe didn't exist.

Vice President Spiro Agnew was right when he said that the viewpoint of New York (which James Reston termed the "most unrepresentative community in the entire U.S.") is not the viewpoint of America.

He is right 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."

(Writing in Harper's last year, Robert MacNeil, now with the BBC but formerly with NBC, said: "If a commentator wishes, he can make his attitude known in a multitude of subtle ways by varying his expression or intonation. More important, however, are the facts the commentator chooses to use and the form of words used to report them.")

Mr. Agnew was right when he quoted an unnamed FCC official (it was Nicholas Johnson, the most prominent liberal member of the commission) as saying that the power of the networks may be greater than that of the federal, state, and local governments combined.

Finally, the Vice President was right when he asked how many marches and demonstrations we would have if the marchers did not know that the TV cameras would be there to record their antics for the next news show.

(Dr. Daniel J. Boorstin, professor of American history at the University of Chicago, says: "The development of radio, movies, and TV means that to be newsworthy almost by definition means to be violent. To attract attention on television, there have to be people in motion or people hitting one another.")

Finally, Mr. Agnew was right to question the concentration of power in the hands "of a tiny and closed fraternity of privileged men" a concentration of power they would not tolerate in the hands of the government.

The answer, obviously, lies not in more government control but in greater network responsibility . . . in balancing the predominant liberal view with that of conservatism, the other major, respectable ideology of our age. Critic and author Leo Rosten said that intellectual honesty demands that one who takes a stand on important issues first be able to express an opponent's position in terms acceptable to the other person.

I believe that with all my heart.

I also believe that the networks have failed woefully to measure up to that standard of intellectual honesty.

My hope is that they set aside their fury with Mr. Agnew long enough to ponder the serious and disturbing questions he raised, and then take positive steps to correct the gross imbalance in their commentary and news.

AS I SEE IT: COUNTRY LUCKY TO HAVE AGNEW
(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—Anarchy, says Vice President Sipro Agnew, is not readily evaluated, and this country may be closer to a crack-up than is generally known.

The October moratorium and the November mobilization turned him on. He burst into whip-lash speeches at New Orleans and Harrisburg.

In public he inveighs against the impudent snobs, the pseudo-intellectuals, the political hustlers who are leading American youth to its own destruction.

"I just hope I didn't wait past the danger point," the vice president told me. "What's my grand design? It's to denounce what I believe to be an unhealthy philosophy and to strengthen the resolve of other national leaders to speak out."

He flipped a leaf of paper on the desk. It showed a letter count of the two weeks which followed his New Orleans speech. The figures read pro-7122, con-1587.

Agnew burns with patriotic concern over his country's internal plight. He is resentful of petty criticism, enraged at his rotten treatment by the hostile press.

How many who ridicule his ardor for the country have what it takes to make a combat company commander? Which of those who feel superior have put themselves through law school and been a law school teacher for seven years?

None of these achievements are mentioned in the typical coverage of Agnew's activities.

Any man of spirit would lash out at his character-assassins. Agnew loathes and distrusts, curses and bypasses those reporters whose publications have done him wrong. The man's got intellectual muscle, and he's got the moxie, and we are lucky to have him around.

**LAND REFORM IN SOUTH
VIETNAM**

HON. FLOYD V. HICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following series of articles from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer by Mr. Frank Herbert which sheds considerable light on "the other war" in Vietnam, and the problems being encountered in efforts to stabilize that country.

Mr. Herbert accompanied Dr. Roy L. Prosterman of the University of Washington to Vietnam, where Dr. Prosterman advised and assisted the Saigon Government in its land reform efforts.

Following is one of Mr. Herbert's interpretative articles on the situation there:

A TOUGH LOOK AT VIET LAND REFORM

(By Frank Herbert)

COPENHAGEN, DENMARK.—All day yesterday as we flew the SAS TransAsian Express across India and Russia from South Vietnam I kept thinking that what the United States needs most desperately right now is a crash course in South Vietnamese politics.

For the past 17 days in South Vietnam, days of 12 to 20 hours each. I have undergone just such a course at the hands of Vietnamese and Americans who see the problems in clearest terms. There were moments when the brutal Oriental logic of my discoveries shocked me in ways difficult to describe.

Those discoveries and the shocks have left me with a firm belief that we must understand what we can do within the limits of Vietnam as it is, not as we would wish it to be.

The political climate in the U.S. is such that we have run out of time for alternate choices.

A major paradox of the Vietnam War is that we have understood our enemy better than our ally. We have tended to assume our ally is just like us and has the same aims we have.

Almost from the beginning however, we have said the enemy was strongly motivated, fanatically determined, capable of the most blood-chilling violence to gain his ends.

By our standards, it takes something viciously evil and depraved to make the Viet Cong chop off a child's hands in front of his parents because the parents gave information to the Saigon forces. But they have done this and worse. A day seldom passes without such terrorist tactics from the VC.

What we have not seen is this same enemy in our ally.

Here's a shocker No. 1, and let me preface it by the warning that you should strive to prevent its turning you against South Vietnam. Attempt to understand it on their terms.

Quiet but intensive real estate speculation to take advantage of land reform legislation is going on right now all through the Mekong Delta and the Central Lowlands of South Vietnam. Its sources reach into the middle echelons of the Saigon government.

Hopefully, this revelation will come with as much shock to President Nguyen Van Thieu as it does to you. There's reason to believe it will.

What you must grasp about this land speculation is that it's accompanied by brutal suppression of protest, mostly at the hands of some units of the Army of the Republic of Vietnam in which we place such great hopes.

ARVN tactics on occasion include dropping artillery rounds "by mistake" onto recalcitrant villagers asleep in their huts at night.

It's well to note that most South Vietnam experts agree ARVN is "substantially infiltrated" by VC. You can imagine how much this VC infrastructure enjoys turning the peasantry against the ARVN.

Operating behind ARVN muscle, the land speculation takes two basic forms: (1) buying up options at prices well below what would be paid under a land reform program, and (2) paying outrageously low prices for property in insecure areas.

I have talked to landowners who accepted 3,000 piasters per hectare for land in areas controlled by ARVN during the day and by the VC at night. (There are 118 piasters to U.S. \$1).

There are authoritative reports of prices as low as 2,000 piasters per hectare in such areas.

These prices work out to about \$18 to \$25 for 2.4 acres. Compensation prices now being discussed for land taken over under a reform program average 45,000 piasters per hectare. They go up to more than four times that price, and even to 20 times that price for exceptionally choice lands.

CONSCIENCE

What disturbs the American conscience is discovery that the land speculation teams operate with information that has to be fed from key points in key ministries.

Buyers know precisely which landowners are feeling the greatest economic pinch—difficulty over taxes, loans, legal judgments against them.

They also know which lands are marked for highest compensation under land reform.

Shocker No. 2: Much of GVN's "open handed dispensation" of former French lands to the peasantry has been on the basis of political promises.

The tactics remind you of the way ward-healers once bought votes in the U.S. You get the land only if you agree to give Saigon your fullest political support.

To understand the rural response, you

have to realize how unutterably war-weary the people are.

Two decades of South Vietnamese have known little more than the ebb and flow of battle across their homes and land.

They are as sick of the VC as they are of Saigon—and this fact alone could account for the drop in VC recruiting noted over the past year.

Realization of this psychological truth has prompted many American advisers to say a big advantage of Popular Force and Rural Force training rests in the simple fact that it arms people and teaches them how to resist both the ARVN and the VC.

You were warned that it's necessary to understand these things in Vietnamese terms.

CONCLUSION

Conclusion number one to be derived from these revelations is that forces within the Saigon government are firmly committed to land reform.

The guns are being turned away from the peasantry and against the landlords.

If this program is carried out quickly and thoroughly it can only help to bring political stability to South Vietnam. People will fight for their own land.

This is a lesson we've learned in South Korea, in Bolivia, in Japan, Mexico and Iran. Land ownership plus economic development bring political stability.

The Saigon government also is aware that every dynasty in Vietnamese history has begun with successful land reform. If they can carry this off—on their terms and with their methods—the war may be shortened by many years.

The clear danger then is that discovery of these actions, which we call corruption, turn us so much against South Vietnam that we abandon that country.

Our task is to read the political indicators clearly in Oriental terms. If we make the wrong decision now, we could be out of the war by this time next year—but with enormous loss of prestige throughout the world, and with nothing to show for our thousands of lives and our billions of dollars except a sad lesson.

If, however, we back Saigon with land compensation money, thus virtually eliminating landlord opposition, we can gain what we've sought all along: a strong South Vietnam firmly committed to support of the U.S.

LESSON

The lesson would be plain to all Southeast Asia. Meanwhile, those who are persuaded that all would be lovely and equitable under a land reform program initiated by the North Vietnamese Communists in South Vietnam should be reminded that land reform or collectivization efforts under communists historically are accompanied by blood baths.

It was true in Russia. It was true in China. And North Vietnamese peasants who took part in a 1954 revolt against Hanoi have not been heard from since. Eight thousand among the peasants of North Vietnam who resisted collectivization were executed out-of-hand.

Of major importance in all of this, is the fact that South Vietnam's effort toward land reform is being attempted through democratic processes. If the North Vietnamese take over South Vietnam, there will be land reform! No question about that. But in a sea of blood.

POLITICS

Someone once said that playing politics in South Vietnam was like fighting for deck chairs on the Titanic.

There's an unfortunate note of truth in this. South Vietnam is essentially an anarchy on a family base. Politics here operate in microcosms of power balance pitted against power balance—all on a family basis.

Whoever holds a power position in South Vietnamese politics holds it as representative

of his family. Think of the importance we place on the individual, then apply this emotional force to the concept of the family—only then do you come close to understanding the Oriental attitude.

The most important cellular structure demanding the loyalty of the South Vietnamese individual is his family. If a decision must be taken where the nation falls but the family gains, the Vietnamese may well decide to let the nation fall.

There's no broad base of real nationalism in South Vietnam. Everything operates only on the basis of the most necessary inter-family cooperation.

If you think of a continuous balance-of-power conflict, family against family, you come close to understanding Vietnamese politics.

The issue in Vietnam then may well turn in part on who has how much wealth securely invested outside that tragic nation.

Instead of listening only to the programed promises of South Vietnamese officialdom, the U.S. could well turn its investigative capabilities toward discovering what we can about this vital state of affairs.

SHOCKING

You were warned the lesson was shocking and brutal and that you must not let it turn you off.

Accept it that the people doing the things described here and elsewhere have a vastly different value and moral structure than ours.

They merely want to strengthen their families by taking their cut of land reform profit off the top.

They expect this as their right, not as a sin or cheating or betrayal. They find it outrageous that we cannot understand this simple (to them) fact. They consider you a simpleton if you don't grasp it immediately.

Wouldn't you do the same thing to strengthen your family? What then is arrayed against essential land reform in South Vietnam?

Assuming we guarantee compensation to the landlords, a dollar cost amounting to only six days of the war, or about \$400 million, the biggest stumbling block in President Thieu's path is family jealousies. Will those who share his power allow him to build a secure political base among South Vietnam's peasants?

If he carries this off, he's president for life. You have only to look at the example of President Park in South Korea to see the truth of this statement. Certainly, President Thieu has seen this.

He obviously is working right now within the political strictures I have described, attempting to gain a workable land reform law.

He also will seek any personal-family advantage he can.

There may be places where he will be tempted to fudge on land reform to gain more personal-family advantage.

Our task is to make it plain to him that we understand what is happening. Land reform will come about only if he can be persuaded there is no way out of building this political base on the broadest and strongest foundation.

He may already have received part of this message.

The U.S. has guaranteed \$10 million from 1969 funds toward landlord compensation under a land reform program. We also have agreed to ask another \$30 million next year for the same purpose.

U.S. Mission to Vietnam officials right now are in Washington, D.C., attempting to gain our commitment for another \$10 million yearly to support this program, up to a total of \$100 million.

But we have been careful. Our promise of \$30 million is couched in such terms the U.S. is not obligated to pay a cent unless the South Vietnamese produce a workable law with strong and immediate political impact.

Many South Vietnamese, aware of this, don't believe we mean it. Our task, then, should be to make it clear we do mean it, that we are not going to spend any more American lives to sustain a 19th Century Mandarin oligarchy.

Either South Vietnam undertakes some of the basic 20th Century reforms, such as in South Korea and notably Mexico, or it forfeits the right to further help from us.

EXECUTIVE ENCROACHMENT

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, an excellent article written by James E. Remmert was published in the American Bar Association Journal in November of 1969.

Mr. Remmert is a member of the major corporation's Dallas legal department and was formerly a member of the American Bar Association staff in Chicago. He is a graduate of the University of Wisconsin. His article is a fine example of the needed distinction that wants emphasis in this Nation; namely, that laws are made by Congress and administered by the Executive, and that differences are resolved by the judiciary.

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

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

[From the American Bar Association Journal, November 1969]

EXECUTIVE ORDER 11246: EXECUTIVE ENCROACHMENT

(By James E. Remmert)

(NOTE.—Section VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, forbidding discriminatory employment practices, was the product of legislative compromise. Executive Order 11,246, issued by President Johnson in 1965 and applicable to Government contractors, was the product of unilateral Executive judgment and consequently not only forbids discriminatory employment practices but requires employers to take affirmative action to ensure against them. Will the Executive always be serving a good cause when he uses the contract power to skirt the legislative process?)

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was made the law of the land amidst great controversy, extended debate and considerable compromise. With far less controversy or compromise and with no Congressional debate, President Johnson on September 24, 1965, signed Executive Order 11,246, the latest in a series that has played at least as significant a role in implementing the objective of equal employment opportunity as has Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.¹ Section 202(1) of this executive order, as amended, requires that every employer who is awarded a Government contract or subcontract that is not exempted by the Secretary of Labor must contractually undertake the obligation not to "discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, religion, sex or national origin".

Since Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act had to endure the rigors of passing both houses of Congress, it is the product of compromise attendant upon the legisla-

tive process. Executive Order 11,246, by comparison, was the responsibility of only the President. Consequently, it imposes much broader substantive obligations, and the procedure adopted for its enforcement conveys to the enforcing agency significantly more authority than was given to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission by the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Evidence of the broader substantive obligation imposed by Executive Order 11,246 is the fact that Title VII imposes only the obligation *not* to do that which is prohibited, *i.e.*, discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex or national origin. By comparison, Executive Order 11,246 not only requires that Government contractors and subcontractors not discriminate but also that they "take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, religion, sex, color, or national origin [Section 201(1); emphasis supplied]." Regulations issued by Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz under authority of Executive Order 11,246 further require that Government contractors and subcontractors develop a "written affirmative action compliance program"² documenting the steps they have taken and setting goals and timetables for additional steps to fulfill the "affirmative action" obligation. The submission of these written programs has also been imposed as a prerequisite to the award of some Government contracts. However, on November 16, 1968, Comptroller General Elmer B. Staats ruled that "until provision is made for informing bidders of definite minimum requirements to be met by the bidder's program and any other standards or criteria by which the acceptability of such program would be judged,"³ contract awards must be made to the lowest eligible bidder without reference to the affirmative action program.

PRESIDENT SIMPLY TOOK POWER THAT CONGRESS WOULDN'T GIVE

That the Executive was willing to assume by executive order significantly greater enforcement authority than Congress was willing to convey to it can be seen by comparing the adjudicatory processes under Title VII and Executive Order 11,246. If an employer disagrees with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission over the legal requirements imposed by Title VII, or if the employer is unable to comply with the remedies proposed by the commission to rectify a discriminatory practice, he may have traditional recourse through the judicial process before any sanction is imposed. To the contrary, however, the regulations issued by Secretary of Labor Wirtz for the administration of Executive Order 11,246 provide that upon request for a hearing to adjudicate a contractor's or subcontractor's compliance with the executive order, the Secretary of Labor's designee may suspend all contracts or subcontracts held by the employer pending the outcome of the hearing.⁴ In addition, as a part of the adjudicatory process, the agency responsible for investigating or supervising the investigation of a contractor's compliance and prosecuting those contractors alleged to be in noncompliance is also responsible for imposing the sanctions of cancellation and suspension from participation in Government contracts.⁵ In other words, the chief investigator, prosecutor and final judge with respect to cancellation and suspension of Government contracts is the Department of Labor.

WITH THE CONTRACT POWER, WHO NEEDS CONGRESS?

These substantive and procedural contrasts between Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and Executive Order 11,246 illustrate the considerable power that the Executive can acquire by pursuing a social objective through the use of the contract power in addition to or in place of legislation. Such broad and sweeping powers are premised on the concept

that the Federal Government has the "unrestricted power . . . to determine those with whom it will deal, and to fix the terms and conditions upon which it will make needed purchases".⁶ This power is founded on the premise that in the absence of a Congressional prohibition or directive the Executive branch is free to enter into contracts on whatever conditions and provisions are deemed to promote the best interests of the Government.⁷

Without question, Executive Order 11,246 has done much to advance the cause of equal employment opportunity, because the Federal Government's bargaining position enables the Executive to require such terms as are found in this order as a condition to a United States Government contract. Once such a broad and sweeping obligation is accepted, the accepting contractor or subcontractor is in an untenable position to oppose steps that are required by the administering agency with respect to the conditions covered by the contract.

To illustrate the impact of this use of the Executive's contract power, one need only consider a list of the top 100 corporations and institutions holding Defense Department contracts.⁸ These corporations are understandably some of the largest in the United States and collectively employ well over ten million persons. Even though the list does not include contractors with any department other than Defense or the many subcontractors involved in Defense Department prime contracts, it aptly illustrates the significant indirect control which the Executive can exert over the private sector of the economy by use of the contract power.

There is very little case law deciding the extent to which the President may by executive order impose ancillary conditions to Government contracts. Some have questioned the validity of Executive Order 11,246 on the ground that the Executive does not have the authority to impose conditions that are unrelated to the purposes for which Congress appropriated funds⁹ and on the basis that the affirmative action obligation conflicts with provisions in the 1964 Civil Rights Act. These provide that preferential treatment on the basis of race, color, religion, sex or national origin is not required to correct an imbalance.¹⁰ However, at least one federal district court¹¹ and two United States courts of appeal¹² have said that Executive Order 11,246 has the full force and effect of statutory law. If these courts are correct and the order is a valid exercise of the Executive's contract power, then some examination of the potential extension of this power is in order.

Although the writer is unaware of any publication listing all firms holding competitively bid or negotiated United States Government contracts or subcontracts, it is the writer's belief that the vast majority of the major commercial enterprises in this country and a great many not-for-profit institutions and smaller commercial enterprises hold one or more Government contracts or subcontracts. Consider, for example, the diverse scope of the organizations holding Government research grants, the utilities and communications services used by federal installations, the dependence of such industries as automotive, aircraft, shipbuilding and munitions on Government contracts, the heavy reliance of the construction industry on such programs as urban renewal and highway construction sponsored by federal funding, and the entrenchment of United States Government financing and deposits as a factor in the financial institutions throughout the country.

WHERE DOES THIS PRECEDENT LEAD?

Consideration should also be given to some of the possible future applications of the concept behind Executive Order 11,246. The contract power could be used to circumvent the intrastate-interstate dichotomy that has

Footnotes at end of speech.

to some extent precluded complete preeminence of the Federal Government in such fields as air and water pollution control, regulation of common carriers and labor relations. One extension already suggested by the AFL-CIO is the debarment of Government contractors found to have committed flagrant unfair labor practices.

Another avenue for extension of the Executive's contract power is in areas within federal jurisdiction but which Congress has left unregulated or has regulated only to a lesser extent than that deemed desirable by the Executive. An example of this use of the contract power is found in Executive Order 11,246. In enacting Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the Congressional consensus was that the prohibition against discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex and national origin was sufficient to accomplish the objective of eliminating employment discrimination on such bases.

The Executive, however, felt that the then-existing executive order prohibiting discrimination by Government contractors did not go far enough in dealing with the objective of equal employment opportunity, and thus the affirmative action obligation was added to place a greater responsibility on Government contractors.

By using the contract power, the Executive could accomplish many objectives deemed desirable without using the legislative process so long as the particular contract clause does not conflict directly with a federal statute. Thus, this technique affords the Executive a limited bypass of the legislative process and gives it the power to give its objective "the force and effect given to a statute enacted by Congress" without the concurrence of Congress.

Several questions should be answered before this procedure proliferates. The first is whether the concentration of this power in the hands of the Executive is desirable in view of the fact that it allows the President to carry an objective into effect without resort to the legislative process established by the Constitution. In this connection, it is significant to note that Congress considered sanctioning the Executive's use of the contract power to achieve equal employment opportunity but rejected the idea. The original House bill (H.R. 7152) that eventually became the 1964 Civil Rights Act, after numerous amendments, contained a Section 711(b), which read as follows:

"The President is authorized to take such action as may be appropriate to prevent the committing or continuing of an unlawful employment practice by a person in connection with the performance of a contract with an agency or instrumentality of the United States."

During the consideration of H.R. 7152 by the House, Congressman Emanuel Celler (D. N.Y.) sponsored an amendment to eliminate this section of the bill. The amendment was accepted by the House, and in the course of the discussion Congressman John Dowdy (D. Tex.) voiced the view that, "Many of us have felt section 711 to be a highly dangerous section of the bill and accordingly much of our debate has been predicated upon the fact that this language should be removed."¹⁴

With reference to Executive Order 11,246, it has been argued that although this use of the contract power is extraordinary the need for equal employment opportunity justifies this departure from traditional concepts. Those who would rush to the conclusion that the cause of equal employment opportunity does justify a departure from the legislative process would do well to remember that the sword of Executive power cuts in two directions. Thus, the first question that should be considered in connection with Executive Order 11,246 is not whether equal employment opportunity should be

pursued but whether this means is consistent with the basic framework and power balance with which our form of government has successfully endured innumerable crises over the last two centuries.

HISTORY THAT SHOULD BE REPEATED

At another time in our nation's history, the Supreme Court had occasion to consider whether a crisis of similar magnitude justified an expansion of Executive power. In holding that President Truman's executive order seizing the steel mills during the Korean conflict was unconstitutional despite the pending emergency, Justice Douglas in a concurring opinion gave the sage advice that:

"The language of the Constitution is not ambiguous or qualified. It places not some legislative power in the Congress; Article 1, Section 1 says "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

"Today a kindly President uses the seizure power to effect a wage increase and to keep the steel furnaces in production. Yet tomorrow another President might use the same power to prevent a wage increase, to curb trade-unionists, to regiment labor as oppressively as industry thinks it has been regimented by this seizure."¹⁵

In a separate concurring opinion in the same case, Justice Jackson expressed a similar view concerning the overreaching use of Executive power that is highly relevant and appropriate to the concept behind Executive Order 11,246:

"The opinions of judges, no less than executives and publicists, often suffer the infirmity of confusing the issue of a power's validity with the cause it is invoked to promote, of confounding the permanent executive office with its temporary occupant. The tendency is strong to emphasize transient results upon policies—such as wages or stabilization—and lose sight of enduring consequences upon the balanced power structure of our Republic."¹⁶

CONGRESS DOES NOT BELONG ON THE SIDELINES

Congress should give thoughtful consideration to and develop a considered national policy on the use of the contract power exemplified by Executive Order 11,246 rather than stand on the sidelines and allow its proliferation without Congressional guidance. Congress should decide the kind of contracts and the kind of ancillary obligations that it will allow the Executive to impose in disbursing the funds that Congress appropriates. A mechanism should be established that will insure a legislative watchdog over the Executive use of the contract power and will allow the Executive sufficient flexibility to administer efficiently the disbursement of Congressional appropriations.

With specific reference to Executive Order 11,246, Congress should eliminate the double standard that now exists between employers generally who are required not to discriminate by Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and employers who, as Government contractors, are subject to a different standard and a different enforcement procedure in measuring their compliance with the obligation. The identical obligation imposed by Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act should apply, procedurally, substantively and with equal vigor to Government contractors without reference to the extraordinary obligation to take "affirmative action". There is no justification for the multiplicity of government agencies enforcing Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and Executive Order 11,246. At present, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Office of Federal Contract Compliance and every agency that awards Government contracts are all involved in enforcement activities. This

duplication has produced inconsistent enforcement standards, confusion and a wasteful use of Government manpower and resources.

Congress should immediately take appropriate steps properly to realign Congressional and Executive authority, and in doing so it might well consider some further words from Justice Jackson's concurring opinion in *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Company v. Sawyer*. In referring to the over extended use of the executive order, Justice Jackson said:

"Such power either has no beginning or it has no end. If it exists, it need submit to no legal restraint. I am not alarmed that it would plunge us straightway into dictatorship, but it is at least a step in that wrong direction."

"With all its defects, delays and inconveniences, men have discovered no technique for long preserving free government except that the Executive be under the law, and that the law be made by parliamentary deliberations"¹⁷

FOOTNOTES

¹ 42 U.S.C. § 2000c.

² C.F.R. § 60-40.

³ Comptroller General's Letter B-163026.

⁴ 41 C.F.R. § 60-126(b) (2) (11).

⁵ 41 C.F.R. § 60-1.24 and 41 C.F.R. § 60-1.27.

⁶ *Perkins v. Lukens Steel*, 310 U.S. 113, at 127 (1940).

⁷ *Kern-Limerick v. Scurlock*, 347 U.S. 110 (1954).

⁸ TIME, June 28, 1968, at 72.

⁹ See Pasley, *The Nondiscrimination Clause in Government Contracts*, 43 Va. L. Rev. 837 (1957).

¹⁰ 42 U.S.C. § 200e-2(j).

¹¹ *United States v. Local 189, United Paper-makers & Paperworkers*, 282 F. Supp. 39, 43 (E.D. La. 1968).

¹² *Farkas v. Texas Instrument*, 375 F. 2d (629, 632 (5th Cir. 1967)), and *Farmer v. Philadelphia Electric Company*, 329 F. 2d 3, 8 (3d Cir. 1964).

¹³ *Farkas v. Texas Instrument*, 375 F. 2d at 632.

¹⁴ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 110, pt. 2, p. 2575.

¹⁵ *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Company v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579, at 630, 633-634 (1952).

¹⁶ 343 U.S. at 634.

¹⁷ 343 U.S. at 653, 655.

THE PRESIDENT'S TRADE MESSAGE

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is a measure of President Nixon that he made no effort in his message on foreign trade to gloss over the virtual disappearance of the United States traditional trade surplus.

Statisticians may argue about how large this trade surplus has been in recent years, but there is no question that it has amounted to many billions of dollars—dollars that were essential to financing our national security efforts. It also meant that jobs lost to imports were more than made up by jobs gained in producing exports.

The President now tells us frankly this surplus has disappeared, that inflation has eaten it up. He also reminds us that a number of foreign countries are fully competitive with us.

But the President does not tell us that this change in world affairs means that we should shield ourselves from competition. Quite the opposite. He properly lists the declines in our trade surplus as one more good reason to get inflation under control and he warns bluntly that if we try to restore our surplus by cutting back on imports, other countries will repay us by cutting back on our exports.

In facing this issue so openly, the President has come to the only possible conclusion. We must continue to uphold the policy of trade expansion that has served us so well. But we must at the same time keep our costs down and insist that other countries open their markets as fully to our products as we have to theirs.

In other words, the President proposes a vigorous policy of meeting the competition rather than withdrawing from it. He has also proposed a meaningful liberalization of provisions for helping those who are hurt by competition. But I am confident that if we follow sound policies at home and move forward in the traditional trade policies of the United States, we will seldom have to use such provisions.

In this sense, the President's proposals add up to a complete package. I believe we should approach it in that manner and seek to quickly provide the President the modest and practical authority he has requested.

NATIONAL FOREST CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT ACT

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I was among many other Members of the House to offer legislation earlier this year that would make it possible to improve the quality and quantity of timber from the national forests.

This large group of Members, from both parties and from every area of the country, is supporting this concept because of its conviction that only through better timber yields will it be possible to meet the housing goals set by Congress in the past.

This legislation will have a number of other benefits.

In addition to providing ample supplies of timber for the future, it will improve the health of commercial timber lands that also are an important component in our outdoor recreational resources. For my district, and others where national forests are located, it will provide an important stimulus to the economy, both by providing jobs and by an increased contribution of funds to the counties, where income from timber sales is used for roads and schools.

The importance of this bill to my district and to the Nation has been pointed up by a resolution adopted at a recent meeting of the Intercounty Chambers of Commerce of Northern California. This organization represents chambers

in the counties of Siskiyou, Modoc, Trinity, Shasta, Lassen, and Tehama.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share that resolution with this House as an expression of the enthusiasm for the National Forest Conservation and Management Act, as it now is titled in this House, from the people who will have much to do with making it work.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION URGES CONGRESS TO SUPPORT NATIONAL TIMBER SUPPLY ACT

Whereas, the National Timber Supply Act has been introduced in Congress and is now being considered by the House and Senate, and

Whereas, the National Timber Supply Act would provide that the receipts from timber sales off the National Forest lands would be returned to the National Forests to provide for increased silviculture efforts and greater harvests within the sustained yield program of the U.S. Forest Service, and

Whereas, Edward Cliff, chief of the Forest Service, has stated that the National Forests could provide an increased yield of as much as two-thirds if funds were available for proper timber management, and

Whereas, the national policy, as stated in the National Housing Act, calls for construction of 2.6 million housing units annually for the next ten years, compared to the recent annual average of 1.5 million units, and

Whereas, low priced lumber products are essential to provide these needed housing units, and

Whereas, the National Timber Supply Act reaffirms the multiple-use management concept of the U.S. Forest Service for national forest lands, and

Whereas, the National Timber Supply Act would provide increased revenues to the counties in which national timber is located, through greater volumes of timber sales.

Now therefore, be it resolved, by Inter Counties Chambers of Commerce of Northern California, that Congress is urged to support the National Timber Supply Act and work toward its passage and

Further, be it resolved, that the Secretary of the Inter Counties Chambers of Commerce of Northern California is directed to send copies of this resolution to the Honorable Harold T. Johnson, Senators Alan Cranston and George Murphy and other interested parties.

BEFORE I MARCH

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker—

To thine own self be true, And it must follow, as the night the day, Thou canst not then be false to any man.

These words of William Shakespeare, as expressed in Hamlet, are particularly challenging in this day when one is confronted with the proposition—to march or not to march in demonstration of a conviction.

One Mr. D. McCoy, a resident of Carlisle, Pa., in my congressional district, has written a piece entitled "Before I March," which touches on this subject of marching. Because it presents a penetrating examination of the multiple facets associated with the marching propositions, I submit it to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

BEFORE I MARCH

(By D. McCoy)

Before I march, there are many things I need to know;
My intelligence must prevail, or only a paradox will grow.

I must be sure that what I believe in, is not being misused;
That my actions stem from what I feel and know, not because I'm confused.

Tell me that freedom was, is, and always will be, free;
Assure me, if the war stops, more people will not die across the sea.

I want to find out if the marchers are honest and sincere in what they protest;
I refuse to be guided by those with an underlying motive or quest.

I must be certain that there is only evil in this undeclared war;
Is it possible to guarantee an end to conflict—now and forevermore?

I wonder what it's like to be responsible for a governmental task;

And why veterans, people of experience, choose not to march in a mass.

I must discover if freedom is merely an unearned, personal right;
Question my thoughts, that too much freedom might be our country's blight.

Can a nation be safe, even when its citizens are afraid and selfish?
Those in another generation—don't they have a peaceful wish?

Is being isolated a valid solution—will America survive the years;
Or will this be the beginning of more inevitable and unpredicted fears?

Will the protestors exclude people who cannot cope with life?
I cannot parade as a scapegoat for someone else's anxiety or inner strife.

Will the group omit the people who follow because it's a thing that's new;
Or because someone they respect shouted, "It's the moral thing to do."

Why is it, if I do not march, I'll be called unconcerned and a hawk.

And if I join the parade, I'll be branded a communist, one of a misled flock?

If I stay in the middle, will I be labelled apathetic, the wearer of two hats;
What youth would call a hypocrite—the cause of the generation gap?

Can a reasonable explanation be given that is not contradictory or appalling;
Or is Chicken Little right—"The sky IS falling."

THE GENTLEMAN FROM NORTH CAROLINA

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the November issue of the magazine Under Sea Technology contained an editorial paying tribute to my colleague from North Carolina, Representative ALTON A. LENNON.

Mr. LENNON's understanding of the subject of oceanography is equaled by few men in Washington. He has served as a subcommittee chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee with dignity and effectiveness.

The article follows:

THE GENTLEMAN FROM NORTH CAROLINA
(By Bob Niblock)

In the consuming push to build a vital national oceanographic effort, there is a natural tendency to forget how far the program has come in one decade. Time and space do not always allow for appropriate recognition of some of the dedicated men who are largely responsible for this progress. There is, we feel, some long-overdue thanks coming to one gentleman in particular and, therefore, we are reserving this page for that purpose this month, although the remainder of the issue is our annual status report on antisubmarine warfare.

The oceanography subcommittee of the House Merchant Marine & Fisheries Committee has just concluded its hearings on the proposed new ocean agency. It was the most crucial round of hearings in the subcommittee's 12-year history and it was no easy chore for the subcommittee members and especially not for its chairman, Representative Alton A. Lennon, the North Carolina Democrat.

We have had the personal pleasure of watching Mr. Lennon in action during these hearings and countless others that preceded them. Few in Congress or anywhere else in Government know the Federal oceanographic program as thoroughly as Mr. Lennon. This knowledge did not come overnight. Since January, 1963, he has been sitting attentively as the subcommittee chairman, listening to one oceanographic expert after another. There is no question that he is one of the few men in Washington who has *really* heard just about everything there is to say about oceanography.

On many occasions, Mr. Lennon has had good cause to properly dress down a witness before him, but we have never seen a man or woman standing before this subcommittee treated without complete dignity and respect. While he can interrogate a witness with the precision of a skilled surgeon, he scrupulously avoids personal assaults.

Each member of his subcommittee is treated with the same high regard, whatever his party affiliation. The non-partisan quality of the oceanography subcommittee is no accident; it was nurtured by a leader who believes firmly that the subcommittee's business is a matter of highest national importance.

Anyone intimately involved in oceanography sometimes grows frustrated by the setbacks, delays and general apathy of those not so involved. We are certain that Mr. Lennon has had his share of discouragement, yet after more than 10 years of duty on the subcommittee, both as a member and as its chairman, he's pushing harder than ever. After hearing all the evidence, he thinks a national ocean agency is something worth fighting for—and that is what he is doing with all the skill, time and energy at his disposal.

This dedicated gentleman from North Carolina has done much in behalf of oceanography.

NEW AUDITORIUM FOR DAVENPORT

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Davenport has for many years faced a problem familiar to many cities of its size. The problem is that of finding adequate space and facilities for various public events. A solution to that problem is now in sight in the form of an auditorium being constructed by

Palmer College of Chiropractic. The building will be known as Alumni-Anton Meister Hall and will seat 5,100 persons.

I would like to take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD the following editorial on the subject and to voice my personal appreciation to Dr. David Palmer, president of the college, and his staff:

[From the Times-Democrat, Nov. 18, 1969]

IT'S A PLUS FOR DAVENPORT

Davenport, which long has been able to count the Palmer College of Chiropractic an asset, is on the way to collecting another dividend.

Alumni-Anton Meister Hall, for which ground has been broken at Eleventh and Brady Streets, promises to supply at least in part a lack which has been sorely felt in this city for years.

Projected primarily to serve college purposes, it will meet general public needs as it shelters gatherings of up to 5,100 persons.

It should spell the end of frustration in efforts to accommodate auto, boat and home shows, the larger musical events, sports contests, exhibits and various commercial presentations.

For the Palmer College of Chiropractic, of course, it means solution of the problem of providing adequately for annual homecoming crowds, freeing the school and the thousands gathering for the programs from the uncertainties of the weather.

At the same time, it enables Davenport to compete with other and larger centers in providing the assembly facilities which are indispensable to a thriving city. Thus it represents a long step up.

The Palmer College of Chiropractic administration deserves unstinted credit for the undertaking. It also merits the full understanding and support of the community.

"CITIZEN SAILORS"—AUTHOR WILLIAM R. KREH TELLS THE STORY OF NAVAL RESERVISTS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in these times of strident dissent and public protest, when patriotism seems to be a dubious attribute in the minds of some, it is fitting to remember and recognize the thousands of dedicated men and women who feel it is their patriotic duty to voluntarily help keep our country alert and strong as members of the U.S. Naval Reserve.

A new book, "Citizen Sailors," by William R. Kreh, has just been published by the David McKay Co. of New York, that should help bring some much needed recognition to this silent and often unheralded group of loyal Americans. This book, written under the sponsorship of the Naval Reserve Association, relates the stirring story of how the U.S. Naval Reserve has earned and maintains a reputation for dedicated service to this Nation.

We owe a debt of gratitude to these citizen sailors of our Navy who for nearly 200 years, from the days of the naval militias of the Revolutionary War, have proved to be such a vital element in our Nation's seapower and military preparedness.

As Adm. T. H. Moorer, the Chief of Naval Operations, says in the foreword to Mr. Kreh's book:

The history of the Naval Reserve is one of brave men and women whose skills, dedication and hard work over the years have enabled our Navy and our American way of life to be what they are today. The Navy's tradition of victory is a heritage of which our countrymen are justifiably proud—and one which Naval Reservists have helped to make a reality.

The story of our Navy citizen sailors has long needed telling and Mr. Kreh, a writer of skill and perception, has told it well. This is neither a dry history nor an organization manual. It is a story of people, of the individual men from all walks of life who make up the Naval Reserve. I doubt that many Members of Congress are aware of the incredible variety of jobs that Naval Reservists do—you can learn about that in this book. I think the Members will also find particularly interesting the six chapters on the kind of difficult and dangerous assignments that Naval Reservists have performed and are performing in Vietnam. Their story is told by a writer who has a singular flair for telling a good action story.

The Naval Reserve Association is to be commended for performing a truly valuable service in helping to bring this interesting and informative book to print. I hope all of my colleagues will read it.

NOT SUPPORTING OUR PRESENT POLICIES IN VIETNAM

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a rather unusual letter from one of my constituents, Mrs. David Whelan. Mrs. Whelan indicates in her correspondence that she is the mother of six children—five of whom are sons. She therefore has a special concern.

The main reason Mrs. Whelan wrote to me was that she resents the fact that, because she was not out demonstrating during the October 15, and November 15 moratorium days, she is considered by the present administration to be a member of the putative "Silent Majority," who support our country's present course of action in Vietnam.

She has requested that I, as her representative in Congress, act as her voice to let the administration know that all who do not march or protest volubly, are not supporting our present policies in Vietnam. In an effort to assist her, I would like to insert her letter at this point in the RECORD. The first paragraph will be omitted, as it deals with previous correspondence.

The letter follows:

LONG BRANCH, N.J.,

November 17, 1969.

DEAR MR. HOWARD: But this is not what I am writing to you about now. It concerns the President's speech, in which I was very disappointed.

I have five sons, and hope desperately that this is not their destiny, to fight in every

war our President and other representatives tell us is strategically important for the safety of our country.

I resent strongly that because we have not demonstrated on Moratorium days, that we backed his speech. My husband is against the Vietnam war, too, but he did not wish me to go to the Monmouth Shopping Center in Eatontown. He believes this would give aid and comfort to the enemy. I respected his wishes. My daughter called from Wagner College and asked if she could go to Washington, D.C. I told her if her father didn't want me to go to the Shopping Center and march, he wouldn't want her to go to Washington. She respected our wishes. But her friends had called their parents and were going. I assumed that some might not have had their parents' blessings, but a good many didn't have strong objections.

Her father told me to write letters and this is what I told my daughter to do. I voted for the 18 yr. old vote mainly because these kids would have a say in what happens to their lives. What right have we to tell an 18 or 19 year old to lay down his very life for our protection, and then tell him he hasn't got the common sense to vote with equal judgment as citizens 21 yrs. and older?

I have great admiration for the majority of the young people. An example of why happened last Christmas at Kennedy Airport. Our son was on stand-by and we waited the whole evening surrounded by so-called "Hippies." This is what we felt anyway, when we first sat down. As we waited we listened to them and watched their courtesy to one another. They had been there all that day and the night before. At 12:30 AM we were told there would be no more flights out that night. We had relatives living nearby and stayed there. We arrived back at the airport at 6:30 AM and there were the same ones, sleeping on the chairs. At about seven thirty, everyone got in line patiently and with the same courtesy. Luckily they put an extra flight on and everyone was accommodated. But for how long can people's patience be tested? What would have happened if they were told no more stand-by that day, and because they were unable to pay full-fare, were also unable to catch their plane?

There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that the Peace Marchers would fight to their death to defend our country here, as would my sons and husband. But fighting in foreign countries and where there is also so much corruption, with our sons' blood has gone too long.

So would you kindly voice our opinion, because this time next year, if it's the same, I am not promising you or my husband that I would not march behind such men as Dr. Spock. Not being able to afford the trip to Washington, D.C., Monmouth shopping center will have to do.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. DAVID WHELAN,
Long Branch, N.J.

LAW STUDENTS STUDY PETROLEUM MARKETING PRACTICES

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the active interest and concern with public issues and problems being demonstrated today by so many of our young lawyers and law students is an excellent sign. As an example of the new role being played by these young advocates, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point, the following statement on

octane marketing practices in the gasoline industry.

This statement was prepared by five law students at George Washington University Law School and filed recently with the Federal Trade Commission for its consideration of the problems raised by the report:

BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION IN
THE MATTER OF THE POSTING OF RESEARCH
OCTANE RATINGS ON GASOLINE DISPENSING
PUMPS

REQUEST FOR PROMULGATION OF A RULE

Introduction

The following report on the marketing practices of the gasoline industry was prepared by students at the George Washington University Law School. The purpose of the report is to present an analysis of the gasoline market from the consumer's point of view. It is proposed that both a rule be promulgated requiring the posting of research octane ratings, in a clear and conspicuous manner on all gasoline dispensing pumps and that the gasoline industry practices of dual distribution and exchange agreements be reexamined taking into full account the deceptive effects of these practices on the consumer. It is felt that these steps are necessary to enable the consumer of gasoline to make a fully informed buying decision.

Marketing practices in the gasoline industry have structured the channels of distribution of gasoline into a complex maze for the consumer. He is incapable of ascertaining either the quality of the product or the components of pricing. Gasoline is an anonymous product to the consumer. He knows only that he is buying a petroleum product, that it has been transformed into gasoline at a refinery, that it is the fuel required for his automobile, and that it may be procured at his local gasoline station. The consumer never sees the gasoline he purchases. He has no idea of what is in it. He has no way to objectively distinguish one gasoline from another. He is unable to distinguish one quality claim from another. Finally, he lacks the sophisticated knowledge necessary to determine if his engine's fuel requirements are being satisfied. But he must use gasoline. He accepts the maze.

Previous examinations of gasoline marketing practices have systematically excluded the effects of those practices upon the consumer. Anti-competitive practices in the gasoline industry have been fully investigated¹ with only one serious defect. Industry marketing practices are irrelevant when treated in the vacuum of what effect the practices have on components of the industry. By definition, marketing includes the consumer. The most flawless distribution system would be useless without the consumer. For this reason, the intra-industrial approach to the evaluation of gasoline marketing practices must be substituted by a consumer-oriented approach.² We deem it necessary to apply this consumer-oriented approach to the current octane rating hearings. At the risk of being accused of attempting to rewrite history, we also deem it necessary to apply this approach retroactively to the previous gasoline marketing practice reports.

Dual distribution

The industry's practice of offering identical products to the consumer through two different outlets—"dual distribution," is often accompanied by the practice of "dual branding"—making one available under a known brand name and the other under an unbranded or private name. These practices, which are common in the gasoline industry, can be deceptive and unfair to the consumer when they are carried out in a fashion which

leads the buyer to mistakenly believe that the lower-priced unbranded gasoline is inferior.

Because the major refining companies, as well as many larger independent refining companies, produce substantially more gasoline than they are able to sell through the normal channels of distribution, additional channels of distribution are utilized. The use of multiple channels of distribution is an obvious solution to the refiner's dilemma of overproduction. The consumer-oriented approach compels us to ask *how* multiple channel distribution effects the consumer.

Dual distribution has been defined as the practice of "marketing products simultaneously through two different channels of distribution—one an independent distributor and the other owned by the marketer, or both independent."³ Dual branding, that species of dual distribution utilized by major branded refining companies, has been defined as "the practice by some manufacturers of selling their branded goods through one channel and simultaneously marketing the same product in unbranded form through another distribution channel."⁴ These definitions which are entirely proper to the intra-industrial approach, must now be rejected and substituted by the following definitions:

"Dual distribution (or dual availability)—the fact of identical products being distributed and made available to consumers through two different outlets.

"Dual branding—the fact of distribution and availability to the consumer of identical products, in branded form at one outlet and unbranded (or private branded) form at another outlet."

Multiple availability of identical products is a common practice in the gasoline industry. Major brand refiners often sell their excess gasoline to private brand or independent dealers at prices substantially below those quoted their own regular branded dealers. The fact that the product sold to both branded dealers and private brand or independent dealers is of like grade and quality, at least, and often identical, raises important legal questions.⁵ The unbranded gasoline is the same exact product, without the benefit of the brand name, but with a price two to three times less than the consumer is willing to attribute to the lack of a brand name.⁶

Dual distribution by the gasoline industry deceives the consumer. With none of the recent consumer legislation⁷ applicable to gasoline "labeling", and with no comprehensive overall rating system, the consumer is unable to realize the advantages of dual availability because the branded product is differentiated in his mind from the unbranded product.⁸ Branded gasolines contain additives while unbranded dealers make no such claims. Branded gasolines are more expensive, which inevitably leads the consumer to the assumption that the higher priced gasoline is "better". This assumption is made with no other tangible quality factors known or made available. The consumer reasons that there must be something inferior about cheaper gasoline. The consumer, unable to objectively determine why the price differential exists, tries to rationalize this difference. Dual distribution, instead of providing dual availability to the consumer, has confused him into the misconception that unbranded gasoline is a product inferior to branded gasoline.

Dual distribution, from an intra-industrial viewpoint, has caused a great deal of instability in the gasoline industry.⁹ Discriminatory pricing practices which characterize dual distribution have the potential of causing serious damage, if not complete destruction to free and open competition.¹⁰ The list of persons in some way injured by dual branding in the refined petroleum industry is long, in fact, nearly all inclusive. It is abundantly

Footnotes at end of speech.

clear that the major brand refiner has the advantage over the smaller independent refiner as a result of a combination of economies of scale and a captive branded market.¹¹ On the retail price level, the branded dealer who sells his branded gasoline for one or two cents above the non-branded dealer must pay from four to six cents more than his non-branded counterpart for the same product. But, one is reminded that although it appears that the non-branded independent dealer is on top in a price war, the independent dealer must finance his losses, while the branded dealer is enjoying a guaranteed margin, regardless of how long the price war continues or how low the price dips. The major-brand refiner, undisciplined and unwilling to restrain output, is the only one who gains from overproduction.

The argument that consumers benefit from price wars and from the market instability caused by dual distribution is fallacious in that, although the consumer in the isolated price war zone temporarily benefits from reduced prices, he later suffers the effects of reduced competition. Also, major gasoline companies have been known to increase prices outside the price war zones to absorb losses stemming from isolated price wars.

The ideal of dual availability is a state in which the consumer has access to the information which would enable him to make a rational buying decision based on the substantive characteristics of the product, knowing exactly what products can be procured at which outlets. Dual distribution as it is presently practiced by the gasoline industry is deceptive in that it perpetuates misconceptions with regard to product characteristics, it serves the industry without either educating or benefiting the consumer, and it insures that the consumer will remain either misinformed or generally uninformed about substantive product characteristics.

It is probably not deceptive *per se* that the consumer is unable to determine what type of branded gasoline he is purchasing at a private, or independent dealer, or whether it is the same gasoline (like grade and quality). However, the fact that the consumer is not informed of substantive product characteristics, and does not have a comprehensive overall rating system by which he may make a rational buying decision provides for a most deceptive situation.

Exchange agreements

Exchange agreements are arrangements between refiners whereby they market each others gasoline as their own. The agreements are usually entered into for reasons of geographical convenience, but they are unfair to the consumer because they deprive him of the benefits of free competition.

An exchange agreement is a contractual arrangement between two refiners in which one produces a specified quantity and grade of gasoline and exchanges it for a like grade and volume of gasoline produced by the other. Exchange agreements are entered into to save the expense of gasoline cross-hauls into an area in which a company markets gasoline, but in which it has no refinery or product pipe line.

Through the years, gasoline exchange agreements have generally become an integral part of the gasoline marketing structure. Few companies have refineries near all the markets which they serve, because the economies of large scale refineries are sufficiently great so that seldom is it desirable for the companies to scatter small refineries throughout the marketing territory. The results of gasoline exchanges include the ability of the companies to reduce costs through the elimination of cross shipment of products.

Perhaps the best example of an exchange agreement is the Hawaii arrangement. There is only one refinery in the state, and it is owned by Standard Oil of California. The

four other major oil companies which market gasoline in Hawaii (Shell, Tidewater, Union, and Texaco) obtain their requirements of regular gasoline from the Standard refinery under exchange agreements. The Hawaiian Senate adopted a resolution in 1963 requesting that the Federal Trade Commission:

"Conduct an investigation into the shipping, distribution, sales and pricing practices of all companies engaged in the business of importing natural gas, gasoline, fuel, and lubricating oils, and all other petroleum products into the State of Hawaii . . . to determine if there exists, or heretofore existed, any illegal monopoly, combination in restraint of trade, price fixing, tie-in sales, or any other violation of Federal law."¹²

One reason for the above legislation order may have been the fact that out of 650 gasoline stations (75% of them surrounding Honolulu) selling five major brands of gasoline, there appears to be little if any price competition at the retail level, with price wars practically non-existent.¹³

It is maintained that ". . . exchange agreements . . . foster competition rather than restrain it", and ". . . the existence of such agreements in our industry has no material effect upon the product quality of the parties to such agreements."¹⁴ Sun Oil assures that "Sun's very limited arrangements of this kind (product exchange agreements) have no effect on the proprietary character of its products."¹⁵ American Oil, likewise, states "[T]he fact that American resells, under its own brand, gasoline received from another refiner pursuant to an exchange agreement, does not mean that the motorist enjoys no real difference in dealing with American as opposed to other oil companies."¹⁶

There are many reasons why exchange agreements may be harmful to the consumer. Within the industry the larger oil companies will naturally exchange only with other large oil companies. Gasoline will not be sold to a marketer who has few redelivery points. Thus exchange agreements minimize price competition because the small companies, who have little to offer the majors, are usually unable to exchange with them. The consumer thus loses the benefit of competition and feels the effect in the price which he pays for his gasoline.¹⁷ Because the larger oil companies are dealing at less than "arms length" terms, their collusive and co-operative efforts cause prices to be much the same in an area, at least among the major branded types of gasoline.

In Hawaii, for instance, the consumer will pay the same price for all major gasolines, because the exchange agreements have effectively eliminated any price competition. If one of the major oil companies selling gas in Hawaii, but not refining it did try to lower the price to increase volume, his supplier might simply terminate the exchange agreement. This would leave him with one gasoline station and nothing to sell. Due to these exchange agreements, the benefits of free competition are lost to the consumer.

The industry has admitted that in some cases the additive packages are not added. It should be deceptive advertising *per se* for a dealer to advertise a branded gasoline and then sell a gasoline not refined by that branded refiner and without the additive package of that refiner.

Octane ratings

Octane ratings are the best known indices of the quality of a gasoline. They are not made available to the consumer, however. For the consumer to make a fully informed choice between the various brands and grades of gasolines the octane ratings should be disclosed.

Even if the consumer gets the particular brand of gasoline which he believes he is buying, and even if he gets all the particular additives promised by the advertising of

the particular gasoline, still the consumer is afforded no objective criterion on which to base his purchase of that gasoline as compared to some other brand. Such a criterion does exist.

That criterion is the octane rating of any given gasoline. The problem facing the gasoline consumer has only been his lack of knowledge about what octane really is. The consumer usually believes that the higher the octane number the better the gasoline. Yet for a given engine there is a particular octane requirement under most driving conditions. Octane of a higher rating than required will do nothing to increase performance while octane of a lower rating may damage the engine if used too much. On the lower side of the scale the driver should be able to hear the knocking of his engine caused by a fuel of too low an octane and then switch to a fuel of a higher octane meeting the requirement of his engine.

However, the consumer has no means to compare fuels. Thus, he may overcompensate for a fuel of too low an octane. For example, the requirement for the consumer's engine might be 94 octane. The regular gasoline at his station might be 93 octane. His engine knocks. He switches to the station's premium fuel of a 99 octane rating. The consumer's cost is substantially increased. But if octane ratings were posted, the consumer would be able to see that the station next door has a regular fuel of 94 or 95 octane which he could try, and thereby find the fuel for his engine's good performance at a fair cost.

Now, the consumer does not have such a tool for rational choice. Naturally the gasoline companies would like every possible motorist to buy premium gasoline. If given only a choice between regular and premium many motorists will certainly be attracted by the connotation of higher quality inherent in the word premium. "Car owners [are] still encouraged to buy premium rather than regular when in doubt—a doubt that the industry itself perpetuates by not giving the buyer the necessary information to help him decide what his car needs."¹⁸

The main argument against using octane as a means of rating gasolines is that octane is but one of many qualities in a gasoline. This is certainly true. There may be as many as twenty-one identifiable qualities in a gasoline. Each of the companies stresses one or more of its additives—for example, mileage, detergent, or acceleration. However, all gasolines contain these additives. The only difference is in the particular blending or concentration of each. The important point is that all the companies use octane rating as the standard means of determining the basic quality of their gasolines. When gasolines are exchanged between companies, the basis for the agreement is quantity and octane rating. Each company receiving the gasoline then injects its own additives.

Furthermore, the main tests run on gasoline quality for the industry use octane as a chief index. The Ethyl Co. makes monthly checks on gasolines, distributing the octane ratings to the manufacturers. The ratings are coded as to company, but many in the industry say these codes are easily broken. The Bureau of Mines also conducts a bi-annual report of octanes which goes only to the government and the manufacturers. Octane tests are also made by DuPont. In some cases the companies run spot checks on their competitors, again for octane rating.

It is claimed that octane is but one of many qualities in a gasoline. Yet octane rating is consistently used as a prime index of quality in tests conducted on their gasolines by them and for them. All gasolines must have certain qualities. One gasoline may take you a little farther, a little faster, with a little less wear on your engine. It is preferred that you use premium to do it. The fact

that you may get more of certain additives in premium gasoline (Humble admits that its regular gasoline contains only two of the six additives contained in its premium) is a factor which the companies might like to further stress in their advertising. However, "If we continue to insist . . . that a gasoline is better because it contains a certain ingredient, when practically all of them do, are we not asking for a 'truth in advertising' bill that would extend controls far beyond what exists now? It is this skirting the edge of legality, staying just a shade short of untruth, that endangers us all."¹⁰

There is some question as to which octane rating method is best. The industry seems to lean towards the road method while continuing to claim that octane is not a good index of quality. The road method, though, is quite expensive because it requires a fleet of cars. As a nationwide rating system the road method might be prohibitively expensive. However, the research octane number, as stated, is consistently used in the major gasoline tests. If it does not exactly reflect the need of a particular car, the driver will still be able to know if he is using a gasoline of too low an octane for his engine. It is argued that the driver would be able to detect a gasoline of too low an octane without the octane being posted. The point is that the driver might pass by a gasoline of sufficient octane for one of unnecessarily high octane.

The research octane number must be a good index of gasoline or it would not be used so prevalently in the industry. Ford Motor Co. gives the gasoline-engine requirements of its cars in research octane numbers. "Experience has shown that of the standard tests available Research Octane Number gives the closest approximation to the anti-knock qualities of typical gasolines when used in engines of most current types of passenger cars."²¹ Forced to choose priorities . . . the most important factor from the point of view of the engine is the octane potential of the fuel.²²

Another argument against octane ratings is the belief that there would be octane wars. "To think that large refineries might give away octanes is ludicrous. A large refinery which can reduce its consumption of tetraethyl lead (important in raising octane) by a tenth of a milliliter per gallon has potential savings of at least a thousand dollars a day."²³ Most likely the octanes would tend to group into a few uniform areas.

It is also argued that the rating of gasolines would be prohibitively expensive. Yet the industry spends \$14 million a year to give away free maps. In 1966-67 the industry spent \$100 million on games. Aside from that the gasoline companies already make use of their own periodic ratings, the monthly ratings of the Ethyl Co., and the biannual reports of the Bureau of Mines. All that needs to be done is to turn these reports over to the consumer via posting on gasoline pumps. A five star system, each star signifying a particular spread in octane, seems to work well in Britain. Also, two states, Virginia and Florida, manage to rate their gasolines.

The consumer might be confused by octane ratings. With slight education that can be easily remedied. With posting he will immediately be in a better position than he is now, having absolutely no means to objectively know what gasoline would be sufficient for the good performance of his car. He is furnished with claims and super-claims but no objective standard.

Furthermore, the consumer does not know what the Society of Automotive Engineers' oil numbers mean. Still he buys S.A.E. 10-20 motor oil because it is recommended in his car owner's manual. He changes to a different oil if driving in the mountains or the desert. (A frequent argument is that the octane requirement is less in Denver

than in New York.) But all car manufacturers could easily give the octane requirements of their cars and specify any changes that might occur because of different driving conditions. This is done for motor oil. It can certainly be done for gasoline of which so much more is consumed.

It is argued that the same make of car may have a wide variance in octane requirements. However, Ford Motor Co. states that 95% of any one of their particular makes will run on the octane rating which is given. Here, again, the point to be stressed is that the driver can tell if he is using a gasoline that does not meet his engine's requirements, but he should not have to purchase a gasoline of too high an octane because he has no means with which to arrive at the correct octane without a needless expenditure for too much octane:

"The Industry's efforts have focused on improving the efficiency of getting and making its product, not really on improving the generic product or its marketing . . . I do not mean that selling is ignored. Far from it. But selling again is not marketing. I do not, as marketing invariably does, view the entire business process as consisting of a tightly integrated effort to discover, create, arouse, and satisfy customer needs. The customer is somebody out there who with proper cunning can be separated from his loss change."²⁴

Not if octane ratings are posted!

Conclusion

We conclude that the gasoline industry has no desire to allow the consumer to make a fully informed buying decision. Their marketing practices serve their industry, not the consumer. Their only association with the consumer is that they offer a necessary, indeed vital, product to him. The industry evidently feels that the consumer is either too ignorant to use octane ratings, or the ratings would endanger the "stability" of a market they have already rendered instable by their own deceptive marketing practices. We therefore move:

1. That the Federal Trade Commission promulgate a rule requiring the mandatory posting of research octane ratings, in a clear and conspicuous manner, on all gasoline dispensing pumps.

2. Further, that the Federal Trade Commission reexamine the gasoline industry practices of dual distribution and exchange agreements, taking into full account the deceptive effects of these practices upon the consumer.

Respectfully submitted,

AUBIN K. BARTHOLD,

THOMAS R. LINK,

JOHN F. LYONS,

H. DAVID MYERS,

HERMAN BLUESTEIN,

Chairman.

November 17, 1969.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Federal Trade Commission Report on Gasoline Marketing, June 30, 1967.

² It is to be emphasized that we do not purport to be the sole representatives of the gasoline consumer interest. It is merely our desire to fill a serious gap that has existed.

³ Mary Gardiner Jones, "Marketing Strategy in Government Regulation in Dual Distribution Practices", 34 *George Washington University Law Review* 456, March, 1966.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 458.

⁵ Section 2(a) of the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act (15 U.S.C. § 13(a)) provides that:

"It shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, . . . to discriminate in price between different purchasers of commodities of like grade and quality . . . where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or to

injure, destroy or prevent competition with any person who either grants or knowingly receives the benefit of such discrimination, or with customers of either of them;

"Provided, That nothing herein contained shall prevent differentials which make only due allowance for differences in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery resulting from the differing methods or quantities in which such commodities are to such purchasers sold or delivered."

In *Borden Company v. F.T.C.* (381 F. 2d 175, 1967), the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in interpreting Section 2(a) said that:

"In the context of Section 2(a), price discrimination means only a price difference, not an invidious price structure. Once the fact of a price difference is established, other provisions of the statute must be applied to determine whether the price difference is legal or illegal." (At p. 177.)

The decision in *Borden* sets down an implicit guideline. It would appear that the retail price differential would be the maximum allowable wholesale differential. The Court held that:

"Where a price differential between a premium and non-premium brand reflects no more than a consumer preference for the premium brand, the price difference creates no competitive advantage to the recipient of the cheaper private brand product on which injury could be predicated. Rather it represents merely a rough equivalent of the benefit by way of the seller's national advertising and promotion which the purchaser of the more expensive branded product enjoys." (At p. 181, citing Report of the Attorney General's National Commission to Study the Anti-Trust Laws, p. 159, 1955)."

The qualifying portion of Section 2(a) has no effect on the illegality of price differentials in gasoline dual branding. The usual four to six cent differential exceeds that required to provide "due allowance for differences in manufacture, sale or delivery . . ." (See F.T.C. Report on Gasoline Marketing, June 30, 1967.)

⁶ Although the consumer is willing to pay one or two cents more for branded gasoline, the major brand refiner is charging the branded dealer four to six cents more per gallon than the unbranded dealer. (See F.T.C. Report on Gasoline Marketing, June 30, 1967.)

⁷ It is apparent that Congress is beginning to direct its attention to the problems confronting the nation's consumers. On November 3, 1966 Congress passed Public Law 89-755, commonly known as the "Fair Packaging and Labeling Act" to prevent the use of unfair and deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of consumer commodities. In Section 2, Congress declares its policy concerning the desirability of a fully informed consumer.

Informed consumers are essential to the fair and efficient functioning of a free market economy. Packages and their labels should enable consumers to obtain accurate information as to quantity of the contents and should facilitate value comparisons. Therefore, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to assist consumers and manufacturers in reaching these goals in the marketing of consumer goods. (80 Stat. 1296; 15 U.S.C. 1451.)

⁸ Informal Survey conducted by authors, October, 1969.

⁹ The Supreme Court, in *F.T.C. v. Sun Oil Company* (371 U.S. 505, 83 S.Ct. 358, 9L.Ed. 2d 466, 1967), recognized this potential harm.

[P]rice warfare appears to be caused by a number of basic factors, not the least of which are industry over-capacity and the propensity of some major refiners to engage in so-called "dual marketing" under which, in order to increase overall sales and utilize idle facilities, they not only sell branded

gasoline to their own dealers but also sell unbranded gasoline to independent retailers or jobbers, often at a lower price. (At pp. 525, 370, 482.)

¹⁰ "Armed with a wholesale price as much as six cents below that of the branded stations, the unbranded retailer is tempted to increase his volume by dropping below the usual two cent retail differential between unbranded and branded gasoline. Of course, this price drop induces retaliatory cuts by major-brand retailers who are operating under a guaranteed margin. This situation rapidly degenerates into a price war. When a price decline occurs, the independent refiner is required to reduce its selling price to protect its dealers and its own future in the market. A price war thus affects all refiners whose gasoline is sold in the area and frequently is responsible for heavy losses." Federal Trade Commission Report on Gasoline Marketing, June 30, 1967.

¹¹ One of the most serious effects of dual branding is the primary line injury resulting from a major-brand refiner's discriminatory price reductions to independent retailers. This has the effect of foreclosing independent refiners from such outlets.

Such foreclosure would have the effect of weakening the position of the refiner, and may well constitute a threat to the long run independence of the private brand dealer . . . To the extent that the private brand loses the independent refiner as a source of supply, and is forced to rely on the major for gasoline, his effectiveness as a competitive force in the marketing of gasoline will be diminished. (Federal Trade Commission Report on Gasoline Marketing, June 30, 1967, Footnote 9.)

¹² Federal Trade Commission Industry Conference on Marketing of Automotive Gasoline (Hereafter F.T.C. Conference) House of Representatives Committee on Small Business, 1965, Vol. 2, page 1591.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ Statement of W. H. Burnap, F.T.C. Conference, p. 477.

¹⁵ Statement of Sun Oil Company, F.T.C. Conference, p. 1890, 1893.

¹⁶ American Oil Company, A Study of Competition in the Refining and Marketing of Petroleum Products, F.T.C. Conference, p. 1055, 1138.

¹⁷ Exchange agreements are a possible violation of Section 2(a) of the Robinson-Patman Act as an anti-competitive practice. A report to the Attorney General states:

Of special importance to this department is the competitive performance of the industry as a whole, whether competitive pressures are sufficient to compel the industry to pass on to the consumer full benefit of advances in productivity and cost reduction which it achieves . . . It is therefore a matter of serious question whether that competition is effective to insure that the industry as a whole is regulated by its forces. Certainly, the field markets for crude can not be described as competitive in any real sense, and the pervasive influence of the nonprice barter sales so peculiarly characteristic of dealing among the dominant integrated companies, appears to insulate subsequent markets from competitive forces. (Report (Number 16-8) to the Attorney General of the United States, United States Dept. of Justice, July 1967, p. 84.)

¹⁸ *Consumer Reports*, October, 1968, page 524.

¹⁹ Neal A. Pritchard, Vice-President for automotive planning and analysis, TRW, Inc. as quoted in *Advertising Age*.

²⁰ *British Standards* 4040, Part 1, 1967.

²¹ W. J. Tancing, Head, Chemical Division, Consumer's Union, contained in F.T.C. Docket 215-21-1-1, page 179.

²² *Ibid.*, page 181.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 180, quoting Theodore Levit, *Harvard Business Journal*, July an August, 1960.

THE BLOOD-RED HANDS OF HO CHI MINH

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been made of the horrors of war in Vietnam. The cry of "atrocities" labels almost every American military effort.

Some excellent reasons why the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese should be driven from South Vietnam are enumerated by John G. Hubbell in the November issue of Reader's Digest in the following article. Do not read before dining:

THE BLOOD-RED HANDS OF HO CHI MINH

(By John G. Hubbell)

The village chief and his wife were distraught. One of their children, a seven-year-old boy had been missing for four days. They were terrified, they explained, to Marine Lt. Gen. Lewis W. Walt, because they believed he had been captured by the Vietcong.

Suddenly, the boy came out of the jungle and ran across the rice paddies toward the village. He was crying. His mother ran to him and swept him up in her arms. Both of his hands had been cut off, and there was a sign around his neck, a message to his father: if he or anyone else in the village dared go to the polls during the upcoming election, something worse would happen to the rest of his children.

The V.C. delivered a similar warning to the residents of a hamlet not far from Danang. All were herded before the home of their chief. While they and the chief's pregnant wife and four children were forced to look on, the chief's tongue was cut out. Then his genital organs were sliced off and sewn inside his bloody mouth. As he died, the V.C. went to work on his wife, slashing open her womb. Then, the nine-year-old son: a bamboo lance was rammed through one ear and out the other. Two more of the chief's children were murdered the same way. The V.C. did not harm the five-year-old daughter—not physically: they simply left her crying, holding her dead mother's hand.

General Walt tells of his arrival at a district headquarters the day after it had been overrun by V.C. and North Vietnamese army troops. Those South Vietnamese soldiers not killed in the battle had been tied up and shot through their mouths or the backs of their heads. Then their wives and children, including a number of two- and three-year-olds, had been brought into the street, disrobed, tortured and finally executed: their throats were cut; they were shot, beheaded, disemboweled. The mutilated bodies were draped on fences and hung with signs telling the rest of the community that if they continued to support the Saigon government and allied forces, they could look forward to the same fate.

These atrocities are not isolated cases; they are typical. For this is the enemy's way of warfare, clearly expressed in his combat policy in Vietnam. While the naive and anti-American throughout the world, cued by communist propaganda, have trumpeted against American "immorality" in the Vietnam war—air bombing, the use of napalm, the inevitable (but relatively few) civilian casualties caused by American combat action—daily and nightly for years, the communists have systematically authored history's grisliest catalogue of barbarism. By the end of 1967, they had committed at least 100,000 acts of terror against the South

Vietnamese people. The record is an endless litany of tortures, mutilations and murders that would have been instructive even to such as Adolf Hitler.

Perhaps because until recently the terrorism has been waged mainly in remote places, this aspect of the war has received scant attention from the press. Hence the enemy has largely succeeded in casting himself in the role of noble revolutionary. It is long past time for Americans, who are sick and tired of being vilified for trying to help South Vietnam stay free, to take a hard look at the nature of this enemy.

Blood-Bath Discipline. The terror had its real beginning when Red dictator Ho Chi Minh consolidated his power in the North. More than a year before his 1954 victory over the French, he launched a savage campaign against his own people. In virtually every North Vietnamese village, strong-arm squads assembled the populace to witness the "confessions" of landowners. As time went on, businessmen, intellectuals, schoolteachers, civic leaders—all who represented a potential source of future opposition—were also rounded up and forced to "confess" to "errors of thought." There followed public "trials," conviction and, in many cases, execution. People were shot, beheaded, beaten to death; some were tied up, thrown into open graves and covered with stones until they were crushed to death.

Ho has renewed his terror in North Vietnam periodically. Between 50,000 and 100,000 are believed to have died in these blood-baths—in a coldly calculated effort to discipline the party and the masses. To be sure, few who escape Ho's terror now seem likely to tempt his wrath. During the 1950s, however, he had to quell some sizable uprisings in North Vietnam—most notably one that occurred in early November 1956, in Nghe An province, which included Ho's birthplace village of Nam Dan. So heavily had he taxed the region that the inhabitants finally banded together and refused to meet his price. Ho sent troops to collect, and then sent in an army division, shooting. About 6000 unarmed villagers were killed. The survivors scattered, some escaping to the South. The slaughter went largely unnoticed by a world then preoccupied with the Soviet Union's rape of Hungary.

With North Vietnam tightly in hand, the central committee of the North Vietnamese communist party met in Hanoi on March 13, 1959, and decided it was time to move against South Vietnam. Soon, large numbers of Ho's guerrillas were infiltrating to join cadres that had remained there after the French defeat in 1954. Their mission: to eliminate South Vietnam's leadership, including elected officials, "natural" leaders, anyone and everyone to whom people might turn for advice. Also to be liquidated were any South Vietnamese who had relatives in their country's armed forces, civil services or police; any who failed to pay communist taxes promptly; any with five or more years of education.

A captured V.C. guerrilla explained how his eight-man team moved against a particular target village: "The first time we entered the village, we arrested and executed on the spot four men who had been pointed out to us by the party's district headquarters as our most dangerous opponents. One, who had fought in the war against the French, was now a known supporter of the South Vietnamese government. Another had been seen fraternizing with government troops. These two were shot. The others, the village's principal landowners, were beheaded."

General Walt tells of the "revolutionary purity" of the Vietcong who came home to two other villages. In one case, a 15-year-old girl who had given Walt's Marines information on V.C. activities was taken into the

jungle and tortured for hours, then beheaded. As a warning to other villagers, her head was placed on a pole in front of her home. Her murderers were her brother and two of his V.C. comrades. In the other case, when a V.C. learned that his wife and two young children had cooperated with Marines who had befriended them, he himself cut out their tongues.

Genocide. In such fashion did the storm of terror break over South Vietnam. In 1960, some 1500 South Vietnamese civilians were killed and 700 abducted. By early 1965, the communists' Radio Hanoi and Radio Liberation were able to boast that the V.C. had destroyed 7559 South Vietnamese hamlets. By the end of last year, 15,138 South Vietnamese civilians had been killed, 45,929 kidnaped. Few of the kidnaped are ever seen again.

Ho's assault on South Vietnam's leadership class has, in fact, been a form of genocide—and all too efficient. Thus, if South Vietnam survives in freedom, it will take the country a generation to fully replace this vital element of its society. But the grand design of terror involves other objectives, too. It hopes to force the attacked government into excessively repressive anti-terrorist actions, which tend to earn the government the contempt and hatred of the people. It also seeks valuable propaganda in the form of well-publicized counter-atrocities certain to occur at the individual level—for South Vietnamese soldiers whose families have suffered at communists' hands are not likely to deal gently with captured V.C. and North Vietnamese troops.

Dr. A. W. Wylie, an Australian physician serving in a Mekong Delta hospital, points out that a hamlet or village need not cooperate with the Saigon government or allied forces to mark itself for butchery; it need only be neutral, a political condition not acceptable to the communists. After a place has been worked over, its people of responsibility are always identifiable by the particularly hideous nature of their wounds. He cites some cases he has seen:

When the V.C. finished with one pregnant woman, both of her legs were dangling by ribbons of flesh and had to be amputated. Her husband, a hamlet chief, had just been strangled before her eyes, and she also had seen her three-year-old child machine-gunned to death. Four hours after her legs were amputated, she aborted the child she was carrying. But perhaps the worst thing that happened to her that day was that she survived.

A village policeman was held in place while a V.C. gunman shot off his nose and fired bullets through his cheekbones so close to his eyes that they were reduced to bloody shreds. He later died from uncontrollable hemorrhages.

A 20-year-old schoolteacher had knelt in a corner trying to protect herself with her arms while a V.C. flailed at her with a machete. She had been unsuccessful; the back of her head was cut so deeply that the brain was exposed. She died from brain damage and loss of blood.

Flamethrowers at work. Last December 5, communists perpetrated what must rank among history's most monstrous blasphemies at Dak Son, a central highlands village of some 2000 Montagnards—a tribe of gentle but fiercely independent mountain people. They had moved away from their old village in V.C.-controlled territory, ignored several V.C. orders to return and refused to furnish male recruits to the V.C.

Two V.C. battalions struck in the earliest hours, when the village was asleep. Quickly killing the sentries, the communists swarmed among the rows of tidy, thatch-roofed homes, putting the torch to them. The first knowledge that many of the villagers had of the attack was when V.C. troops turned flame-

throwers on them in their beds. Some families awoke in time to escape into nearby jungles. Some men stood and fought, giving their wives and children time to crawl into trenches dug beneath their homes as protection against mortar and rifle fire. But when every building was ablaze, the communists took their flamethrowers to the mouth of each trench and poured in a long, searing hell of fire—and, for good measure, tossed grenades into many. Methodical and thorough, they stayed at it until daybreak, then left in the direction of the Cambodian border.

Morning revealed a scene of unbelievable horror. The village now was only a smoldering, corpse-littered patch on the lush green countryside. The bodies of 252 people, mostly mothers and children, lay blistered, charred, burned to the bone. Survivors, many of them horribly burned, wandered aimlessly about or stayed close to the incinerated bodies of loved ones, crying. Some 500 were missing; scores were later found in the jungle, dead of burns and other wounds; many have not been found.

The massacre at Dak Son was a warning to other Montagnard settlements to cooperate. But many of the tribesmen now fight with the allies.

Mutilation on the School Bus. If the communists' "persuasion" techniques spawn deep and enduring hatred, Ho could not care less; the first necessity is the utter subjugation of the people. Ho was disturbed by the rapid expansion of South Vietnam's educational system: between 1954 and 1959, the number of schools had tripled and the number of students had quadrupled. An educated populace, especially one educated to democratic ideals, does not fit into the communist scheme. Hence, the country's school system was one of Ho's first targets. So efficiently did he move against it that the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession soon sent a commission, chaired by India's Shri S. Natarajan, to investigate.

Typical of the commission's findings is what happened in the jungle province of An Xuyen. During the 1954-55 academic year, 3096 children attended 32 schools in the province; by the end of the 1960-61 school year, 27,953 were attending 189 schools. Then the communists moved in. Parents were advised not to send their children to school. Teachers were warned to stop providing civic education, and to stop teaching children to honor their country, flag and president. Teachers who failed to comply were shot or beheaded or had their throats cut, and the reasons for the executions were pinned or nailed to their bodies.

The Natarajan commission reported how the V.C. stopped one school bus and told the children not to attend school anymore. When the children continued for another week, the communists stopped the bus again, selected a six-year-old passenger and cut off her fingers. The other children were told, "This is what will happen to you if you continue to go to that school." The school closed.

In one year, in An Xuyen province alone, Ho's agents closed 150 schools, killed or kidnaped more than five dozen teachers, and cut school enrollment by nearly 20,000. By the end of the 1961-62 school year, 636 South Vietnamese schools were closed, and enrollment had decreased by nearly 80,000.

But, in the face of this attack, South Vietnam's education system has staged a strong comeback. Schools destroyed by the communists have been rebuilt, destroyed, and rebuilt again. Many teachers have given up their own homes and move each night into a different student's home so the communists can't find them, or commute from nearby cities, where they leave their families.

Against such determination, the size of Ho's failure can be measured: in 1954, there were approximately 400,000 pupils in school

in North and South Vietnam together; today South Vietnam alone has some two million in school. About 35,000—four times as many as in 1962—now attend five South Vietnamese universities, while 42,000 more attend night college.

A South Vietnamese government official explains: "A war shatters many traditional values. But the idea of education has an absolute hold on our people's imagination."

Bar of Justice. The pitch of communist terrorism keeps rising. After the Tet carnage at Hue early this year, 19 mass graves yielded more than 1000 bodies, mostly civilians—old men and women, young girls, schoolboys, priests, nuns, doctors (including three Germans who had been medical-school faculty members at Hue University). About half had been buried alive, and many were found bound together with barbed wire, with dirt or cloth stuffed into their mouths and throats, and their eyes wide open. The communists came to Hue with a long list of names for liquidation—people who worked for the South Vietnamese or for the U.S. government, or who had relatives who did. But as their military situation grew increasingly desperate, they began grabbing people at random, out of their homes and off the streets, condemned them at drumhead courts as "reactionaries" or for "opposing the revolution" and killed them.

"The Tet offensive represented a drastic change in tactics," says General Walt. "This is a war to take over the South Vietnamese people. Ho launched the Tet offensive because he knew he was losing the people. But his troops didn't know it; they were told that they didn't need any withdrawal plans because the people would rise and fight with them to drive out the Americans. What happened was just the opposite. Many fought against them like tigers." Some of the Tet offensive's explosion of atrocities probably can be attributed to sheer vengeful frustration on the part of Ho's terror squads—which Ho may well have foreseen, and counted on.

The full record of communist barbarism in Vietnam would fill volumes. If South Vietnam falls to the communists, millions more are certain to die, large numbers of them at the hands of Ho's imaginative torturers. That is a primary reason why, at election times, more than 80 percent of eligible South Vietnamese defy every communist threat and go to the polls, and why, after mortar attacks, voting lines always form anew. It is why the South Vietnamese pray that their allies will stick the fight through with them. It is why the vast majority of American troops in Vietnam are convinced that the war is worth fighting. It is why those who prance about—even in our own country—waving Vietcong flags and decrying our "unjust" and "immoral" war should be paid the contempt they deserve.

Finally, it is why the communists should be driven once and for all from South Vietnam—and why, if possible, the monsters who presently rule North Vietnam should be brought before the bar of justice.

HELP!

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, Margery Burns of Rosport Farms is an institution in Minnesota and especially in our Sixth Congressional District.

Mrs. Burns writes a weekly newspaper column devoted in part to national political opinions and in part to State and local issues.

I read her column religiously. She writes with the good, down-to-earth commonsense of a farm wife. She is not afraid to speak up nor timid about raising her voice in an effort to correct an injustice.

In an entertaining way she can bare the foibles of the modern scene but at the same time deal them a devastating blow.

Recently Mrs. Burns went into a hotel for a steak dinner and was shocked to find a notice on the menu:

Due to the unexpected and unusually high increase in the cost of beef, we are reluctantly forced to make some menu price adjustments.

How Mrs. Burns, herself a raiser of beef, dealt with this situation is the subject of her column reprinted below.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly commend the reading of this column to my colleagues, especially those who are not too familiar with the farm problem:

HELP!

What would you do?
A short time ago, I took my kids out to dinner at one of the nice hotels in Minneapolis. Because I don't get a chance very often to enjoy that particular kind of delightful outing, I almost fainted when I saw the prices listed on the menu. But that wasn't what bothered me. Do you know what was printed on a note clipped to the menu? Let me quote . . .

"Due to the unexpected and unusually high increase in the cost price of beef we are reluctantly forced to make some menu price adjustments to partially offset these increases. For the duration of these high prices there will be an additional charge of 75c per steak and 50c for roast prime ribs of beef made to our present menu prices. We certainly hope that you will understand the necessity of this action."

AND since we raise beef, I knew that the price of beef was lower than it was 20 years ago!

Now, we were served an elegant dinner by a very nice and ornately dressed waiter in that beautifully decorated dining room. The steak I ordered (and what else could I order?) was as tender as the steaks from our own beef. It was a sumptuous and satisfying meal.

But beef alone was getting the blame for higher prices in that dining room.

So . . . that night I wrote a substitute note for the hotel management to pin on their menus! Let me quote it . . .

"Due to the inflationary increase in all the costs of giving you the best food and service, we are reluctantly forced to make some menu price adjustments to partially offset these increases. For the duration of this inflationary period, there will be an additional charge . . . etc."

The next day I asked to see the manager in charge of the dining rooms. He came tearing in from a meeting with all the dining room people (I can imagine how pleased he was to be called out of that meeting, but I didn't know he was at a meeting), and he looked braced to hear almost any complaint . . . except the one I had. It really took him by surprise.

I can understand why he was a manager. He handled this "different" complaint with real grace. (He probably was pretty relieved that this was all it was.) Anyway, it turned out that this note about beef came from the head office in the east, and in using it, he was only following orders.

So now, should I send my substitute note to the office in the east or should I just drop the whole thing? The people in charge ought to know that beef isn't the culprit. To be fair

and accurate, they should blame the whole cycle of inflation for raising prices and not single out one item, especially when the price of beef is lower than it was 20 years ago. But do you suppose that one complaint will make even a small dent?

There must be some way for us to explain to people how fair prices would keep farmers on the farms instead of forcing them into overcrowded cities and it would make small towns boom again because of more farm customers. Fair farm prices would help solve a lot of big problems for everyone.

What would you do about it?

INTELSAT

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today on behalf of myself and Mr. VERNON W. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. DON FUQUA of Florida, and Mr. JOEL T. BROYHILL of Virginia a bill to provide for the immunity from taxation in the District of Columbia for the International Telecommunications Satellite Consortium—INTELSAT.

I insert the following reprint of a section-by-section analysis of the bill and principal portions of a letter forwarded by the Department of State, explaining the need for this legislation:

THE INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CONSORTIUM BILL SECTION BY SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 of the proposed bill defines the scope of the legislation, by stating that it applies to INTELSAT and any successor organization thereto in which the United States through its designated entity participates pursuant to the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 (47 U.S.C., § 701 and following).

Section 2 exempts INTELSAT, and any successor organization thereto, its assets, property, income, operations and other transactions, and the participants therein other than the designated United States entity, from all taxes imposed by the District of Columbia and all license fees imposed by the District of Columbia as a condition to engaging or carrying on a trade or business. It is further provided, however, that this exemption shall not apply to any property which shall not be used for the purposes of INTELSAT and any successor organization, nor to any income, operations or other transactions which shall not be related to the purpose of said Consortium or successor organization. The purpose of this provision is to establish that the ownership or operation of such a communications satellite system is exempt from District of Columbia taxation, regardless of whether INTELSAT or its successor, or any foreign participants therein, are "carrying on or engaging in any trade or business within the District" or receiving income "from sources within the District," within the meaning of section 47-1580 of the D.C. Code, and regardless of whether such system would otherwise be subject to tax.

Section 3 authorizes the District of Columbia Council to promulgate regulations to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Section 4 provides that the Act shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1964.

PORTIONS OF AN EXPLANATORY DEPARTMENT OF STATE LETTER

INTELSAT is a joint venture of entities now representing 63 nations, formed to es-

tablish a global commercial communications satellite system. It was created by the Inter-governmental Agreement establishing interim arrangements for a global commercial communications satellite system and the attached Special Agreement dated August 20, 1964 (TIAS 5646). The Communications Satellite Corporation has been designated by the President, pursuant to the Communications Satellite Act of 1962, as the United States Representative to and member of INTELSAT.

Most of the foreign participants in INTELSAT are either foreign governments or foreign government ministries. Other foreign partners, however, are either private corporations or entities wholly owned by foreign governments but separate in form therefrom . . . foreign governments or ministries would not be subject to applicable District of Columbia taxes, but foreign private or governmentally-owned corporations might well, under existing legislation and regulations, be subject to the District of Columbia franchise tax. Taxation of such private or quasi-governmental entities in the District of Columbia could, therefore, create inequities among the various foreign partners. From the point of view of the effective operation of the joint venture, it is clearly inequitable for the majority of signatories to be exempt from District of Columbia tax while other partners in the joint venture, in precisely the same position except with regard to their governmental affiliation, may not be similarly exempt. From the point of view of our foreign policy interests, this possible discrimination must be eliminated.

If the taxability of a foreign partner in the joint venture depends upon whether such partner is a government or government ministry, then the freedom of that government to select the appropriate form of entity to represent it in IntelSat would be unduly affected by operation of United States and District of Columbia tax laws. It is clearly desirable to allow each government the freedom to choose the form of entity which it believes can most effectively contribute to its participation in the global system.

Imposition of the District of Columbia unincorporated business franchise tax upon certain of our foreign partners in the international joint venture would be based necessarily on a determination that IntelSat is either (a) engaged in a trade or business within the District, or (b) that it derives any other net income from "sources within the District". Either such determination would rest in part on the activity of the ComSat Corporation as Manager for IntelSat. It is in our interest that these managerial activities continue to be performed in the United States and not transferred abroad because of possible United States or District of Columbia tax consequences. It is, accordingly, in our national interest to ensure that our tax laws, in this respect, are consistent with our overall policy.

The interim nature of the present arrangements provides an additional reason for legislation at this time. Article IX of the Agreement contemplates agreement on definitive arrangements for an international global system by January 1, 1970. The draft legislation is designed to exempt foreign signatories to the Special Agreement (or to a successor agreement) from District of Columbia taxation, irrespective of the form of the definitive arrangements. The enactment of such legislation at this time would ensure that the choice of an appropriate structure and form for the permanent organization would not be influenced by United States or District of Columbia tax laws.

The foregoing discussion demonstrates the necessity to establish with certainty that the income to the foreign participants derived from INTELSAT operations is not taxable by the District of Columbia. Since it is not possible to achieve this certainty

within the existing framework of statutory law and administrative interpretation, legislation is necessary to set forth clearly that, as a matter of national policy, all foreign participants in INTELSAT are exempt from District of Columbia taxation on their income derived from the ownership or operation of the global system.

This legislation will not result in any significant loss of revenue to the District of Columbia. As pointed out earlier, the greatest share of INTELSAT's income (currently 53.03%) is received by ComSat. The taxability of ComSat is not affected by the proposed legislation. Thus, if INTELSAT is exempted by the proposed legislation, such share of INTELSAT's income will be included in ComSat's gross income, and hence ComSat will be liable for franchise tax with respect to the portion of such income fairly attributable to the District at the same rate (5%) as INTELSAT would have been. Of the balance of the income from INTELSAT, i.e. the share received by the foreign participants, only that portion which would be considered to be fairly attributable to the District is affected by this legislation. Thus, when the franchise tax rate is applied to the small portion of INTELSAT income actually affected by this legislation, it can be seen that the result in terms of loss of revenue is *de minimis*. INTELSAT does not presently own any real property in the District and does not contemplate acquiring any in the future. Hence, no potential real property taxes would be lost by affording INTELSAT the exemption. The revenue loss to the District resulting from the exemption from personal property tax, sales and use taxes and the unincorporated business license tax would be insignificant.

A RESOLUTION TO CREATE A STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, our country, I believe, is at a crossroad. We can turn down one fork and go merrily on our way, only to wind up one day in a world where our rivers are too dirty to sustain marine life, and our air is too filthy to sustain human life. Or we can turn in the other direction, focus our efforts on cleaning up our Nation, and reverse the trend that finds us polluting our environment at a devastating rate.

Local governments have taken some steps to control pollution. California has particularly strict antipollution laws on the books, due in part to the smog problems that have plagued that State for so long. Delaware has just authorized a State department of natural resources and environmental control, and I commend the general assembly and Gov. Russell W. Peterson for their foresight. The Federal Government has also taken some action in this area.

But the time has come for a concerted comprehensive effort to attack the problem of our rapidly deteriorating environment. Because of the urgency of the situation, I join most willingly with a number of my colleagues in sponsoring a resolution to create a Standing Committee on the Environment. Only by working from a common base, I believe, can we

make enough headway in the next few decades to assure man of a livable world. Any resident of a large city, anyone who lives by a polluted stream, anyone who sees the Delaware, the Anacostia, or any other river that flows through a major industrial area, I am certain, will agree that continued limited action in this area is a luxury none of us can afford.

A few weekends ago I spent some time with my father in the State of Montana. The air is clear and fresh there, the rivers are clean, the sky above the cities is blue, not gray. Unfortunately, such an atmosphere is more the exception than the rule. If we want our children and our grandchildren to enjoy the fruits of all our labors in the 21st century, we had best begin right now the long overdue process of cleaning up our environment. If by 1990 the clean air of Montana has turned to soot, I shudder to think of how difficult it will be to breathe in some of our cities.

MALNUTRITION AMONG THE POOR

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Springfield, Mass., Daily News has just finished publishing a series of four articles examining the problems of hunger and malnutrition among the city's welfare families. Written by Zedra Aranow, one of the newspaper's ablest reporters, the series points out the alarming effects of chronic malnutrition—widespread physiological and psychological damage in the young, a stultifying listlessness and languor in mature people, early senility in the old.

The articles find serious shortcomings in the way surplus food is distributed to welfare recipients and make specific recommendations for improvement—recommendations I consider particularly apt and astute.

With permission, Mr. Speaker, I insert the articles in the RECORD as this point:

SPRINGFIELD NOW—THE SHAPE OF HUNGER

(By Zedra Aranow)

Hunger is the common enemy.

The hungry child cannot learn in school. A hungry man cannot work well.

A hungry woman cannot run her house, look after her family.

Yet the shape of hunger in our city is hard to define.

It can only be outlined by asking the experts—medical, educational, nutritional—the welfare workers, the urban ministers.

The questions asked across desks in offices, over coffee cups on kitchen tables, begin to reveal the problem.

"The corn-oriented diet of Africa and India produces the hunger symptoms seen in Biafran pictures; the pot belly, the edema, the change of hair color," said Dr. Morris Medalle, chief of pediatric service at Springfield Hospital Medical Center. "We can be fooled by our wheat-oriented diet which is apt to emerge as the 'failure to thrive' syndrome—which in turn can lead to heart disease and brain damage. Virtually all the cases of hunger we see in the hospital here are caused by inadequate food intake. We know

that because they gain weight startlingly in a few days."

Hunger in Springfield can be the nine-month-old child brought to the hospital weighing only 12 pounds. The father works for minimum wages. The mother is ill and not at home. Weekly wages of \$58 cannot support the family of eight children, yet the father did not know where to turn.

Hunger is a group of children in the Headstart Program at the South End Community Center. "They're too quiet, too listless," say psychologists visiting the class.

Hunger is the elderly woman, living alone, and refusing the diet suggestions made by a visiting nurse. "I'm 86 and this is what I've eaten all my life. How can a child like you tell me to eat what I've never eaten?"

Hunger is the stack of surplus food gathering dust on Chestnut Street. Five products are refused by at least half of the people standing in line; flour, rolled oats, rolled wheat, cornmeal—and dry milk. Dry milk which would nourish children who seldom have an adequate diet.

In Springfield, the biggest enemy is lack of knowledge. Bigger than lack of food and lack of money although both of those are here too.

Brush aside the feature stories about families who have been triumphant about surviving for a week on welfare food allowances . . . the well educated, well fed families who have managed to last seven days by carefully plotting every cent, every vitamin.

Think instead about the thousands of Springfield families who must eat every week on welfare checks which are based on these monthly food allowances: for an adult living alone, \$27; for an adult living with others, \$22.50; for children up to age of six \$12.80; for child from seven to 12, \$18.40; age 13 to 20, \$22.95.

THE GRAY AREA

This is a walk around the outline of hunger in Springfield . . . a walk that stretches from the Puerto Rican mother of six who said wistfully, "I don't mind myself to learn something new to cook, especially American dishes. In the restaurant I eat hash and wonder how to make it."—to Miss Grace Minkler, assistant administrator of Adult Services in the Welfare Department here, "I am convinced there are almost as many people entitled to welfare help who are not being reached as there are on our rolls. Much of the hunger in Springfield is in this gray area."

It includes a list of practical, now things which could better use what the city has, without spending more, to help our own people.

"Hunger—the weakened condition brought about by continued lack of food."—dictionary definition.

Lack of food may mean lack of money or lack of nutritional knowledge. In either case, a hunger-hunter starts to ask questions at the city Welfare Department.

"Our case load of 18 to 30 year old clients here has tripled in the last year," says Miss Minkler. "We're trying to find out why." Is it a liberalized program?

People moving into the city?

AN EMERGENCY

Small as the food allowance in a welfare check is—about 90 cents a day for an adult living alone down to less than 50 cents a day for a child under six—any emergency can rob a welfare client of even that amount. If a child has no shoes to wear to school, if the rent is overdue, food money will be spent on the emergency.

Not all welfare recipients apply for surplus foods although all of them are eligible.

Surplus commodities went to 1,600 families in Springfield in June. At least 7,000 were entitled to this help.

Each family has a surplus food card. Every three months the card is collected and a new one sent out with the next welfare check.

"I take all the food they offer me because I heard if you don't, they mark it against you and you don't get a card again," said a mother of six in the North End.

THE CASE LOAD

There is no routine letter to a welfare client informing him of his right to surplus foods.

Social workers struggling with as many as 100 families, each of which should be visited twice a month, sometimes don't explain surplus foods to clients.

That takes time . . . and there is never enough time.

A language barrier may make it difficult. Mountains of red tape and forms to fill are made higher with an extra form for surplus foods. There are so many informational papers now that it is not unusual to have some lost in the shuffle.

Each family has an assigned day, once a month to collect surplus foods.

"The food weighed almost 100 pounds. I had to take it right away. I needed it. It cost me \$3 to get it home in a taxi."

Some of the food is refused.

SHE WANTS RICE

"They want to give me 30 pounds of flour," a woman said. "I took only one bag. (10 pounds) I don't bake. What can I do with it? Why don't they give me what I eat every day . . . rice?"

When an item is left on the shelves, less of that item is ordered for the next month. There is not enough refrigeration to take all of the high protein, easily used cheese that everyone wants.

There is no way to give one woman more rice although in another part of the city unopened boxes of rice are frequently stacked beside trash barrels on rubbish collection days.

Miss Minkler worries because, although she has vitamins she can supply to welfare clients who need them, only 10 per cent of the case load apply. The vast majority of people—those on welfare and those servicing them—don't know about them.

People can be informed about vitamins by either doctors or social workers.

"There is a lack of communication here," says Miss Minkler. "Social workers feel this is a medical question. They try not to invade the medical field. They have more than enough to do as it is."

There is indeed a lack of communication. A nurse in the Headstart Program here has been looking for vitamin supplements for over a year, was startled to learn welfare had them.

HUNGER REACHES INTO SPRINGFIELD'S SCHOOLROOM

How do you recognize hungry children in school?

Miss Elizabeth Rhoades, principal of Lincoln and Jefferson Avenue schools, and her teachers recommend youngsters for the free breakfast program.

"We look at them," she said simply.

"Sometimes they're listless. They may fall asleep in class. They may actually take someone else's lunch.

"We have health lessons in class. Questions about breakfast may provide a clue which we try to follow up with families."

Not all welfare families want their children to have free breakfast which is cold food. Some mothers explain that it's a struggle but they are providing their children with hot breakfasts at home and want to continue.

"I see one small boy every day," Miss Rhoades said, "who's at school at 7:15. He leaves home before anyone else is out of bed.

. . . and I know there is no breakfast put out for him."

Teachers will come quietly to her office during the morning and ask, "Have we got anything to eat?" Miss Rhoades knows another hungry child has come to school.

Some arrive at school late and tell a teacher, "My mother didn't have time to make breakfast."

Mrs. Ruth O'Connell of welfare has learned to recognize young malnutrition too. "I notice pallor, poor color.

"Some children are irritable and jumpy. They're quick to disobey, want to be the center of attention. Others are so listless they are interested in nothing. There is no way to rouse them."

Recommendations from school principals put a child's name on the list for free breakfasts and lunches. Nine hundred of them are on the current list.

"These meals are paid for by federal funds," explains John Sullivan of the Federal Project Office here.

"But there is a limit to federal and Title 1 funds. We've been up as high as 1200. Principals are calling for additional breakfasts right now. We have no funds to pay for more."

Free breakfasts include fruit juice, cold cereal and milk plus either fresh fruit or some kind of pastry when possible.

The scope of the problem was indicated when an unplanned survey was taken one day last year at the Howard Street School.

Students were asked what they had eaten for breakfast that day. Ten percent had nothing. Another 20 percent had one item. A total of 75 percent had two items or less.

How does Springfield welfare find the people who need help and don't know where to find it?

"Occasionally we get a telephone call from a concerned neighbor and we'll learn of a woman, alone with four children, struggling on an impossible budget," said Miss Grace Minkler, assistant administrator of Adult Services. Impersonal urging often fails to break the barrier . . . doesn't balance the stigma of applying for help. She will do nothing that involves making a formal admission of her poverty.

"Much of the city's hunger lies in pockets of borderline cases. They are eligible for surplus foods even though they are not on welfare because their income is so small. It might be the margin between bare survival and comfort for them—if we could reach them."

CASELOAD

Bruce Bowen, welfare administrator in charge of surplus food, agrees.

"There must be better communication established with people who really need surplus foods and are not getting them."

Proof of this came when surplus food center moved recently to the present location on Chestnut Street. Routine notification of the move went out with welfare checks that month . . . and prompted a flood of applications for surplus food from families who hadn't known about it before.

But Bowen adds, "Welfare has to be more efficient and better staffed to handle the needs we uncover. We are barely able to keep up with our present load."

According to a survey in September, Springfield's overall case load has increased 93 per cent in the last 15 months.

Bowen sees wider significance in adequate diets.

"Nutrition could be a key area for us. Better fed people would be more willing and more motivated to work and get off welfare rolls. They would be less indifferent to their children's needs. And the children, in turn would learn more at school."

Mrs. Ruth O'Connell, supervisor of home economics at welfare, talks about the special nutritional problems of the elderly, especially those living alone.

TEA AND TOAST

"They fall into a tea and toast pattern," she explained. "They simply fill themselves up periodically without ever making a really nourishing meal. They don't have the initiative to make food for one person. They need someone to cook for, someone to eat with. A social worker's visit, especially if she will sit down and share a meal, is a red letter occasion."

The elderly face special problems in trying to pick up surplus food allotments.

"I take a child's wagon for my food. I wish it could be put in bags instead of boxes. They are so heavy and hard to handle."

"I stood in line for two hours once. I was very tired. When I got up to the door, they closed it and said, 'It's lunch hour. Come back later.'"

Recently, they stopped closing the distribution center at lunch, but Bowen says manpower is critically short there.

"We are running a five or six man operation with two men and one part time volunteer from Concentrated Employment Program."

This makes vacations or employees' illness an almost impossible problem at the distribution center.

"I wrote to Boston over two months ago, and Miss Minkler had written before that, explaining our predicament," said Bowen.

"We haven't even gotten a reply."

HUNGER IN SPRINGFIELD COMES FAMILY SIZE

"We often see hunger as lethargy," says Mrs. Constance Petrunenko.

As project director for Community Nursing at University of Massachusetts, she spends every day at the Riverview housing project here. Three days a week senior students join her to learn how to work with families.

"We're in contact with about 300 families. We can see that they are not buying the right foods.

"We see unopened packages of surplus foods in wastebaskets on home visits. And we try to convince them to use these foods."

She shrugged. "If you've never eaten hot cereal in your life, you're not interested in it. But they do eat lots of bread."

Often, as she makes her rounds, Mrs. Petrunenko finds children at home instead of at school.

"Everyone was too tired to get up in time to get them ready."

This is largely due to inadequate diets, she feels. The victims offer many vague complaints—of headaches, just not feeling good, not being able to pinpoint problems.

"We go into households of large families. Their apartment size refrigerators are tiny when you realize they must hold food for 10 or 11 people. And we often find nothing—nothing at all—on the shelves.

"Families will build up crippling food bills at small local food stores which extend credit. Then they are 'locked in' so they can't buy elsewhere—until there is a real emergency; no food, no money."

At first sight, some mothers and children look chubby and well fed. But they have eaten, literally stuffed themselves, with too many starchy foods to keep, from feeling pangs of hunger. Often they will have skin conditions which are hard to diagnose and treat.

"Other children are exhausted from steady high-carbohydrate diets to nourish parasitic worms with which they are infested. Fruit is too expensive.

"We see mothers giving food to babies and denying themselves. They give them milk, milk, milk. But even mothers love and milk are not enough for babies. They need more in their diet than that.

"Often we don't discover how these devoted mothers are depriving themselves until

illness demands surgery. Then pre-surgical blood tests reveal anemia."

Mortality rates for infants less than a year old bear a striking correlation with poverty. "They are higher in Springfield, Worcester and Boston than anywhere else in the state," said Dr. Morris Medalle, "and the core area rate within each city is high for the area."

Springfield's own city-wide mortality rate is 21.12 per 1,000 live births; the Model Cities area rate is 43.62.

Mrs. Phyllis Harris, supervisor of public health nurses, tells how a family in trouble may be discovered.

"A malnourished baby was so badly off, he was reported to us. The child, youngest of four in the family, responded quickly to treatment in the hospital. We had no choice. We had to send him back home.

"There was no food at all for the family of six. We worked with them, had the older children accepted for free breakfasts and lunches at school. We even made out shopping lists for the father, since the mother was ill.

"It was almost impossible to plan. There was no nearby supermarket, no family car.

"One older child was so hungry, he took the baby's bottle away. We got surplus food and are trying to show the family how to use them."

THE SYMPTOMS

How do you look for a hungry child, Mrs. Shella Malloy, health coordinator for Headstart, was asked.

"I have an advantage because I see the children over a period of time.

"I check for pallor. I check for activity—a three or four year old shouldn't be listless. And I see a good deal of this.

"I watch for frequent illness. Even circles under the eyes can be a tip-off."

Mrs. Malloy may decide to have a hemoglobin test done to confirm suspicion of anemia, even though Headstart children have had a physical examination.

An anemic child is not apt to have a big appetite. Illness can produce an unfortunate cycle. A child with chronic tonsillitis, for example, eats little because he feels sick. And he feels sicker because he isn't getting enough nourishment—which causes him to eat still less the next day.

This cycle will be common during the winter just ahead.

URBAN MINISTERS

"I came here this summer from a section near the Brooklyn Navy Yard and I find conditions worse in Riverview than there," says the Rev. Juan Valesquez of the Council of Churches. "Puerto Ricans have been there for centuries. They have had time to form societies to help each other."

The soft spoken minister is distressed by what he sees in Riverview, from the rats and cockroaches so prevalent in first and second floor apartments ("How can they store food safely?") to social agencies which treat poor people like 'cases,' not individuals.

"It is not easy for Puerto Ricans coming here," he explains. "They are country people, not urban. Lack of education keeps them from getting good jobs with fat paychecks . . . yet because they look hard for any kind of work, they don't get full welfare. They will always be underemployed.

LANGUAGE BARRIER

"The language barrier keeps them from bettering themselves economically. At the same time it keeps them from learning what help is available.

"What we need is not just another survey to count people. We need committed and concerned people to help people.

"I try to help." His shrug was expressive. He takes six families at a time in his microbus to get surplus foods. He helps families whose names and files have disappeared.

His black briefcase is filled with painstak-

ing pages of individual families who need help. . . and are not on welfare.

"The foods are not familiar and they don't know how to use them."

The Rev. Vaelasquez feels a brief period in a bilingual atmosphere would make the transition less painful.

"I see lack of communications between ethnic groups at Riverview . . . and sometimes petty group jealousies . . . but not hate.

RECENT ARRIVALS

"Yes, there are hungry children, but often pride prevents a family from talking about it and asking help. They won't tell me about themselves personally, but they will talk generally until I gradually learn about their difficulty."

The Rev. Vernie L. Bolden, pastor of St. John's Congregational Church, agrees.

People who don't have enough to eat are recent arrivals, he feels. Or residents who simply aren't aware of what local agencies do. Neighbors may tell them about it, but it doesn't really register.

"They're fearful of red tape, resentful of the invasion of privacy. They are reluctant to give every tiny detail of their family story to authority . . . and this reluctance is matched on the other side of the official desk where every 'right' claimed makes more paperwork.

NO FURNITURE

He sees evidence of malnutrition. One house visit brought him to a woman with four children. There was no furniture in the apartment, no food at all. Church members took the mother to a store for food to tide her over until she could visit city agencies.

A man and wife, temporarily separated from their children, were discovered living in the railroad station, begging food money from passersby. They had no idea where or how to apply for help.

"We are more used to subsidies for things, like roads, rather than people," Rev. Bolden believes, "and what help we offer fails to be human."

LACK OF KNOW-HOW ADDS TO CITY'S HUNGER PROBLEM

"Nobody uses corn syrup; sometimes I get a whole case and I don't know how to use it . . . only to mix with water when children get diarrhea. And they give me 10, 12 pounds of butter and only one box of cheese. I only use butter on bread, not for cooking."

Mrs. S—, mother of six, was talking about surplus foods. She has been receiving them for two years.

Now she sat in her kitchen, sipping coffee, and talked about the program.

She tries not to take food she doesn't use. "Not the dry milk, the children won't drink it. Not the split peas. What you do with them?"

"I like the raisins, but sometimes the kids make such a mess on the floor with them, I don't always bring them home."

She usually waits in line over an hour for her food. She shakes her head as she thinks of it. "I don't like everybody to go by and see me there. It was better, more room inside, when it was at Buckingham (school). It can be very cold standing in line."

Yet Mrs. S— has been creative with some surplus foods. She discovered how to make delicious meatballs wrapped in instant potatoes and fried.

"When I use regular potatoes, I cold (cooled) them. So I think I will try others. It's easier, no cooking, no peeling."

She'd be happy to show other women her recipes . . . and she'd like to learn new ones. "Sure, if they show me, I learn."

Mrs. M— has found how to mix surplus cornmeal, flour, water with a little sugar, roll it in balls and fry it. (And yet bags of flour are thrown away unopened; surplus cornmeal has been used in children's sand-

boxes—while welfare clients buy finer cornmeal. They don't know how to use the coarser surplus cornmeal.)

"You try to make out as best you can. Food is so high you just have to." Mrs. A— shrugs.

A neighborhood aide at the South End Center talks about the difficulty of putting children into the Headstart Program.

"We need it here more than any place. The South End has changed. It's an area of transients now. Most here are mothers without a man in the house. They're not family oriented.

"If I could hold a parents' meeting in a cafe, I'd get good attendance. It's not lack of money. They don't care. The kids are out on the streets at all hours. Some of them look as though a good breeze would blow 'em away."

She can take 30 children in the South End Headstart Program. To keep up to that number, she has admitted 58 during the year. Other centers have waiting lists. Here parents don't want to be bothered getting their children to the program.

"Professionals visit us here and say, 'What's the matter with these kids on Monday morning?' If they knew what some of them go through on weekends! And the Headstart kids are the lucky ones!"

SIZE 2 CLOTHES

A professional aide came through, hunting the records of one small boy who is five years old, wears Size 2 clothes. He's a failure-to-thrive case and she's worried about him. He's been at three different home addresses this year and now his mother is getting ready to move again.

The aide doesn't want to lose track of him. At 22 pounds, he's in too poor shape to be accepted by schools. His trouble may be parasites because he eats tremendously in the center—when he is there.

"We don't toss out a child who only comes occasionally. He may need desperately the few meals we can give him."

George Franklin of Headstart nods when he hears of these cases. He knows.

And he asks, "What's bulgur?"

ON THE LIST

You try to find out for him. Welfare says, "It's on the surplus food list, but we don't know what it is."

The welfare nutritionist says, "It's a kind of crushed wheat, a cereal product. But it hasn't been distributed here since after World War II."

You tell Mr. Franklin this and he can't believe it.

"I've got four cases of it right here. We would serve it to the children but we don't know what to do with it. And we can get an unlimited amount of it if we find out how to use it."

And there are still hungry people in Springfield.

This may be the time for the city to help its own, with the resources, people and food in the city now.

These suggestions are simple, practical and down-to-earth.

They would cost very little (in most cases, nothing) and may prompt more suggestions from the community itself.

BAKE THE FOODS

1. Since the five most often rejected products (flour, cornmeal, rolled oats, rolled wheat and dry milk) can all be used in breads—and since bread is universally liked and used—why can't the leftover surplus foods be baked? In tax supported school kitchens? By independent bakeries at the end of their own schedule when ovens are hot and bakers still on the job?

COOKING CLASS

2. Every seventh grade girl in the city has cooking twice a week for a semester; every eighth grader has it four times a week. Why

can't their lesson plan focus on recipes made of surplus foods? All those from core areas or "gray area" homes could really carry these lessons home.

EXCHANGE IT

3. Why can't surplus foods which are refused be piled on a counter at the distribution center so that they may be exchanged for other items? For example a woman who serves rice frequently might leave one of her bags of flour for extra rice if it is on the "leftover counter." Don't throw it away—exchange it.

DEMONSTRATIONS

4. Why can't the hour-and-a-half demonstration of a day's menus made with surplus foods, designed by Mrs. Ruth O'Connell, welfare supervisor of home economics, be repeated? It was a great success when given at Riverview. There are many nutritionists in the area, in government agencies, schools, hospitals and large businesses who might be able to give one demonstration a month.

FOOD SAMPLES

5. Why can't the baking equipment at Trade High School and the classes in industrial baking be used to perfect surplus food recipes and to bake samples for handing out with the recipes at the surplus food center? Women are much more apt to try a recipe when they know they will enjoy the results.

LANGUAGE BARRIER

6. Why can't all recipes handed out by welfare be written bilingually?

CAR POOLS

7. Why can't car pools be set up systematically at Riverview and other similar centers for collection of surplus foods? Even in a family with a car, the husband is likely to need it for work when it is time to go for surplus foods.

KITCHEN PARTIES

8. Why can't "kitchen parties" be set up in all neighborhoods where women can exchange the surplus foods recipes they have invented? Some are very creative. Almost all are shy about attending meetings out of their immediate vicinity. In groups of about 10, they could gather (and take preschool children with them so there would be no babysitting problems) and exchange ideas. Helping each other . . . being recognized for their inventiveness . . . getting to know neighbors better; there are many plusses for this idea.

STORAGE

9. It is very difficult to store a month's worth of surplus foods, especially grain products, in housing where rats and cockroaches are a problem. (First and second floor apartments at Riverview, for example.) But they could be safely stored in metal or glass containers. Why not get empty metal containers from industrial users so surplus foods may be safely stored in all homes?

MORE CHEESE

10. Lack of sufficient refrigeration prevents the city's storing more surplus cheese which is a popular item and important nutritionally. Couldn't the city get more cheese to distribute merely by adding a few secondhand refrigerators?

"SCHOLARSHIPS"

11. Why can't a handful of welfare mothers be added to cooking classes at Trade High School for a week of instruction as "scholarship" students? It would be a welcome respite from their usual schedule and they might learn a good deal that would be helpful in their own kitchens later. If they went with a few neighbors, they wouldn't feel shy, and would get an extra dividend out of talking it over with each other later.

GOOD FOR DINNER

12. Why can't first and second graders who often learn spelling and pictures of specific food items go a little farther? Why can't

the teacher ask "which three items make a good dinner?" or "what is the best food to have for breakfast?"

INFORMATION

13. Why can't a clearing house of information be established for all the departments trying to service the poor? Then all of them would know, for example, where and when supplementary vitamins were available.

FOR SNACKS

14. Why can't a model kitchen be established at Riverview where mothers can use surplus foods to try new recipes—and to provide snacks at community centers or housing developments? This might work through Headstart.

BIG TRUCK BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my editorials for today are from the Eugene, Ore., Register-Guard, the Roseburg, Ore., News Review, and the Astoria, Ore., Astorian, in the State of Oregon. The editorials follow:

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register Guard, July 31, 1969]

HIGHWAY USERS SHOULD NOT PERMIT THIS

Last year the truck lobby came close to getting a law that would permit even larger trucks to use the interstate highway system. Public outcry prevented passage of the new truck law. Now the truckers are at it again. Again it is time for public outcry. Trucks are too long, too wide, too high and too fast already.

Truckers argue convincingly that the wider, longer and heavier trucks would have larger, wider tires and be more stable, thus safer. That may be so. But what of the fate of the majority of highway users, those in private cars? Passing the highway behemoths—if one can catch up with them—is already a nerve shattering experience in many cases. Suppose the truck were even longer and wider?

The present width limitation for the interstate system is 96 inches, or eight feet. Truckers would like to add six inches to this. That would have the effect of reducing the width of a two-lane road by one foot. And remember that when one talks of regulations for the interstate system, he is really talking about two-lane roads and city streets and bridges. It is impossible for a major truck to make its entire journey on the interstate. It must load somewhere and then get to the interstate. Then it must leave the interstate for its destination.

And then there is the matter of wear and tear on the roads and bridges. John Gunther, executive director of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, has testified about this on behalf of his own organization and the National League of Cities. Older facilities, he noted, were designed for lighter loads. Donald B. Fugate, first vice president of the American Association of State Highway Officials said his organization's studies show that an increase in load from 18,000 to 20,000 pounds could result in a loss of remaining pavement life of 25 to 40 per cent. Increasing the load to 24,000 pounds would result in a 70 per cent loss of pavement life, he said.

American Automobile Association figures show that, obviously, when a passenger car and a truck collide, the passenger car comes out second best. Heavier trucks, argues George F. Kachlein, the association's executive vice president, increase the truck's odds. And then there is the matter of visibility.

A driver stuck behind one of the monsters cannot look ahead to traffic lights in built-up communities or directional signs on the freeways. Often the driver has a hard time seeing around a truck.

One of the disgraceful law enforcement episodes in Oregon is the way the police permit trucks to violate the 50-mile-an-hour speed limit posted every few miles along the freeway.

The truckers' arguments are solely economic and, as economic arguments, they are sound. However, other considerations outweigh the economic. Cargoes too big for the large trucks on the highways today can be moved by train.

The bill to permit larger trucks is before the House Committee on Public Works. No Oregon congressman is on that committee. But Representative John E. Moss, California Democrat, who is not on the committee either, is one of the staunchest opponents of the bill. He might appreciate a letter. The chairman of the committee is Representative George H. Fallon of Maryland. He might like some mail, too.

[From the Roseburg (Oreg.) News Review, Oct. 1, 1969]

KNIGHT SIDES WITH ROAD "DRAGONS"

(By Betty Canary)

There has been much ado about legislation allowing an increase in the size of trucks. States still have the right to set size and weight limits under federal minimums. I thought it would be well to get a trucker's opinion on whether bigger behemoths should be allowed on the nation's highways.

"You're Andy O'Connor?" I asked the driver.

"My friends call me Axles," he said.

"I see. Do you think it wise to put even heavier trucks on the road?"

"Some people call me Knight of the Open Road."

"Just answer the question, please."

"Sounds great to me," he said. "Bigger trucks would definitely speed up the traffic flow."

Glancing at the expressway, where cars were scurrying along before trucks like mice before elephants, I had to agree with him. Give the average American motorist a chance to escape and he's going to try.

"It is my opinion," I said politely, "that heavier trucks would benefit nobody but the trucking companies."

"According to the American Trucking Association, an increase in truck width would permit marked improvement in stability and additional length would make it possible to build safer trucks."

"Safer for whom?" I asked.

"Look at it this way," Axles said. "How many people complain about the length and width of a train?"

"Well, not many of us drive on train tracks," I pointed out.

"Look at the sign on my truck," he said.

"Flammable!" I read.

"Not that one!"

I looked again. Another sign said, "This vehicle pays \$4,870 in road taxes annually."

"How much is \$4,870 in cement?" I asked.

"You're one of those!" he said disgustedly.

"You're going to complain that we tear up the roads?"

"You'll have to admit—trains don't."

"But," he asked slyly, "do railroad engineers blink their lights to tell you when it's safe to pass?"

"Again—I never drive down the tracks."

"O.K.! How about picking out good places to eat? Don't you know everybody says 'Truckers know the best places to eat?'"

"I'd prefer talking about accident statistics," I said. "According to the American Automobile Association, heavy trucks account for 1.54 per cent of total registrations, drive only 5.33 per cent of all miles of travel,

but were involved in 11.6 per cent of fatal accidents."

He drove away while I was talking. The last I saw of Axles, he was hitting the air brakes and easing his truck in between two others. One was labeled Wide Load. The other, Explosives.

[From the Astoria (Oreg.) Astorian,
Aug. 28, 1969]

TRUCKS ARE TOO LARGE ALREADY

Last year the truck lobby came close to getting a law that would permit even larger trucks to use the interstate highway system. Public outcry prevented passage of the new truck law. Now the truckers are at it again. Again it is time for public outcry. Trucks are too long, too wide, too high and too fast already.

Truckers argue convincingly that wider, longer and heavier trucks would have larger, wider tires and be more stable, thus safer. That may be so. But what of the fate of the majority of highway users, those in private cars? Passing the highway behemoths—if one can catch up with them—is already a nerve shattering experience in many cases. Suppose the trucks were even longer and wider?

The present width limitation for the interstate system is 96 inches, or eight feet. Truckers would like to add six inches to this. That would have the effect of reducing the width of a two-lane road by one foot. And remember that when one talks of regulations for the interstate system, he is really talking about two-lane roads and city streets and bridges. It is impossible for a major truck to make its entire journey on the interstate. It must load somewhere and then get to the interstate. Then it must leave the interstate for its destination.

And then there is the matter of wear and tear on the roads and bridges. John Gunther, executive director of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, has testified about this on behalf of his own organization and the National League of Cities. Older facilities, he noted, were designed for lighter loads. Donald B. Fugate, first vice president of the American Association of State Highway Officials said his organization's studies show that an increase in load from 18,000 to 20,000 pounds could result in a loss of remaining pavement life of 25 to 40 per cent. Increasing the load to 24,000 pounds would result in a 70 per cent loss of pavement life, he said.

American Automobile Association figures show that, obviously, when a passenger car and truck collide, the passenger car comes out second best. Heavier trucks, argues George F. Kachlein, the association's executive vice president, increase the truck's odds.

And then there is the matter of visibility. A driver stuck behind one of the monsters cannot look ahead to traffic lights in built-up communities or directional signs on the freeways. Often the driver has a hard time seeing around a truck.

One of the disgraceful law enforcement episodes in Oregon is the way the police permit trucks to violate the 50-mile-an-hour speed limit posted every few miles along the freeway.

The truckers' arguments are solely economic and, as economic arguments, they are sound. However, other considerations outweigh the economic. Cargoes too big for the large trucks on the highways today can be moved by train.

The bill to permit larger trucks is before the House Committee on Public Works. No Oregon congressman is on that committee. But Representative John E. Moss, California Democrat, who is not on the committee either, is one of the staunchest opponents of the bill. He might appreciate a letter. The chairman of the committee is Representative George H. Fallon of Maryland. He might like some mail, too.

WORD FROM A SERVICEMAN

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, Wayne Strickland, the son of my friend and constituent, Mr. W. Virgin Strickland, of Claxton, Ga., was one of three servicemen to author a joint letter expressing their views about the recent Vietnam moratorium. This letter was printed in the editorial space of the Claxton, Ga., Enterprise.

I earnestly feel Wayne and the others have much to say and I therefore commend their letter to the attention of my colleagues:

WORD FROM A SERVICEMAN

NOTE.—The following letter from three servicemen sets forth their feeling about the reports of militant peace demonstrations occurring Oct. 15. One of the servicemen is Wayne Strickland of Claxton. He is now stationed in England. Because of its timely nature, we are giving this letter our editorial space this week.

SIR: As a serviceman stationed overseas I don't have the opportunity to discuss with some of our local politicians, religious leaders and educators some of the questions that I have come up with and have been particularly bothered by since the Oct. 15 peace demonstration, so I'm going to try to speak to them and to the citizens of the community through the newspaper.

First, I'd like to ask what happened to some of our other ideals than peace, such as freedom? All we hear of today is peace, peace for mankind, peace for Americans, etc. etc. I remember being taught in Sunday school, church and in school that freedom of mankind is just as important as peace, for how can there be peace unless there is freedom?

These politicians, people of the cloth, educators and all other advocates of pulling out of South Vietnam today and letting them fend for themselves, have they thought of what would happen as soon as we leave an uneducated, overpowered, under-trained army of regulars and irregulars to hold off a well-trained, well-armed regular army and guerrilla force of North Vietnamese backed up, trained and manned by Red China?

Have these people forgotten what communism is and stands for? Have they forgotten what mass retaliations are? Have they forgotten what slavery is? Or is it that they haven't forgotten these things, but find it easier to set them aside as they protest and march and demand peace for themselves?

Another question, Peace for whom? Just the unfortunate country that has got involved in a dirty, unjust war or for the people who live in daily fear of guerrillas and trained soldiers out to dominate them and then annihilate them if they can't be convinced that communism is their salvation?

I go along with anyone who says this is a dirty, unjust war. Yet I can't see myself donning a black arm band, protesting and saying, "Get out now."

If that happened and we got out, I would have to accept the fact that I and my countrymen condemned a country to slavery by the form of government that proclaimed to the United States, "We will bury you!"

I believe that if some of those advocates of immediate withdrawal would stand back and look at how they have preached and taught the importance of freedom, while proclaiming peace, they would find that they have been hypocritical.

When the people of South Vietnam have been taught what a democratic government can mean as opposed to communism and have been given the arms and training to defend and support themselves, then is the time to withdraw, but not before.

We made big mistakes at the Bay of Pigs and in Hungary by not helping people stand up to tyranny. Why should we make the same mistake again after we have already committed ourselves?

RAYMOND A. KENYON, JR.,
JACK LEES,
WAYNE STRICKLAND.

"BE A GOOD GUY" SUCCEEDS

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I was pleased to bring to the attention of our colleagues the excellent efforts being made by the Miami Police Department to foster better community relations.

The "Be a good guy" program was the brainchild of Officer Bill Winn. Through this program of policemen visiting local elementary schools, great strides have been made to eliminate the antagonism between policemen and children.

An article in the November 20 Christian Science Monitor describes the success of the "Be a good guy" program. I commend this article to the attention of our colleagues:

GOOD GUY VISITS SCORE WITH SCHOOL-CHILDREN IN MIAMI

(By Jeanne Wellenkamp)

MIAMI.—Police Officer Bill Winn recently marched up the steps of Robert E. Lee Junior High School in Miami, not far from the scene of rioting in the summer of 1968.

He wore the shiny badge of authority on his starched white shirt, and on his hip he carried a loaded Smith & Wesson .38. Tall, ruddy, with square shoulders, Officer Winn appeared the perfect symbol of police authority, a symbol long despised in that area of the city.

But, surprisingly, word traveled from room to room: "The Good Guy is here!"

One seventh-grader ran up to the officer. The boy's eyes were wide with anxiety: "Can I tell you something?"

Mr. Winn took him aside and the youngster explained that a girl in his class said she was going to smoke marijuana.

Officer Winn relayed the information to the school's principal, Ralph Moore, and the two men were able to steer the child away from the experiment.

"That incident could not have happened a year ago," Mr. Moore reported. "Our children regarded a policeman as an enemy. It's amazing how their attitudes have changed since the Good Guy program has started in our school."

ATTITUDES CHANGED

Attitudes have changed similarly in other low-income areas. A representative of the Dade County Department of Housing and Development wrote to Officer Winn:

"The Good Guys have done a fantastic job with the children of the public-housing projects. Before your visits, they had openly stated that they were 'scared of cops.' That feeling has changed greatly, and many of them now know that the policeman is a friend. This was not an easy accomplishment. . . ."

The original Good Guys of Miami are four police officers who are reaching thousands of children and enlisting them as Little Good Guys.

In addition to Officer Winn, the Good Guys are Officers Gaddy Rawls, Ron Koivu, and Bob Alba. Mr. Alba, the most recent Good Guy, is bilingual and works with Cuban children.

During the school year, the Good Guys visit classes at various schools. During holidays they carry their message to Variety Children's Hospital, Sunland Training Center for children, and wherever else they are invited.

INTEREST NOTED

To become a Little Good Guy, a child promises to listen to his teacher, listen to his parents, respect and be courteous to one another, and remember that when in trouble and there is no parent or teacher to help, the policeman is his friend.

The Good Guys have been in existence for less than a year, but already their program has aroused interest in police departments as far away as Japan and South Africa—and in 400 communities in the United States.

The program actually started when Officer Winn's fourth-grade daughter asked, "Daddy, are you the only policeman who smiles at people and is nice to them?"

His daughter's question made him realize that if the police were to help the community solve its problems, they must change their own image. He received the help of Officer Koivu, who was walking a beat in the ghetto, and of Officer Rawls who lived in Liberty City, where the 1968 riot occurred.

PROGRAMS FORMED

Officer Rawls recalls: "I think only my next-door neighbors in Liberty City saw me as a person. Everyone else looked at me with suspicion because I wear the police uniform. It's not a good feeling to have people on your own street fear you."

During the past summer, the Good Guys organized programs in the heart of the ghetto area. Chief of Police Bernard Garmire relieved them of other duties, and the officers devoted their full time to making sure that the summer of 1969 would not be a repetition of 1968.

The Good Guys had no budget, but James Ryder, president of a local trucking company, donated \$5,000 which was used to defray extra expenses such as the printing of 150,000 Good Guy decals. The children put these on books, bicycles, or on the windows of their homes.

Programs during the summer included demonstrations of the K-9 Corps, the police helicopter, rescue squad, motorcycles, and other police equipment.

PROGRESS CITED

Officer Rawls feels he received his best reward when he walked down a street in Liberty City and a little girl, dressed in her best, approached him and said shyly, "I'm not afraid of the police any more. All the police are my friends." And she impulsively gave him a big hug.

Officer Winn hopes that the Good Guy concept will spread to the entire police force. But he says that very special qualities are required of the officers who actually go into the schools.

"You have to be a missionary for this sort of work. Maybe you have to be a kind of nut.

"You have to communicate with children when they are very young. You talk about racial prejudice. What do children know about this? They're beautiful. They have no prejudices at all.

"We try to sock it to the parents when we have the chance. We don't care about the length of a kid's hair or what kind of clothes he wears. I was a zoot-suiter myself. We are

concerned with the mind of the child, his thinking."

CONGRESSMAN DON EDWARDS' STATEMENT ON SECRET SERVICE GUIDELINES

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, recent Secret Service guidelines for collection of information on a substantial portion of our citizens who disagree with the Government are a clear violation of the basic premises of this Government.

Rightfully, the press, one of our guarantors of freedom, has spoken in opposition to these unfair and unconstitutional guidelines. On November 11, 1969, the San Jose (Calif.) Mercury editorialized on the subject. I include this excellent editorial in this RECORD:

ABANDON "GUIDELINES"

Those "guidelines" laid down by the Secret Service for the collection of intelligence designed to protect public officials go far beyond the legitimate concerns of security and should be withdrawn immediately.

The guidelines, issued to federal and some state and local law enforcement agencies last summer, came to public attention only last week. Literally interpreted and widely applied, these "guidelines" could undermine freedom of political expression in the United States. This is, of course, why they must be disavowed, preferably by President Nixon himself.

The United States Secret Service has, among its other duties, the task of protecting the President, other high federal officials and their families. What need, then, has the Secret Service for information about attempts to "embarrass" high officials.

Public officials who conduct themselves honorably need have no fear of attempts to embarrass them. All public officials, in fact, should be open to embarrassment; it helps to remind them that they are, after all, servants of the people and responsible to them in the long run.

Along the same lines, the Secret Service says it wants:

Information "regarding civil disturbances."

Information on individuals "seeking redress of imaginary grievances, etc. . . ."

Information on persons making "irrational" or "abusive statements" about high government officials.

Information "regarding anti-American or anti-government demonstrations."

Clearly, this is a formula for the stifling of dissent in the United States. Already, the nation's scientific and legal communities are concerned about the collection and exchange of such negative information among the federal departments and agencies. This information has resulted in the compilation of "blacklists" that have deprived the government of the services of men whose political views have been at variance with government policies. This has been so even though the technical expertise of these men has been unassailable.

It is understandable that the Secret Service should wish to keep track of potentially dangerous individuals. Its "guidelines" are not likely to be much help, since the history of political assassination in this country suggests that the assassin is typically a loner, not a man to be involved in demonstrations or organized politics.

What the Secret Service has done is encourage Americans to become informers on one another—with all the potential for evil and injustice that this entails. This is so un-American, in the most fundamental sense of that term, that it must be put aside at once.

LACK FUNDS FOR HIGHWAY SAFETY

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Public Works Committee, I rise to say a few words with reference to funding of the Highway Safety Act.

The committee report indicates that the overriding cause of the small progress and disenchantment with the Highway Safety Act is the lack of money invested in the program at the Federal level. Many of the Government's promises of assistance have fallen short of fulfillment.

It is a strange paradox that we can be so properly concerned about Vietnam, and violence in the streets, and so unmoved when motor vehicle accidents in the decade of the sixties killed more than 475,000 men, women, and children; injured 32,500,000 and accounted for \$90 billion in economic waste.

The seventies will be even more disastrous if we do not decide to do something about it and act accordingly.

Secretary Volpe, before the annual meeting of the National Safety Council, said:

An astonishing 44 percent of the drivers killed in accidents lost their lives because the other driver was drunk.

The use of alcohol by drivers and pedestrians is a factor present in some 25,000 deaths and a total of at least 800,000 accidents in the United States each year. Even while countermeasures to the alcohol and driving problem are being augmented, the use of alcohol is going up.

From the cost estimates provided by the States and the analyses performed by the National Highway Safety Bureau, several dimensions of the highway safety program needs become clear: Total needs in 1968 were \$2.5 billion and will grow to \$4.5 billion annually in 1976. Needs average \$3.4 billion per year for all programs over the next 10 years.

In an effort to get the ball rolling, I have introduced legislation which could provide as much as \$1.7 billion for highway safety program activities. The Department of Transportation's 1968 alcohol and highway safety report to Congress outlining the relationship of abusive alcohol use to highway losses, served as the basic research document in formulating the bill.

I would urge every Member of the House to join with the committee in paying close attention to future funding under the Highway Safety Act.

For your information: H.R. 13668 would amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968 to provide additional funds

for highway safety programs by authorizing appropriations for such programs in an amount equal to 40 percent of the revenue collected from Federal taxes relating to alcohol.

THE QUESTION OF FOREIGN AID

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I was gratified to see the foreign aid bill passed by the House, but the slender margin by which it passed indicates the questions which foreign aid raises in the minds of many Americans.

Clearly, there are weaknesses in our aid program, and serious issues which need further critical examination, particularly in the areas of supporting and military assistance. But a carefully administered program of developmental aid is important to the achievement of the economic and social goals of other countries not as well endowed as the United States.

Reg Prentice, the former British Minister of State, Technology, who resigned to become a rank-and-file Member of Parliament, has written an article which appeared in the October 19, 1969, issue of the Observer. I commend it particularly to the attention of those who oppose the foreign aid program:

AID: THE REASON WHY

(By Reg Prentice)

Two impressions of a visit to India stand out among memories of my two years as Minister of Overseas Development.

The first is of a walk through the slums of Calcutta. Nowhere does the brutal fact of stark poverty make a bigger impact on the visitor. I defy anyone to go there and still oppose overseas aid. Calcutta is getting worse. People still crowd in from the impoverished countryside to live and die on its pavements.

The second is of a tour of Punjabi villages in an area of rapid agricultural progress. New types of wheat had been introduced. The land had been irrigated and agricultural extension workers had achieved a breakthrough in terms of better husbandry, the use of fertilisers and co-operative marketing. The farmers' incomes had increased several times over in recent years. Farmers from farther afield were walking hundreds of miles to ask for a few handfuls of the new seed and to learn about the new methods.

I have met these two aspects of the problem in many other parts of the developing world. On the one hand, the massive human needs of millions of desperately poor people. On the other, examples of successful development leading to a real improvement in people's lives. No room for complacency, but no room for despair.

The success stories are more numerous than is usually imagined. Translating them into global statistics, the United Nations objective for the 1960s (the first "Development Decade") was an annual average rate of growth of 5 percent for the gross national products of the poorer two-thirds of the world. The annual rate at the end of the decade is now about 5 percent on average, although the figure for the whole decade will be a little lower. This is the fastest rate of growth most of these countries have ever

had. It is faster than we achieved in the early stages of our own industrial revolution. Being an average figure it means that many countries achieved less than this, but many achieved more—nine of the developing countries will have doubled their GNP in the 1960s.

Most of this progress is due to their own efforts. About 80 percent of the new capital created in the developing world in this period has been generated from within. All the aid programmes and all the private investment in the world provide only 20 percent, but this outside aid will often have made the crucial difference between relative stagnation and real progress.

I believe that the real conclusion is that development is succeeding, but in most of the poorer world it is succeeding too slowly. The average growth rate of 5 percent or so has to be seen alongside an average population growth of 2½ percent a year, or thereabouts. At this rate the vast majority of people in Asia, Africa and Latin America will remain desperately poor for a very long time.

Meanwhile, we are all learning more about the development process. We are avoiding past mistakes. At an early stage there was too much concentration on large prestige projects. Now there is more emphasis on smaller projects, on rural rather than urban development, on agriculture and small industries rather than heavy industries. This coincides with the development of new types of seed for rice, wheat and maize—the Punjabi success story is being repeated in varying degrees in other parts of the developing world.

There is also much more practical attention being given to the threat to mankind posed by the population explosion. There is new emphasis on family planning, especially in Asia. This is a vital part of any sensible policy of development and many of the poorer countries—though not yet enough of them—are pursuing vigorous official programmes in this field. Within our own aid programme we have provided advisers in this field. We are organising family planning courses for overseas medical students in Britain, and we have established a Population Bureau within the Ministry of Overseas Development to work on these problems.

We have now reached the stage when the development process can gather faster momentum. We know what needs to be done. The question is whether we have the will to do it and by "we" I mean both the poorer and the richer countries. The poor countries will require very great restraint and self-discipline to achieve faster progress. If they make the necessary efforts to help themselves—as many are doing already—then they are entitled to look to us for help and for more help than we have been giving.

This help can take many different forms. Trade, private investment and political relationships all come into the picture. But the provision of a growing aid programme is the most vital point of all.

Why should we do more? I believe there are four basic reasons:—

There is a simple moral duty to help those so much poorer than ourselves. As the late President Kennedy said in his inaugural address, we must do it "because it is right." These four words need no elaboration.

It is an investment in peace who can doubt that the lack of development in two-thirds of the world, while the other one-third gets richer, and the gap grows wider, will set up strains and tensions that will make the world more dangerous for all of us?

It is an investment in our own future markets. We all have a vested interest in the growth of the world economy. This particularly applies to Britain with our pattern of trading relationships all over the world. We get nearly 12 percent of the orders for goods

imported by the developing world, although we provide only 7½ percent of the global flow of aid. A lead by Britain towards a general rise in aid from all donors would be a powerful investment in our future export prospects.

Our own political health depends upon it. How can we, a multi-racial society, expect to solve our domestic problems, unless we play a constructive part in a multi-racial world? The Western nations cannot retreat into cozy little rich men's clubs and expect to prosper in isolation. A policy of inward looking selfishness is not only morally wrong; it would be self-defeating.

Aid should go up in the 1970s, not only from Britain, but from the richer one-third of the world generally. The question has been put before us forcibly by the report of the Lester Pearson Commission. Specifically, they have called upon all donor countries to reach the target of 1 percent of GNP (which includes both Government aid and private investment) by 1975 at the latest. (Last week Labour MPs put down a motion calling on the Government to carry out the Pearson requirements.) Within this total they call for Government aid to be 0.7 percent. Last year the flow from Britain was 0.83 percent, of which 0.42 percent was Government aid.

These figures are about average for the Western donor countries. The Americans are providing a smaller share of their national wealth, but the French and Germans are both exceeding 1 percent. Some countries have announced target dates for reaching 1 percent, but Britain has not yet done so, and our aid has been falling slightly as a percentage of GNP.

Our present performance simply does not measure up to the needs of the situation. For all our economic difficulties of recent years, we could and should have done better under both Conservative and Labour Governments. But an inquest on the past is not very fruitful. The vital point is to give this subject greater priority in the future.

Too many people—including people in high places—approach development aid with a kind of "flag-day" mentality—a nice generous thing to do if we have a little cash to spare. The facts of the situation demand that we regard this issue as being in the forefront of politics and the fulfillment of the 1 percent target as an urgent priority.

PARTISAN POLITICAL HAY

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I noticed in last Thursday's newspaper that one of my Democratic friends has called on the President's Communication Director Herbert G. Klein, and FCC Chairman Dean Burch to resign.

I, too, would like to call on both of those gentlemen. I would like to call on them to resign themselves to the fact that as long as they are serving as appointees of President Nixon, they will be subjected to such silly and childish demands by those whose only purpose is to make partisan political hay.

Mr. Speaker, I do not call on the Super-Democrat who came up with that self-serving demand to resign. I leave him to his constituents who have the inalienable right to send anyone they wish to represent them in Congress.

REPORT TO CONSTITUENTS

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am now sending to my constituents another of my regular series of newsletters. I am including the contents of that report in the RECORD at this point:

WASHINGTON SPOTLIGHT

(Report from Congressman Ed ESHLEMAN)

CONGRATULATIONS

My congratulations to those men and women who were elected and re-elected at the polls earlier this month. I'm sure that your dedication to public service in the months ahead will verify the wisdom of Lancaster, Lebanon and Lower Dauphin Counties' voters.

OLD FRIEND

My research assistant, Robert Walker, recently greeted an old high school and college friend at my Washington Office. Specialist Fourth Class Denton Ortman of Washington Boro took some time off from his duties as a guard at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier to pay us a visit. As you can imagine, the assignment as Tomb Guard is one of the military's most elite, and we can be proud of the Army's confidence in this 16th Congressional District soldier.

INTERESTING BREAKFAST

Earlier this month I had breakfast at the White House with President Nixon. 90th Club members (those of us who entered Congress at the same time) were invited to an 8:00 A.M. to 10:00 A.M. session during which the President made some confidential remarks and then allowed us to ask any questions which came to mind. It proved to be an extremely worthwhile two hours. The four main topics discussed were Vietnam, inflation, crime and the domestic reforms proposed by the Administration. The Vietnam conflict received some special consideration, and the thing that struck me most was the shift in policy which the Nixon team has brought about. In 10 months we have gone from a war policy to a peace policy. Another topic of interest concerned the relationship between the President and Vice-President, particularly since the latter has stirred so much controversy lately. Mr. Nixon made the point that the news media always tries to get a President to publicly disown his Vice-President. He said that between 1953 and 1961 the press attempted to separate President Eisenhower and Vice-President Nixon. They failed then, and the President indicated they will fail this time, too.

SUPPORT APPRECIATED

In a massive show of bi-partisan support, over 300 House Members signed a resolution endorsing President Nixon's peace plan. The resolution stated in part: "Resolved, That the House of Representatives affirms its support for the President in his efforts to negotiate a just peace in Vietnam, expresses the earnest hope of the people of the United States for such a peace, calls attention to the numerous peaceful overtures which the United States has made in good faith toward the Government of North Vietnam, approves and supports the principles enunciated by the President that the people of South Vietnam are entitled to choose their own government by means of free election . . ." The President appreciated this overwhelming display of support in Congress, and so indicated in a letter to me (shown at right).

HARD TO BELIEVE

Some of the opponents of President Nixon's peace plan seem to feel that their loy-

alty to America is under question. Perhaps the air should be cleared. The right of dissent is basic in our free society and mere disagreement cannot be used to set someone apart as disloyal. However, the intemperate remarks of some of the leaders in the drive to discredit the President's peace efforts are what have become hard to believe and tend to raise serious questions. Consider these statements of Dr. Benjamin Spock. He said that Richard Nixon's Vietnam speech was "weasily" one of his "shabbiest proposals". "Kennedy tried to Vietnamize the war. Certainly Johnson tried to Vietnamize the war—the only trouble is that it won't Vietnamize because all good Vietnamese are on the other side." So spoke Dr. Spock to a university audience in Vancouver, British Columbia, where he shared the stage with two Vietcong representatives. The baby doctor continued, "Eventually the Saigon army will collapse and go tearing off for wherever they've got their gold salted away." Needless to say, the Vietcong delegates greeted the speech with hearty applause. Is it so surprising that officials like myself would question that kind of irresponsibility?

PREHOLIDAY NOTE

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare is going to have more to say about toys. As children's playthings have become more complicated, mechanical and realistic, they also have become more dangerous. Recently, the list of toys to be reviewed by HEW was expanded to those with electrical, mechanical or heat-hazard characteristics. Previously, the agency could control only poisonous, inflammable, radio-active and explosive toys.

BIG DIFFERENCE

Because we walk on the moon, there is nothing we men—especially we Americans—cannot do if we simply set our minds to it. We can eliminate poverty, rebuild our cities, clean up our streams, freshen our air. You name it. We can do it. That's the kind of moon madness that has afflicted us as a result of Apollo successes. To believe that because we have the technical and managerial skill to reach the moon, we also have the skill to solve immediately our problems at home is both erroneous and dangerous because it can lead to expectations that cannot be fulfilled. The moon goal was reasonably easy to define precisely. The solutions to our major problems back here on earth cannot be given simple definition—and some cannot be defined at all. Consider, for example, the problem of trying to clean up water pollution. Early in his term of office, President Johnson said he wanted to be able to swim safely in the Potomac River before he left the White House. This set a dandy goal for the Water Pollution Control Administration. They didn't know where in the river he wanted to swim or just exactly when he planned to leave the White House. Anyway, they set about doing the preliminary planning. Finally, they came up with an estimate that the Potomac along the District of Columbia shore could be made swimmable at a cost of \$2 billion. That's an awful lot of money—enough, in fact, to build a private swimming pool in the backyard of every home in Washington. Or, take the matter of curing poverty. One organization wants us to dedicate the nation to eliminating poverty by 1976. While this goal is worthy, it is not nearly as easy to define poverty precisely as it is to point to the moon and say, "go there." And if you fail to reach the moon, there will be disappointment, but if you promise to eliminate poverty and fail, you might have revolution.

COBWEB CONGRESS

The lack of activity in this 91st Congress is most distressing. One has to wonder if Congress is ever going to get down to work and take some steps toward meeting our

great national problems. Only one of the Nixon Administration's reform efforts has cleared the Congress. I would be encouraged if some of the routine legislative business got finished. For example, I think we might expect a majority of the appropriation bills to be passed in a fiscal year that is five months old. There is little doubt but what this Congress lacks leadership, and the fallings are rapidly becoming a national disgrace.

HAPPY HOLIDAY

This being the last Newsletter of the Year, I take this opportunity to wish you and yours a Happy Holiday Season. Let us look forward to a New Year with hope for the blessings of peace and renewed faith in the future.

COMMENTARY ON THE OTHER SIDE

The Vice President of the United States was criticized roundly following a speech in which he condemned the news reporting of the national television networks. The networks launched an immediate attack against Mr. Agnew's remarks calling the speech an attempt to impose government censorship on the press. In fact, the Vice President had denounced government censorship in his speech, but had raised a number of important points. It is interesting to me that these same points had been raised by a variety of network personnel prior to the Agnew remarks. I thought you would be interested in some of these comments by television people, all of which were made before the Vice President spoke, but within the past few weeks.

Lester Cooper—ABC: "I want to do a show on what's right with America. We've heard so much about what's wrong. There's a great America out there to cover."

Shad Northshield—NBC: "I was stunned by the public reaction to Chicago. We all were. It's the key thing that opened my eyes to the cleavage between newsmen and the majority. We didn't know 56% would have thought we were unfair. It raises enormous questions about journalism. . . . In TV News Departments, we appear to know a lot about the black minority. It's the silent majority we must explore. We haven't done it. We didn't know it was there."

Phil Lewis—CBS: "We're beginning to realize that we've ignored the majority. America doesn't end at the Hudson!"

Joseph Benti—CBS: "We spend so much time on angry blacks, angry youth. But what about that vast forgotten army out there? How many hard-working, law-abiding whites are mad as hell because their story isn't being told?"

Desmond Smith—CBS: "There's been a great deal of manipulation from the left. The left and SDS have been getting a great deal of play. Americans are getting to feel they're not getting the whole story."

Fred Freed—NBC: "This generation of newsmen is a product of the New Deal. These beliefs that were sacred to the New Deal are the beliefs that the news has grown on. This is true of the networks, of Newsweek, of the New York Times, of all media. Men of like mind are in the news. It's provincial. The blue and white collar people who are in revolt now do have cause for complaint against us. We've ignored their point of view. It's bad. It's bad to pretend they don't exist. We did this because we tend to be upper-middle class liberals. We think the poor are "better" than the middle class. We romanticize them. The best thing that happened to me was a month I spent walking in Detroit slums after the riots. I stopped romanticizing the poor."

Bill Leonard—CBS: (who defends network objectivity, but also says, "Most reporting is lousy.") "The worst problem of all is the reporter who doesn't ask the next question—the cheap, lousy reporter who'll quote an attack but doesn't go to the other side be-

cause the answer might kill his story. And these producers who develop and edit a broadcast from the point of view the way they want it to turn out—with their own prejudice showing. That happens quite often."

PERRY HALL STUDENTS HELP FIRST GRADERS

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I recently learned of an outstanding educational program being carried on in my district by the members of the National Honor Society at Perry Hall Senior High School. These students have begun a tutoring program for first graders to provide them with individual help and guidance several times a week. The tutors give up their own free periods at high school in order to work with these small children. I should like to commend the Perry Hall Senior High School Honor Society for its active interest in providing quality education in Baltimore County by including a description of their program in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PERRY HALL STUDENTS HELP FIRST GRADERS

The National Honor Society of Perry Hall Senior High has started its second year of tutoring the first graders at Perry Hall Annex. Members of the Society who asked to be a part of the program, donate one or two free periods a week to tutor some of the children. This year's program was started a week ago and will last until the close of the school year.

"Big brother-big sister" is the name of the independent study program for the troubled first graders. The main purpose of the program is to give individual help and guidance to those first grade boys and girls who need help. Some may be slow learners or have difficulties in a certain field of study. The program's goal is to get the habits of those small children started in the right direction.

According to Annex sponsor, Mrs. Gebler, the aim of the program is to first build a relationship of mutual feelings of friendliness and the desire to help a little brother or sister.

Activities are directed toward the building of basic concepts, basic math, colors and color words and other general concepts, that are needed in order for the young students to advance next September.

The program was started by Miss Mary Powell an English teacher at Perry Hall. She has since transferred to Taipei American School in San Francisco, California. The program was conceived by an ex-student of Miss Powell, who talked to her last year concerning serious problems that some first graders had in their studies. As a result of Miss Powell's concern, steps were taken and by February, 1969 the independent studies program was underway. At the end of last school year the program had been marked with success.

In appreciation for their time and efforts, the first graders invited their big brothers and sisters to a party "out under the trees."

President of the National Honor Society is senior Richard Healy. Sponsor this year is Mr. Kocher, a history teacher, and again Mrs. Gebler is sponsor at the Annex.

POLLUTION—TIME FOR ACTION

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, on November 13, 1969, I was privileged to deliver an address at a conference on "Pollution—Time for Action" at the University of Notre Dame.

My address was delivered during a seminar sponsored by the University of Notre Dame Industrial Associates Program for Service to Industry and Business.

In my remarks, I discussed the growing awareness among public officials and private citizens of the threat to our environment, the increased funds Congress has voted for Federal water pollution control programs this year, the conditions in our society which lead to ecological imbalance, and the need for programs in environmental education from school through college.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to insert the text of my remarks in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY JOHN BRADEMÁS

I am delighted to be with you here at the University of Notre Dame today to take part in this conference on "Pollution—Time For Action".

This meeting is an outstanding example of how the resources of higher education, business and industry can be brought together to focus on a major challenge, in this case, the challenge of pollution control.

GROWING REALIZATION OF DANGERS TO ENVIRONMENT

Quite striking to me, and I am sure to you, is the really phenomenal growth in awareness in this country and abroad of dangers to the quality of our environment.

Here are some examples, chosen at random; of what I mean:

1. Dale Cotter's excellent articles on the problem of pollution currently appearing in the South Bend Tribune;
2. The UNESCO conference later this month in San Francisco on environmental problems;
3. Prince Phillip's observation on the "Today" Show that environmental problems constitute one of the biggest concerns of the British people.
4. The vote this week by delegates to the Annual Convention of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters that environment and air pollution are number one national priorities, worthy of the greatest attention by educational broadcasters.
5. Another conference, of which some one hundred Congressman and Senators, including the Congressman addressing you, were sponsors, to bring together in Washington law-makers and scientists to discuss national priorities with particular attention given to environmental problems.
6. My own experience of increasing activity in the environmental field. During recent months, I have been involved in fighting to protect the Indiana Dunes, the Big Walnut Valley in Indiana, and the Sleeping Bear Dunes in Michigan.

And I have been an active member of that rapidly building bipartisan coalition in Congress that has been pressing for more intelligent environmental policies by the Federal Government and more funds with which to make them work.

I shall say more in a moment on these matters.

7. I cite as well the rise in activity on the part of at least some leaders in industry to eliminate air and water pollution. I note, for example, last month's report that Monsanto had spent \$15 million over the past two years to curb pollution at its plants, and that the Wheelabrator plant in neighboring Mishawaka has just produced the first system of its kind to control air pollution from a municipal incinerator—in Brooklyn.

Industry has a long, long way to go before it meets its responsibilities in controlling industrial pollution. But these examples are encouraging.

8. Increased activity by State and local governments in the pollution control field. In fact, a few State governments beat the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the punch by banning the use of DDT.

But, as I say, we have just touched the surface in the fight against pollution—and everyone here knows it.

POLLUTION FIGHT JUST STARTING

Here is a report by the General Accounting Office—the chief investigating arm of Congress, issued only last week. It raises serious questions about the Federal water pollution control program.

Based on surveys of eight rivers chosen as typical examples, the report concluded that the effort has been hampered by poor planning, inadequate funds, and unchecked industrial pollution.

The Federal government has contributed \$1.2 billion of the \$5.4 billion spent on water pollution control since 1967.

But the report found that in every case, government efforts were being overwhelmed by continued outpouring of industrial waste.

For example, six cities along the Mississippi River in Louisiana used \$7.7 million in Federal grants to build facilities that cut pollution by 147,000 units, but 80 industrial plants along the same stretch are putting 2.4 million units into the river.

You and I know that American industry has for years turned its back on the problem of pollution, so that:

Oil from faulty drillings fouls our beaches and endangers marine life and water fowl.

Industrial smoke and auto exhaust combine to take minutes off each of our lives.

Industrial waste soils our systems and rivers.

Messy industrial areas, unsightly junk yards, ugly billboards, and thickets of power lines diminish the joy of what we would otherwise see.

And states and local governments are to blame as well. They have refused to enforce laws, codes, and regulations; failed to enact legislation that would cross the interests of industry; and been reluctant even to display concern about the problems of protecting the environment.

As I was thinking of what I ought to say to you today, I recalled how just one week ago tomorrow I was unable to fly from Chicago's O'Hare Field early in the morning for a speech in South Bend, not because of snow, but because of pollution-induced smog. My mind then turned back seventeen years when I was a student at Oxford University in England and took the train into London to see Cab Calloway in "Porgy and Bess" only to come out of that performance in the afternoon into the blackness that began the famous four-day London smog in 1952—a smog that was directly responsible for dozens of deaths and indirectly responsible for 4,000 other deaths traceable to aggravated heart and respiratory conditions.

No longer can we regard these events as accidental or freak cases.

Are such experiences in the offing for larger numbers of people? They may well be, unless we move, and move quickly to see that

our technological advances contain no more built-in booby traps for us and for our surroundings.

CAUSES OF POLLUTION

Pollution of our environment is the result of the interaction of man and his technologies and the earth and its resources. As long as populations were small in relation to the earth's resources, man could move on to other areas when he had produced conditions that were unbearable, or unsafe, or unproductive. In the past century, his ability to move on to new resource frontiers became increasingly limited. The scientific and industrial revolution, though its productivity was a boon to man, began to exact a terrible toll on the resources it used, particularly in terms of polluting the environment it affected.

Our society came to regard productivity as our highest national purpose. We rationalized the rapid exploitation of our resources in terms of their output in tons and units of production and dollars, heedless of the consequences. For the most part, there seemed no end to the resources; new jobs and new markets were the national goals. Then, as we approached the middle of this century, we began to realize that the frontiers were gone. We were rapidly moving toward a population of perhaps three hundred million by the end of the century. Suddenly we saw in glaring relief some of the results of the thoughtless use of our national heritage.

Now it is late. Some of our ruined land, much of our forests, and certain of our lakes and streams, we are told, may never again become the highly productive elements of our surroundings they once were. Now, the dark prophecy of Isaiah—2,600 years ago—the one that begins, "The earth also is defiled under the inhabitants thereof . . ." does not seem remote. No longer does Albert Schweitzer's warning that "man has lost the capacity to foresee and to forestall. He will end by destroying the earth," seem like the dark muttering of an old man.

Clearly we have reached a point when our economic goals have to be squared with an increasing public concern for the quality of our environment.

CONGRESS' RESPONSE TO POLLUTION

In my remaining time, I want to speak to you of some of the responses in Congress to the rising concern about pollution and environmental quality.

I shall not pretend to be exhaustive, but hope rather to touch on what I believe are particularly significant developments in what I might call the politics on pollution.

Both Senators Edmund S. Muskie of Maine and Henry Jackson of Washington have been championing bills that would establish environmental quality advisors at the White House level and would require annual reports to the President on the state of the nation's environment.

And many other bills have been introduced in both the House and Senate that have as their objective the development of a national environmental policy.

For an excellent summary of most of these proposals, I refer you to a "Congressional White Paper on a National Policy for the Environment", published just a year ago last month following an informal House-Senate Colloquium on this subject in July, 1968.

There are, however, two particular aspects of Federal environmental policy about which I wish especially to speak to you before closing.

One is money, and the other is education. First, let me talk about money.

On May 16, 1968, Presidential candidate Richard Nixon said, "In cutting the budget, the President must set his own priorities. While some sectors are certain to be pared, other must be preserved. Among those that

should escape the budget knife are appropriations for conservation . . . and for the preservation of natural resources."

I both share and applaud that commitment on the part of candidate Nixon—and I regret that President Nixon has abandoned it.

Let me be specific and refer to the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966.

This measure authorizes Federal grants to states and local communities for the construction of facilities to combat water pollution.

Hundreds of local and state governments in Indiana and elsewhere have drawn up plans for water treatment facilities in the expectation that the Federal government would fulfill its commitment to provide the necessary matching funds.

Here is a splendid opportunity for President Nixon to indicate his priorities and make good on his campaign promise; the Clean Water Act authorizes \$1 billion in Federal grants for the current fiscal year.

But what did the President request in his budget for this desperately needed assistance?

Only \$214 million.

To give you an idea of the impact of the Nixon administration's budget on Indiana, only two of the 135 local communities in our state which have displayed initiative and have filed application for water pollution grants would be funded.

Is this what the President means when he talks about "The New Federalism"?

Congress has not responded quietly to this short-sighted and disastrous policy.

A bipartisan group of 219 Congressmen, including the one addressing you, a few weeks ago publicly agreed to vote to increase funds for water pollution programs to the authorized level of \$1 billion.

The House Appropriations Committee voted to recommend \$600 million, and we came within just two votes of appropriating the \$1 billion figure in voting on the floor of the House.

I am glad to tell you that about last night Senator Muskie, a leader in the fight in Congress against pollution, told me what you have read in this morning's paper, that the Senate voted yesterday 86-2—for the full \$1 billion.

And I hope that the House-Senate Conference Committee will now agree to the larger figure.

It is clear to me that the Congress of the United States has a far better appreciation of the nation's priorities than has a President who rejects the recommendations of a top Subcabinet level committee against a super-sonic transport to urge millions of dollars in Federal subsidies for it, while the same President refuses to face up to the grave dangers to our air and water.

THE NEED FOR ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION

I turn now to a final subject—education.

For some months now I have been reflecting on how little most of us know about the entire range of problems associated with our environment and ecology.

We are increasingly concerned in the United States, but about or environment, do we know as much as we should?

I think the evidence is clear that we do not.

As a former secretary of the Army, former President of Indiana University, and now President of the National Audubon Society, Elvis J. Stahr, Jr. said a few weeks ago, our schools and colleges "have done a demonstrably miserable job of educating about the fundamentals of man's relation to nature and the balance of nature. . . ."

Dr. Stahr added that the fragmented nature of our educational system was one of the major causes of the failure to cope with the environmental problem.

"In education," he said, "the root of the failure may lie in the almost frenzied spe-

cialization which has virtually taken over. Even the environmental sciences are studied piece-meal: nature is broken into little bits—geology, botany, astronomy, zoology, bacteriology, ichthyology, physics, chemistry, etc.—scarcely anywhere in academe are the pieces put back together."

"Somehow," Dr. Stahr concluded, "more environmental awareness must be fed into curricula all along the line."

I agree, and I shall now report to you on two very recent moves in exactly this direction.

I refer first to a report released last week prepared for the use of the President's Cabinet-level Environmental Quality Council by a member of the Office of Science and Technology and by a student, a White House summer intern.

In brief, this report recommends Federal financial assistance for setting up schools of the human environment at colleges and universities throughout the United States, and notes here a comparison with schools of agriculture and public health, both Federally subsidized.

The report is critical of resistance to what it calls "problem-focused education" within universities, and recommends substantial autonomy for the new efforts.

The authors note a serious shortage of trained professionals to deal with environmental problems and say that an expansion of 10 to 100 times our present supply is possible. They recommend \$20 million annually initially.

I trust this report will fall on friendly ears at the University of Notre Dame, where significant progress is already being made in environmental studies under the leadership of such persons, to cite only a few, as Professors Patrick Horsburgh, Wayne Echelberger, Mark Tenney, and Harvey Bender.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY EDUCATION ACT

Finally, I want to tell you that, taking seriously the admonition of Elvis Stahr that "environmental awareness must be fed into the curricula all along the line," I yesterday introduced in the House of Representatives a bill that I believe can have a powerful effect in encouraging the education of Americans on preserving and enhancing the quality of their environment.

My bill, which is co-sponsored by my Democratic colleague, Congressman James Scheuer of New York, and my Republican colleagues, Congressmen Ogden Reid of New York and Orval Hansen of Idaho, can help us to begin now to educate our citizenry, especially school children, about the entire range of problems that will determine the kind of environment that we will have in the future.

Under our bill, Federal funds would be provided for teaching about natural resources, conservation, pollution control, and the need to maintain a balanced ecology.

Today, there are very few resources to help our elementary and secondary schools teach environmental education.

Yet, if we are to shape intelligent environmental policies and generate effective support for them, we must have a citizenry informed and literate about the need for environmental quality and balanced ecology.

My bill, by providing for grants to colleges and universities for developing teaching materials, for teacher training, for pilot projects and for support of environmental education both in schools and community programs, can help fill this serious gap in our educational system.

The bill also provides for environmental education for government officials at local, state, and Federal levels and for community, business, and industrial leaders as well.

The Environmental Quality Education Act has been referred to the Subcommittee which I chair, and I hope to schedule hearings on it during the next session of Congress.

Today in commenting on some of the poli-

tics of pollution I have tried to speak of the growing awareness in nearly every sector of our society of the importance of attending to the quality of our environment.

I have told you of some of the response of Congress in developing measures for a national environmental policy.

I have indicated the need for far more Federal financial support of efforts at local and state levels to combat pollution.

Finally, I have spoken of a burgeoning appreciation of the importance of education in our national effort—the education at our colleges and universities of persons professionally qualified to deal with environmental problems, and the education of every American, beginning in our elementary and secondary schools and in local communities, on the significance of the quality of the environment to their own lives and to the future of our country and of mankind.

I trust that what I have said today will make clear that at least one Congressman shares with you, representatives from the fields of industry and higher education, a commitment to action *now*—if our country and our world are to be what we all want them to be—places where men and women can live lives of abundance and joy and beauty.

WHEAT INDUSTRY COUNCIL

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Wheat Industry Council. I am happy to announce that the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MAY) joins me as a cosponsor of the proposed Wheat and Wheat Foods Research, Education, and Promotion Act.

This proposed legislation will enable the wheat industry to coordinate and finance research and education programs for the benefit of consumers in the United States. I stress the consumer benefit advisedly for it is only through increased nutritional contributions of wheat foods, along with taste appeal, that the wheat industry can prosper.

A few years ago, representatives of growers, millers, bakers, Federal agencies, and scientific and academic institutions joined together in an informal pro tem committee on human nutrition research. They produced a notable document that pointed out just how little is known about the nutritional contribution of wheat foods—and others—in general, particularly in relation to malnutrition, atherosclerosis, obesity, dental caries, anemias, and other special health conditions. In describing the job to be done, the pro tem committee closed with these words:

To shirk any part of this personal and group responsibility is to shrug off our obligation as producers of food for man and to evade recognition of present and future need.

Mr. Speaker, the wheat industry, from producer to end-product manufacturer, is now trying to assume this responsibility. I hope we will give them our support in the next session.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like

to add one comment. This program is not intended to finance the competition of one food against another. Instead, it is intended to provide information where little exists, for the purpose of permitting the wheat industry to combat malnutrition to the extent it can. This, Mr. Speaker, should be the cooperative goal of all elements of the food industry.

FDA'S FAILURE TO PROTECT THE PUBLIC

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by Morton Mintz in the Washington Post on Sunday, November 23.

Although there is nothing that the Congress can do at this point to alleviate the distressing conditions outlined in the article, I think it is in the public interest to bring the matter to the attention of as wide an audience as possible.

I commend Mr. Mintz on his unflinching attention to public health matters.

His article follows:

PUBLIC SWALLOWS FDA'S MISTAKES

(By Morton Mintz)

Despite a lot of tough talk, the Food and Drug Administration continues to approve the sale of about 90 widely prescribed antibiotic combinations that, it says, cause needless massive injury and even death.

FDA Commissioner Herbert L. Ley, Jr., solidly backed by the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, has ruled the medicines unsafe. With full NAS-NRC support, he has also ruled the products ineffective as fixed-ratio combinations. In such combinations, the components are mixed in proportions determined by recipe rather than the individual needs of patients.

Yet month after month, under a court order he has failed to resist, Dr. Ley goes on certifying new batches of the combinations as safe and effective, thus permitting them to remain on sale.

Dr. Ley, himself a specialist in the use of antibiotics to treat infections, has testified on Capitol Hill that one of the mixtures, Panalba, alone causes hundreds of thousands of injuries—a few of them lethal—every year. Other specialists are alarmed at the possibility that widespread, needless use of the combinations may bring worldwide epidemics of infections resistant to treatment.

Yet there is no assured end to the "conflict between commercial and therapeutic goals," as Dr. Ley once described it, in which he goes on certifying the combinations.

A CHARGE OF FEAR

This extraordinary situation has many roots—in the FDA's approach to the broad problem of ineffective medicines, in a series of agency responses to resistance from the drug industry and in attitudes of the medical profession.

But according to two former FDA scientists, the period of transition between the lame duck Johnson administration and the incoming Nixon administration was crucial to FDA treatment of the case. There was, the scientists say, an intuitive fear that if agency leaders took strong action against the combinations, it would bring retaliation from a business-oriented White House.

Dr. Robert S. McCleery, who was Commis-

sioner Ley's special assistant for communications, says bluntly that the commissioner "wanted to keep his job," in which he serves at the pleasure of the President.

Dr. McCleery and Dr. B. Harvey Minchew, who was acting director of the FDA's Bureau of Medicine, were interviewed during an investigation by The Washington Post that turned up hitherto secret aspects of the agency's decision-making processes.

They say that a second factor inhibiting the FDA in its treatment of the antibiotic combinations was an uneasy recognition that such a move would focus attention on failures within the FDA itself—starting with a medically unjustified decision a dozen years ago to let the mixtures enter the market.

Thus, Drs. McCleery and Minchew argue, fear abetted by coverup joined to obstruct the FDA from protecting the health and pocketbooks of a vast number of patients.

Dr. Ley and another key figure in the case, J. Kenneth Kirk, associate commissioner for compliance, heatedly deny the charges of fear and cover-up. Kirk concedes, however, that he delayed action on the antibiotics in order to obtain figures on their sales volume (probably \$100 million or more a year at wholesale). That was "my idea," he says.

And FDA's counsel, William W. Goodrich, acknowledges in retrospect that had the agency invoked one simple word in the drug law, the subsequent problems might have been substantially minimized if not avoided. The law allows action against drugs posing "an imminent hazard to public health." The agency balked at the word "imminent."

"SHOTGUN" THERAPY

The antibiotic combinations are among the so-called "ethical" drugs, which means that they can be sold only by prescription and cannot be advertised to lay audiences. Their names, therefore, are hardly household words. But in medical channels, including journals distributed free to physicians, they have been long and heavily promoted.

They began entering the market in the 1950s. The FDA released them even though—then as now—specialists in the antibiotic treatment of disease almost universally opposed them.

The main argument in favor of the mixtures has been convenience. This appeal has been especially strong to doctors who wish to be spared the need to make precise diagnoses.

Dr. William L. Hewitt, professor of medicine at the University of California at Los Angeles and chairman of a National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council panel to review drugs, told Sen. Gaylord Nelson's Senate Monopoly Subcommittee last May that the person responsible for FDA's initial approval of antibiotic combinations was Henry Welch, a bacteriologist who in the 1950s headed the agency's Division of Antibiotics.

Dr. Hewitt recalled that Welch had staged symposiums and had engaged in other efforts with an FDA imprimatur to popularize the combinations. This "very bad policy" encouraged "a shotgun approach to the treatment of undiagnosed disease," Dr. Hewitt testified, and he denounced it as "pharmaceutical quackery."

The late Sen. Estes Kefauver developed evidence that Welch got \$287,000 from antibiotics producers in an eight-year period, mainly by collecting "honorariums" from two journals whose existence depended upon the antibiotics companies. Welch resigned after the situation was exposed.

However they got on the market, the antibiotic combinations took up an increasing share. Many have been among the 200 most-prescribed medicines. Last year, sales of Panalba—the combination involved in FDA's test case—ran at a rate of \$1.5 million a month and accounted for 12 per cent of the domestic gross of the manufacturer, the Upjohn Co.

CASE AGAINST COMBINATIONS

Almost without exception, specialists in the treatment of infectious diseases denounce the use of combinations. They say that the use of two antibiotics when one will do at least doubles the risk of adverse reactions. They also say that fixed ratios prevent a physician from increasing the dose of one component without increasing the dose of the second, thus ruling out treatment tailored to the needs of individual patients.

Panalba, for example, combines two effective antibiotics—novobiocin and tetracycline. But Dr. Ley has said that novobiocin contributes little but risk to patients receiving tetracycline.

In addition, tests sponsored by the Upjohn firm about a decade ago (but not disclosed until and FDA inspector discovered them in company files this year) showed that the components of Panalba were "antagonistic." That is, novobiocin and tetracycline acted against each other, making one less effective than either would be if used alone.

UCLA's Dr. Hewitt told the Nelson subcommittee that all sales of Panalba thus become "a net theft from the public."

A primary worry among 30 specialists in infectious diseases—members of five panels that reviewed combinations of anti-infective drugs for the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council—was that the products allow resistant strains of bacteria to proliferate, creating the possibility of epidemics of infections that resist treatment. They recall with dread, for example, staphylococcus epidemics of the 1950s that were nurtured by overuse of sulfonamides and the early penicillins.

Testifying about one group of mixtures, Dr. Calvin M. Kunin, chairman of one of the NAS-NRC panels, told the Senate Monopoly Subcommittee that "widespread" and "indiscriminate" use "has almost led to disaster" by threatening not merely the individuals receiving the drugs but—because of possible epidemics of resistant infections—"all society."

Dr. Kunin, who is chairman of the department of preventive medicine at the University of Virginia, was speaking about 16 combinations of penicillin with streptomycin (pen-streps). The latter antibiotic can cause deafness, particularly in children. An additional 32 products also contain penicillin but mix it with sulfonamides (pen-sulfas).

THE PANELS' VERDICT

Until 1962, the Food and Drug Administration was empowered to get prescription drugs off the market only if they were unsafe. But in that year, Congress passed the Kefauver-Harris amendments, which added regulatory weapons against ineffective drugs as well. After seven years, no drug with significant sales has been removed.

The National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council entered the picture in 1966, when the FDA made a contract with it to review the efficacy of the approximately 4,000 formulations marketed in the period before 1962 when safety alone had to be demonstrated before marketing.

Last year, NAS-NRC review panels concluded that the pen-streps and the pen-sulfas were not only unsafe but also ineffective as fixed combinations because none was more efficacious than a component used alone. As to Panalba, the initial conclusion was that it was ineffective and "has no place in rational therapeutics."

Last Christmas Eve the FDA moved formally to take Panalba off the market. The reason given was that the company had not submitted the substantial evidence of efficacy required by the 1962 drug legislation. The agency failed, as had the NAS-NRC panels, to cite a lack of safety.

That failure was surprising. For one thing, the FDA for several years had approved a labeling for the novobiocin component of Panalba warning that it can cause serious

and even fatal blood diseases, serious liver damage and allergic or hypersensitivity reactions "in a significant percentage of patients."

FDA Commissioner Ley told Sen. Nelson's subcommittee last May that because of novobiocin, about one out of five patients on Panalba is expected to suffer a "reaction that, most often, is merely irritating . . . you can't sleep for several nights or a week, or you may break out in a very unpleasant, uncomfortable rash."

The FDA's formal notice last December gave Upjohn 30 days to file comments, after which the company could request a hearing.

At roughly the same time, the FDA was working to produce positions on two other major classifications of the antibiotic combinations—the penstrops and the pen-sulfas—which the review panels had found both hazardous and ineffective.

Testimony before Rep. L. H. Fountain's House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee last spring established that a document declaring the agency's intention to remove the penstrops from the market reached the office of Associate Commissioner J. Kenneth Kirk last Dec. 3, and that a similar document relating to the pen-sulfas reached the same office Jan. 10. Both would have been effective upon publication in the Federal Register, and that in turn would have triggered publication in a medical journal of a "white paper" by two NAS-NRC review panel chairmen warning of the hazards of pen-streps and pen-sulfas. Both documents were in final form—awaiting Commissioner Ley's signature—on Jan. 15.

A FINE SENSITIVITY

On that day, Robert S. McCleery remembers, he had a chance encounter with Associate Commissioner Kirk at FDA headquarters in the Crystal Plaza in Arlington. Then Commissioner Ley's special assistant for communications, Dr. McCleery acquired a reputation for tough-minded regulation during his six years at the agency. He holds FDA's award of merit and the distinguished service medal of the parent Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

He was under pressure at the time from the NAS-NRC panels, which wanted to alert the medical profession to the hazards of the pen-streps and pen-sulfas. Since release of the "white paper" designed to do so depended on publication of the Federal Register documents, "Dr. McCleery was on my back," Kirk recalls.

In the Jan. 15 meeting with Kirk, Dr. McCleery recalls inquiring about the regulatory documents involving the pen-streps and pen-sulfas that had been prepared for the signature of Commissioner Ley. Kirk told him, Dr. McCleery says, "I have advised him [the commissioner] not to sign the papers, because he would be fired by the Nixon administration when it comes in next week."

Although there was no evidence that anything of the kind might happen, Dr. McCleery says, there was in the FDA a finely tuned sensitivity to such signals as Mr. Nixon's campaign stance against tough regulation by the Securities and Exchange Commission and to the incoming President's well publicized friendship with Elmer W. Bobst, the "honorary chairman" of a pharmaceutical firm—not, by the way, one involved in the antibiotics combination controversy.

Kirk "categorically" denies making the statement about administration retaliation, and Dr. Ley says Kirk never told him he might be fired by the Nixon administration. Kirk does say that he told Dr. McCleery that the regulatory papers should not go to the office of the HEW Secretary without a prior determination of the sales volume of the questioned antibiotic combinations.

THE ECONOMIC IMPACT

Later the same day, Dr. McCleery says, he met with Dr. Ley in his office. Saying nothing about the conversation with Kirk, Dr.

McCleery asked the commissioner if he had signed the papers. Dr. Ley said that he had not yet seen them. Later he was to tell the Fountain subcommittee that he had the documents on Jan. 21, the day after the Nixon administration took office.

Eight days later, there was a meeting at the FDA about the possibility of setting up an advisory committee on antibiotics. Dr. McCleery, who says he was "bird-dogging" the matter, requested Dr. B. Harvey Minchew to check on the status of the papers. Dr. Minchew put the question to Deputy Commissioner Winton B. Rankin, the FDA's No. 2 man.

"His answer, in essence, was that we were not going to act on it until the whole potential impact of the antibiotics was brought to the Secretary's attention," Dr. Minchew says. By "impact," he says, Rankin meant "economic impact—the fact that they were best-selling drugs. Anticipating industry resistance, they did not want to implement the action until the Secretary's office had concurred."

At a later date, says Dr. Minchew, Dr. Ley told him "substantially the same thing."

"I can't see that the agency should concern itself . . . with how much is being sold in terms of the medical issues involved," Dr. Minchew says. "It was a disappointment."

Kirk says he is "sorry that Harvey was disappointed." But, the associate commissioner says, there is a longstanding rule that the Secretary's office be alerted to any regulatory action with a potentially great impact.

The Commissioner signed the Federal Register papers on April 2—2½ months after the day when, according to his testimony, they were in his office ready for signature. Publicly, he has never given a clear explanation for the delay. Nor has Kirk given a clear explanation as to how the computation of financial effect could have accounted for the delay.

THE PANALBA DELAY

The Panalba case was undergoing a parallel delay. When he signed the initial notice of intention to take the drug off the market last December, Dr. Ley had given the Upjohn Co. 30 days to file comments. But in January, he extended that deadline to give the firm an additional 120 days. That had the effect of ensuring that any possible decisive action would be taken under the Nixon administration.

Dr. Ley has acknowledged that the extension was "a mistake" because it was used by Upjohn not to supply substantial evidence of Panalba's efficacy but for a campaign to deluge the FDA with testimonials from physicians. An estimated 23,000 doctors have prescribed a reported 750 million doses of Panalba since it went on sale in 1957.

Not all the effects of the delay were in the drug company's favor, however. For by March, Dr. Minchew, as acting director of FDA's Bureau of Medicine, was becoming increasingly disturbed about one of Panalba's components, novobiocin.

In a memo to Dr. Ley, Dr. Minchew cited multiple and serious health hazards of this antibiotic that had been noted by an NAS-NRC panel that recommended its removal from the market. (Dr. Ley had overruled the recommendation, choosing instead to try to restrict novobiocin's use drastically with new warnings to doctors.)

The Minchew memo threatened a crisis for the Upjohn firm. So long as efficacy had been the sole issue raised by the FDA, sales of Panalba could continue unabated while an administrative hearing was sought and held and then litigated in the courts. That would probably take years. But with safety an issue, Upjohn had to face the possibility that sales would be halted immediately.

At the FDA, the Minchew memo became the basis for a crisis of a different kind. After all, the agency had been certifying Panalba as safe and effective for 12 years, batch by batch and month by month.

But Dr. Ley himself—in a draft letter of April 29 to the Upjohn firm—discussed Panalba's "clearly evident imminent hazards . . ." And he testified that it needlessly injured hundreds of thousands of persons annually and, along with the pen-streps, contributed to the possibility of staph epidemics.

How, then, could he fail to take the "imminent hazard" route—a route that, in hindsight, FDA counsel Goodrich says "would have been better?"

Commissioner Ley now concedes that the case for an "imminent hazard" decision might have been made on the basis of serious or fatal blood diseases attributed to Panalba. He contends, however, that the FDA would have faced a severe court challenge because of a lack of records showing that skin and allergic reactions were as prevalent as the agency claimed.

Differing from counsel Goodrich, Dr. Ley insists that, overall, the public health probably was better served by his decision to follow an "intermediate" course. This was to declare Panalba a "serious" or "significant" hazard to patients.

In choosing such a middle ground, Dr. Ley says he was trying to come down between "the Rankins and the Kirks" on the one hand—a reference to the two high-ranking FDA officials who rose from the ranks of agency inspectors and who are known for their bureaucratic caution—and the "Don Quixotes" on the other.

Before Dr. Ley's newly contrived weapon could be tested in court, the commissioner had a struggle within HEW that indicated he could not count on the kind of unequivocal support from Secretary Robert H. Finch that his predecessor, Dr. James L. Goddard, had received from former Secretary John W. Gardner.

The struggle began when Dr. Ley called in the Upjohn firm to say that he was going to announce several decisions. These included halting certification of Panalba as effective and safe, recalling existing stocks and requiring the company to distribute a warning letter to physicians.

Through the intervention of Rep. Garry E. Brown (R-Mich.), whose district includes Upjohn's home city of Kalamazoo, the firm met with Finch and Under Secretary John G. Veneman. The result was that on the day of the meeting, May 5, Veneman took an action without known precedent in the history of antibiotic regulation.

In a phone call to Deputy Commissioner Rankin, Veneman asked the FDA to consider resolving the dispute by taking certain alternative steps. These, it turned out, were the very proposals that Upjohn had made. They include a ban on publicity about Panalba, no recall of existing supplies and an administrative hearing that would allow Panalba to remain on the market without interruption.

The next day, Dr. Ley responded in a memo addressed to Finch that, along with other key documents, was aired by the Fountain subcommittee of the House. Dr. Ley said that he "cannot" certify Panalba as safe and effective. The product "has been judged by very competent people not to be effective . . . and to be a hazard to the public health," Dr. Ley's memo said.

"We have the right and the obligation to move to protect the public by requiring its removal from the market and by requiring an appropriate warning to be issued to the doctors of this nation," Dr. Ley said.

"I recommend that the department endorse and support the action initiated by FDA," he continued. "If the department is unable to accept this recommendation, I request your instructions as to the departmental position that I should follow."

(On May 9, three days later, the "departmental position" was relayed to the FDA: to do what Upjohn had asked. But as it hap-

pened, that was the very same day that the Fountain subcommittee, preparing for a hearing that was to begin the next week, asked to see FDA files on combination antibiotics.

This request set off a chain of events that included a briefing of Finch by FDA counsel Goodrich. Late in the day, Secretary Finch reversed himself and backed Dr. Ley.

THE UNUSED WORD

With this development, Upjohn moved on May 27 to put Dr. Ley's concept of a "serious" or "significant" hazard to a court test. The firm filed a petition in federal court in Kalamazoo that was intended to keep Panalba on sale through the device of an administrative hearing.

On June 19, the eve of oral arguments before Judge W. Wallace Kent, W. Donald Gray of the Fountain subcommittee staff asked FDA counsel Goodrich in a phone conversation why he was not asserting that an "imminent hazard" existed. Goodrich assured Gray that he had the legal weaponry he needed without that one.

In court on June 20, the Washington lawyers opposing Goodrich—Stanley L. Temko of Covington and Burling for Upjohn; Lloyd N. Cutler of Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering for the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association—emphasized repeatedly that the FDA had not claimed an "imminent hazard."

FDA's Goodrich, using phrases about Panalba that are nowhere in the statute ("unwarranted hazard," "substantial hazard," "unacceptable risk"), argued that the agency had not deemed it necessary to invoke "imminent hazard."

He contended that the FDA had traveled the correct legal route when it first required Upjohn to submit substantial evidence of Panalba's efficacy and then, when such evidence was not forthcoming, refused to certify the product as safe and effective.

Even though Goodrich produced affidavits showing 11 fatalities among Panalba users, Judge Kent was clearly unimpressed. His concern, he said, had to be with legal issues, not issues of safety and efficacy.

In July, Judge Kent held that there was no serious threat to the public health. But, he found, there was a threat of another kind—of irreparable injury to the Upjohn company.

He granted an injunction requiring Commissioner Ley to go on certifying Panalba until 30 days after whatever date he disposed of company objections to the FDA's refusal to grant a hearing.

Sensing a clear industry victory, the American Home Products Corp., whose Wyeth Laboratories division is a major producer of pen-streps and pen-sulfas, swiftly went into federal court in Wilmington, Del., where, on the basis of Kent's ruling, it asked for and got an injunction requiring continued certification of those antibiotic combinations as safe and effective.

The ruling was a shattering setback to the FDA's seemingly interminable efforts to stop the sales of unsafe and ineffective drugs.

By the time Judge Kent ruled, Dr. McCleery had left the FDA to join Rep. Fountain's House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee as a consultant. After the ruling, he and staff member Donald Gray had a three-way phone conversation with Goodrich. Again the question was, why had the FDA counsel not invoked "imminent hazard?"

As Dr. McCleery and Gray recall the conversation, Goodrich said he still believed he had been on solid legal ground in deciding it was unnecessary to cite the phrase. But, they add, Goodrich also alluded to the tortured record of the FDA in the Panalba case—including the 120-day extension granted by Dr. Ley for Upjohn to file substantial evidence of Panalba's efficacy—and asked, "How could I go into court and charge an 'imminent hazard?'"

Judge Kent's order to continue certifying

Panalba posed for Dr. Ley what Dr. McCleery calls "one of the greatest moral challenges" ever faced by a public official.

As a physician and scientist, how could Dr. Ley certify as safe and effective what he had frequently pronounced unsafe and ineffective? As an official of the government, how could Commissioner Ley refuse to obey a court order?

"Above all else," Dr. McCleery argues, Dr. Ley should not have signed certifications for Panalba—even if it meant resigning. But there was, he points out, an honorable third course: appeal Judge Kent's decision.

Asked why he didn't take it, Dr. Ley says, "I can't really answer this . . . I'm not really sure this course was open to us at this time."

The commissioner adds that he relied on William Goodrich because "I trust Billy as much as I've trusted anyone in my life." He is sure that if an appeal had been "an attractive course, I'm sure I would have followed it."

But Goodrich says he rejected the idea of appealing in favor of what he deemed to be "the shortest and surest way" of getting unsafe antibiotic combinations off the market—ruling on Upjohn's objections to decertification without a hearing. So long as these objections were pending in FDA, Goodrich contends, the chances of a successful appeal would be "not good."

MIDDLE GROUND AGAIN

Commissioner Ley formally ruled that the objections filed by Upjohn offered neither substantial evidence that Panalba was either safe or effective (as a fixed combination) nor reasonable grounds for an evidentiary hearing. "Such a hearing would serve no purpose other than delay," he said in a statement in the Federal Register.

Had Dr. Ley left it at that, he could have stopped certifying Panalba 30 days later as stipulated by Judge Kent. Then the company, if it wished, could appeal. Once again, however, Dr. Ley procrastinated on an invented middle ground.

First, while denying an "evidentiary hearing," he gave Upjohn an opportunity "to make an oral presentation to the commissioner." Second, contrary even to the FDA's own press release, he did not start the clock running on the 30-day moratorium on decertification.

The "oral presentation"—which was as much of a legal novelty as was the "serious," "significant" and "unwarranted" hazard—was held Aug. 13. Five weeks went by in which the FDA continued to certify Panalba—and the pen-streps and pen-sulfas, as well—as safe and effective.

On Sept. 19, Dr. Ley, ruling that nothing in Upjohn's "oral presentation" had changed his judgment, signed a "final order" to take Panalba off the market. But, reversing the position he had taken in May, he did not propose to decertify existing stocks. With this action, the 30-day clock at last began to run.

The Upjohn firm then stopped the clock by filing an appeal in Cincinnati. The FDA "voluntarily agreed to suspend any action against the [Panalba] products pending a decision by the court," the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association Newsletter reported. "The court further noted that the government had not found any 'imminent hazard' to health requiring immediate prohibition of the products' sale, and that in the past these products had been repeatedly certified as 'safe and efficacious' by the FDA."

"INEPT" IS TOO KIND

Sometime in December, the appellate court will hear oral argument on issues that it has termed "very significant both to the public and the drug industry." Sometime after that, the court will rule. Sometime after that, an appeal probably will be taken by the losing party—the FDA or Upjohn—to the Supreme

Court. And for an indefinite time to come, the FDA commissioner will go on certifying as safe and effective products that he believes to be neither.

It was with more than a premonition of these events that Dr. McCleery went to Dr. Ley last February to tell him he was leaving.

"I told him I couldn't agree with his kind of regulatory philosophy," Dr. McCleery recalls. "I told him I was seeing evidence that he was handling matters so as to take into account political and economic factors.

"Dr. Ley asked me to stay, to reconsider, to take a couple of weeks vacation to think it over," Dr. McCleery says. "I refused."

Dr. McCleery then was retained as a consultant by the Fountain subcommittee, which at the time was preparing for hearings in April and May on how the FDA had been fulfilling its mandate from Congress to halt the sale of ineffective drugs. The hearings showed, Dr. McCleery says, "that the FDA is not upholding the provisions of the law."

After the hearings, Rep. Fountain characterized the FDA's performance as "inept." Dr. McCleery finds that a "complimentary" adjective. As Dr. McCleery sees it, the consequences for the public of the mishandling of the antibiotics will reach far beyond these drugs to vast numbers of ineffective medicines of all types which were marketed before 1962 but which remain among those most often prescribed today.

"How well have the leaders of the FDA served the nation with only the law to protect it in this confrontation with industry self-interest?" he asks. Yet "in these serious and deadly matters, the FDA is our sole agent for the use of law in the protection of public health. If the law can be so misused by some against the government and the public interest, then the law should be employed by others against the government but in the public interest."

Dr. McCleery recently left the Fountain subcommittee to join consumer advocate Ralph Nader.

Another of the FDA's "Don Quixotes," Dr. Minchew, resigned in May to join the Johns Hopkins Hospital unit in Columbia, Md. "The Rankins and the Kirks," of course, are still there.

In a speech a few months ago, FDA Commissioner Ley defined "the real 'gut' issues of the antibiotic combination controversy" this way:

"Are we in this country dedicated to a rational, scientific basis of antibiotic therapy or are we dedicated to contributing unnecessarily to the 1.5 million hospital admissions annually attributed to adverse reactions to drugs?"

A speech given a few days ago by Dr. Lester Breslow, president of the American Public Health Association, contained a sentence that reads as if it were tailored to give Dr. Ley his answer. In the Panalba case, Dr. Breslow said, "The administrative and judicial action to assure continuing sale was clearly designed to protect the interests of the drug manufacturer, not to avoid the hazard to patients taking the drug."

CHILDREN'S PRAYERS

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, Supreme Court decisions have outlawed prayer and Bible reading in the Nation's public schools.

To counteract this decision we are placing five children's prayers in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD each week for use by the Nation's schoolchildren.

By reading these prayers from the RECORD, there is no violation because even the high-handed Supreme Court has dared not outlaw prayer in the Congress of the United States.

The week's prayers follow:

I

Through the night Thine angels kept
Watch around me while I slept.
Now the dark has gone away,
Lord, I thank Thee for the day.

II

Now I wake and see the light;
'Tis God has kept me through the night.
To him I lift my voice and pray
That He will keep me through the day.

III

Father in Heaven, all through the night
I have been sleeping, safe in Thy sight.
Father, I thank Thee; bless me I pray,
Bless me and keep me all through the day.

IV

Lord, teach me to love Thy children every-
where, because
Thou art their father and mine.

V

God bless all those that I love;
God bless all those that love me;
God bless all those that love those that I love,
And all those that love those that love me.
—From an old New England sampler.

BILL KREH WRITES THE STORY OF THE NAVAL RESERVE

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, those of us who deal with Reserve matters here on Capitol Hill have fought many notable battles. But because of the nature of our work, our battles deal with numbers and dollars and organizational structure and immense authorizations for weapons and training facilities. In so doing, we may sometimes lose sight of the fact that the most important elements in our Reserve forces are people—individual men and women who give a little something extra of themselves in service to their country.

There has now appeared a book—"Citizen Sailors, the U.S. Naval Reserve in War and Peace"—which reminds us that the people are what matter in the Naval Reserve, not the number of people but the individuals, their dedication, their professionalism, and their sense of sacrifice.

The myriad jobs they do for our national defense, the great service they have given in Vietnam, is told dramatically and movingly in this action packed story.

In the years he was managing editor of Navy Times, Bill Kreh established the reputation as an author with a skillful command of the language and an editor with a discerning knowledge of military affairs. When he writes a book, you can be sure it is valuable knowledge and enjoyable reading. I commend Mr. Kreh and the Naval Reserve Association, which sponsored the volume, for the efforts they have made to improve the understanding of the Naval Reserve on the part of the American people.

MRS. SILVER BEAVER SPEAKS

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, anyone who has been active in working with the Boy Scouts of America is well aware that one of the highest honors that can be attained by an adult leader is the Silver Beaver Award.

This award is presented once each year to a select group of individuals, chosen for their "outstanding service to boyhood."

There are Members in the Congress who have been granted this recognition for service to Scouting.

In the December issue of Scouting magazine, Mrs. Oril Wolf, of Lake Stevens, Wash., writes most eloquently of one man who received the Silver Beaver Award.

The article follows:

MRS. SILVER BEAVER SPEAKS

(By Mrs. Oril Wolf)

The framed certificate reads "For Outstanding Service to Boyhood." The little Silver Beaver, suspended from its blue and white ribbon, is perfect in detail.

I can remember a long time ago, more than 20 years ago in fact, when I watched the first Silver Beaver ceremonies I had ever seen, in a big auditorium in a big city. I was tremendously impressed by these men who had obviously given so much that they had been chosen above hundreds of others for this distinguished award. To me that little "Beaver" was so unattainable it might as well have been a medal from the President of the United States.

Now I know a little more about the "Beaver." I know one man who received it and what he did to merit it. There was never any one big thing or any selfless act of sacrifice. There were many, many little things.

The summer vacations always spent with the troop at camp instead of taking a trip with the family or catching up on some home repair projects. The merit badge counseling for innumerable boys who came evenings, Saturdays, and Sundays. The once-a-week pack or troop meetings planned and carried out. The committee meetings with other dads. The training courses attended and later conducted. The formation of new units. The planning for Scout circuses and Scout-aramas. Camporees, a time of highly competitive excitement. The paper work, mountainous—and neglected.

How many times this was positively the last year he was going to be Scoutmaster! The now more than 200 nights he has slept on the hard ground in tents with kids who eagerly sought adventure in the great out-of-doors. And that's what they wanted—adventure!

It didn't necessarily include such mundane things as collecting firewood in the pouring rain, putting up tents, or learning to cook. So the "Whip," as he called himself, set them to their tasks, prevented them from eating all the food raw, groaned when they fell over the pots and pans, lost his temper, and screamed, "Out, everybody out!" when they put freshly caught fish on his sleeping bag.

He climbed mountains, prowled valleys, rescued kids from precarious perches, watched over them in swimming holes—all the time grumbling to himself and growling like a bear routed from his winter's sleep too early, "I'm going to quit this nonsense, I'm getting too old."

The many friends he has acquired, close

friends he may never have met outside Scouting. The fine people in all walks of life who also give time and effort to boys.

And above and beyond all else, the hundreds of boys who call him friend. Some now married with boys of their own. He writes to them in places like Germany and Vietnam. They don't forget him.

He may not think so, but I know he has influenced boys to a better life for maybe generations to come. This was his contribution to a better America. And this is what his Silver Beaver means to me.

He didn't get it just because he was such a willing hand. He also got it for the times he went camping when he would rather have stayed home, for the times he was ready to throw in the sponge and didn't. For the gripping he did to make things a little better for "his" boys.

There hasn't been a single spectacular thing he has done for boys really. He has just been there.

This time when I watched the Silver Beavers awarded and they called his name, I didn't feel awed. I just felt a deep quiet pride. Because someone besides Mrs. Silver Beaver knew the kind of a guy he really is.

A STEEL BEAM IN SOUTH AFRICA

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Roy Wilkins' column which appeared in the November 19, 1969, St. Paul Dispatch deserves a wide audience. He points out that—

The American system works well enough to deflate the black separatists and not nearly well enough to justify the smug complacency of the white standpatters.

And whatever its faults, ours is not generally a society "where grown men can be ordered to carry a steel beam 12 miles in their bare hands because no one is outraged that skin color dictates both pay and opportunity."

South Africa is such a society.

The article follows:

A STEEL BEAM IN SOUTH AFRICA (By Roy Wilkins)

An account from Johannesburg, South Africa, of the delivery by hand of a 36-foot steel beam by six black Africans over a distance of 12 miles highlights both the plight of black people in South Africa and the senseless apartheid pressure being applied to black Africans in our country.

When the company boss told three Africans to deliver the beam they thought (even in South Africa in 1969) that he was joking. He added three more Africans after their protests and in seven hours the trek was over. The manpower method was used in this day of engines because the beam would have required a double-trailer auto truck that the whites maintained was "too expensive."

The black beam-toters did not receive extra pay for their long, hot task.

Here in America there is persistent propaganda by black separatists for the kind of apartheid now in effect in South Africa. They advocate cutting off from white people completely and "going it alone" in blackness. According to this school of thought, the test of every man and idea, of every theory and practice, must be blackness. Nothing tinged with whiteness, no matter how efficient, is acceptable and everything run by blacks, no matter how expensive and inefficient, is man-

datory. The only whiteness permitted is white money—without white control.

Whites who seek to justify the snail-like improvement of the lot of Negro Americans also use black people and whites in underdeveloped nations to exhort Negro Americans to patience and contentment. They say, "Look at South Africa and be glad you live in Alabama."

The question, however, is not how Negro Americans rank with the Indians in Chile, for example, but how they rank with white Americans, their fellow citizens for more than 100 years and their fellow residents for 350 years. The test of the American system is not whether it is horrified at black Africans being made to carry steel 12 miles, but whether it is agitated and galvanized to action by black Americans being barred from jobs in their own country because of their color.

The American system works well enough to deflate the black separatists and not nearly well enough to justify the smug complacency of the white standpatters. Ed Wilson is a black laborer working as a union member on a construction crew at a Manhattan luxury apartment. He makes \$189 a week and hopes his job will last another year. But the most telling indictment of American racial barriers was his calm assertion that in 10 years only about four jobs came to him through the union. The hard fight for membership is only the beginning of the battle.

The black separatists preach that the history of Ed Wilson "proves" that a black man cannot make it in a white society. Ergo, withdraw to a black society.

Ed Wilson does not believe in this deadly hocus-pocus. He knows that it is better to be able to fight for a better deal than to be in a society where grown men can be ordered to carry a steel beam 12 miles in their bare hands because no one is outraged that skin color dictates both pay and opportunity.

WISCONSIN'S WORK OR STUDY ABROAD PROGRAM

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin Work or Study Abroad has been in operation since 1963 and has grown from a small beginning to the point where it plans to send over 2,000 students to study, work or travel in Europe and other places. The directors are J. David Kupper and Arno Michaelis III.

I enclose the summary and conclusions of the work or study program for 1969:

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I think it is obvious from this report that I was favorably impressed with this operation. Next year's operations will be even larger, and the experience gained this year will be very helpful in planning next year's operation. It appears that there will probably be between 2,000 and 3,000 students going abroad next year. WSA has made reservations for 2,600 with leading airlines to transport their students in 1970.

The WSA program is definitely an in-depth cultural experience. This was very evident at each location I visited and was verified by the group leaders in charge. All of these group leaders are teachers in the fields involved, and since many do have students from their own schools in attendance, they felt responsible and are concerned that the programs are worthwhile.

Institutions in the United States should have no hesitancy in granting credit for work done at these schools operated and sponsored in Europe by WSA. The classes meet for 3

hours per day, 5 days a week for 4 weeks which totals 60 hours. This is equal in clock hours to a semester in most United States schools, and with the tours and other experiences in the various communities I feel will exceed the work that would be done in a similar semester course at home. What better way can there be to study a language than in the country itself, living with a native family, mingling with local residents, and hearing practically nothing but that language all the time?

The cost of the program is very reasonable. In calculating travel, board and room, instruction at the various schools, and administrative costs, it is obvious the rate has been held to a minimum.

The WSA program with 4 weeks of study and excursions and two weeks of tour (two weeks independent travel for college students) seems to be about right. A shorter period of study would hardly be worthwhile, and the final tour is a fine way to conclude the experience.

The WSA system of providing chaperones at each campus who are so well qualified assures that everything possible will be done to make the program worthwhile. These people would not tolerate anything less.

It was a privilege for me to make this evaluation. WSA made every effort to make the trip a pleasant one. I was given the opportunity to observe all phases of the operation. I tried to be objective and critical, but I found very little to criticize. WSA officials are aware of the problems that I did mention, and from discussions I heard, I know that these will be corrected. The attitudes of WSA and staff are important. Most of them are young and are energetic and eager to build an organization for the future, and are not primarily interested in financial gain. There were many places they could cut corners and save money, but as far as I could see, they were more interested in providing a good program for the boys and girls involved. I have no reservations in recommending WSA to anyone interested in summer study abroad.

SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, 6 years have passed since that infamous Friday, November 22, 1963, when the 35th President of the United States was tragically murdered in Dallas, Tex. Since the death of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, many of his policies designed to build a New Frontier have been implemented—welfare programs have been established to aid our needy poor, American men have walked on the surface of the moon, our young people continue to serve mankind in the Peace Corps—and other programs of the Kennedy administration have been enacted.

Yet, all of us know that much more must be done before we have built the America John Kennedy led us to hope was attainable. On the sad occasion of the sixth anniversary of his death, it is fitting that each of us should resolve, yet once again, to strive with all our abilities and energy to realize his dream of an America that was a secure and healthy homeland for all her citizens, a land of brotherhood, and a nation of which we all might be proud.

EXPERTS IN GRANTSMANSHIP HELP
CORNER FEDERAL FUNDS

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, an article entitled "Experts in Grantsmanship Help Corner Federal Funds" appeared in the Bakersfield Californian on November 13, 1969, that I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues. This article deals with the accessibility to Federal funds that wealthy States and local governments have due to their ability to hire experts in grantsmanship. Many of our States and local governments cannot afford to hire these experts and since the Federal Government does not provide a complete catalog or a central office where information on all Federal programs can be obtained, these governmental units are often unable to get the Federal assistance they need.

This thought-provoking article further dramatizes the need for the Program Information Act that will require the creation of a single, comprehensive compendium of all Federal programs. All States and local governments as well as private individuals need such a catalog so they can make sound judgments based on factual and complete information concerning Federal programs.

The article follows:

EXPERTS IN GRANTSMANSHIP HELP CORNER
FEDERAL FUNDS

(By Louis Cassels)

WASHINGTON.—In theory, federal aid programs are set up so that the most liberal grants are available to the areas in greatest need.

In practice, it often works out just the opposite. Wealthy states and cities make a rich haul of federal largesse because they can afford to hire experts in grantsmanship. The really needy ones sometimes go without because they don't know how or where or when or for what to apply.

The federal government now has so many different kinds of aid programs that it takes a great deal of effort to keep track of what's available. A careful count by one member of Congress, Rep. William V. Roth Jr., R-Del., has turned up no fewer than 1,315 separate federal programs under which loans or grants are disbursed to qualified applicants.

There are, to choose a few examples at random, 51 programs which disburse aid for economic development, 62 which are intended to help localities deal with environmental pollution and resources conservation, 142 which subsidize particular types of housing projects and 165 which provide aid for schools.

There is no central office in Washington, or anywhere else, which can provide information about all of these programs. In fact, the Budget Bureau cannot even say for sure how many programs there actually are. Rep. Roth's survey may have missed a few dozen—or even a few hundred.

Some states and cities have created special offices, staffed by full-time experts, to make sure they're not missing any bets on federal aid. But a large number of communities—including most of those in most acute need of federal help—are falling to take advantage of assistance programs for which they are eligible. Others are slow getting their applications filed, or apply for help under the wrong program.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

There is a simple and obvious remedy for this situation.

The government could publish a catalog, well indexed and kept up to date by frequent revisions, listing every federal aid program, with details about the amount and kind of help available, the eligibility requirements, the proper procedure for making application, and the specific federal agency to be consulted for further information.

The cost of creating and maintaining a master list of available aid programs would be minuscule compared to the sums now being wasted under programs that never reach the people they were supposed to help.

Legislation to require the publication of such a catalog has been introduced in Congress by Rep. Roth and others. A Senate subcommittee on intergovernmental relations, headed by Sen. Edmund S. Muskie, D-Maine, has held hearings on the bill (S-60) and may vote later this month on whether to clear it for floor action.

The legislation has encountered no vocal opposition. But neither has it attracted much public support. It's not, apparently, the kind of issue that stirs people to write to their Congressmen. If it dies in a pigeon-hole, it will be just another victim of public apathy about the "tedious details" of government housekeeping.

Meanwhile, the haves will go on getting, and the have nots will go on missing out.

SAVE OUR SERVICE

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

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

A PLEA FROM YOUR LETTER CARRIER: SAVE
OUR SERVICE

Your letter carrier is struggling against overwhelming odds.

For years we've done everything we can to get the mails delivered as promptly as humanly possible. We have regarded your letters, checks, post cards and packages as symbols of trust, knowing that in each daily round we carry the hopes and fears of millions of people.

We've faced the ancient perils of snow, rain, heat and gloom of night as well as dog bites, traffic, endless flights of stairs, and increasing heavy burdens. We've done our part to maintain the honored traditions of our service.

Now we need your help.

As a result of short-sighted fiscal policies of the Bureau of the Budget, discriminatory pay scales and scandalous working conditions have reached the point where employment in the postal service imposes a sacrifice on postal workers that no citizen should be forced to bear in the ordinary course of events.

Wages of postal workers average thousands of dollars a year less than the amount determined by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics as necessary for a "modest but adequate" standard of living.

To reach the top step of our postal pay scale takes up to 25 years of service . . . a goal most postal workers never reach. Over 90% of the letter carriers never rise above level 5 of the 21 level scale.

The rate of turnover among postal workers is nearly 10 times the turnover rate among factory workers—23 per hundred compared to 28 per thousand. That costs the

November 25, 1969

postal service . . . and the taxpayers . . . over \$100 million a year in locating, hiring and training new employees.

To remedy these conditions and to achieve the kind of postal service Americans want and deserve. Congress has passed a bill. That bill is HR 13000 and is now before President Nixon for approval.

Here's what HR 13000 would do:

Provide step increases equivalent to a 5.4% pay increase.

Establish a Federal Wage Commission to determine future postal and federal pay scales.

As of July 1970, provide for top pay scales after eight years of service instead of 25, thus increasing the incentive for postal workers to stay in the postal service.

Here's what you can do:

Please wire or write to President Nixon.

That way you will help us and other organizations of postal workers who are now fighting to better their condition of life. We want to receive from our government employer the same treatment accorded, as a matter of course, workers in the private sector. We want to be paid as well as workers in similar jobs in private industry.

The simple fact is that postal reform begins with good postal pay.

President Nixon can take that first large step toward postal reform by signing HR 13000.

Postal wages are not inflationary.

Postal workers are the victims of inflation.

NO CORPORATION NEEDED

Postal reform is badly needed. The surest path to postal reform is through good postal pay. It cannot be achieved by turning the postal service over to a corporation that will simply put a new name on old practices. Postal reform is up to Congress. The Postal Service, however, should remain in the hands of the people through their elected representatives and not in the hands of a profit-motivated Board of Directors.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
LETTER CARRIERS.

THERE WILL BE NO MAIL BREAK-
DOWN THIS CHRISTMAS—THAT
IS, UNLESS MANAGEMENT CRE-
ATES IT

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a month from today is Christmas Day. When that day comes it is my sincere hope that all of the Christmas mail properly posted will have been delivered.

It is a big job and everyone recognizes that the postal system has not received the backing and support that it has deserved in the past. It is behind on modernization of buildings and equipment, it is behind in its relations with its workers, particularly on pay and working conditions.

But the mail is getting through. And our House Committee is hard at work trying to correct the inequities of law.

The disturbing factor at this time is the demoralizing attitude of the new top management team at the Department. Although it has a big job ahead in the next month, it is repeatedly knocking down the morale of its employees, instead of trying to bolster it.

It is more, it is reported that an order has gone out barring the filling of clerk and carrier vacancies. Is management trying to insure breakdowns in Christmas service around the country?

It happened once before and the Department keeps reminding the public of it in trying to sell its phony panacea that conversion to a public corporation will solve all the postal ills overnight.

That Christmas fiasco at Chicago a couple of years ago was not the fault of postal employes in Chicago or of local management. They saw it coming and pleaded for overtime authority to try to prevent the jam-up.

But the then Postmaster General and his staff, from their ivory tower in Washington, refused to authorize the emergency overtime and other steps needed in Chicago. Result: chaos.

Who was that Postmaster General? None other than Lawrence F. O'Brien, the fellow who takes credit for dreaming up the public corporation idea, now embraced by the new administration.

I recall what James A. Farley, one of our great Postmasters General, said recently at a convention of postmasters:

There isn't anything wrong with the Post Office that money can't solve.

As a result of the headquarters' order barring filling of vacancies at the present time, the local postmasters are being required to put employees on 12- and 16-hour days. Not only that, but if an employee declines to work overtime, he must have a doctor's certificate to obtain authorized exemption.

Is management trying to wreck the morale and the health of its employees on the eve of the peak mailing season? How can management expect employees to maintain efficiency when it is needed while it requires employees to work overtime for weeks leading up to the Christmas avalanche?

I wonder: Suppose the Postmaster General has his way and obtains his public corporation. Then would he require—and, indeed, be able to force—employees to work the unreasonable shifts which he is now forcing upon them? I doubt it.

The Postmaster General was in London recently for the conversion of the British postal system to a government corporation.

But has he been taking Vice President AGNEW's admonition to tell both sides of the story? Not at all. He neglects to tell anyone that the British system is a complete communications setup—not just the postal system. It also includes the telephone and telegraph system, quite a different proposition than exists in the United States.

I refer to the speech he made the other day in Hattiesburg, Miss., in which he said:

The corporation concept for managing the mails is spreading throughout the world. I recently attended a ceremony in London marking the transfer of the British postal system to a government corporation, and while in Japan last week, I had the opportunity to study their corporation proposal, which is currently before the Diet.

Certainly this is an idea whose time has come.

Did the General bother to tell you the difference between handling mail in the concentrated area of Great Britain or Japan as compared with service covering 50 States spreading across thousands of miles? Of course he did not, Mr. AGNEW notwithstanding.

Mr. Speaker, our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has been working diligently on this matter of postal reform since April. Four months of hearings. Nearly 3 months of executive sessions. We know what the problems are. We listened to all sides and are making recommendations. We did not start out with a conclusion and then wear blinders to all variations.

Unfortunately, this is what the administration and its mouthpieces have done. We are looking for solutions—not more chaos. We welcome cooperation.

The General said our hearings were fair. I wish I could consider his approach to the situation likewise.

TIRE SAFETY TESTS

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of the rubber capital of the world, I am much concerned about the serious effect on the tire industry of undeserved bad publicity arising from the recent release of tire safety test reports by the Department of Transportation.

These reports are nothing but raw, unevaluated data on a few tests which the Department itself plainly says prove absolutely nothing. Yet, we read in the papers scare headlines which say such things as "Tires Failed 25 Percent of Tests for Safety, U.S. Reports."

This gives the unfortunate impression, whether intended or not, that 25 percent of the tires on the road today are unsafe. We know that is utter nonsense, from our own experience as motorists. When tires do fail, in 99 percent of these cases it is due to the fact that they have been worn too thin or completely bald.

I hope that the Highway Safety Bureau and the news media in the future will go to more pains to keep these safety test reports in proper perspective. Or we in the Congress will have to take another look at what is actually happening under the legislation we passed.

To help clarify the situation, I would like to include in the RECORD at this point the following statement by Ross R. Ormsby, chairman of the Tire Industry Safety Council, which is self-explanatory:

TIRE INDUSTRY SPOKESMAN CAUTIONS MOTORISTS AGAINST SNAP JUDGMENT BASED ON PARTIAL SAFETY TEST REPORTS

WASHINGTON, D.C., November 24.—A spokesman for the tire industry today cautioned motorists not to jump to the wrong conclusions because of preliminary reports on the government's tire safety tests.

"Fragmentary reports on a few early tests can give a very misleading and distorted view of the overall situation," said Ross R. Ormsby, Chairman of the Tire Industry Safety Council.

"The favorable experience of millions of motorists over many years with good, safe tires far outweigh a few isolated laboratory tests," he declared.

"As the government testing program continues, and evidence is accumulated on a much larger scale, we are confident that a better pattern of findings will emerge," Mr. Ormsby added. "It will confirm what American motorists and manufacturers already know: our tires are remarkably strong and safe. And they are getting better all the time."

The best measure of tire safety, up to this time, is what has happened to tires in actual use on the highway, Mr. Ormsby maintained.

Independent studies have shown that tire failure is involved in only about one percent of all highway accidents, he pointed out. He cited studies by the California Highway Patrol, Northwestern University Traffic Institute and Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory.

The Tire Industry Safety Council is a new organization formed by all U.S. manufacturers of passenger car tires to expedite the flow of news and information about tire safety development.

The complete text of Mr. Ormsby's statement today follows:

"Motorists should not jump to wrong conclusions because of preliminary reports on the government's tire safety tests. The whole testing program is still relatively new and small. Fragmentary reports on a few early tests can give a very misleading and distorted view of the overall situation.

"The best measure of tire safety, up to this time, is what has happened to tires in actual use on the highways. Independent studies of highway accidents by such organizations as the California Highway Patrol, Northwestern University Traffic Institute and Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, have shown repeatedly that tire failure is involved in only about one percent of the highway accidents. And in most of those cases, the tread was worn very thin or bald—much below minimum safety standards—before the accident occurred.

"The Department of Transportation itself very properly has put a strong disclaimer on everyone of its early test reports, warning against snap judgment. The disclaimer says plainly: 'Favorable test results should not be interpreted as necessarily establishing that the vehicle or item of equipment is in conformity with any of the relevant Federal Safety standards; similarly unfavorable test results should not be interpreted as establishing nonconformance with the Federal standards.'

"While the government program is just getting underway on a small scale, the manufacturers have been engaged in testing for many years and their own programs have been greatly enlarged in recent months.

"The industry as a whole now runs over four billion tire test miles a year. That is the equivalent of more than 8,000 round trips to the moon each year.

"The manufacturers now spend over \$80 million a year on research, development and testing.

"The purpose of this activity is to make sure that all new tires exceed the rigid federal safety specifications now in effect, and to help make even better tires for our customers in the future.

"The favorable experience of millions of motorists over many years with good, safe tires far outweighs a few isolated laboratory tests.

"In the California Highway Patrol study, for example, it was found that tire failure was involved in only 545 out of 60,000 accidents investigated during a six-month period in 1966—roughly one percent. The tread was worn down below accepted safety minimums in 57 percent of those cases. And in 22 percent it was actually worn down to the cords.

"As the government testing program continues, and evidence is accumulated on a much larger scale, we are confident that a better pattern of findings will emerge. It will show a very high degree of safety and durability in tires.

"It will prove what American motorists and manufacturers already know: our tires are remarkably strong and safe. And they are getting better all the time.

"Of course the members of the Tire Industry Safety Council will continue to cooperate with the Highway Safety Bureau, and all other agencies and groups dedicated to improving tire safety even further."

CHILD ABUSE—A GROWING PROBLEM

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill known as the National Child Abuse Act of 1969 last May. Twenty-six of my colleagues cosponsored this bill.

At the time, the problem of child abuse was brought into focus by the New York Daily News. During one of its many public service campaigns, the Daily News took the brutal death of a 3-year-old girl to show that child abuse had become a very serious problem. With William Federici researching and writing many of the articles, the Daily News did such a superb job that I felt compelled to introduce remedial legislation.

Since then, there have been vivid signs that the problem has become even more severe in cities across the Nation. I ask, therefore, that we reexamine my bill and consider it in the light of what is happening to some of the children in our society.

I believe an article written by syndicated columnist Jack Anderson is worthy of our attention. For that reason, I am submitting the text of that article as it appeared in many newspapers on Monday, November 24. It read:

A secret grand jury investigation in Baltimore may blow the lid off a shocking American tragedy—the abuse of helpless children in institutions.

The American Humane Assn. estimates that 10,000 children are beaten, burned, boiled and deliberately starved in the U.S. each year by parents, relatives and guardians. Strangely none of the national agencies that specialize in child welfare keeps a check on abuse in children's institutions.

Joseph H. Reid, executive director of the Child Welfare League, acknowledged that child care centers sometimes attract personnel of the wrong kind. "They are apt to attract people who are themselves looking for a shelter, including homosexuals," he said.

Vincent DeFrancis, children's director of the Humane Association agreed: "It is commonly known in the field that staff people and inmates are frequently involved in homosexual acts."

But both acknowledged that no one knows how serious the problem is—because, explained DeFrancis, "Institutions don't report child abuse, in order to protect themselves."

The Baltimore probe may focus the spotlight on a national scandal that has been kept in the shadows. Under investigation is the Maryland Child Study Center, a residential institution for emotionally disturbed children.

The grand jury's secret inquiry has turned up these alleged examples of brutal treatment and scandalous conduct:

A 10-year-old, brain-damaged child was held by two "houseparents" (untrained child care workers) while he was severely beaten by a third.

Children were forced to perform perverted sexual acts with other children and with their adult supervisors.

Emotionally disturbed children, some with serious sexual problems, observed sexual relations between their unmarried adult supervisors.

At least one alleged abortion was performed on the premises.

Children had access to dextedrene and other drugs, which they accumulated.

Probably the most poignant testimony is contained in a letter written by 16-year-old Dennis Landes, a high school student who had been discharged from the institution.

"The houseparents were brutal, even savage . . ." the boy recalled, "and frequently were indulged, in sexual activities while on duty and in the early hours of the morning."

"One houseparent," he wrote, "would beat and kick us and everybody was terrified of him. One incident that occurred which was typical of (the houseparent's) brutality was with a boy from my dormitory, Billy Anthony.

"I remember standing in 'A' dorm helplessly watching (the houseparents) beat up Billy. He struck Billy in the face several times as well as in the stomach and threw him on the floor where he put scars on his face and head by kicking him repeatedly with his foot. Afterwards he threw him in the quiet room head first on the concrete and proceeding to kick him for 15 minutes until he was content."

Recalling another of the houseparents, the former patient wrote: "He had a fierce temper and half killed anybody when he got mad. I can remember when he had little Jerry Morland pinned by the neck hanging from the wall a foot from the ground."

Most social workers contacted by this column felt child abuse in institutions wasn't as serious as other problems. Perhaps they should talk to Dennis Landes.

NO CHANGE IN SOUTH AFRICA'S APARTHEID

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, among the outstanding foreign policy problems yet to be tackled by the administration is the future course of our Nation's relations with the Republic of South Africa. It is hoped that one pitfall that will be avoided by our policymakers is seeing a change for the better in South Africa's regressive racial policy where, in fact, the reverse is actually true. The Manchester Guardian Weekly in a front-page story earlier this month concisely and perceptively demolished the theory currently being disseminated that the internal split within the ruling National Party, and the rapid economic growth of the country, are contributing to fundamental changes in South Africa's blatantly racist policies. I commend this article, which follows, to the attention of those of my colleagues who are concerned over the continuing denial of basic human rights to the non-white majority in South Africa. It would

be well also for those well-meaning, but regrettably naive Americans, who are seeking the silver lining in the dark cloud hanging over South Africa to heed the admonition of the Guardian that "there are no signs that the small shifts of policy which the South African Government has made have changed her internal structure at all."

The article follows:

APARTHEID ANCIENT AND MODERN

It was a useful coincidence that Dr. Hilgard Muller, the South African Foreign Minister, should be in England when the row over the Springboks' rugby tour should have come to its head. It should remind him that his country's new "outward-looking" foreign policy convinces few people here.

The South African Nationalist Party's arch-conservatives may feel that the sight of an African diplomat fraternising in South Africa is a mortal blow to white supremacy. But people outside the country want rather more evidence than that. There are no signs that the small shifts of policy which the South African Government has made, in diplomacy with black Africa or in being prepared to accept Maoris on a visiting rugby team, have changed her internal structure at all. Dr. Muller knows this. He should know now that Britain knows it too.

It would be wrong to call these changes of South African policy concessions. They are designed to strengthen the system of white supremacy by bringing it up to date. The split in the Nationalist Party between so-called Verkrampptes (hardliners) and Verligtes (enlightened ones) is really a division of opinion between Ancient and Modern, between fundamentalists and pragmatists. But the basic philosophy remains the same. The hardliners, who were purged from the Nationalists and are to set up their own party under Dr. Albert Hertzog, are worried over what are the only nuances in the Vorster policy.

Mr. Vorster's decision to hold a snap election gives the new party little chance to organize. Indeed, in the long term the split in the Nationalists will strengthen the modernists by making the Nationalist Party even more acceptable to the English-speaking electorate. The tendency for the United Party to lose ground and for a one-party system to emerge grows stronger.

If this trend is discouraging for nonwhite South Africans, industrialisation offers them little more hope. It used to be hoped that economic development would somehow soften white supremacy. If this remains a possibility in the remote future, there is no prospect in the foreseeable years ahead. The last five years have seen a steady dismantling of the limited political rights which Africans and Coloureds had, and growing efficiency in the police state apparatus. The trend is thus towards an increasingly united white electorate with a one-party system ruling over an increasingly numerous and better educated but transient, voiceless, and totally repressed majority. To call the rulers in such a system "enlightened," or to want to sell them armaments, reveals a political and moral obtuseness of a high order.

A SILENT AMERICAN'S RESPONSE

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, if there is one constructive thing the Vietnam moratoriums have accomplished, it is to stimulate a mass of silent Americans to

speak out in support of their country and their President.

The polls have shown that nearly eight out of 10 Americans support the President's efforts to secure peace in Southeast Asia. This outpouring of sentiment by the "silent Americans" will help the President meet his responsibilities.

A good example of the kind of response the moratoriums have stimulated is an ad which was run in the Torrington, Conn., Register of November 10. The ad was sponsored by a "silent American" and a good friend of mine, Harry Purcell. I wish to insert the text of this ad in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

COMMUNISM, THE MORE IT CHANGES THE MORE IT STAYS THE SAME—BUT SOME AMERICANS HAVE NOT YET AWAKENED TO THIS TRUTH
(By Harry B. Purcell)

Leftist antiwar marchers will congregate in Washington this week for 36 hours of demonstrations that are expected to include some shedding of blood. Security officials note that the Washington action—November 14 and 15—is under the direct and overall control of "New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam" (New Mobe), whose leftist character is not so well camouflaged as the Vietnam Moratorium Committee which sponsored the nationwide October 15 observance. "New Mobe's" steering committee includes persons with well-known Communist backgrounds of violence. The most militant Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) group—"Weatherman"—and "black liberation" units are also expected, so police and military leaders have made plans to cover all eventualities, from peaceful marching, to "mass civil disobedience," to outright riot. The main thrust of the action will again be to attract maximum publicity so as to embarrass the United States before the world, to try to convince the nation and the world that the anti-war movement is a mass movement (actually, the much publicized October 15 action involved less than one half of 1% of the U.S. population).

But there will still be a large number of Americans who will watch this unspeakable spectacle with a "boys will be boys" attitude.

Distinctly perhaps, but nevertheless related to such strange people, are those who profess to be more afraid of individuals who are always warning us about Communism than they are of Communists themselves. If they really mean that, they must tremble a lot. Because there are hundreds of millions of people in this world who would warn us about the evil of Communism. They can be found in every free country but particularly in the dozen and one half "captive nations." Let those in the United States who scoff at the dangers posed by Communism tell it to the suffering souls in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, East Germany, and Vietnam, to mention just a few countries that are expert on the subject. But then, communicating freely with those masses is somewhat restricted, isn't it?

As an alternative to that, the naive noisy minority in this country who, even after 50 years of indisputable and bloody evidence to the contrary, still regard the Russian Bear as something to be embraced, "teddy"-like, might take whatever time they would need to read a couple of books. Two men who had a great deal to do with establishing the Communist Party in the United States knew whereof they wrote. We recommend, therefore, "The Whole of Their Lives" by Benjamin Gitlow; and, "The Techniques of Communism" by Louis F. Budenz.

Or, how about the just published evaluation by this nation's foremost authority on the danger of Communism within the borders of the United States. As a young at-

torney in 1919 for the Department of Justice, he studied the earliest documents of Communism. Since 1924, as head of the FBI, he has daily followed the ramifications of this conspiracy. No man in America can claim a greater understanding of this evil which is without equal in the twentieth-century. We refer, of course, to J. Edgar Hoover and his just off the press "On Communism." Here is his assessment of the Communist poison:

(1) Communism means primarily a threat from the Soviet Union and its satellites (as well as Red China and other communist nations).

(2) The Communist Party, U.S.A., the largest communist group in this country, has remained obediently loyal to Moscow. A person cannot be a communist and a loyal American at the same time.

(3) Communism is a totalitarian philosophy which embraces all phases of human life: education, art, literature, the press, etc. It is all-encompassing.

(4) In the United States, no indication is apparent that communism has changed even in the slightest from its historic Marxist-Leninist core of a materialist atheistic conspiracy dedicated to overthrowing the institutions of our society. Communism is not, as some claim, becoming more democratic through the passage of time.

(5) Communism employs different facades or tactical changes of clothes to conceal its inner core of revolution and assault against this country. At present the Party has a New Look, post-Stalinist style. This tactic is just as dangerous, if not more so, than the Stalinist Party.

(6) Communism is depending in large measure on noncommunist hands to do its work. As a small minority, it seeks through deception to gain your support. Americans must beware lest the Party achieve support through deception, masquerade, and false promises.

(7) Disrespect for law and order is a fundamental cornerstone of communist tactics. Charges of "police brutality," "illegal arrest," and "persecution" have long echoed in the Party press. These false communist charges, unfortunately, have been taken up by other groups whose basic purpose is to destroy law and order and to create chaos.

(8) A half century of communism has done much to make both the Party and its ideology respectable among many elements in our society. Too many Americans are today becoming ideologically disarmed. Here lies one of the Party's major gains over five decades.

(9) Communism has been able to implant much of its Marxist vocabulary into the rising New Left, "anti-Establishment" movements which are appearing on our campuses. The legacy of communism in this country has been to implant distrust of free government, law and order, and rational solution of conflicts. Marxist terms are regularly used and applied in New Leftist student circles.

(10) At the heart of communism is the concept of violence. Despite Party protestations to the contrary, violence is the ultimate weapon of the communist kit of tactics. He who believes that the communists are peace-loving and have given up the "games of violence" is badly mistaken. The violence doctrines of communist theory and practice have undoubtedly influenced New Left and black nationalist thinking.

(11) The concept of the class struggle remains at the heart of communist revolutionary propaganda and agitation. There has been no lessening of the communist effort to convert issues, such as the civil rights struggle, New Leftism, infiltration into labor and industry, into class struggles—in accordance with historic Marxist teachings. The Party has absolutely no interest in reforms or any activity which would strengthen the existing society.

(12) In these fifty years many varieties of communism have arisen, some competitive and hostile to each other. But not one variety, be it Soviet or Red Chinese, Polish or Yugoslav, Castro or Albanian, is a genuine friend of the United States.

The overwhelming majority of Americans thoroughly understand that the above indictment of Communism is a valid one. They have endured in silence the un-American-like demonstrations and statements of the noisy publicity seeking minority, that strange mixture of admitted Communists, expedient politicians, the immature, the professional communist apologists, the hippies, the draft dodgers, the draft dodger counselors, the seditionists, the traitors, and the sincere but gullible. They have endured it because the vast majority of Americans are a patient, generous people, quick to respect the right of freedom of speech—slow to protect or punish the abusers of their cherished freedoms.

But there are signs of a stirring within that American majority—indications that they have had it, and that their inclination to remain silent is about to end. They are quite fed up with the self-styled "doves" who appear more as "chickens" as they desert to Canada and Sweden; who have only a "knife in the back" for our fighting men in Vietnam; who would "pull the rug" out from under our representatives in Paris who are trying to negotiate an end to the war; who openly declare their desire for the United States to suffer a humiliating defeat in Vietnam; who, even though they are barely beyond the bed-wetting age, insist that they are more competent in prescribing national and international policies than is the President, his cabinet, the U.S. Senate, the House of Representatives and all the other sources of intelligence in and out of Washington that the President can muster.

One of these "signs" took the form of a resolution introduced on the floor of the United States Senate on October 13, 1969 by Senator Dole of Kansas. It is identified as Senate Resolution No. 271 and it was immediately hailed with speeches of many senators who, like millions of other Americans, believe it is time to put the onus for continuing this war where it belongs—on the backs of the Communist governments of Moscow, Peking and Hanoi.

Senate Resolution 271, reads as follows:

"Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Government of North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front are urged to take promptly the following steps:

"(1) Acknowledge that a just and mutually-agreed settlement is the best hope for a lasting peace;

"(2) Show at the Paris peace talks the same flexibility and desire for compromise which the Allies have clearly demonstrated over the past year;

"(3) Agree to direct negotiations between representatives of the National Liberation Front and of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam as proposed by the latter;

"(4) Withdraw their insistence on Allied surrender through their demand for the overthrow of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam before genuinely free elections could be held;

"(5) Provide information on the status of U.S. Prisoners of War held in North Vietnam and by the National Liberation Front, and give evidence that these prisoners are being treated humanely in accordance with the provisions of the Geneva Convention.

"Further resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States must maintain its one fundamental goal in Vietnam of peace, with self-determination for the South Vietnamese people."

The names of cosponsors of Senate Resolution 271 ordered to be printed in the RECORD, are as follows:

The Senator from Colorado (Mr. Allott), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Baker), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Bellmon), the Senator from Utah (Mr. Bennett), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Boggs), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. Cannon), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Cook), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Curtis), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Dominick), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Ervin), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. Fannin), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. Fong), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. Goldwater), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Griffin), the Senator from Florida (Mr. Gurney), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. Hansen), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Hollings), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Hruska), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Jordan), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGee), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Mathias), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. Miller), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Mundt), the Senator from California (Mr. Murphy), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. Pearson), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Percy), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Saxbe), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Scott), the Senator from Maine (Mrs. Smith), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Smith), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. Stevens), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Thurmond), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. Tower).

We heartily applaud Senator Dole and the 33 or more senators who promptly associated themselves with S. Resolution 271 as sponsors or cosponsors.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

Communism continues to hurl us a mortal challenge. How we respond will determine whether or not America—this last best hope for freedom on earth—will survive that challenge.

The fight against Communism is the responsibility of all of us. We urge the immediate taking up of this fight by every citizen. A good way to start would be to tear this page out and send it to your senators and representatives in Washington. Tell them in language that they will have no trouble understanding, that you are in favor of the immediate adoption of this resolution. If they are not, demand a written statement as to why they are not. Urge every friend you have to do the same so that our President and our men and women fighting for us in South Vietnam will know that we are 100% behind them.

In addition, we suggest, as a positive counter-demonstration to the violence and disruption planned by the radicals throughout the country on November 14th and 15th, your personal participation, in every possible way, in the patriotic ceremonies that will take place tomorrow on Veteran's Day.

By our natural inclination to be silent, we have allowed a spurious fraction of our total society to believe that they can take over this country and destroy our traditional American ideals.

It's time to blow the whistle on these old ones and to let them know just how fed up America is with their treasonous handiwork.

NATIONAL RIFLE CHAMPIONSHIP TROPHY

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, November 26, 1969, the Reserve Officers Training Corps Rifle Team at the R. E. Lee Institute at Thomaston, Ga., will be presented the Army National Rifle

Championship Trophy for the third time and this trophy will be retired in the permanent possession of R. E. Lee Institute.

This program started in 1964 as the National Junior ROTC marksmanship program. R. E. Lee Institute won the championship in 1965, 1966, and 1969 and was runnerup in 1967 and 1968.

In addition, the rifle team has won the: 3d Army area championship, 3d Army shoulder-to-shoulder match, Georgia State championship, Herb Atkins Memorial Junior ROTC rifle match, Association of the U.S. Army championship at Fort Benning, and the high school rifle match sponsored by the National Explorer Division of the Boy Scouts of America.

Maj. Gen. B. F. Evans, deputy commander 3d Army, will make the presentation to R. E. Lee Institute and retire the trophy permanently with R. E. Lee Institute.

The rifle instructor and assistant professor of military science tactics at R. E. Lee is Sfc. Robert B. Brese, U.S. Army retired, who has served as coach of the R. E. Lee Institute Rifle Team for the past 14 years. Some of the outstanding marksmen in the State of Georgia have developed their skills under his guidance and instruction.

Col. Robert J. Heckert, U.S. Army, retired, is the professor of military science and tactics at R. E. Lee Institute, and Mr. Kenneth J. Moore is principal.

I congratulate R. E. Lee Institute, its rifle team, and the devoted officials of the R. E. Lee Institute for this splendid record of achievement.

"FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL PRIORITIES." A PERCEPTIVE SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN F. BRADFORD MORSE

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, last month our colleague, the Honorable F. BRADFORD MORSE, addressed the National League of Insured Savings Associations at the Boston Statler Hilton Hotel on the subject of "Foreign Affairs and National Priorities."

In his perceptive remarks, Congressman MORSE, a distinguished member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, grasps the essence of this Nation's difficulties. That is, "The United States, as a Nation, has at its disposal limited resources with which to meet rapidly expanding demands." Thus, the major decision to be made now is "how we shall allocate our resources to meet those demands."

The problem exists at this time, he continues, because "our system of assigning priorities has failed us." This failure Congressman MORSE attributes to our preoccupation with international commitments and with the threat of world communism which, in turn, has resulted in an "increasing emphasis on the ac-

quisition of military hardware, designed to secure us against a threat which is substantially different from that we faced in the late 1940's."

His suggestions for realining our priorities specifically exclude actions which would jeopardize national security or abandon our international responsibilities. In fact, he observes:

A substantial portion of what we spend on the military is redundant to the maintenance of national security—that some of it is no more than frosting on what is already a very substantial cake.

As one who attempted during the debate on the military procurement bill to start this body on a course of considering funding requests in light of priorities, I was particularly pleased with Congressman Morse's conclusion:

What we lack is not the capacity to do what must be done. What we do require is a national concern and a national commitment, indeed a national determination, not to squander our resources on spending that benefits only a few, but to marshal those resources in a concerted effort to solve our domestic problems.

Mr. Speaker, I share the confidence of my good friend from Massachusetts in this Nation's capacity to do what must be done, as I am sure every Member of this House does. Therefore, I recommend to the Members the full text of his remarks which follows:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL PRIORITIES (By F. BRADFORD MORSE, Member of Congress)

"They've all come to look for America."

A line from a song of the 1960's. The decade which began as the decade of hope but has ended as the decade of despair.

What's gone wrong?

Where have we gone that we have had to begin to look for ourselves?

For generations our people, and indeed the rest of the world, looked upon America as the "City upon a Hill, with the Eyes of all people upon us," to recall the words of John Winthrop as he landed on the coast of Massachusetts over three hundred years ago.

There was great hope. Ours was the country to which all eyes turned to find the basic truths of freedom, justice and democracy. Where other nations had failed, the promise of America was held out as evidence that men—all kinds of men—could govern themselves in their own best interests and thus attain the common good.

And now—they've all come to look for America.

What they have found has disillusioned many: the richest nation in the world, unable adequately to feed and clothe some ten million of its people; the most powerful nation, unable successfully to contribute to the peace for which this embattled world yearns; the most successful democracy in the history of man, unable to make its institutions responsive to the needs and aspirations of all of its people.

Those who look at America see a nation that in the space of nine years began and concluded a triumphant effort to put a man on the moon; but which is unable, or, even worse, unwilling, to eradicate its slums and the poverty and degradation and disease they breed.

Increasing numbers of Americans are beginning to ask themselves—and their leaders—what has become of the City on the Hill? Has the American Dream become a nightmare? Indeed, where is America?

These are not questions being asked by the few—they are the concern of millions who cannot avoid taking note of what is going on around them. Today, one does not have to

read about problems to be aware of them. They are there and, unwittingly perhaps, we absorb them. Television has brought a war into our homes every night for the last five years. We have seen our cities burning and our fellow citizens clawing at each other in the streets. No housewife needs to be told about inflation—she feels it in her pocket-book every week when she does the family shopping.

The questions are also asked by the fisherman who searches in vain to find an unpolluted lake or stream where he can catch some fish; by the air traveler who may spend hours stacked up above an airport, only to find that when he lands, he has comparable difficulty in getting to his destination through endless traffic jams on the ground; by the young Black who cannot find a job or the hundreds of thousands who cannot get decent housing for themselves or adequate education for their children.

Where we are and where we are going are the central questions in what is fast becoming the predominant national debate—the need to establish, as a nation, a new set of priorities for the coming decade.

At the end of World War II, the United States emerged as the preeminently powerful nation in a world devastated by war. While we had committed both men and treasure to the battle, we had not suffered the destruction experienced by England, France, or Germany, who had fought the war on their own homeland, or Japan, who had been devastated by the first atomic weapons. Rather, the war pulled us out of the prolonged stagnation of the Depression years. In terms of our economy we were a far healthier country in 1945 than we had been at the war's beginning.

Some twenty-five years before that, when U.S. intervention had helped to bring the first World War to an end, the reaction on the part of our people was clear—we wanted to return to tending our own business and let the rest of the world go its own way. The battle over the League of Nations demonstrated in unmistakable terms the American people's unwillingness to take on the responsibilities of an international power.

But it was different in 1945. There was little question then that the United States had the responsibility, welcome or not, to share its resources and use its power to aid the countries of Europe in their efforts to rebuild. And with the growing and very real threat posed by our war time ally, Soviet Russia, it also became clear that the United States would have to accept the major responsibility for helping to protect other nations from potential Communist expansion.

That response was not unreasonable, given the facts which faced the world a generation ago. Soviet Russia had just occupied the countries of Eastern Europe, and her post-war activities convinced us that she was indeed setting out to extend her influence and her ideology throughout the rest of the world. And if we did not join forces with the other free nations of the world, and resolve to resist her attempts to export Communist domination, she might very well succeed.

Throughout the late 40's and early 1950's we faced a monolithic Communism, united in its parts and presenting an unvaryingly hostile face to the rest of the world—especially to the United States.

Our response to that threat was to construct a number of alliances through which we could extend the protection of our power to nations not able to defend themselves alone against the threat of Communism, both from Russia and from China. We joined the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, and encouraged the formation of the Central Treaty Organization.

Through our several "collective defense" treaties, we pledged ourselves to protect our fellow signatories against armed attack with our massive military strength. In the case of

Western Europe, we had committed ourselves to a nuclear war with Russia in the event she should launch an attack against our allies.

The sum of those commitments is staggering. In theory at least, the United States is committed—simultaneously if need be—to repel a conventional attack on Western Europe, to counter a nuclear strike launched by the Soviet Union, and to check Communist Chinese aggression in Southeast Asia. In addition we have a self-expressed interest in the right of self-determination on the part of the Latin American republics and the emerging African countries, an acknowledged commitment to the integrity of the state of Israel and an earnest desire to help bring peace to the Middle East.

To ask the question whether the United States has over-committed herself is not unreasonable. To ask the question, whether our alliances and our promises—made in the 1940's and early 1950's—are relevant to the present world situation, and to our own needs and responsibilities as a nation, is imperative.

The world has changed drastically since 1945 when the United States stood alone in the world arena, not only as a dramatically successful experiment in self-government, but also as a nation whose military power was unparalleled.

The nature of the threat we diagnosed then had changed, but we are still applying essentially the same medicine. While we have remained geared to the threat from the monolithic Communism of the 1950's, the internal dynamic of the Communist world has been changing. The 1960's have shown that there are some Communists who think differently from others. We have only to witness the independent posture of Yugoslavia, the liberalization movement in Czechoslovakia, crushed though it was by Soviet tanks, the independent foreign policy of Rumania, and the very real and historical split between the Chinese and the Russians.

Today, nationalism is one of the strongest forces at work in the world. We have seen it in sophisticated form in de Gaulle's France, and as a more primitive but nonetheless equally powerful force in the developing world.

The communist nations are not exempt from this influence. Each of them seeks to establish its own identity as a nation and a people, independent of its identification with world communism. As real as is the continuing hostility of Soviet Russia and China toward the United States, world communism will never be the same again.

Most aspects of the international environment have undergone vast transformation since 1945. A war torn and devastated Europe has now become economically strong and politically stable. Japan has become an international economic power and her prosperity increases steadily.

These changes, and I have mentioned only a few major ones, should be clearly visible to any observer. But the United States has demonstrated, by our conduct in the last several years, that we have failed to understand the impact of these changes and we have failed to respond to them through adjustments in our foreign policies.

We are still a relatively young international power. The American tradition has always focused on our own internal life, on the pursuit of the economic "good life". In addition, America has always stood for the basic principles of freedom and democracy—we were to be, as Emerson wrote, "a beacon lighting for all the world the paths of human destiny". And we viewed it as part of our destiny to spread, by example, the light of freedom to all men and to demonstrate the virtues and the superiority of our democratic way of life.

Our "can-do" attitude has led us inevitably to believe that we could help make the rest of the world achieve a similar suc-

cess—and there was little question in our minds that the rest of the world would want to follow the American example.

It is all too obvious today that the rest of the world is becoming increasingly skeptical about the American way of life.

Why?

Why has the shining symbol become so tarnished in the eyes of other nations?

I think it is because, in our failure to alter our view of the world and our place in it from that which we perceived a quarter century ago, we have neglected to notice that massive changes were taking place, not only in the world environment, but of perhaps greater importance, in our own country as well.

Because of our preoccupation with the external threat we felt so acutely, we have neglected our own plaguing national problems until they have become so serious and so divisive and so public, that we can no longer ignore them.

And that failure has brought us not only to the present critical domestic impasse; it has also eroded our influence in the community of nations. What we thought was our superior democratic domestic life has been revealed in the last decade as an imperfect system with weaknesses and shortcomings of major proportions.

Once admiring foreign observers now see an America beset by internal conflicts so severe that they threaten to tear our society apart.

Notwithstanding civil rights legislation that has put comprehensive anti-discrimination statutes on the books, Black Americans in many places continue to suffer deprivation of the promise of American life. And they continue to insist, ever more urgently, upon their right to full participation in the American adventure.

White Americans fear the disruption of a society in which they have a predominant stake, and are apprehensive about the potential loss of the material benefits of life for which they have worked very hard and very long.

In the midst of the greatest affluence the world has yet known, poor Americans, white and black, go hungry in some parts of our land. Others subsist on a diet that is far below what is necessary for basic nutrition.

Older Americans, who have spent their most productive years contributing to our growth and prosperity, and who ask only to be able to now reap the benefits of that contribution, look on in despair at an ever increasing cost-of-living which leaves them unable to enjoy fully their retirement years. On fixed incomes, they find even the basic necessities being priced out of their reach.

And young Americans, on dozens of college and university campuses across the country, stage demonstrations and seize buildings, voicing their dissatisfaction and disapproval of both their own institutions and on society as a whole.

The baffled foreigner sees a country where the politics of compromise, once so highly cherished by its practitioners and marveled at and praised by its observers, has been replaced by the politics of confrontation, often violent, always hostile.

British historian Sir Denis Brogan has stated: "This is not going to be the American century. Very few people are enamored of the American way of life."

Until we can successfully make the American dream a reality at home, how can we expect to provide effective moral and political leadership in the world?

Until we make peace and freedom a reality at home, how can we expect other nations to heed our words about peace and freedom in the world?

So, we must ask ourselves, what are we going to do about it?

And that question unavoidably focuses our attention on the problem of national priorities. We have heard this phrase with

increasing frequency in recent months, most often in connection with the growing national debate over American involvement in the world and especially our allocation of large sums of money to national defense in support of that involvement.

At the same time, others are arguing that those who would change our priorities are out to disrupt our society and to engineer a retreat from the world.

That is not the case. Those who are concerned about national priorities are neither "peaceniks", nor "anti-military", nor "unilateral disarmers". Rather they share a genuine concern about a simple basic fact. The United States, as a nation, has at its disposal limited resources with which to meet rapidly expanding demands. We must determine how we shall allocate our resources to meet those demands.

But while the statement of the problem is simple, finding and agreeing on its solution is not.

Where and how we assign our priorities in a democracy is determined by political processes. In the past, we have had an overall national consensus on the validity, propriety and desirability of our goals. In part, this consensus had resulted from the fact that the majority of our people, in which was vested the prevailing political power, shared a common culture and respected common values. But even while consensus exists, there are, almost by definition, changing attitudes and aspirations which may be inconsistent—even hostile—to it. If the consensus does not accommodate these forces, if the majority rejects their reality and importance through ignorance or indifference, they inexorably will erode—and ultimately destroy the consensus. And I fear that this is happening.

Too many times our political institutions, responsible as they are for assigning our priorities, have failed in their most basic obligation—to be responsive to the changing and growing needs of the people. Long standing neglect has permitted problems—once measurable and manageable to mushroom out of control. Whereas catastrophe used to be regarded as a temporary phenomenon, today we seem to have found ways to make catastrophe permanent.

We have polluted our water, in some areas far beyond the capacity to make it clean again without spending many years and many billions in the effort. We have desecrated vast portions of our living space—we dump some 3½ billion tons of waste on the land each year. We have so neglected our systems of transportation that today traffic jams so congest our cities that it becomes almost impossible to move in them. We have let our urban centers become potential disaster centers.

Clearly, our system of assigning priorities has failed us.

I have tried to suggest that this is partially because we have been so preoccupied with our international commitments and with the threat of world communism, that we have neglected our first commitment—to our own people. We have seen an increasing emphasis on the acquisition of military hardware, designed to secure us against a threat which is substantially different from that we faced in the late 1940's. We are at the point now where we spend some \$80 billion—\$80 billion dollars a year—in military expenditures, and yet we cannot or will not spend enough money to purify our environment, educate our young, feed our hungry, house our poor, or care for our sick.

I do not suggest that we should jeopardize our national security or abandon our international responsibilities. What I suggest is not retreat, nor is it disarmament, although I hope fervently that we may reach an effective and enforceable agreement with the Soviet Union. What I do suggest is that a substantial portion of what we spend on the military is redundant to the

maintenance of our national security—that some of it is no more than frosting on what is already a very substantial cake.

In the recent debate in the House of Representatives over the military procurement authorization legislation, one of my colleagues, Congressman Pike from New York, took the floor to oppose spending \$1 billion on new ships. The Chairman of the Armed Services Committee insisted that we must spend this \$1 billion to replace our older ships. Mr. Pike responded: "Old ships? Yes, and we have old schools and old hospitals, and old highways, too. Our air smells old, our water tastes old and there are people who are old and not being adequately cared for."

That is the question of national priorities in a nutshell.

During the recent controversy over the anti-ballistic missile system, increasing numbers of Americans became aware, as they have not been for many many years, of just what it is costing them to spend such vast amounts of money on ever more complicated and ever more costly weapons systems. And a good many began to ask themselves the question, is this really necessary? It's a good question, and it must be asked again and again.

I think the most important message which our young people are trying to communicate to us today, is that we must take stock of where we are and where we are going. They are demanding that we re-examine our goals, and determine priorities that take account of human needs. They are saying something else too. They are saying that unless we make our political institutions responsive to these human needs, unless we make them work once again for the people they represent, those institutions will not endure as we have known them.

There has never been a more direct challenge to the capacity of democracy to respond to its people's needs.

Our institutions are no better than the concern of the people demands that they be. For too long, too many of us have sat back, secure in our own comfort, willing to let other people deal with what have now become critical national problems with national and, indeed, international ramifications.

We can, if we will it, make our governmental institutions work better for the common good. And make them work better we must if our society is to survive. Unless we can reach those disaffected citizens, young and old, black and white, who sincerely and with some justification, doubt the efficacy of our political processes, we will surely find them seeking other means to achieve their objectives.

We must replace the "culture of the country club" with a culture of concern. Those who have stood apart, or who have resisted change as a potential threat to their own material well-being, must be persuaded that only change will preserve both our democratic system and our way of life—for any of us.

We must realize that national security involves more than guns and missiles and armies. For if a democracy continues systematically to exclude millions from the promises of its abundance, then that democracy hasn't a prayer in the world of survival.

If we cannot all have a share, than I am quite convinced that none of us will have it.

Let me add one footnote. There has been a good deal of discussion in recent months about the so-called "peace dividend"—the extra funds that will become available when the Vietnam war is concluded. More recently we have been warned that the "peace dividend" is illusory. We are informed that making up for losses in stockpiles and the natural growth of defense-oriented spending will take up most of the slack. I do not think that this is an acceptable alternative. I believe

that we can make such a dividend available if we insist hard enough on it—if we refuse to let those funds become lost in the self-generating growth of an over-inflated defense budget instead of going toward programs to improve housing, education, job training, medical care and all the other worthwhile and currently underfunded efforts to meet our domestic ills.

But, I am optimistic. Thankfully, the question for our relatively wealthy country is not one between guns or butter, or between producer goods or consumer goods or anything quite so stark as that. Rather, we shall probably be pursuing a number of goals in the coming years, including the solution of our social problems, the discharge of our international responsibilities, and the maintenance of our security. The relevant problem is not so much the question of which goals to pursue, because they are indeed rather clear, but the questions of how much, in what combinations and how soon?

What we lack is not the capacity to do what must be done. This "can-do" country is far from being a country that can't do. What we do require is a national concern and a national commitment, indeed, a national determination not to squander our resources on spending that benefits only a few, but to marshal those resources in a concerted effort to solve our domestic problems.

I was impressed that when the crew of the Apollo 11 came to appear before a joint session of Congress, they expressed unanimity on one idea: Colonel Buz Aldrin expressed it: "The Apollo lesson is that national goals can be met where there is a strong enough will to do so."

All of us here can—all of us here must—help to provide that will.

EULOGY FOR MAJ. GEN. FRED L. WALKER, TEXAS' 36TH DIVISION

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my good friend Felix McKnight of the Dallas Times Herald has written one of the finest eulogies on an individual I have seen—that individual being the former commanding general of the 36th Infantry Division, Maj. Gen. Fred L. Walker.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Mr. McKnight's editorial for Sunday, November 23, the subject of which is a man who was loved and idolized by a great number of Texans, as follows:

T-PATCHERS MOURN THEIR STRONG MAN

(By Felix R. McKnight)

The other day a very strong man died . . . and many men flinched and paused in the villages and cities, wherever they were. The indestructible, at 82, was gone.

Fred L. Walker was their man. Never the headline personality, but saintly to those who logged through hell with him as the commanding officer of Texas' 36th Division.

Death came unexpectedly to Maj. Gen. Walker, only days after the public appearance of his long-awaited diary—journal that tediously detailed the World War II story of the T-Patchers.

Men in war make decisions based on two factors: the achievement of an objective and the protection of human life.

General officers—men of the Fred Walker breed—put the high premium on a soldier's life. Not an hour passed in the bloody lurch of the 36th to its final glory that Gen. Walker did not make an entry in his diary that bespoke wracking concern about the well-being of his warriors.

He wept in solitude when his officers and men were killed or maimed. He stayed with them in the suicide zones and he had thin escapes from death.

You could almost feel the wetness of his leathery cheeks when he wrote bitter entries of the Rapido River crossing folly that sent men to what he vainly protested was senseless death.

It is this chapter, written by a man each night as he planned tomorrow's strategy, that will be argued in military critiques and textbooks.

You can hear as many stories of Fred Walker as there are survivors of the 36th. But none could so perfectly frame the man as his own words.

Deep in devastating simplicity, they told of a single man and his men, committed in war to mutual trusts, triumphs and tragedies and eventual victory that had the bitersweet taste.

In the book, "From Texas To Rome," Gen. Walker tells how he inherited a National Guard division and made soldiers of civilians. He loved them, he lived for them, he defended them against the cruel dictates of unwise command decisions.

The Rapido River crossing tragedy—Jan. 20-22 of 1944—tells it all; for the first time in his words. Briefly, Lt. Gen. Mark Clark, commanding the Fifth Army, directed the 36th to cross a 50-foot-wide, 8-to-12-foot-deep, vertically banked and swift Italian River—with Germans fortified and swarming the hills just on the other side.

Gen. Walker thought it was a sentence of murder; and said so . . .

"I'll swear, I do not see how we, or any other Division, can possibly succeed in crossing the Rapido River when the stream is included within the main line of resistance of the strongest German position . . . My men (engineers) look upon the Liri Valley as a muddy bottleneck, guarded by an organized defense behind an unfordable river, without suitable approach routes or exits.

"Any attack would create an impossible situation and end in failure and result in the loss of a great many lives . . ."

Futilely, Walker talked over the problem with Gen. Clark and his staff. The diary notes: ". . . But they do not want to talk about it. The situation looks bad for us . . . They do not understand the problems and do not know what I am talking about . . . Even when our troops get across the river, they are nowhere . . . We are undertaking the impossible, but I shall keep it to myself . . . However, my staff and regimental and battalion commanders are no fools."

Fred Walker knew the ghastly odds of trying to cross unfordable rivers. He was a battalion commander on July 15, 1918, in the pivotal Battle of the Marne River. He made a piece of history when he took 1,200 men in good defensive positions and turned back, confused, disorganized and slaughtered, 10,000 Germans who attempted to attack across a swift, deep and unfordable Marne.

He knew a bit about rivers. And men who died.

But, on Jan. 20, 1944, the soldier taking orders wrote in his diary . . . "I do not know of a single case in military history where an attempt (like this) has succeeded," and then sent his men on the impossible mission. Next day, his diary noted:

"The attack last night was a failure . . ."

Once more, Gen. Walker went back to high command and militarily protested the unacceptable strategy. He wrote: "But he was impatient, in a determined mood, and insisted upon attack before noon. I felt like

saying that battles are not won by wishing, while ignoring the facts, but this was no place to court insubordination . . . The stupidity of some higher commanders seem to be profound. I agree with Gen. Harmon that "These are times when the high command is stupid as hell" . . .

Finally, very painfully to Gen. Walker, his message got across. A third order to attempt to ford the river was canceled. He stood in the shadow of insubordination; he endured "insulting remarks," but he prevailed.

War is an indefinable, strange and leveling sort of thing. There are individual and group efforts that make for drama, even pages of history.

Footnote to this story is almost what you would expect. Gen. Fred Walker, loser of almost two regiments of the 36th Division in a Rapido fiasco that broke his heart, later argued another high command decision that didn't make military sense to him.

Gen. Mark Clark wanted to capture Rome and ride triumphantly in ahead of American troops. But his plan was wrong—and Gen. Walker told Clark's staff just that.

That time they listened, and permitted Gen. Walker's 36th to crawl an improbable mountain trail the Nazis thought no one would tackle. But the 36th did . . . and they swarmed over a little place called Velletri, routed the Nazis.

And Rome was seized, the back was broken. Gen. Walker and his beloved 36th came back . . . and Gen. Clark had his day. From there it was all downhill.

MYSTIC ORAL SCHOOL

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the well-known Mystic Oral School, located in my congressional district at Mystic, Conn., is this year observing the 100th anniversary of its existence. It was founded in 1869 by Jonathan Whipple, who developed the oral method of teaching the deaf to communicate.

On November 9, 1969, the Mystic Oral School dedicated a new classroom building very appropriately named Whipple Hall as a memorial to its founder. I had the honor of dedicating this beautiful building which will house some 70 deaf children and will also provide additional space for teachers, the school administration, and recreational facilities.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an editorial from the Hartford Courant of November 13 and my address at the dedication of Whipple Hall on November 9:

MYSTIC ORAL GIVES A CENTURY OF SERVICE

So many programs are either planned or well under way to give opportunities for education and normal lives to afflicted children that we tend to forget former attitudes which relegated them to meaningless existences. But such was the case generally speaking, when Mystic Oral School opened its doors to the hard of hearing in 1869. For many years after Jonathan Whipple founded the institution where he developed the oral method of teaching the deaf to communicate, the place was in the same category with state hospitals: Most people would rather die than be admitted.

Yet while the average citizen was unlearned concerning the problems and possibilities for correcting their affliction, the

deaf already were benefiting from medical research. The Hartford School for the Deaf accepted its first students on April 15, 1817 to become the first school in the United States to receive a governmental appropriation for other than a regular school. But, it and two other institutions which followed at New York City and Boston used the manual, or sign language, technique.

It was not until 1866 that the Clarke School at Northampton, Mass., and the present Lexington School for the Deaf at New York City began encouraging the deaf and dumb to try to speak and to read lips. Many educators believed that the noticeable finger-movements tended to set the deaf even further apart from the rest of society. The argument raged for many years between adherents of the manual and the oral methods. It is now recognized that each technique has its place depending upon the amount of disability and the psychological make-up of the afflicted person.

Mystic Oral School began its century of help to the hard of hearing by implementing Jonathan Whipple's pioneering teaching style. The ensuing years have provided sensitive mechanisms to allow many deaf persons to hear while they also learn to speak. The remarkable results among the school's students have been demonstrated on television and at seminars. Many go on to college where they do as well or better than their classmates and excel in their chosen fields.

A new classroom building was dedicated on November 9 as a memorial to the Nutmegger who applied his talents to bringing hope where there once was none. Whipple Hall will serve 70 preschool and first-grade children. Chances are excellent that many of them will graduate so skilled at communicating with both the deaf and those who hear, that nobody will know the difference.

A CENTURY OF ACCOMPLISHMENT IN EDUCATION FOR DEAF CHILDREN

(Address by Congressman WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, at the Mystic Oral School dedication, Sunday, Nov. 9, 1969, 3:30 p.m., Mystic, Conn.)

Dr. Owsley, members of the board of trustees, teachers, parents and friends of the Mystic Oral School: It is exactly one hundred years since young William S. Downing of Wilmington, Delaware, was admitted as the first pupil of the Whipple Home School at Ledyard, Connecticut. Master Downing was instructed by Zerah C. Whipple, grandson of the founder of the school and inventor in this country of the Oral Method of instructing the deaf, Jonathan Whipple.

In the one hundred years since that very modest beginning, the Mystic Oral School for the Deaf has compiled a most impressive record of accomplishments. Most impressive of all, perhaps, is the fine new facility known as Whipple Hall which we are dedicating here today in honor of the Whipples. It is a handsome structure, and I know it will be a useful one in the years to come. I am proud to be here with you today and to be able to take part in these ceremonies.

Although the school was first founded by the Whipples in 1869, it was not until three years later, in 1872, that a bill was passed by the General Assembly of Connecticut to provide the first State aid to the school. This assistance, in the sum of one hundred and seventy-five dollars annually for each indigent student, was like the school itself quite modest. But, like the school, the State's interest and degree of assistance have grown in the last century. I understand that the State has contributed about three-quarters of a million dollars to help make Whipple Hall a reality. This is a noteworthy demonstration of the State's interest in the education and its concern for the welfare of all of its residents, particularly the deaf.

It is difficult for a hearing person to un-

derstand the special problems, the seemingly insurmountable obstacles, which often confront the deaf or hard-of-hearing child. Deafness is unquestionably one of the most socially isolating of all physical handicaps, since loss of hearing interferes directly with communication. Helen Keller described this feeling of isolation in her book *Midstream*: "Ours is not the silence that soothes the weary senses.

"It is an inhuman silence which severs and estranges, it is a silence which isolates cruelly and completely. Hearing is the deepest, most humanizing philosophical sense man possesses."

Those of us who have been able from an early age to express ourselves easily in words, can only begin to comprehend the deaf child's habitual frustration when we try to communicate in a foreign land, and find even the simplest phrases misunderstood.

Possibly no disability exerts so much impact on so many aspects of a child's development as does an early, severe hearing impairment. Intelligence, language, oral communication, school achievement, general adjustment, and the ability to relate, tend to be adversely affected. But such tendencies are no real measure of a child's potential or human worth. Therefore, it is to society's, as well as his own, advantage that the child be provided with the most skilled instruction that education can devise.

This is what the Mystic Oral School is doing—providing the most skilled instruction that education and research can devise. Back in 1910, Dr. Clara M'Guigan, then the superintendent of the Mystic Oral School, stated its threefold aim as follows:

"First to provide a place where deaf children may be taught to speak and read the lips so they can communicate with hearing people, thus bringing them in close relation to normal members of society; second, to give them a good common school education and to train them in some handicraft by which they may earn their living, if necessary, after they leave school; and third, to preserve the home life, so that these children, who are away from their homes during most of the formative period of their lives, may not miss the family love, care and attention usually provided there. . . ."

I think these aims, expounded almost sixty years ago, stand up very well for the school to strive for even in our own day.

This dedication today is visible proof of what a good conscientious job the State of Connecticut is doing in educating its deaf young people and has been doing for many years. The U.S. Congress and the Federal Government, however, have been active in recent years in improving educational opportunities for the deaf on a broad scale. Much of this recent activity has come as a result of a report issued in 1965 by an Advisory Committee on the Education of the Deaf. This report told the Nation bluntly that we were not doing enough to realize the potential locked in many of our deaf children which could be let out with just a little concerted effort.

Before this report was made, it had been easy to assume complacently that Gallaudet College, a fine liberal arts college for the deaf in Washington, D.C., supported by Federal funds and the only institution of its kind in the world, answered all the needs of deaf teenagers for higher education. This was apparently not the case, however, because Gallaudet was finding out that it had to devote a whole year to pre-college work and adjustment for all but 15 percent of its student body. Even after this year, many of them were not prepared, especially in language and English composition skills, to follow a regular college course. These problems were occurring because a substantial number of deaf youngsters were not being prepared well enough in high school. And for many deaf teenagers who were not in-

terested in a liberal arts education, there was no institution they could go to in order to obtain a technical or scientific education.

The 1965 report also noted that not enough had been done to improve the quality of education offered the deaf child. There had not been enough research into the special needs of the deaf child and the possible applications of modern audiovisual and other educational techniques to teaching the deaf. I am happy to report to you today that during the past four years action has been taken by Congress to remedy some of these problems. New legislation adopted by Congress has made possible the establishment of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf, expansion of the Captioned Films for the Deaf program, and creation of a model high school for the deaf to test new techniques and to provide adequate secondary education.

The National Technical Institute for the Deaf has been established at the Rochester Institute of Technology in Rochester, N.Y. When it is fully operational, it will offer post-secondary technical and scientific education, at no cost to some 600 deaf students.

The Model Secondary School for the Deaf was authorized in 1966. The legislation provided for the construction and equipment of this facility, run by Gallaudet College as an extension of its preparatory year, to serve the District of Columbia and nearby States, and to be a model program to stimulate development of similar programs of excellent secondary education for the deaf in this country comparable to that offered the hearing teenager. The lack of an adequate secondary education makes not only college work impossible, but also means that skilled technical education is virtually out of the question. So the goal of this high school will be excellent preparation of its students, and, in addition, it will serve as an example, to pioneer new methods of instruction which will be made available to all teachers for the deaf through the U.S. Office of Education.

The Captioned Films for the Deaf program was first established in 1958 as a loan service aimed primarily at the cultural enrichment and recreation of deaf persons, although its educational implications were apparent. Amendments to the program in 1962 and 1965 broadened it into an amazingly flexible, productive and comprehensive instructional media program for the deaf, involving research and development, production, acquisition, distribution, and training of teachers to use media. In 1967, legislation by Congress was passed extending these benefits to all handicapped children requiring special education.

This past August, the Congress completed action on a bill which adds a further dimension to the Captioned Films for the Deaf program. This bill provides for the establishment and operation in the Washington, D.C. area of a National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped. This center, when operational, will provide a comprehensive program of activities to facilitate the use of new educational technology in education programs for handicapped persons, including designing and developing, and adapting instructional materials.

Just last year Congress passed a modest program which is full of potential to help all handicapped children, the deaf included. This legislation, the Handicapped Children's Early Education Assistance Act, recognizes the fact that the most rapid learning period comes in the years before school traditionally begins. The program engendered by this bill and carried on by public and private agencies and organizations should do much to identify handicapped children early and to help give them a better start toward full, productive lives.

These are some of the things the Federal

Government and the Congress have done and are doing to give deaf Americans the full opportunity they deserve. These programs can work only if State and local governments and private organizations and individuals make them work. We are all devoted to the cause of wiping out disability as a barrier to a full life. The Mystic Oral School's devotion to this cause is deep and abiding.

The value of the contribution you make is measureless. The first hundred years and its accomplishments are now history; and I know that with this new facility, the next hundred years will be full of challenges and new accomplishments—and therefore most rewarding to all of us who are striving to make this world a little more pleasant for our fellowmen. May I take this opportunity to congratulate all of you on this day of dedication, which is as much a day to stress the dedication of those of you who work tirelessly for a great human cause as it is an occasion to dedicate this beautiful new building.

FCC COMMISSIONER JOHNSON
COMMENTS ON THE VICE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, Commissioner Nicholas Johnson of the Federal Communications Commission has been an ardent and outspoken advocate of greater responsibility in broadcasting. His efforts to convince the networks and individual broadcasters of the great need for diversity and creativity in broadcasting not only predate Vice President AGNEW's insidious attacks on the networks but also lack the blatant partisan overtones of the Vice President's remarks.

On November 17, Commissioner Johnson addressed students at the University of Iowa in his hometown of Iowa City. His remarks bear the careful consideration of us all, and I commend them to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. NICHOLAS JOHNSON

It is a part of my responsibility as an FCC Commissioner to work for a free and open television system that will operate in the public interest. In the past I have written of the dangers of censorship by the large corporations that own the nation's broadcast facilities. I believe my responsibility today requires a few words about government censorship.

Vice President Agnew's Des Moines speech has rocketed into public consciousness many questions about the significance of television in our society. Such dialogue and awareness could be quite healthy.

Unfortunately, he has also frightened network executives and newsmen in ways that may cause serious and permanent harm to independent journalism and free speech in America.

We are in the Vice President's debt for bringing the issue—and the tactics—into the open. It has not always been so.

In 1968 one of President Nixon's top advisers said he would "love" to demand more favorable TV coverage of candidate Nixon by privately threatening a particular network president. He never did. But he said he wished he could tell the network executive, "If we are elected you just might find yourself in Washington . . . having a little trouble

getting some of your licenses renewed." This is reported in Joe McGinnis' book, *The Selling of the President 1968*, and has in effect been confirmed by the adviser in question.

Now President Nixon has been elected, and his Vice President—and other Administration spokesmen—are demanding more favorable coverage by all the networks. The threat to licenses is still there. The networks own the most valuable television stations in the country (as well as programming hundreds of affiliates). The threat at least appears worse when President Nixon selects as FCC Chairman the former head of the Republican National Committee, who is scarcely on the job before obtaining transcripts of televised comments of which the President disapproves.

Vice President Agnew simply did publicly—before a nationwide, three-network audience—what corporate and government officials have been doing for years in the privacy of their luncheon clubs and paneled offices. They cajole and threaten publishers and broadcasters in an effort to manage news and mold images.

The Vice President was speaking to the American people. But he was principally castigating the three network presidents—as any other major advertiser might—for televising men and ideas thought to be bad for business. Those who control major power centers, corporate and government, often believe they have a right to manipulate American public opinion to their own ends—to sell goods or elect candidates.

The networks are apparently expected to go along with the system, repeating government press releases during the early evening news, spinning their cotton-candy entertainment at night, and merchandising corporate products with an unending stream of commercials. Too often they comply, but not always.

We are indebted to those television newsmen who have lost their lives in combat or lost their jobs in controversy in order to give all of us occasional glimpses into the powerful institutions that control our lives. We need not agree with their point of view, or believe them to have performed with professional perfection, to be thankful. This century has seen the chilling effects of the control of mass media by other "Directors of Communications" enforcing conformity of views and one-party systems in totalitarian societies. Their leaders also depended on "silent majorities."

Unfortunately, network management has not always provided its newsmen the support they deserve. Profits have often won out over the public interest under corporate or government pressure for conformity. We will be watching carefully the networks' response to the Vice President's assault. It does not bode well that network newsmen have already had their comments about Vice President Agnew's speech discouraged by management, and that the networks have found it easier to provide live coverage from the moon than from the Washington Monument last Saturday during the largest assemblage in the nation's history.

It is true that a handful of men control what the American people see of the world through their television screens but the answer is not to transfer this power from a handful of men in New York to a handful of men in the White House. The answer is to return this power to the people.

We must work, not for less, but for more: Citizens commentary presenting all points of view;

Locally-owned stations instead of monopoly ownership;

Public participation in the FCC's license renewals;

Locally-originated public service programming;

Right of access to the mass media by all Americans;

Opportunity for creative and talented people in network-dominated program production;

Audience supported stations; Funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Surely less discussion, less controversy, less relevant comment are not the answer.

Tolerance of diverse views is the birthright of this nation, enshrined in the freedom of speech and press clause of the First Amendment. Dissent, seemingly divisive, has been for the past 200 years the foundation of our nation's great strength.

It is heartening that FCC Chairman Burch has called for more "public participation" in broadcasting. It could provide a happy ending to what might otherwise become a tragedy for a nation dependent upon free speech and an informed citizenry.

WHERE DOES THIS HERO REST?

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, not too long ago a young black American named William Terry volunteered to serve in the U.S. Army. Proudly he assumed the uniform of his country, and willingly took his training and was sent to Vietnam.

Private First Class Terry wore his uniform proudly, even though it may have been woven by a company which would not have hired or promoted him. And he fought for his country, even though he and 24 million of his countrymen were denied the rights due to them as full-fledged American citizens. And, not long afterwards, Private First Class Terry, only 20 years old, gave his life to his country—killed in action in defense of a government that renounced the same freedoms he was told he was fighting for.

Bill Terry did not think of the slave ships, the auction blocks, Jim Crow, or Judge Lynch. He did not allow himself to be swayed by those who would destroy the dreams of himself and his fellows, by those who would segregate his schools, isolate his jobs, hurl threats, or even bombs at his doorways. Instead, he thought only of what he conceived to be his duty to his country. He fought for what he thought right, and he died for it.

And then, in a Government-issue coffin, he came home to his family—in Birmingham, Ala.

His family asked that he be buried in Birmingham, in a place called the Elmwood Cemetery. But the Elmwood Cemetery said no, only white people could be buried there. So, because he was black, Bill Terry was buried in another cemetery outside of Birmingham, where only blacks were interred. And he was buried in an unmarked grave.

Just as it is a source of pride to relatives of others who lie with him that he is there, so it is a source of shame to our country that he was forced to lie there. What was he to America, even in death? What was his family to America? And now, what is America to them?

In recent days we have heard much of patriotism and our country. Many speeches have been delivered. With all those flags flapping in the breeze, I won-

der whether all those speakers included Bill Terry in their thoughts. Did they count him in? Did they care?

Maybe Bill Terry even heard them, there in that place where he rests.

SIGHTS AND SOUNDS

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, on October 28, 1969, 1 day before his 47th birthday, Edward Banks died. Ed and Eloise Banks, his devoted wife, were warm personal friends of my wife and me. We shall miss him.

Ed Banks was a striking man. A tall, handsome black man, with iron gray hair and a Yorkshire accent, he attracted attention in almost every crowd. His ready wit, sense of humor, and lively interest in every phase of American life made him a delightful person and a worthwhile citizen.

Ed Banks had a distinguished record during World War II as an employee of the International Red Cross. It was after this that he migrated from his native England to the United States and married Eloise. They came to Arizona in the early 1950's and bought the Arizona Tribune, a paper which had the black population of the Phoenix area as its constituency. The paper improved both in quality and in influence under the expertise and hard work of Ed and Eloise Banks. It is today a steady articulate voice of the people it serves.

Ed Banks was a community leader in every sense of the word. He was loyal to his race, but also loyal to his community. Racial relations in Phoenix have been good because of the work of Ed Banks and other like-thinking people of both races.

Very few men have ever had a tribute equal to the one Eloise Banks paid Ed in an editorial in the Arizona Tribune of October 30, 1969. The editorial follows:

SIGHTS AND SOUNDS

(By Eloise Banks)

You and your wisdom and laughter/The silence falls from each rafter; No cup of tea at four, five or seven/Calendar days plus eleven. Pane, pain, writhing inside yet calmness and/Outside you kept laughter despite short breath, and the nearness of death.

What makes a life? Some love and some strife? What makes a wife? Some joy and some fire. What makes a man? Live, love and be life? Some love, fire, strife, joy and a devoted wife.

The pillow is empty—your place is bare/Far lies the book and the hollow chair. Your telly schedule and magazines fall . . . In heaps near your comb and I stare . . . When did he stop living? Was it so brief—twelve years. A dozen—twelve. Twelve equals six pairs, a pair is a double.

Our love equals 12x12. That is a lovetime and a double time of two persons whose initials said EBEB be be never ebb ebb . . . be be—twelve is double six—double time—double love double E double B

EBEB Eloise

Edward

BANKS—where it's reserved.

Farewell to the man who left the misty land of Yorkshire moors—Who heard the

whirl of destiny and met with scores—Of men from far and near—to meet, talk, learn and ascertain—That manner of man he would become and let spirits soar—To catch the sight of time beyond the span of yesterday. His time will never end—his day will never darken . . . maintain—The hope and courage he always gave—Death never lowers—A giant among the thousands of men who pass as boors—Farewell—here's a cheerio for the Man from Yorkshire. He said they were too tough for someone called a Hitler or something called Fear. . . .

Here's to the British Square—the victory goes to the last man down . . . the one who leaves silently . . . with courage and bequeaths a pattern of unassailable fortitude to his wife . . . never his defeats—only the wins.

We planned a birthday party. We had planned 23 other birthday celebrations because my husband and I like to enjoy the zest of living. We looked forward to each birthday with almost childish anticipation because he often compared me to his little dear or a little woman who had great intelligence but often could not hide some bit of meanness or glee.

We had planned a birthday party. We had planned 23 other birthday celebrations because Edward and I preferred to grow older with merriment. Each birthday occurred faster than we realized. Twelve years flash by with moonthruster propulsion. We wanted to encompass our years with an insulation of happy memories.

We had planned a birthday party. We had planned 23 other birthday festivities because my Teddy and I were fortunate to enjoy the company of many loyal and party conditioned friends. They enjoyed attending parties and we enjoyed hosting parties.

We planned a birthday party. We had planned 23 other birthday celebrations because my husband and I felt that our happiness was deep, big and wide enough to share with many wonderful friends.

We planned a birthday party . . . tomorrow never came for the birthday planner. Mr. Edward Banks and his wife cordially invite you to attend the late birthday celebration.

Mrs. Edward Banks invites you to attend the late birthday of her beloved husband, Edward, better known as Teddy or Sir Edward, who was born October 29, 1922. The usual celebration was canceled because of an early and unseen guest. Death answered the previous invitation . . . there was no time to R.S.V.P.

The celebration will be held at a later date. His birthday never came—he invited the early visitor. A day too soon. R.I.P. October 28, 1969. Toast the day—Break the glass—Drink the wine.

There will be many more sights and sounds in my life . . . but none can ever replace or erase the sights and sounds brought into my heart and my head and my soul by the Baron. That name was our private one. He simply called me Baroness or Little Bear. We planned a birthday party . . . me and the Baron.

WISCONSIN—STILL AMERICA'S
DAIRYLAND

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in the rapidly growing Ninth Congressional District of Wisconsin, where farms continue to give way to suburban residences, industrial parks, and subdi-

visions, it is well to keep in mind the contributions of Wisconsin's agricultural producers. Southeastern Wisconsin farms have helped to keep Wisconsin first in these categories: number of dairy cows, corn silage production, hay, production of milk, production of milkfat, production of cheese, acreage devoted to commercial vegetables for processing, and production of commercial beets, sweet corn, and peas for processing.

In 1968, dairy farms in southeastern Wisconsin contained an average of 40 milk cows. They required an average of 4,560 man-hours to operate, of which 4,000 was contributed by the owner and his family. They averaged \$111,610 in total capital, of which \$71,190 went for land and buildings, \$17,770 for machinery and equipment, \$16,100 for livestock, and \$6,550 for crops. Gross farm income averaged \$27,502, of which \$14,018 went for farm operating expenses, leaving \$13,484 as return to operator for labor and management, and total capital. If we assume a 6-percent return on his investment—\$6,696—this leaves \$6,788 as the net return to the farmer and his family for their labor, or \$1.70 per hour.

And while Ninth District housewives, like housewives everywhere, frequently express dismay at the rising dollar-and-cent increases in food prices, 1969 figures indicate that after-tax income spent for groceries has declined, since 1960, from 20 to 16.5 percent, the lowest in the world.

Mr. Speaker, as we approach the laden tables of Thanksgiving Day, we might well pause to give thanks to the efficient producers and distributors of America's food.

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, LATE
A PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED
STATES

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 24, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago last Saturday, I lost a dear and close friend. The loss of President John F. Kennedy was a great shock to the Nation.

Six years ago, on the floor of the House, I said:

Words are certainly meaningless tools of expression when one tries to fumble for the proper phrase to convey deep sentiment. What can one do at a time like this except to pray for the assistance of the Lord for the soul of John F. Kennedy and pray for the strengthening of our country, and offer prayers that will bring solace to the members of the bereaved Kennedy family.

Like all of you, I mourn the passing of a dear friend, a friend whom I have known since the first day he entered into the public life of this Nation.

It is less than 2 weeks ago that this great Nation of ours was rent by remorse and silence. In the deltas and the cane breaks, in the prairies of the West. In the tenements of the East, the Nation was shocked and silenced.

To be with silence is to be with God—for in the hearts and minds and on the lips of men were fervent prayers for the soul of our departed President.

Yet during these trying hours, I cannot help but think of the words of the poet, Robert Frost, a great favorite of our President John F. Kennedy. Robert Frost on his 80th birthday made this statement: "Despite our fears and worries, and they are very real to all of us, life continues—it goes on."

Life has gone on for all of us, but because John F. Kennedy lived, the quality of that life has changed. In the 6 years since November 22, 1963, the Nation has accomplished and fulfilled a great many of the programs that President Kennedy proposed.

I will remember Jack Kennedy not only for the policies he gave to the Nation, but more for the hopes, the thoughts, and the ideals he gave to all Americans.

One of his greatest gifts was the spirit of adventure and dedication with which he attacked problems and sought solutions. With him there was a feeling that all things were possible as long as each man did his part.

His ideas were superb; even after his death they led to progress on many fronts, but his ideals were even greater—they created an aura of hope and a spirit of willingness to overcome all obstacles and every evil.

John F. Kennedy did not live to accomplish all he would have done. But because he inspired the Nation, and gave it confidence, much of what he hoped for has become reality. For 6 years, his ideals and his spirit have moved the country in the direction to which he pointed.

Life goes on; we are saddened at his death, but we are grateful that he lived.

CONGRESSMAN WAYNE HAYS

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 24, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment and commend my very able, distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS), for arranging the very fitting tribute to our esteemed and admired colleague from Ohio, the Honorable WAYNE HAYS, upon the occasion of his election as President of the Atlantic Assembly Parliamentary Union.

I also want to join the many colleagues who have expressed their pleasure and felicitations and best wishes to the very distinguished gentleman from Ohio for the great, unprecedented honor he has received in being named for the second time as President of this great organization of parliamentarians and statesmen.

WAYNE HAYS is a valued friend and an outstanding leader of this House for many years. He was selected to head this great international body because, through his rare talents, expertise, dedication, and meritorious service, he has brilliantly demonstrated the kind of

strong leadership, guidance, and effectiveness which the Members stand for and desire to exemplify.

Mr. HAYS is particularly fitted by reason of his long service in the fields of foreign relations and international affairs, and he is especially endowed by his rich experience, and his understanding and knowledge of the high purposes of this organization, to map a course of action and a program that will meet with the approval of the Members, and result in a united front on the great issues before this distinguished body which may well assure security, freedom, and peace for the world.

I wish for our great friend, WAYNE, another outstanding term of parliamentary office, and even greater success, if that be possible, in achieving the highest goals of NATO, the Assembly, and the Parliamentary Union.

We know that WAYNE HAYS will lead from a posture of understanding, expertise and strength, and full awareness of the concerns which affect so many peoples these days in the world community.

May he and his colleagues in this great work be very successful in reaching all their goals.

PROMPT AND EFFECTIVE CONTROL OF THE INCREASING DISSEMINATION OF PORNOGRAPHIC MATERIAL IS IMPERATIVELY URGENT FOR THE PARTICULAR PRESERVATION OF YOUTHFUL MORALS AND THE WHOLE STRUCTURE OF OUR SOCIETY

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I think it is commonly agreed there are few, if any, subjects waiting upon congressional action more vitally important to the national welfare than the control and elimination of the increasing dissemination of pornographic and salacious material through interstate commerce or the mails.

I, and a great many other Members, have introduced legislative proposals designed to effect the elimination of this growing national evil and on October 9, last, I presented a statement before Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Judiciary Committee, in support of my bill, H.R. 5171, and similar bills to accomplish this wholesome purpose. At this point I would like to include the statement I submitted to the committee. It follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

Mr. Chairman, may I first express, for myself and I am sure the vast majority of my constituents, the deepest appreciation to you and your diligent associates for scheduling and holding these timely hearings on a subject of such tremendous national significance to the preservation of a wholesome morality and morale among the people of this country, particularly our young people.

Although I have personally introduced a bill, H.R. 5171, that is pending before your esteemed committee, designed to eliminate

the increasing dissemination of pornographic material, especially to our youth, through interstate commerce or the mails, let me make it clear that my primary concern and appeal here is for this committee, in its wisdom, to recommend to the Congress any bill or combination of bills that will serve to prevent the illicit use of the United States mails and the legitimate avenues of interstate commerce as instruments by which unscrupulous individuals can flood our people with disgusting and undesired solicitations for the sale of pornographic and salacious material, which too often is either directed to or falls into the hands of young people.

Of course, there is no doubt that the peddling of this smut through these channels of solicitation carries with it a very grave danger to the moral structure of our society.

This most offensive invasion of our national mail boxes and vicious commercial assault upon the moral senses of our people, particularly the young, has become so great and so bad that I, and I am sure you and all other Members of Congress, have received a tremendous number of written protests against this evil. I am sure you have also been stopped, just as I have been, on the streets of your home district, by constituents pleading and urging for sensible restriction and control of this immoral disease that threatens to destroy us if appropriate measures are not taken to cure it.

It, therefore, seems clear that we must find appropriate ways and means to strengthen the laws of our States and our Nation, in order to prevent this evil disease from spreading its infectious poisons any deeper into the moral fabric of this country. In the face of this legislative effort, you may hear a great deal of talk about the right of free speech and expression, but I submit that there are other fundamental rights involved in this matter. For instance, the right of a person not to have his privacy invaded; the right, as well as the duty, of a parent to shield the child from what the parent considers evil; and the right of a community to encourage the maintenance of high moral standards.

Admittedly, this is a challenging legislative area because of outstanding court decisions, but the instruments and channels through which this evil is spread around the country are, in substantial measure, subject to pertinent Federal regulation and control.

Therefore, I believe that we must, that we can, and that we cooperatively will, through the leadership of this committee, and the proper legislative step that will lead to the eradication of what has become one of the most threatening national dangers in our whole history.

For our common inspiration toward fulfillment of this imperative legislative duty, let us recall the wise admonition of the father of our country and first president, George Washington, as contained in these words from his "farewell address"—

"Of all the things that lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports."

Mr. Chairman, one of our fundamental legislative obligations is to try, in pertinent legislation here, to encourage improvement in the quality of life for all our citizens, most particularly for the young. I am certain that you, Mr. Chairman, and your distinguished associates, will strive diligently, after examination of all the evidence placed before you, to recommend to the Congress a legislative measure that will serve to retain constitutional privileges, while at the same time, projecting rigid restrictions and control of the unholy and unbridled dissemination of salacious and pornographic material through interstate commerce and the United States mails. May the Almighty grant you effective guidance to the most expedient accomplishment of your vitally important legislative mission.

ALLEGED ATROCITIES BY U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, recent reports in the press have concerned the alleged massacres of a large number of Vietnamese civilians by American military personnel.

The Army announced yesterday that an Army officer, a Lt. William L. Calley, Jr., would be court-martialed on charges of the premeditated murder of at least 109 men, women, and children on or about March 16, 1968, in the village of Songmy in Quangnai Province in South Vietnam.

According to an article in today's New York Times, surviving villagers of Songmy claim that an American infantry unit killed 567 unarmed men, women, and children. Furthermore, in the same article it is held that an initial investigation of the alleged massacre was made in March of 1968, concluding that no massacre had occurred.

The incident is now under a rather more detailed investigation.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, if these reports contain even a grain of truth, we have committed very grave crimes about which we must find the whole truth.

We are told that we are fighting only to insure that the people of South Vietnam will be allowed to choose their own future through free elections. Is there any justification for mass murder as a means to this end?

We are told that a withdrawal of U.S. troops could mean a "bloodbath" and the murder of thousands of innocent civilians. Yet as we condemn Vietcong atrocities at Hue or the possibility of others following U.S. troop withdrawal, we must equally condemn any action on our part, if verified.

When somewhere between 100 and 600 innocent people are intentionally gunned down in a matter of hours, can we with any moral conscience accept the atrocity as a "natural consequence of war?"

One of the charges being brought against Lieutenant Calley is the murder of a 2-year-old child "whose name and sex is unknown." If, as has been reported, "orders" were to destroy the village and to eliminate all Vietcong, I question how a 2-year-old baby can be identified as a member of a political party, and how moreover a 2-year-old baby can be classified as anything but a defenseless human being.

The transcript of an interview was printed in today's Times, which I would call to the attention of my colleagues. It is an interview conducted by Mike Wallace of CBS News with Mr. Paul Meadlo, a Vietnam veteran present at Songmy. Meadlo was asked why he had taken part in the killings. He replied, in part:

Because I felt like I was ordered to do it . . . at the time I felt like I was doing the right thing, because like I said I lost buddies. I lost a damn good buddy, Bobby Wilson, and it was on my conscience. So after I done it, I felt good, but later on that day, it was getting

to me . . ." And now, a year and a half later, Meadlo says: "I still dream about it . . . I see the women, and children in my sleep. Some days . . . some nights, I can't even sleep. I just lay there thinking about it.

Meadlo is 22 years old. He lost a foot the day after Songmy. We can easily say that he should not have shot civilians, but we all bear a responsibility. As a nation we must recognize that this is a serious betrayal of our ideals and everything we have said we are fighting for. The most thorough possible investigation by the military and the Congress is imperative. An incident such as the allegation surrounding Songmy does far more to destroy our name around the world than does any concern over loss of honor or saved faces. We cannot escape our responsibility, but we can and must end the war.

AN AMERICAN NIGHTMARE

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the recent revelations about possible American massacres of Vietnam civilians raise the most serious questions about the conduct of our war effort, troop discipline, and perhaps even more importantly, the effect of the war on America and Americans. These issues were put into sharp perspective by the New York Times editorial of November 23, 1969, and an accompanying analysis by Anthony Lewis which I strongly commend for consideration by my colleagues in the House. The articles are inserted herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

AN AMERICAN NIGHTMARE

Reports of the deliberate, methodical killing of hundreds of civilians—men, women and children—by American troops in a Vietnamese village last year are so shocking, so contrary to principles for which this country has always stood, as to be beyond belief. Yet the evidence mounts daily that something horrible did take place.

Congress must waste no time in launching a thorough, public investigation of this sordid affair, as proposed by Senator Goodell and others. The fact that North Vietnam and the Vietcong have been guilty of barbaric conduct provides no excuse for any foot-dragging or cover-up by American authorities. The United States public must know—and face—the long-suppressed facts about what may turn out to have been one of this nation's most ignoble hours. If the reports are sustained, those responsible must be brought speedily to justice. It must be made absolutely clear that America does not condone such conduct, war or no war.

At the same time, the United States should take a hard look at other aspects of the conduct of the war in Vietnam that have long disturbed many Americans and foreign friends. The face-to-face shooting of civilians in a village street is not far removed morally, if at all, from the indiscriminate shelling or bombing of civilians from a distance, as happens regularly in the "free fire zones."

More than two years ago, three respected American civilian volunteers in Vietnam resigned, calling the war "an overwhelming atrocity." They cited the destruction of villages and the deaths of "innocent victims of

United States bombing, strafing and shelling." It is a measure of the moral callousness engendered by this mass destruction that South Vietnamese officials have attributed their slowness in investigating the Songmy incident to the fact that reports of heavy civilian casualties have become routine.

More recently, the aborted Green Beret murder trial and the documented story by Daniel Lang of the kidnapping, rape and murder of a Vietnamese girl by an American patrol have thrown cruel light on other aspects of a war that has become an American nightmare.

Recognizing that war is always brutal and ugly, but also remembering their own shocked disapproval of German and Japanese atrocities in World War II, Americans must face up frankly to what has become a severe test of conscience.

WHAT ARE WE DOING TO OURSELVES?

(By Anthony Lewis)

LONDON.—One reason given by President Nixon for keeping American troops in Vietnam until an unspecified day when the Thieu-Ky Government can carry on alone is that, otherwise, "Our allies would lose confidence in America." After the terrible news of this past week, the proposition sounds like mockery.

The reports of mass murder by American soldiers have been devastating in their effect on the British, long our closest allies. Like anyone whose trust in a friend's honor is shadowed by doubt, they are bewildered; they meet Americans and ask: Why? How?

Even before this week's allegations, our involvement in Vietnam was probably on balance lessening British confidence in the United States. The Government gave official support, but privately many informed Britons expressed their urgent wish that the United States get out of Vietnam.

Their reason was not, mainly, sympathy for the Vietnamese; it was concern about the effect of the war on the United States. There was a fear that disillusion with Vietnam might turn us to isolation. More important, there was anxiety about the impact of the war on American society—the brutalization of young men, the bitter division of opinion, the signs of moral obtuseness.

Thus the affair of the Green Berets was deeply disturbing to British civil servants and politicians. They were not surprised at one murder in a war. What shocked them was President Nixon's decision to quash the prosecution of the suspected murderers in the interest of intelligence secrecy—and the evident American public approval of that decision.

CORRUPTING EFFECT

It was the sense of a corrupting effect on the American character that changed a man as devoted to the United States as Lord Harlech from a supporter to a resolute critic of U.S. policy in Vietnam. And David Harlech speaks from hard experience; as British Ambassador and friend he stood close to President Kennedy in the Cuban missile crisis.

Last Sunday's Observer devoted four pages to a condensation of Daniel Lang's horrifying New Yorker article, now a book, on how four American soldiers on patrol kidnapped, raped and killed a Vietnamese girl. Even at that the editors, perhaps making clear they were not anti-American, said their purpose was to show the effect of war "on any men and any country."

And then came the stories of American soldiers shooting down hundreds of unarmed old men, women and children in Songmy village. In London, memories of the Nazis were inevitably evoked. Songmy was compared with Lidice, the Czech village destroyed by the Germans in a 1942 reprisal. But at Lidice the Nazis spared the women and children.

One of the most awful visual images of the Nazis was that of a storm trooper leading a child who could barely walk into the gas chambers. It was the description of the children at Songmy that was most heart-rending.

Sgt. Michael Bernhardt, in his account, spoke of a boy three or four years old holding a wounded arm while blood trickled between his fingers. "He just stood there with big eyes staring around, like he didn't understand; he didn't believe what was happening. Then the captain's radio operator put a burst of M-16 fire into him."

Ronald Haerberle, the photographer, said he saw "two small children, one only four or five years old. A guy with an M-16 rifle fired at the first boy. The older boy fell over to protect him . . . then they fired six more shots and just let them lie."

If that is even partially true, how can America ever be the same?

And even then the British friends of America found some hope. For unlike the Germans, they said, we had pointed to our own sin; it had taken twenty months, and the persistent effort of just one or two men, but now the conscience of America was aroused and the guilty would surely be punished.

PUNISHMENT NOT SURE

But punishment cannot be so sure. In a guerrilla war with objectives unclear to those who fight it, there is bound to be moral ambiguity. When a President takes us into war by stealth, when he orders more bombs dropped on a small agricultural country than fell on Europe in World War II, will the law surely overrule an ordinary soldier's plea that he was only following orders when he shot civilians?

An Englishman who greatly admires the United States tried last night to articulate his feelings about Vietnam. Finally he said:

"It is what you are doing to yourselves that matters."

SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY'S MOVING TRIBUTE TO HIS FATHER

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, at his father's funeral last week, read an eloquent and moving tribute written some years ago by Senator Robert F. Kennedy. This statement, a testament of a son's abiding love and admiration, makes clear how Joseph P. Kennedy inspired his sons to strive for excellence. With permission, Mr. Speaker, I put this tribute in the RECORD at this point:

TEXT OF TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH KENNEDY WRITTEN BY HIS SON ROBERT AND READ AT MASS

I don't believe he is without faults. But when we were young, perhaps because of the strength of his character or the massiveness of his personality, they were unobserved or at least unimportant. When we grew a little older we realized he wasn't perfect; that he had made mistakes, but by that time we realized everyone did. In many, many ways, to us he is something special.

It wasn't just that he was smarter than anyone else—although I thought he was. Time after time, while growing up, I remember listening to him talk with an important figure in business, the theater or politics and always observing that he was the dominant figure—that he knew more, that he expressed it better.

When I was with the Hoover Commission, he was serving as a member, and President Hoover told me, "Your father is the finest of the commissioners; he makes the greatest contribution."

TOUCHED HEART OF PROBLEMS

His judgment has not always been perfect, but somehow he almost always made sense. He seemed to be able to touch the heart of a problem and to look at things a little better and a little surer than anyone else.

If he was cleverer or wiser than others, he would be unusual. But then perhaps everyone's father is cleverer and wiser than anyone else. But what he meant to all of us went far beyond that.

He has called on the best that was in us. There was no such thing as half-trying. Whether it was running a race or catching a football, competing in school—we were to try. And we were to try harder than anyone else. We might not be the best, and none of us were, but we were to make the effort to be the best. "After you have done the best you can," he used to say, "the hell with it."

He has taken such an active interest in what we were doing. He was not a remote figure asking for periodic reports of our activities. When we played touch football or baseball, he sat on the front porch and watched. He left important discussions with Franklin Roosevelt regarding the Securities and Exchange Commission to go to Choate School in Connecticut because my brother Jack was in difficulty.

ATTENDED FOOTBALL GAMES

If we were racing a sailboat, he was there in his cruiser. One time we did badly. He felt it was because we were not paying attention. There was absolute silence at dinner that evening.

When I played football in high school, he was at the games; when I was questioning Jimmy Hoffa, he was following the hearings on television; when I wrote a book, he read the script.

But most importantly, he has been there when things went badly. Our opponents became his opponents, our problems his problems, although he was careful to make sure we understood that his enemies were not to become our enemies.

And he was there to help. In bad times it has been he, more than anyone else, who has seen the bright side. "Call up Dad, he will be cheerful," my older brother used to say.

The greater the disaster, the brighter he was, the more support he gave. I remember he even found something of comfort on how we handled the Bay of Pigs.

And so it has been this interesting combination—his demand that all his children strive for excellence—strive for it, perhaps not achieve it, but continuously strive for it, and—what made this demand tolerable and in fact enjoyable—the interest and support we felt we always had from him.

Of course, our mother was the stabilizing influence, performing all the functions that a mother can for her children. But his personality was so strong, his ideas so definite, his views and outlook so determined, that he dominated our home and our lives.

What it really all adds up to is love—not love as it is described with such facility in popular magazines, but the kind of love that is affection and respect, orders, encouragement and support.

A SOURCE OF STRENGTH

He loved all of us—the boys in a very special way. Our awareness of this was an incalculable source of strength, and because real love is something unselfish and involves sacrifice and giving, we could not help but profit from it.

His feeling for us was not of the devouring kind, as is true in the case of many strong men. He did not visualize himself as

a sun around which satellites would circle, or in the role of a puppet master. He wanted us, not himself, to be the focal points.

This man with such a strong personality, with definite views and a willingness to express them consciously retreated to the background so that the spotlight would be on his sons.

After the nomination in Los Angeles, to which he had contributed more than anyone other than John Kennedy himself he quietly left the city, not waiting for the proud moment of the acceptance speech. He watched it on television in New York. And even the day after the election. When President Kennedy acknowledged his victory at the armory in Hyannis Port, my brother had to use all his powers of persuasion to get his father to accompany him.

It wasn't so much that he felt he was controversial and public expression of his views could perhaps adversely affect all of us. Rather, he was aware of the fact that as we began our careers, we were known as Joe Kennedy's sons.

"Ambassador Kennedy's son has become a Navy pilot." "Joe Kennedy's son Jack is a Congressman." "Ambassador Kennedy's son Robert has become a newspaper columnist.

He knew if he insisted on remaining in the center of national affairs, we would continue to be known as his children. He would be the dominating figure, the personality, the spokesman for the family.

And in how many other families have the young been stultified? Again and again, young men with ability and talent have been kept from taking their places in the affairs of business or on the national stage because an older figure refused to make room and insisted on the glory and attention until the very end.

He decided, I believe consciously, this would not happen in our family. The most important thing to him was the advancement of his children.

His sole concern was to contribute to that advancement. After the end of World War II, he decided this aim could best be accomplished by doing what, for a strong figure, is probably the most difficult thing to do—to submerge his own personality. This is what he did.

I can say that, except for his influence and encouragement, my brother Jack might not have run for the Senate in 1952, there would have been much less likelihood that he would have received the Presidential nomination in 1960, I would not have become Attorney General, and my brother Teddy would not have run for the Senate in 1962.

He wanted us to be independent in the full sense of the term. At an early age we were sent on trips of our own. We were given tasks of responsibility. We embarked on study programs under teachers or political leaders who held views quite different from his.

My brother Joe went to Spain in the civil war; Jack was given the assignment to help the survivors of the Athenia just prior to the beginning of World War II; I went to Czechoslovakia just after it was taken over by the Communists.

STUDIED UNDER LASKI

Both my older brothers studied under Harold Laski of the London School of Economics, and Joe traveled to Moscow with him.

My father believed we could think and decide things for ourselves. There have been disagreements, sometimes violent, on politics, economics, the future of the country, the world. But he was stimulated.

If his sons had a different philosophy, were more optimistic about the future of life on this planet, then in a more mellow mood he would say, "If I were your age, I would hold these views also."

Beneath it all he has tried to engender a social conscience. There were wrongs which

needed attention. There were people who were poor and who needed help; mentally ill who needed assistance. And we had a responsibility to them and to the country.

Through no virtues and accomplishments of our own, we had been fortunate enough to be born in the United States under the most comfortable conditions. We, therefore, had a responsibility to others who were less well off.

Business, even his own operations, were so seldom discussed at home. Despite his rather extensive holdings, none of us was encouraged to go into business, even for the purpose of carrying them on after his retirement. He would rather have been happy with this, but he thought we should discharge our responsibilities and obligations to others by entering government and politics.

His interest in life has been his children—not his business, not his accomplishments, not his friends, not his children. Any lasting contributions we might have made have been in a large part due to the effect he had on our lives.

I think of him now as Tennyson wrote of Ulysses in his old age in a poem the President liked so much:

"... that which we are, we are;
One equal temper of heroic parts,
Made weak by time and fate, but strong in
will
To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield."

STATUS OF WOMEN IN TEXAS: LET'S NOT WASTE TALENT

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, recently, in San Antonio, Tex., the Business and Professional Women's Club sponsored a regional seminar having to do with the expanding role of American women in business and professional life. It was a most productive and meaningful gathering, attended by such notables as the distinguished jurist, Judge Sarah Hughes, of Dallas and other great female leaders. The prime mover of this event was Mrs. Willie Meyer, past president of the B. & P.W. Club of San Antonio. Mrs. Meyer has successfully pursued a career in business and professional endeavor herself and is a perfect symbol of the American career woman who has contributed so greatly to the progress and well-being of American society; in fact, the uniqueness of our American way unquestionably being the very crucial factor of the contribution of the educated and trained woman in American society.

One of the principal speakers at this productive meeting was another highly distinguished woman leader in government, Miss Rhobia C. Taylor, the regional director, Women's Bureau, Wage and Labor Standards Administration of the Department of Labor, headquartered in Dallas, Tex. Miss Taylor has distinguished herself in her role as the regional director. I can testify that she has been a credit to the U.S. Government and has been the cause of the citizens of Southwest United States having complete confidence and faith in the efficiency and superiority of performance of the Federal civil worker. Miss Taylor made a most interesting and valuable contribution to the discussion. But prior to this meeting

she made a memorable address on September 16 in Irving, Tex. Mr. Speaker, I place Miss Taylor's remarks into the RECORD:

STATUS OF WOMEN IN TEXAS: LET'S NOT WASTE TALENT

(Address by Miss Rhobia C. Taylor)

WOMEN'S POSITION

More than 75 years ago in his book of enduring fame, "The American Commonwealth," James Bryce wrote:

"It has been well said that the position women hold in a country is, if not a complete test, yet one of the best tests of the progress it has made in civilization."

Comparing different societies, he concluded that in every case civilization's advance has been accompanied by greater freedom accorded women and "by a fuller participation on their part in the best work of the world."

Bryce thought American women were the most advantaged in the world at that time, and enjoyed the greatest measure of equality.

By Bryce's test of civilization's advance, measured by the improved position of women, we have made great progress here in the United States since his time. Would he, were he alive today, be pleased by the extent to which our rights and opportunities have been enlarged? Or would he feel we still have a fairly long way to go before we can say we are full participants in—as he put it—"the best work of the world."

I propose to talk of some of the great forward strides we have made and of new ones now in the making. And then I'd like to indicate some of the unfinished items on our agenda as women and some of the challenging goals which remain for us to win.

CHANGING PATTERNS

As I look back just over the years of my own lifetime the transformation in the economic, social and political role we women play in American life has been almost incredible.

One of the most far-reaching and significant changes is the increase in our average expectation of life. The year I was born, girl babies in the United States could expect on the average to live about 50 years. For the baby girl born today, the average expectation of life is nearly 75.

Think what a spectacular difference this makes to all of us as women—this incredible gift of another quarter-century for the enjoyment of life, for the rewarding use of skills, or a larger contribution to the family, to the community, to the Nation. This fact alone makes your lives and mine utterly different from those of our grandmothers.

Isn't this one of the main changes which raise so many of the questions women are thinking about today which relate to our role in society? In addition to living longer, another factor is that today we marry younger, and bear our children earlier. The last child is born to the average American woman at the startlingly young age of 26. For an increasing number of us, by the time we are in our mid-thirties our children are launched in school, and we can then look ahead with the realistic expectation that we shall have at least another 30 or 35 years of active life which we will want to be filled with rewarding and interesting experience. So many of the diseases which used to afflict us and turn us old before our time, or used to afflict our children, are conquered. Think of what this alone means in terms of release of time—quite apart from its release from pain and anguish. Longer, healthier, more active lives for ourselves and our children mean new and exciting challenges.

And the changes wrought by technological advance have also given us new freedom. Housekeeping isn't the arduous job it used to be. It doesn't begin to be as time-consuming as when I was a child.

Is it any wonder, then, that more and more young women are asking themselves, "Is being a wife and mother going to be enough for me?"

Being a wife and mother remain primary goals for all of us, but because we have the gift of time and health and release from many former household chores, more and more of us are seeking ways to take an increasingly active part in the world around us. We have talents we want to use. We want to contribute our energies and skills not only to fulfill our own personal aspirations, but also to help make the world a better place for our children—for all mothers' children.

Improvements in our educational opportunities have equipped us for new roles. This is one of our major areas of progress.

The doors to higher education opened early; but for a long period the number of women entering through them remained small, and professional training opportunities beyond the college level were extremely limited. Were they afraid we would lower standards of academic achievement?

Only 57,000 girls graduated from high school in 1900. In 1966 more than a million did so.

At the century's turn, only 50 percent of girls aged 5-20 were enrolled in our schools and colleges. Now the percentage is nearly 90. Our participation in higher education has increased very rapidly indeed. Five thousand young women won their B.A.'s in 1900, all of 300 received an M.A. or other second professional degree that year; and just 23 earned a Ph. D. By 1966 college degrees granted women had mounted to about 225,000; 47,000 won an M.A. or other second professional degree and some 2,100 the doctorate or its equivalent.

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENTS

Women are earning the highest percentage of degrees they have received from the nation's colleges and universities since before World War II, and are steadily gaining on men, according to a survey by the U.S. Office of Education.

The survey, released in August, shows that during the 12-month period ending June 30, 1968, women received 40 percent of the degrees awarded in the country. Before the war, women also were receiving 40 percent of the degrees, but when tens of thousands of returning soldiers flooded the colleges under the GI Bill, the percentage of women graduates dropped to 25 percent.

The figures for the most recent 12-month period have not yet been computed.

During the period studied—a record year in the granting of degrees—women received 345,068 degrees, a 125 percent increase over their 1957-58 total, the survey shows. During the same period, men received 526,764 degrees, a 70 percent increase over their total of a decade earlier.

The percentage of degrees earned by women in 1967-68 was up two points from the previous year, from 38 to 40 percent, as the percentage received by men declined by the same figure.

Of the degrees awarded by 1,567 institutions during the 1967-68 period, men received 56 percent of the bachelor's, 95 percent of the first professional such as law, 64 percent of the master's and 87 percent of the doctorates, the survey shows.

It also notes that:

Publicly controlled institutions accounted for 61 percent of all degrees awarded. The number of degrees from public institutions increased 15 percent over 1966-67, compared to a 10 percent rise from private institutions.

At the bachelor's and master's levels, more degrees were awarded in elementary education than in any other field. Law had the highest number of degrees at the first-professional level, and chemistry had the highest at the doctoral level.

Women received more degrees in education than in any other field, 103,141 bachelor's

and 32,773 master's. The largest number of degrees received by men at the bachelor's level was in the social sciences—77,243—and at the master's level in education—30,891.

Women received the majority of degrees in the fields of English, journalism, foreign languages, literature and fine arts. One woman during the 1967-68 school year received a degree in military science.

WORLD OF WORK

This leads us to where we stand in the world of work. First let's talk about our increased participation in the world of work—which is very considerable—and then let's turn to the kinds of work we do.

Nearly half of all women aged 18 to 64 are wage and salary earners. This percentage has been rising very rapidly. When I was a girl, only around a fifth of us held jobs. And of course, in consequence, the proportion of the total labor force we women represent has increased. It's now well over one-third. Today about 30 million women leave their homes to go to work—full-time or part-time.

The likelihood is that 8 or 9 out of 10 girls will hold a job at some time in their lives! Nearly three-fifths of college-educated women, aged 18-64, were in the labor force in 1962, in contrast with 45 percent of those with high school diplomas, and 38 percent of those, also aged 18-64, who did not go beyond elementary school.

And here is an astonishing finding, if you will. Eighty-one percent of those women who had had 5 years or more of college, and who were in the age bracket 45-64, were in the labor force in 1962.

Add to the percentage of college women who are in paid jobs, the percentage now taking an active role in politics, and add in those serving their communities as volunteers, and most of us are really "at work."

I begin to wonder where among today's college graduates are the frustrated females, removed from and yearning to be a part of the world outside the home, that Betty Friedan writes about in her "Feminine Mystique."

While the figures on the proportion of college women in the labor force might seem to suggest that for them work is increasingly and elective choice, expressing their growing desire to fulfill their potentialities as creative human beings, we want to be careful not to lose perspective.

We must remember that we who have this wonderful opportunity to go to college are still very privileged people. (Only about 7 percent of all women over 25 today have enjoyed 4 years or more of higher education.) And being privileged, we have greater responsibilities. But more of this later.

What we should recognize quite clearly is that a very large number of women today who hold down jobs do so out of hard economic necessity.

NEARLY 5 MILLION WOMEN HEADS OF FAMILIES

Many of these women have no alternative but to work. The compulsion to add to the family income is urgent for many wives living with husbands who are unable to provide even the barest essentials—many because they are ill, unemployed, under-employed, or inadequately skilled. We must remember that about one-fifth of our families today have total incomes of less than \$3,000. Almost another fifth have incomes between \$3,000 and \$5,000—still considerably less than what is required to provide a modest but adequate living standard.

But the search for employment is a response to more than merely the need to make ends meet. More and more women want to help purchase the family home. They want to provide added advantages, especially a college education for their children. They also want to be useful human beings.

We women who work add substantially to the Nation's income. Our efforts are helping greatly to lift family living standards. And

improved levels of life are one of the most significant aspects of our time. In the past 30 years, the income of our average American family, measured in dollars of constant purchasing power, has doubled. We women have contributed to this, but our larger contribution has also been made possible by the rapid expansion of our economy, which has greatly enlarged job opportunities for women as well as men. Higher incomes have whetted our appetites for still higher incomes. When we have more of the good things of life, we want still more.

The dual role of homemaker and jobholder or volunteer has become a reality for the overwhelming majority of today's college graduates.

IS IT THE "BEST WORK OF THE WORLD?"

Increasingly we are playing a part in the world of work, but to revert again to Bryce's phrase, "Is it the 'best work of the world?'"

We are quite a long way from anything like equality of opportunity. We are still in a highly disadvantaged position relative to men. This is revealed by our earnings. On the average, women who are full-time, year-round workers receive only about 60 percent of what men who are similarly employed earn. This reflects the fact that we are all too often paid less for doing the same work; even more, it reflects our concentration in the lower paid, lesser skilled occupations.

Among all employed women—not college women alone—82 percent are clerical, sales, factory and farm workers or in service occupations. Six percent of us are teachers in the grammar and high schools. (Only 7 percent of us are medical and health workers, college teachers, or other professional and technical workers.) Just 5 percent of us are managers, officials and proprietors.

The factors which have narrowed our opportunities are multiple and complex. There are restrictive hiring practices. There is discrimination in promotions. Many myths, which run entirely counter to the facts, maintain that women make poor supervisors, or that they have substantially higher rates of absenteeism and labor turnover. The claim is often made, and without the slightest justification, that even women with more than adequate training and knowledge lack the ability to assume higher level positions in industry.

Not only do we women confront obstacles in our jobs—they still exist in many other aspects of our lives. Our role in public life is still far from commensurate with our numbers, skills or abilities. Some of our State laws relating to our property rights and other rights are antiquated. For instance, some States still restrict the right of a wife to engage in a separate business of her own. Many other examples might be cited.

The late President Kennedy declared in December 1961 that these "continuing prejudices and outmoded customs act as barriers to the full realization of women's basic rights which should be respected and fostered as part of our Nation's commitment to human dignity, freedom and democracy." These were the opening words of his Executive Order establishing a Commission on the Status of Women made up of a most distinguished group of men and women under the chairmanship of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

President Kennedy asked the Commission to report to him on what we need to do as a Nation to overcome these discriminations, and to develop recommendations for services "which will enable women to continue their role as wives and mothers while making a maximum contribution to the world around them."

The Commission appointed seven committees. Two concerned themselves intensively with the employed woman and her future, one in private and one in Federal employment. Another was asked to report on pro-

tective labor legislation as it affects the employed woman, and still another on the questions of social insurance and taxes—both subjects of vital concern.

Committees were also appointed to consider problems relating to civil and political rights, education, and finally home and community. I couldn't attempt to summarize for you even the highlights of the immense amount of work done and the recommendations presented unanimously by the Commission. But I think it can rightfully be said that when the history of American women's progress is written, the story of the work done by the President's Commission and of what has followed from it will be one of its most dramatic and significant chapters.

It has generated a new spirit of concern about remaining inequities—a new determination to eliminate them. It has created an upsurge of interest in every type of problem women still confront, and in all the changes needed to help women maximize their contribution to their world. Let me mention just a few of the gains made in consequence of the Commission's work.

EQUAL PAY LAW

An Equal Pay Law was enacted by the Congress in 1963. This went into effect on June 11, 1964. It is now the law of the land that women employed in interstate commerce, with the exception of executive, administrative and professional personnel, must be paid wages equal to those of men doing equal work. In 36 states and the District of Columbia equal pay legislation gives women this assurance.

As a result of Presidential directive, both hiring and promotions are being made by all Federal agencies on the basis of qualifications and merit alone, regardless of sex.

Another similar advance resulting from the Commission's recommendations might be cited. Although it has long been the policy of the U.S. Employment Service to refer people for jobs on the basis of their qualifications, regardless of sex, it was found that many employers were inclined to specify whether they wanted a man or woman when filing job orders with public employment offices. (At the Commission's request, the USES issued a policy statement, applicable to State and local public employment offices, to promote equal employment opportunity for men and women.) It included the statement that the policy of USES is "to encourage acceptance and use by employers of hiring specifications based exclusively upon job performance factors."

All working women will benefit from the showcase example of the Federal service.

TITLE VII, CIVIL RIGHTS ACT

We have seen included in the Civil Rights Act which became law in July 1964, a provision ruling out all discrimination in employment on the basis of sex. This applies to all women in interstate industries. One wonders whether such a provision would have been included, had not the Commission's concentrated attention been given, on the national level, to problems relating to the status of women.

American Women, the Commission's report, and I hope all will read it, has been a tremendous impact not only at home but abroad. It has been translated into Italian, Japanese and Swedish. Denmark has set up a Commission; other countries will follow.

But what is probably the most constructive consequence of the Commission's work is that State Commissions on the Status of Women have been set up by administrative or legislative action in every state, the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and two municipalities.

Here in Texas, your Commission was established by Executive Order on January 13, 1967. It was composed of 20 members with the Governor responsible for the appoint-

ment of those persons with a competency in the areas of public affairs and women's activities, including heads of state departments considered necessary to carry out the work of the Commission. Governor John Connally designated Hon. W. S. Birdwell, Jr., Commissioner, Texas Employment Commission, Austin, as Chairman.

The Commission's duties as stated in the Executive Order were to explore in depth and make recommendations as needed for constructive action in the following areas: (a) the broad scope of educational needs for women with emphasis on vocational training and the special educational needs; (b) new and expanded services for women in the home and in the community to assist them in making their maximum contribution to the general welfare of their families and communities; (c) employment policies and practices affecting women including those of cities, counties and state government, and ways of achieving equal opportunity for employment and advancement and full utilization of the talent and skill of the entire work force; (d) state labor laws applicable to women including examination of the effects of current laws to determine whether they are accomplishing the purposes for which they were designed; and (e) the legal treatment of women in regard to political and civil rights, property rights, and family relations.

Governor Preston Smith is expected to announce the names of members of his Commission in the very near future.

There were 3,700,000 women in Texas fourteen years and older in 1967. Of these, 1,333,000 were in the civilian labor force, and 1,288,700 were actually employed.

The median (half above, half below) age of women workers in Texas rose to 39 years in 1960, from 35 years in 1950 and 32 years in 1940. Over the 20-year period there was increased labor force participation among women of all age groups, with the greatest advance occurring among women 45 to 54 years of age.

Thirty percent of married women (husband present), 35 percent of single women, and 42 percent of women with other marital status were in the labor force in 1960. Married women accounted for 58 percent of all women workers.

The median number of school years completed by all women 14 years of age and over was 10.6 years; by Negro women, 9.0 years. Thirty-nine percent of all women were high school graduates; about 25 percent had less than 8 years of formal education. Of the Negro women, 24 percent were high school graduates and about 37 percent had less than 8 years of formal education.

More Texas women were employed in 1960 than 1950 in 9 of the 11 major occupational groups. The greatest percentage gains occurred among professional and technical workers and clerical workers. Employment decreases were reported among farm workers. In every industry except agriculture, women's employment rose over the 10-year period. The greatest percentage increases occurred among women in construction and mining; finance, insurance, and real estate; manufacturing; and most of the service industries.

In 1959 experienced women workers in Texas had median earnings of \$1,783. Highest median earnings were reported for women professional and technical workers. The median income in 1959 for white women 14 years of age and over was \$1,170; for non-white women, \$750.

The Commission made a comprehensive study of employment and other opportunities open to women. The formation of this program came as a result of cooperative efforts among leaders of women's groups, civic organizations, and the news media. A report was prepared and submitted to Governor Connally.

This means that many thousands of people throughout our country are now engaged in a country-wide enterprise—inquiring into every aspect of the position of women. They are holding meetings and public hearings. Countless committees are hard at work. Out of these deliberations will emerge a new and better climate as far as women are concerned. There will be improvements made in employment practices in the States and localities, in the more widespread provisions of homemaker and day care and other services which will be so helpful to the employed women. Impetus will be given to the enactment of Equal Pay Laws in the 14 States still without them.

The work being done by the many State committees set up to inquire into the need for the extension and improvement of protective labor legislation is bringing home to large numbers of people the fact that many millions of women are still being paid distressingly low wages. (About a fifth of the Nation's women who work at full-time jobs, and work 40 weeks or more during the year, earn less than \$2,000 a year.) We already see evidence that the State Commissions are stimulating far greater interest in minimum wage legislation all across the country.

Above all, I think this deepened interest in the problems and needs of women will help to forge new approaches to their education. There are many institutional adjustments needed if we are more fully to realize our potentials.

CONTINUING EDUCATION

We need more programs such as have been developed by Southern Methodist University's School of Continuing Education, with Mrs. Mary E. Miller as Associate Dean, plus the Program for Continuing Education of Women at the University of Texas at Austin, and the Center for Human Resources, University of Houston, to make it possible for women in their middle years who drop out of college to obtain, through part-time study, their B.A.'s or to get their M.A.'s for teaching, social work and other careers. They can do this when their children are still young and then later ready to resume their careers.

The State Commissions are helping us in the Women's Bureau to stimulate interest throughout the country in improving our vocational guidance and training programs for young women.

Another important social change is needed. We ought to give far more consideration to part-time employment opportunities for women. We are woefully short of good teachers. Why shouldn't our schools permit two women to work as a team—one taking the morning periods, the other the afternoon? The mature woman who is raising her own children has much to offer the children of others.

WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

But it is the future that interests us. What are the jobs that will be available in the coming decade, and in which of these jobs can women realistically expect to find opportunities?

Suppose we start with the most glaring shortage, and one generally staffed by women: Elementary and Secondary Teaching. The demand for teachers rose 10 percent between 1965 and 1966, with the following results:

Twenty states had substantial shortages of teacher applicants; shortages of elementary school teachers were widespread.

Nine out of ten states had shortages of Mathematics and Science teachers, and many lacked teachers of English, Foreign Languages, and special education.

Shortages affected communities of every size: 37 teachers for small cities; 22 for central cities; and 19 for suburbs.

But suppose one happens not to be gifted with that particular brand of endurance that is required of teachers. What about Social Work? Shortages exist in public and voluntary agencies, in services to families, children, and the aged; school social work; psychiatric and medical areas.

Only one percent of our engineers are women and only three percent of our lawyers, a ratio that has remained virtually stationary for many years. In Denmark, one-half of the law students are female. In the Soviet Union, the figure is thirty-six percent, and in Germany, almost one-third of the law students are women. In these fields and even to a greater extent in medicine, the United States is woefully behind most other countries in placing women in medical professions. A 1965 survey indicated that we rank behind some 25 other nations (including lots of little ones such as England, Hong Kong, and Switzerland) in percentage of doctors. The Philippines has 24.7 percent, while the United States boasts only 6.7 percent and ranks just above South Vietnam, Madagascar, and Spain.

The needs are tremendous. All of your talents and skills are needed.

SAIGON GOVERNMENT REMAINS THE BIG HANGUP AT PARIS TALKS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, one of the most disturbing aspects of President Nixon's November 3 speech was the implication that there was no possibility of peaceful settlement in Vietnam.

That this is a regrettably mistaken, indeed defeatist, conclusion is well argued by the able columnist Joseph Kraft in today's Washington Post.

I call attention particularly to his final sentence.

The column follows:

SAIGON GOVERNMENT REMAINS THE BIG HANG-UP AT PARIS TALKS

(By Joseph Kraft)

For a little while, it looked as though the Vice President would give us some other things to debate. But not all the false leads in Mr. Agnew's capacious bag of decoys can divert attention from Vietnam.

Even while nobody looks, the awful fact of the war is reasserted by rising casualty rates and the reports of the Sonmy massacre. And the way out is once more underlined by developments at the Paris peace talks.

For despite obvious propaganda overtones, the latest exchange points up the advantages of the negotiating track as a way out. It shows more clearly than ever before that the big hang-up in the talks is the Saigon regime. And with that obstacle out in the open, it is possible to see a way around—through a kind of Rhodes formula for proxy negotiations.

The unique importance of the negotiating track is confirmed in the interview given to Harrison Salisbury of The New York Times by the chief North Vietnamese negotiator in Paris, Xuan Thuy. In his talk, Ambassador Thuy focused attention on two problems that can only be met with assurance through negotiation.

First there is the problem of achieving security for South Vietnam and Southeast Asia after an American withdrawal. Mr.

Thuy indicated that the other side would be prepared to negotiate for a neutral South Vietnam, set, he implied, in a neutral South-east Asia. Then there is the problem of averting a blood bath, or massacre, after a settlement. Xuan Thuy indicated that the other side was interested in negotiating an amnesty against reprisals.

Neither of these points is new, of course. Even so, amplification through Hanoi's favorite American reporter is important. The interview came after President Nixon's exceedingly tough speech of Nov. 3, and after the announcement that the administration would let Henry Cabot Lodge withdraw as chief American delegate to the Paris talks without immediately naming another leading public man as a substitute. In these circumstances, the interview is notice that the other side continues to attach significance to the Paris negotiations but will not alter its stance under pressure.

With respect to the hangup in the talks, it emerges clearly from the rejoinder made by Ambassador Lodge to the Xuan Thuy interview. Xuan Thuy had indicated that Hanoi was prepared to meet secretly with Washington to discuss two main subjects—troop withdrawal and the composition of the government of South Vietnam. He claimed that the United States was only prepared to talk about troop withdrawal.

Mr. Lodge asserted the United States was prepared to discuss much more than troop withdrawal in bilateral secret talks with North Vietnam. He did not say that this country was prepared to talk about the politics of Saigon in such talks. And, in fact, the United States will only discuss Saigon politics if the representatives of the South Vietnamese government are present. But Hanoi will not sit down with the representatives of Saigon. The central hang-up, in other words, is the government of South Vietnam and its status at the peace table.

A strong case can be made that President Nixon is to blame for the emergence of the Saigon government as the big hang-up. The President overruled repeated recommendations by Ambassador Lodge for an early approach to private talks with the other side; by the time the private talks finally got under way the other side had irrevocably hardened its position against the Saigon regime.

But that is not the issue now. The issue now is how to get round the obstacle. And one obvious way lies in the Rhodes formula of proxy negotiations that has been used in the Near East. Under that formula, the United States would sit down in direct talks with North Vietnam on all subjects. But when the question of the composition of the Saigon government came up, the United States would act only as an explicit proxy for the government of Saigon, which would be consulted in all matters at every step of the way.

No doubt it would not be easy to arrange such a procedure. The present Saigon government would squeal—and especially its chief supporter, Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker. Still there is not much doubt that with determination, the United States could wring the necessary concessions out of Saigon. The more so as the other side has already made a step in the direction of proxy negotiations. For Xuan Thuy's statement of Hanoi's willingness to negotiate bilaterally with the United States is the most explicit statement yet made by the other side that North Vietnam will act as proxy for the Vietcong.

Thus, for all the harsh words, the negotiating track remains open and important. But the United States can only get on that track by asserting its interest in peace over the hawks of Saigon. And the true choice is between continuing the war, or putting pressure on Saigon to do what is required for a negotiated settlement.

VIETNAM RESOLUTION—WHY NOT VICTORY?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, following the Thanksgiving recess the Members will vote on House Resolution 613, a sense-of-the-House resolution ostensibly expressing the Members' support for the President in his efforts to negotiate a just peace in Vietnam.

Like many of the silent majority, I unequivocally support the President's every effort on behalf of the American people in our assumed role of world leadership and in containing Communist aggression, sustaining the spirit of liberty in the hopes of millions of people oppressed in Communist-dominated countries.

To date, 315 Members have cosponsored this resolution and, I am sure, in good faith—feeling that they are expressing a desire for peace and support for our President. I respectfully declined to join because I feel the resolution goes far deeper than support for the President and negotiating a just peace in Vietnam.

The resolution provides, "supports the principles enunciated by the President that the people of South Vietnam are entitled to choose their own government by means of free elections open to all South Vietnamese and supervised by an impartial international body." This clause of the resolution is not only repulsive as high-handed dictatorial interference into the affairs of the people of South Vietnam, it is also self-contradictory.

What elections are "free" when they are supervised by outsiders? At most they are a meaningless exhibition. What is intended by "open to all South Vietnamese?" This House is to establish voting qualifications in South Vietnam? Does "open to all" include people who are imported into the area for the election? Does it include children, criminals, traitors, incompetents?

Most contradictory is the phrase, "supervised by an impartial international body." If the body is international, how can it be impartial? If it is international then it is certain to include, if not be controlled by, Communists.

Experience should teach us that in any election, the Communist apparatus is never satisfied until their candidate wins. And I, for one, would never insist that the free people of South Vietnam—who have resisted Communist aggression for such a long period of time—yield powers to the Communists, through political maneuvering, which they have never been able to gain through terrorist activities.

The resolution is self-defeating. While the news media may explain the votes as being for or against peace or support of the President, passage would align our President with Hanoi who has been calling for new elections, under international controls. This is what the war is all about. Hanoi knows it. We should.

Those who urge the resolution, to give

an appearance of support for the President's Vietnam policy, would have the American people believe that there are but two alternatives in Vietnam—the Hanoi position, echoed by the moratorium crowd, demanding immediate unilateral withdrawal—or the President's policy, which differs from the radicals only in the timing of our departure.

There are other alternatives. Some who support the United States, desire peace through victory in Vietnam. Limited to only two alternatives we, by necessity, must support the President's policy even though we are not in full accord.

Most Americans support the President's objectives in Vietnam—a termination of the hostilities as speedily as possible, consistent with our national interests. But many do not necessarily agree with the wisdom of the course which has been chosen—that of negotiating with an undefeated enemy. Negotiation implies compromise—the absolute antithesis of victory, which is the only legitimate reason for war. The best and most certain method to terminate the war promptly and permanently, while discouraging any further such aggressive ventures, is to win it.

Military experts are agreed that the war could be won by conventional weapons in 6 to 8 weeks. Had this course been chosen at the beginning, 40,000 American lives would have been saved. Had it been adopted last year, 10,000 American lives would have been spared. How many additional American lives will be lost by negotiating instead of winning in 1970.

If the President had shown strong, positive leadership and pursued a courageous policy upon his taking office, he would not now seek national unity—it would be spontaneous. The great majority, who are now uninspired, would rally behind a dedicated leader on a true course for the United States and their voices would overwhelm the disloyal minority of Hanoi's fifth column.

Why, then, have neither Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, nor now President Nixon adopted such a positive policy?

Are not our Presidents free to command American troops to win or to formulate positive plans for peace through victory? Why must our people suffer a perpetual loss of American manhood and an insatiable drain of American tax dollars?

We are told our country is committed to defend South Vietnam against Communist aggression by reason of a treaty, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, a collective defense treaty authorized under the UNO Charter. South Vietnam is not signatory to either the SEATO treaty agreement or the Pacific Charter.

In voting on the resolution, we will be voting on new elections in South Vietnam contrary to the constitution of that country. An "aye" vote would seem tantamount to a vote supporting the propaganda of the enemy—that South Vietnam does not have a legitimate government.

If the present government of South Vietnam is not *de jure*—how can we have any binding agreement with it? If it

is *de jure*, how can we justify voting to force internal changes?

Consider that article 4, paragraph 1, of the SEATO Treaty provides that military "measures taken to repel aggression must be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations."

This is in compliance with article 54 of the UNO charter commanding that "the Security Council shall at all times be kept fully informed of activities undertaken or in contemplation under regional arrangements." In our SEATO involvement, in which Vietnam is not a party, every activity—every command of our military—must be reported to the UNO Security Council.

Since 1946, the post of Under Secretary General for Political and Security Council Affairs in the United Nations Organization, with one 2-year exception, has been held by a Russian officer. The exception was a term held by a Yugoslavian Communist. The post is presently held by Leonid N. Kutakov of the Soviet Union.

That Vietnam is a UNO war is clear by the language in the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. The gulf resolution at section 2 provides:

Consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations, in accordance with this obligation under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force . . . in the defense of its freedom.

Section 3 of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution provides that it shall expire "when the President determines that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by the action of the United Nations or otherwise."

In Korea our men fought—and still die under the UNO flag, in a UNO declared war against Communist China. There has been no peace settlement negotiated—and there is no peace. There is only an uneasy cease-fire where American men—who were not even born when the Korean war broke out—continue to be sacrificed, as we continue negotiations at Panmunjom.

In Vietnam we fight another UNO war. This time under the American flag—but with our national leaders bound by treaty not to win nor end the war—except at the discretion of the United Nations Organization.

And, by the same treaty, we are restrained from offensive action. We are limited to "repel," or "defend." It does not permit pursuit, and precludes victory—because it is impossible to win when you can't advance, and when every operation must be approved by the real enemy, sitting in New York at the head of the UNO military committee.

Just as there has been no end to Korea, there can be no end to Vietnam—nor any peace, unless we repeal the UNO Participation Act, or we breach our mistaken allegiance to that organization.

By the resolution at hand, we are further subordinating the office of President of the United States and the powers delegated to us by the American people to the UNO for supreme control over the

Vietnam situation. After 15 years of struggle and loss of the substance and the men of America, any solution achieved under this resolution would be considered to the credit of the UNO in the eyes of the world.

In my humble judgment the enactment of this resolution is far more than an emotional appeal to support the President and bring peace to Vietnam. The resolution has no legal effect. It cannot help the United States, but it could prove a wedge to further polarize our people. It contains within it the seeds of destruction and includes an appeasement guaranteed to result in lengthening the war—not bringing peace. There remain many questions unanswered.

So that our colleagues may see the treaties and resolutions which have precipitated the war, and now the Vietnam resolution which confronts us, I include the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, and the Vietnam resolution.

SOUTH-EAST ASIA COLLECTIVE DEFENSE
TREATY
(Manila Pact)

The Parties to this Treaty,
Recognizing the sovereign equality of all the Parties,

Reiterating their faith in the purposes and principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments.

Reaffirming that, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, they uphold the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and declaring that they will earnestly strive by every peaceful means to promote self-government and to secure the independence of all countries whose peoples desire it and are able to undertake its responsibilities.

Desiring to strengthen the fabric of peace and freedom and to uphold the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law, and to promote the economic well-being and development of all peoples in the Treaty Area,

Intending to declare publicly and formally their sense of unity, so that any potential aggressor will appreciate that the Parties stand together in the area, and,

Desiring further to coordinate their efforts for collective defence for the preservation of peace and security,

Therefore agree as follows:

Article I

The Parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international dispute in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered, and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

Article II

In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this Treaty, the Parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack and to prevent and counter subversive activities directed from without against their territorial integrity and political stability.

Article III

The Parties undertake to strengthen their free institutions and to cooperate with one another in the further development of economic measures, including technical assistance, designed both to promote economic progress and social well-being and to further

the individual and collective efforts of governments toward these ends.

Article IV

1. Each Party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the Treaty Area against any of the parties or against any State or territory which the Parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. Measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations.

2. If, in the opinion of any of the Parties, the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any Party in the Treaty Area or of any other State or territory to which the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article from time to time apply is threatened in any way other than by armed attack or is affected or threatened by any fact or situation which might endanger the peace of the area, the Parties shall consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defence.

3. It is understood that no action on the territory of any State designated by unanimous agreement under paragraph 1 of this Article or on any territory so designated shall be taken except at the invitation or with the consent of the government concerned.

Article V

The Parties hereby establish a Council, on which each of them shall be represented, to consider matters concerning the implementation of this Treaty. The Council shall provide for consultation with regard to military and any other planning as the situation obtaining in the Treaty Area may from time to time require. The Council shall be so organized as to be able to meet at any time.

Article VI

This Treaty does not affect and shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the rights and obligations of any of the Parties under the Charter of the United Nations or the responsibility of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security. Each Party declares that none of the international engagements now in force between it and any other of the Parties or any third party is in conflict with the provisions of this Treaty, and undertakes not to enter into any international engagement in conflict with this Treaty.

Article VII

Any other State in a position to further the objectives of the Treaty and to contribute to the security of the area may, by unanimous agreement of the Parties, be invited to accede to this Treaty. Any State so invited may become a Party to the Treaty by depositing its instrument of accession with the Government of the Republic of the Philippines. The Government of the Republic of the Philippines shall inform each of the Parties of the deposit of each such instrument of accession.

Article VIII

As used in this Treaty, the "Treaty Area" is the general area of South-East Asia, including also the entire territories of the Asian Parties, and the general area of the South-West Pacific not including the Pacific area north of 21 degrees 30 minutes north latitude. The Parties may, by unanimous agreement, amend this Article to include within the Treaty Area the territory of any State acceding to this Treaty in accordance with Article VII or otherwise to change the Treaty Area.

Article IX

1. This Treaty shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the Republic of the Philippines. Duly certified copies

thereof shall be transmitted by that Government to the other signatories.

2. The Treaty shall be ratified and its provisions carried out by the Parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited as soon as possible with the Government of the Republic of the Philippines, which shall notify all of the other signatories of such deposit.

3. The Treaty shall enter into force between the States which have ratified it as soon as the instruments of ratification of a majority of the signatories shall have been deposited, and shall come into effect with respect to each other State on the date of the deposit of its instrument of ratification.

Article X

This Treaty shall remain in force indefinitely, but any Party may cease to be a Party one year after its notice of denunciation has been given to the Government of the Republic of the Philippines, which shall inform the Governments of the other Parties of the deposit of each notice of denunciation.

Article XI

The English text of this Treaty is binding on the Parties, but when the Parties have agreed to the French text thereof and have so notified the Government of the Republic of the Philippines, the French text shall be equally authentic and binding on the Parties.

UNDERSTANDING OF THE UNITED STATES OF
AMERICA

The United States of America in executing the present Treaty does so with the understanding that its recognition of the effect of aggression and armed attack and its agreement with reference thereto in Article IV, paragraph 1, apply only to Communist aggression but affirms that in the event of other aggression or armed attack it will consult under the provisions of Article IV, paragraph 2.

In witness whereof the undersigned Plenipotentiaries have signed this Treaty.

Done at Manila, this eighth day of September, 1954.

PROTOCOL TO THE SOUTH-EAST ASIAN COLLECTIVE
DEFENSE TREATY

Designation of states and territory as to which provisions of Article IV and Article III are to be applicable:

The Parties to the South-East Asia Collective Defence Treaty unanimously designate for the purposes of Article IV of the Treaty the States of Cambodia and Laos and the free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Vietnam.

The Parties further agree that the above mentioned states and territory shall be eligible in respect of the economic measures contemplated by Article III.

This Protocol shall enter into force simultaneously with the coming into force of the Treaty.

In witness whereof, the undersigned Plenipotentiaries have signed this Protocol to the South-East Asia Collective Defence Treaty.

Done at Manila, this eighth day of September, 1954.

THE PACIFIC CHARTER

The delegates of Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Republic of the Philippines, the Kingdom of Thailand, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America:

Desiring to establish a firm basis for common action to maintain peace and security in South-East Asia and the South-West Pacific;

Convinced that common action to this end in order to be worthy and effective, must be inspired by the highest principles of justice and liberty;

Do hereby proclaim:

First, in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter, they uphold the

principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples and they will earnestly strive by every peaceful means to promote self-government and to secure the independence of all countries whose peoples desire it and are able to undertake its responsibilities;

Second, they are each prepared to continue taking effective practical measures to ensure conditions favourable to the orderly achievement of the foregoing purposes in accordance with their constitutional procedures;

Third, they will continue to cooperate in the economic, social and cultural fields in order to promote higher living standards, economic progress and social well-being in this region;

Fourth, as declared in the South-East Asia Collective Defense Treaty, they are determined to prevent or counter by appropriate means any attempt in the Treaty Area to subvert their freedom or to destroy their sovereignty or territorial integrity.

Proclaimed at Manila, this eighth day of September, 1954.

JOINT RESOLUTION TO PROMOTE THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Whereas naval units of the Communist regime in Vietnam, in violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law, have deliberately and repeatedly attacked United States naval vessels lawfully present in international waters, and have thereby created a serious threat to international peace; and

Whereas these attacks are part of a deliberate and systematic campaign of aggression that the Communist regime in North Vietnam has been waging against its neighbors and the nations joined with them in the collective defense of their freedom; and

Whereas the United States is assisting the peoples of southeast Asia to protect their freedom and has no territorial, military or political ambitions in that area, but desires only that these peoples should be left in peace to work out their own destinies in their own way: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.

Sec. 2. The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. Consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.

Sec. 3. This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, except that it may be terminated earlier by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

Approved August 10, 1964.

RESOLUTION

Resolved, That the House of Representatives affirms its support for the President in his efforts to negotiate a just peace in Vietnam, expresses the earnest hope of the people of the United States for such a peace, calls attention to the numerous peaceful overtures which the United States has made in good faith toward the Government of North Viet-

nam, approves and supports the principles enunciated by the President that the people of South Vietnam are entitled to choose their own government by means of free elections open to all South Vietnamese and supervised by an impartial international body, and that the United States is willing to abide by the results of such elections, and supports the President in his call upon the Government of North Vietnam to announce its willingness to honor such elections and to abide by such results and to allow the issues in controversy to be peacefully so resolved in order that the war may be ended and peace may be restored at last in Southeast Asia.

AVAILABILITY AND USEFULNESS OF FEDERAL SERVICES AND PROGRAMS TO ELDERLY MEXICAN-AMERICANS

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Marie C. McGuire has already left enduring monuments of her great work in public housing in San Antonio, Tex., and throughout the Nation. She served as public housing commissioner with distinction and now is program adviser for problems of the elderly and handicapped with the Renewal and Housing Assistance Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Recently she presented testimony to the Senate Special Committee on Aging and made a valuable contribution the understanding of the peculiar problems confronting the aged of Mexican descent who abound in the Southwestern section of our country.

It is a privilege to set for the text of this presentation at this point in the RECORD:

AVAILABILITY AND USEFULNESS OF FEDERAL SERVICES AND PROGRAMS TO ELDERLY MEXICAN-AMERICANS

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, it is a pleasure to appear before this committee for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. With me this morning are two representatives from the *Equal Opportunity Administration of HUD*, Mr. Isaac Rodriguez and Mr. George J. Royball. Also present is Mr. Daniel L. Schulder from the Model Cities Administration. They will be happy to respond to questions you may have in their areas of responsibility.

The hearings of this Subcommittee of the Senate Special Committee on Aging on January 14, 1969 explored reasons for underutilization of HUD's housing programs for the elderly by eligible Mexican-American senior citizens in cities and states with large Mexican-American concentrations. Testimony revealed that in Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado and California some 320,000 elderly Mexican-Americans lived on very limited incomes and yet the number occupying HUD-assisted housing for the elderly was far less than other groups in proportion to their numbers.

Three major problems that might account for or contribute to this situation were developed in the hearings:

1. The lack of emphasis on communication techniques that recognized the language and other barriers to an understanding by elderly Mexican-Americans of the

availability and their eligibility for such housing. It was suggested that improvement in communication could be brought about by the issuance of a variety of brochures in Spanish, and by increased employment of bilingual staff, particularly in HUD regional and local housing authority offices. Local agencies planning housing or dealing with the housing needs of the Mexican-American elderly were encouraged to expand their efforts to include not only the use of Spanish language mass media, but to recognize the necessity of person-to-person contact with those living in substandard housing.

2. The Committee encouraged the further exploration, as well as the demonstration of special housing types and designs that would be more acceptable to elderly Mexican-Americans and more responsive to social customs and traditions.

3. The Committee heard testimony to the effect that housing intended to encourage occupancy by elderly Mexican-Americans should be located in neighborhoods where Spanish is the dominant language, and where the elderly could remain close to their families, friends, churches and shops.

In addition, the Committee expressed its interest in the emphasis being placed on Mexican-American needs in Model Cities, with particular concern that there should be opportunities for participation in the planning process by elderly Mexican-Americans.

Some progress has been made in each of these areas since that January hearing. We have held two meetings with the Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs to explore the specific issues raised by this Committee. We also have met with several local housing authority officials planning new public housing for the elderly in cities where there is a concentration of Mexican-Americans.

IMPROVEMENT OF COMMUNICATION TECHNIQUES

Since our report to this Committee in January 1969, the number of employees with Spanish surnames in HUD has increased from 157 to 182. On August 21, 1969 a meeting was called by the Assistant Secretary for Equal Opportunity and attended by Secretary Romney with approximately 25 Mexican-American community leaders and organizers. The group discussed the availability and applicability of existing HUD programs to the problems of Mexican-American communities and resulted in the airing of specific criticisms of HUD efforts. Thereafter the department followed up to ascertain local performance responsive to the Mexican-American community's needs and interests. This work is continuing.

Meetings have also been held with Mexican-American entrepreneurs to familiarize them with the ways and means to obtain Federal contracts, particularly HUD contracts.

SER (Service Employment Re-development) a Mexican-American organization, activated initially by the Department of Labor in cooperation with the League of United Latin American Citizens and the American GI Forum, has been named the subcontractor on a contract let by HUD's office of Research and Technology to survey and identify minority building trades contractors and develop their potential for participation in the re-development process. This work is under the direction of HUD's office of Equal Opportunity.

Two Mexican-Americans have been added to the Equal Opportunity staff. Both are in professional positions: one is working in a liaison capacity with the Model Cities Administration and the other as the Director of the Job Development Division of the Office of Contract Compliance and Employment Opportunity. HUD has made two surveys of Spanish-American employment within the Department. Thus the Department is seek-

ing improvement in hiring efforts to coordinate a Mexican-American talent bank and jobs available in HUD's Western and Southwestern offices, in cooperation with SER. Lists of job vacancies are forwarded by the HUD Equal Opportunity staff to representatives of various segments of the Mexican-American community who might be able to reach qualified, interested Mexican-Americans.

A number of HUD's public information materials have been published both in English and Spanish. Attached is a list of 53 pamphlets, 16 of which have particular relevance to the housing needs of Spanish speaking people and have been issued in both English and Spanish. While many of these now are obsolete due to legislative changes, updated and new bilingual publications are now becoming available. Four of them are: *A Summary of Fair Housing Laws; How to Become a Non-Profit Sponsor; Equal Opportunity: What It Is, What It Does; and Fair Housing, USA*. Two new publications in both English and Spanish on the Model Cities program will be ready for distribution within 30 days. These are *Model Cities—Questions and Answers* and *A Place to Live—What Relocation Means to You*.

At present, the Radio and TV Division of HUD's office of Public Affairs has available a number of radio spots on fair housing which have been translated into Spanish for use by Spanish language stations. In addition, the Division is now processing English and Spanish film strips on cooperative housing.

All of these materials are designed primarily for use by local agencies and organizations interested in the needs of the Mexican-American people, including the elderly. In these ways, HUD recognizes the need for more and better printed and audio-visual material in Spanish to keep Mexican-Americans better informed about the programs of benefit to them.

It also may be of interest to you to know that bibliographies of historical, social and cultural books on the Spanish-speaking people in this country are under review in order to select pertinent publications for HUD's library.

HOUSING TYPES AND DESIGN

As mentioned above, two meetings have been held with staff members of the Inter-Agency Committee for Mexican-American Affairs to explore the types and designs of housing that in their opinion would be more responsive to the needs or desires of the elderly Mexican-American and which they would more readily accept and use. It was recognized that as in many cities where this Committee held its hearings, the areas of concentration are in the center city, with intense land use of generally low rise structures. While the neighborhoods are at least partially substandard, both the in-town location and structure density result in very high land acquisition costs. For new construction, this situation will often require high-rise development in order to achieve economic feasibility.

While it was generally agreed in our discussions that one-story dwellings for the elderly would be preferable, it was also recognized and agreed that if an educational program were undertaken to explain how high-rise buildings can increase security and comfort, more and more elderly Mexican-Americans could be expected to take advantage of this type of housing. It was suggested that these high-rise structures preferably should not be over six stories. The need for ample walking and sitting space to take the sun was emphasized. Community space for neighborhood social activities would also play an important part in acceptability. Thus neighborhood residents of all ages would gather together at the older person's place of residence, and this would have significant social and cultural benefits.

It was generally agreed, however, that in

order to achieve the acceptance of such a change in living patterns, the educational programs undertaken prior to occupancy, could not rely on mass media alone, but must involve personal meetings with eligible needy elderly and their families.

During these meetings we also explored the concept of a housing development in which only older people live and the acceptance of this pattern by elderly Mexican-Americans. There is some evidence that older Mexican-Americans prefer to live in neighborhoods of all age groups rather than in age-segregated housing, since each age group traditionally has a place and a role in general community affairs. This would indicate that our planning should stress housing designed for the elderly in family housing developments rather than separate from them.

Differences in interior layouts of housing for the Mexican-American elderly also were discussed. We were told that there are numerous special occasions when their families gather at the home of the grandparents. Therefore, our designs should consider arranging the living space so that such gatherings would be possible in comfort. This might mean a combined living-kitchen-dining space to accommodate family gatherings. Such designs probably would not mean an increased cost or an increase in overall space—simply a rearrangement of space. However, we were told that for the elderly Mexican-American woman, it would be absolutely essential to have a private dressing area, and if possible, a sleeping area separate from the larger gathering area. Small, but private outdoor spaces, particularly in warm climates, were considered desirable—designed as an extension of the living area. In high-rise buildings, this relationship to the outdoors might be achieved through a greater emphasis on private balconies. With respect to exterior design, the emphasis was on sturdiness and warmth rather than any special types such as Spanish, Contemporary, Early American, etc.

In connection with the desirability of these planning concepts, HUD's Office of Research and Technology currently is reviewing a proposal to study the relationships of Mexican-American living patterns to house design. This research proposal was designed by *The Institute for Personal Effectiveness in Children*, San Diego, California, under the direction of Uvaldo H. Palomares, the Institute President. The Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs is the sponsoring group. In brief, the study would attempt to develop a solid base for planning policy or change based on substantiating facts from the people affected, rather than relying on opinions of observers.

HOUSING LOCATION

It is the Department's general policy to see to it that all racial and ethnic groups have the opportunity to reside within and without areas of racial or ethnic concentration. We have been in communication with Mexican-American organizations in an effort to develop the most meaningful approach for providing maximum housing opportunities for Mexican-American elderly in local communities.

NEIGHBORHOOD FACILITIES

With respect to neighborhood upgrading, our neighborhood facilities program is making an increasing contribution. Of the more than 70 community centers now in operation, 13 serve areas where Spanish-surname users range from 10 to 95 percent. These cities include:

	Percent
Colorado Springs, Colo. (est.)	60
Pagosa Springs, Colo.	95
Hutchinson, Kans.	10
El Paso, Tex.	95
Laredo, Tex.	90
San Jose, Calif.	28

	Percent
Brawley, Calif.	37
Fresno, Calif. (est.)	35
Visalia, Calif. (est.)	40
Dinuba, Calif.	16
Flagstaff, Ariz.	56
St. Johns, Ariz.	49
Phoenix, Ariz.	22

The Phoenix area will soon open a second center. Both centers will provide transportation over a 35 mile area to and from the centers.

In addition to these, 5 more grant reservations have been approved for construction of centers which will be in operation within the next two years in areas with high concentrations of Mexican-Americans.

Since these centers serve all age groups, their location in these neighborhoods reflect their usefulness to the elderly along with other age groups.

MODEL CITIES

This committee has shown a continuing interest in the Model Cities Program and its potential for increasing opportunities for Mexican-Americans. In previous testimony we submitted a comprehensive list of Model Cities programs developing in a number of cities with large Mexican-American concentrations. We would add to that list the plan in Albuquerque for an "employment over 60 programs," and the Eagle Pass, Texas plan to use 20 older women as home-maker aids to assist other elderly in need of these services.

On October 14, 1969, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Model Cities, Mr. Robert H. Baida, testified before the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Special Committee on Aging on activities to increase emphasis on the needs of the older population in Model Cities areas. Since this is a current statement I would like to include it in the record as the Model Cities' presentation for this subcommittee today.

HOME OWNERSHIP

A word about home ownership. It was pointed out in previous testimony that Mexican-American people generally, including the elderly, put great emphasis on home ownership even though many of these homes were substandard. Rehabilitation aids therefore are of particular significance. While we cannot give you precise statistics by nationality groups, we do know that over 60 percent of the low-income home owners in urban renewal or code enforcement areas who received HUD grants for rehabilitation of their homes were elderly, and over 25 percent of the rehabilitation loans were received by those 62 and over. Grants are available to owner-occupants with incomes of \$3000 per year or under. Those with incomes of over \$3,000 also are eligible if their housing expenses after rehabilitation exceed 25 percent of their income. It is possible to combine the grants with three percent loans if needed to bring the homes up to local code standards.

As previously indicated, we anticipated that the HUD-FHA Sec. 235 home ownership program might have particular significance for the lower income Mexican-American family since it had the potential of a one percent interest rate. We now can report from 13 HUD FHA-insuring offices in the 5 states with large Mexican population. Out of 4,362 firm commitments issued as of November 13, 1969, some 1,229 were to families with Spanish surnames. One of the FHA offices (Santa Ana, California) has conducted counseling sessions in Mexican neighborhoods and as a result, 51 families were told that they would probably be acceptable under the 235 program. An additional 50 reservations have been tentatively set aside for other Mexican-American families participating in the counseling program.

In the 5 Southwestern states, there were 20 builders with Spanish surnames and these builders have reserved funds to cover 343 dwelling units.

REPORTING BY ETHNIC GROUPS

This Committee will be interested to know that effective September 30, 1969, reports to HUD from local housing authorities on applications for and continued occupancy in public housing, will reflect six major nationality groups, including the Mexican-American. In the future, HUD will be able to analyze and report more precisely the utilization of this housing program by several ethnic groups.

HUD-DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The Committee also will be interested in an attachment describing a joint effort by HUD and the Department of Labor to provide jobs and housing in Friona and Hereford in the Texas Panhandle. While this effort is not related to the elderly per se, it could have beneficial side effects in view of the extended family tradition of Mexican-Americans.

It has been a pleasure to present this brief progress report since your earlier hearings.

I LOVE AMERICA WEEK

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I feel proud that my hometown of Pittsburg, Kans., has observed a very important week called I Love America Week. I think it is quite noteworthy the news coverage given to the event by an article in the Pittsburg Headlight Sun as follows:

[From the Pittsburg (Kans.) Headlight-Sun, Friday, Nov. 21, 1969]

I LOVE AMERICA WEEK TO BE CELEBRATED HERE

Joining other communities in the tri-state area, the city of Pittsburg will observe "I Love America Week" next week.

Mayor Rex Bowers Thursday issued a proclamation at the behest of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars and other interested persons. Coming during Thanksgiving week, it is intended to bring out a positive voice in behalf of the country while giving thanks to God for the country in which we live.

Rev. Walter W. Snyder, pastor of the Zion Lutheran Church, explained the week as follows:

The idea behind this was started by Dr. J. B. Simon of Joplin, an optometrist, who felt that there has been too much negative expression in regard to our country. He felt that something positive should be said.

The move to proclaim the week of Nov. 24 through Nov. 30 as "I Love America Week" is non-political, not pro or anti anything. It is intended only as a positive affirmation that whatever the shortcomings of our nation might be, we love it, are proud of it and certainly on Thanksgiving Day should give thanks that we live in such a nation as we do.

Various interested parties from Pittsburg in cooperation with the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars petitioned Mayor Rex Bowers to proclaim the week of Nov. 24 through Nov. 30 as "I Love America Week," in cooperation with other towns and cities in the surrounding area.

The governor of Missouri has been petitioned to issue a similar proclamation for the whole state.

The rash of negative demonstrations has prompted this move as a positive reaction. Posters will be placed in the stores of all co-operating merchants, together with a supply of red, white and blue arm bands to be worn during the week. Citizens are also asked to fly their flags.

Every citizen in his own way is asked to give particular thanks on Thanksgiving Day. Ministers are requested to have special prayers for our nation in the Thanksgiving services and every citizen should use the opportunity to speak positively, constructively and proudly of the nation which has given him the freedom of speech which he exercises.

Also the proclamation:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas: the United States of America is a free democracy, permitting freedom of speech and thought, and

Whereas, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion and interested citizens want to express thanks for living in a free country, and

Whereas, all people should be given the opportunity, without political restriction, to express themselves positively that whatever shortcomings our nation might have, we are still proud to be citizens of such a great land, and wish to express our love for our nation during this time when we pause for a special day of Thanksgiving,

Now therefore, I, Rex Bowers, Mayor of Pittsburg, Kansas, hereby proclaim the week of November 24-30, 1969: "I LOVE AMERICA WEEK", and urge all citizens to express our love for our country, not only this particularly designated week, but each day throughout the year.

Dated this 20th day of November A.D., 1969.

REX BOWERS,
Mayor.

Attest:

City Clerk.

CALL OFF THE WOLVES

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, along with many other Americans I watched the Vice President of the United States articulate his "dissent" in Des Moines and Montgomery. Vice President AGNEW has challenged the news media to do better than it has in the past to present balanced and objective coverage of the day's events. Even his critics agree that the Vice President raised some important questions.

Today, our communications media possesses almost inestimable power. If it is used properly, it can be the most powerful force in the world to bring about social and political progress. If it is abused, it can be one of the most negative forces in society.

Mr. AGNEW's speeches have harkened a warning. He has alerted the public to discriminate between fact and commentary. He has warned the viewer that all television commentators may not be neutral objective in their presentation of the news. And he has challenged the media men to "relate their great freedom with their great responsibility."

Herman Angel, who writes for the Meriden Record, has written an interesting column entitled "We Second SPIRO: Call Off the Wolves." Mr. Angel is the dean of the press corps at the State capitol in Hartford, Conn. He is known around the capital for "telling it like it

is." This column is a good example of Mr. Angel's style. He minces no words.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share his comments on Mr. AGNEW's speeches with my colleagues by inserting his column in the RECORD:

WE SECOND SPIRO: CALL OFF THE WOLVES

(By Herman Angel)

As one who doesn't agree with Vice President Spiro T. Agnew, all of the time, we found ourselves in partial agreement with his Des Moines speech last Thursday evening some of the time.

Agnew criticized the television networks harshly for their habit of immediately following speakers of great national importance, mostly the presidents of the United States, a few minutes after they conclude an all-network address to the nation, with their own specialized comments, taking advantage of the big audiences built up by the expectation that the nation's chief executive may have something of importance to say to everyone.

Before the vast audience, estimated at 70 million people, could digest the speech delivered on Nov. 3 by President Richard M. Nixon, the highly regarded commentators of the three major networks were at him like a pack of wolves.

All of the quotes they could muster from previous Nixon's speeches, some made in the 1963, campaign, quotes that could be used to embarrass the President, were on tap ready for use, and use them they did.

The listeners, for whom the speech was intended, before they could give the President at least an honest consideration, were at the mercy of the so-called commentators on the three major networks.

This was the part of the night's "entertainment" to which we objected, and were heartened by the Agnew speech in which he severely condemned the practice as a danger for American democracy.

We were also quite alarmed at the immediate response that came from the networks on Thursday night, indicating they were just as ready, inserting their alarm over government licenses of radio and television stations as a result of the criticism that came from the Vice President. Agnew, if our memory serves, made no threat against any station or network, but the presidents of the networks, apparently prepared by a copy of the speech issued in advance, jumped at the idea as a means of discrediting the Vice President.

As we have indicated, and want to repeat, we are no blind follower of Spiro Agnew, but we think he scored a point when he referred back to March, 1968, when President Lyndon B. Johnson, heckled furiously and continuously by the same commentators, announced unexpectedly that he would not be a candidate for reelection. The commentators, so ready with their quick and witty remarks on other occasions, were left speechless, only because President Johnson didn't have the foresight to permit them to know in advance what his political plans were for the future.

There is a great deal of difference between newspaper commentary and that practiced, at least on presidents, by the major networks, all of whom seem to ape one another in matters of entertainment and politics. We don't believe it is a conspiracy, just a case of imitation.

In the newspapers, the report of the speech appears as a separate news item, and the commentary appears on the editorial page, mostly in different section. Sometimes the editorial comment appears the same day as the report on the speech, other times, two or three days later. But there is no intention of the part of newspapers to cram down the throats of readers the opinions of one or two editors in the same report of the speech or item of news.

The best judgment in these affairs would be for the networks to allow the listeners time to consider the speeches delivered by a president before rushing to the air waves with their own comments, comments which sometimes destroy everything the president has said. As happened on this occasion, and on Nov. 3.

Agnew probably went too far when he tried to judge the actions of the networks in their presentation of the news, as news. Both President Nixon and Vice President Agnew were carried live, and in full, in their recent speeches, and the networks are in the clear in this regard. Very few newspapers in the nation could spare the space to carry both speeches in full text, although there are some who do.

But the president of the United States is not a shuttlecock for the networks to use in their own game of badminton.

In the present national dilemma in Viet Nam President Nixon is trying to do what others in national United States office have failed to accomplish in 10 years; and the French government was unable to do in 10 years before that.

The least the people can do, and the commentators too, is give him an ample chance to come to terms with a most difficult enemy, encouraged, it now seems by the dissenters.

Until President Nixon uses up a reasonable length of time to accomplish his goal, reasonable people will give him every chance to drag us out of the mud in Vietnam.

ANARCHY DOES NOT JUST HAPPEN—IT IS PLANNED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, two of the three points on which the foundation of this Nation was laid are the family ties and responsibilities, and the willingness to diligently labor to improve ourselves and our position in life. One of the fundamental doctrines of America, the right of social mobility, says that a man can go as far as his ability and his willingness to work will take him. It does not give a guarantee of success, or wealth, or happiness to anyone, nor should it.

But things seem to be changing. Youngsters who are in the process of flunking freshman English, accompanied by the teachers who cannot teach the subject which they failed last year, are streaming behind the pied pipers of the left in their assault on civilization. It seems that government owes everyone a Utopian existence—and the elite intellectuals are quite prepared to plan and deliver it; with the money taken by taxes from the poor fools who still feel that a man should work to support himself and his family.

If it were not sure to be taken seriously by those who have a vested interest in perpetuating their own bureaucracy, the plans being leaked out of the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health, would make good slapstick comedy. They all have one basic premise—the encouragement of total destruction of family life and the destruction of all rewards for work. Unemployment compensation during pregnancy, free

food stamps under HEW jurisdiction, fluoridation of all water, the encouragement of teenage immorality and high school pregnancies, all are designed to aid the indigent and penalize the industrious and worthwhile citizen.

The District of Columbia, whose integrated schools were to be a model for the Nation, has apparently given up even a pretense of an effort to teach the unteachable in its nearly all-black school system, but is prepared to feed two meals a day during the school year, and operate the schools as free meal centers for all the year round. Food offered should be, it is said, "in keeping with the cultural background and food habits of the local people." More and better foods are to go to the "unusually large percentage of low-income families here"—and any such offensive words as "donated" or "not to be sold" are to be deleted, in case anyone can read and might have their feelings hurt by the idea of charity.

Meanwhile the left lauds the values of the Communist style collectives of Israel, called "kibbutzim" there. It would seem that such a total destruction of the family is a thing to be desired, if the glowing accounts of such successes are to be given credibility. But Americans who have not yet been brainwashed still remember that the history of such collectives in this country, as in all of the world, is one of total failure. Even the free-love hippie colonies which abound in some of our cities are not working out too well when it comes time, as it always will, for someone to pay the piper.

Then, finally, as a surprisingly appropriate memorial to the late Robert F. Kennedy, and assisted by a Ford Foundation grant, a group of agitators are roaming the country stirring up the "have-nots" in the never-ending search for the American proletariat with which to man the barricades for the long sought "class war" which no one has ever quite organized in this country. This is the same combination which attracted a little attention by giving huge "readjustment" grants to the Kennedy staffers who were severed from the payroll by the incident in Los Angeles, while the Kennedy campaign debts remained unpaid.

I include in my remarks a potpourri of typical newspaper clippings, showing the ever plainer outlines of the attack on American civilization:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 23, 1969]

PANELS PLANNING WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON NUTRITION URGE SUBSTANTIAL CASH AID FOR THE POOR

(By Marjorie Hunter)

WASHINGTON, November 22.—Substantial cash aid for the poor was strongly recommended today by several panels involved in planning the upcoming White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health.

One panel proposed a guaranteed annual income of "at least" \$5,500 for a family of four. Another recommended \$5,915 as the minimum amount needed.

Such levels far exceed amounts proposed this year by President Nixon and by the President's Commission on Income Maintenance Programs.

The President has asked Congress for \$1,600 for a family of four, plus \$750 in bonus food stamps.

COMMISSION'S PROPOSAL

The Presidential Commission, appointed by President Johnson and headed by Ben W. Heineman of Chicago, proposed last week a \$2,400 minimum income level, without bonus food stamps.

Cash aid for the poor was one of hundreds of recommendations that will be submitted to the White House conference by numerous panels.

The conference, to be held Dec. 2 to 4 at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, was called by President Nixon to recommend ways to meet the nation's nutritional needs, with particular emphasis on the poor.

Dr. Jean Mayer, a special consultant to the President, who is organizing the conference, predicted today that its key recommendations would be implemented "quite quickly."

WILL GO TO WHITE HOUSE

He said the recommendations, particularly those involving money, would be presented to the White House before Christmas for inclusion in the President's budget for the fiscal year 1971, which will be sent to Congress in January or February.

"We'll see rapidly mounting expenditures for food programs," Dr. Mayer predicted.

The panel recommendations, to be considered by the full conference, range all the way from encouraging breast feeding of infants to repeal of all state and local sales taxes on food.

Among the recommendations of the 26 panels are the following:

Unemployment compensation for women during periods of pregnancy when they are unable to work.

Transfer of all food aid programs, such as food stamps, school lunch, surplus commodities, from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

\$125 worth of free food stamps each month to four-member families whose monthly incomes do not exceed \$100.

\$1.5-billion a year in Federal funds for free or reduced-price school lunches and breakfasts.

Fortification or enrichment of such basic foods as milk and grain products, including bread and cereals.

Food preparation centers for the distribution of nutritional meals to invalids, the aged, institutions and schools.

Flouridation of all community water systems.

Mobile food stores to serve the rural poor. Development of new low-cost, nutritional foods, as well as fortified or enriched snacks.

A nationwide surveillance and monitoring system to seek out the hungry or malnourished.

An increase in Federal aid for training of public health nutrition personnel.

\$25-million a year to help develop home gardens in rural areas and small towns.

An increase in the pay or allowances of the "military poor" and the provision of food stamps redeemable in post exchanges.

Family planning information and services for teen-agers, whether married or not, and the repeal of all laws or ordinances that prevent pregnant girls from remaining in school.

There are hundreds of other recommendations, dealing with labeling of foods, research on safety of additives, consumer protection, establishment of food stores in urban slums and special aid to migrants and Indians.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 23, 1969]

ACLU PRAISES DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE ACTION

The Washington chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union yesterday released the contents of a letter to Police Chief Jerry V. Wilson praising the "extraordinary job" performed by Wilson and the force during last weekend's antiwar demonstrations here.

Signed by board chairman Allison W. Brown Jr., the letter says the department's actions "created a standard which should be studied by police chiefs all over the country. . . ."

However, Allison did find minor faults with police actions during the disturbances Friday night in DuPont Circle and Saturday afternoon in front of the Justice Department.

He specifically criticized what he termed "excessive" use of tear gas at the Justice Department.

He also suggested to Wilson that the police had been too quick to use tear gas at Dupont Circle and that some of the civil disturbance units lacked coordination and worked at "cross purposes" on Saturday.

However, reiterating that these were minor complaints made in the spirit of constructive criticism, Allison renewed his praise of the restraint and discipline of the force.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 23, 1969]

TWO FREE MEALS A DAY PROPOSED FOR ALL CITY SCHOOLCHILDREN

(By William L. Claiborne)

Free breakfasts and lunches in their own schools for all children in Washington and transferral of food assistance policy making here from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare were proposed yesterday by the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health.

The need for broad reforms of the District's programs to battle hunger was attributed by the Presidential panel to the unusually large percentage of low-income families here and, because of the absence of representative government, to their inability to effect change in existing food programs.

The chairman of the panel's subcommittee on the District of Columbia said in an interview yesterday that the decision to propose withdrawing food program control from the Agriculture Department stemmed from a belief that existing measures were "ineffective" and that the department is "oriented toward the farmer and not the low-income consumer."

The panel, which will meet next week to condense subcommittee recommendations contained in the voluminous report released yesterday and present them to the President for legislative action, also recommended that:

The supplemental food program be expanded and made so flexible that "any person in need" may be quickly certified for assistance.

By next July, school feeding facilities be used communitywide so that free food is available to other "vulnerable" age groups, such as preschool children, elderly persons and pregnant women.

Major expansion of nutrition training in public, college and post-graduate schools as well as various media and community campaigns to educate the public.

Feeding programs be operational year-round.

The cost of food stamps be reduced significantly and that free stamps be made available to those with very low incomes or no income at all.

Food stamps be issued for the purchase not only of food but items of personal and household hygiene items.

A program be developed to advise parents and day care center operators of their rights to participate in feeding programs.

Foods offered should be "in keeping with the cultural background and food habits of local people." Also, the panel recommended that the word "donated" be stricken from food packages, because of the stigma attached to the term.

Noting that Washington is the only municipality in the nation without self-govern-

ment, the panel emphasized the "responsibility and power" of the federal government to act swiftly on behalf of the city's hungry and impoverished.

However, Dr. Leroy A. Jackson, chairman of the panel's D.C. subcommittee, sounded an unoptimistic note for speedy congressional action on the recommendations.

"Other recommendations of the report may get immediate attention by the localities involved, but we've still got the same old problem of going slowly through the Congress," Dr. Jackson said.

Dr. Jackson said about 15 witnesses from the inner city were heard by his subcommittee and that the consensus was that the federal food stamp program is "basically inadequate" because of the cost of stamps and the lack of flexibility in certification standards.

Also, he said, there are not enough supplementary food distribution centers and that the requirements for supplementary food are too rigid.

The same complaint was recently voiced by City Councilwoman Polly Shackleton, chairman of the Council's health and welfare committee, who publicly assailed "stringent requirements" imposed by the Agriculture Department. A parade of witnesses before the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs also denounced the federal food stamp program, one calling it "government-guaranteed hunger."

Free lunches are available in some District schools to children whose parents are at poverty level and free breakfasts are being experimented with in some schools. However, some schools do not have any lunch facilities at all.

FOR CITY PAY RAISES: DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ASKS CONGRESS TO INCREASE GRANT

(By Irna Moore, Washington Post Staff Writer)

The Nixon administration has suggested to Congress that it consider increasing the federal payment to the District by \$10.8 million to cover the cost of police, fire and teacher pay raises.

Mayor Walter E. Washington, who has proposed an increase in the city income tax and a \$5.2 million additional federal payment to finance the pay raises, sent the city's version of the salary and revenue legislation to Congress Thursday.

A letter from the mayor sent with the bill lists a full \$10.8 million federal payment as "the other alternative" to the income tax raise. That suggestion was reportedly inserted by the federal Bureau of the Budget, which acts as administration spokesman on city legislation.

In earlier statements to the City Council and the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, the mayor offered the combination of income tax and federal payment as his only revenue proposal.

The Budget Bureau and the administration decided to add their suggestion for a number of reasons, several sources speculated yesterday.

Because the legislation raising the salaries of policemen, firemen and teachers stands an excellent chance of passage, both the administration and the mayor are concerned about taking a "fiscally responsible" position by providing a source of funds to pay it. But the administration was reportedly worried that the income tax increase might not win congressional approval, and felt another source of revenue should be suggested.

If no new revenue is approved, the cost of pay raises—\$10.8 million for the rest of the fiscal year—will have to come out of the city's budget. As approved by the House Appropriations Committee Thursday, the budget has already been trimmed by \$27.8 million.

"When the administration knows we're already cut that close to the bone," one city official commented, "naturally they don't

want to see any more budget cuts, especially not anything that might cut the President's crime program."

Another reason for the administration's support of an additional federal payment, the officials added, is the President's April 28 home rule message. In it, the President backed the city's proposal to fix the federal payment at 30 per cent of local revenues—or \$120 million this year.

The revenue bill passed by Congress last month authorized only a \$105 million federal payment. Another \$10.8 million to finance the pay raises would still be well within the President's commitment to \$120 million.

In addition, new income tax legislation must originate in the House, where it could run into trouble. If that happens another official noted, the traditionally more friendly Senate District Committee could initiate legislation to increase the federal payment.

The city actually prefers enactment of increased income tax rates as a solution. While either an additional federal payment or higher income taxes will pay for the cost of the pay raises this fiscal year, new tax rates would also raise \$21.5 million to cover the cost in fiscal 1971.

City officials drew some encouragement for the income tax increase's chances from the House Appropriations Committee report issued with its version of the budget.

After noting that the pay raises and the funds needed to pay for them were not included in the budget, the report quoted without comment from the mayor's letter to the committee outlining his plan to raise the necessary revenue.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 29, 1969]

THE KIBBUTZ: A LESSON FOR AMERICANS

(By Dorothy Rich)

(NOTE.—A kibbutz school is run by the community. The entire kibbutz selects members to serve on the education committee and sends its most qualified people to be trained as teachers. To decide educational issues the kibbutz meets as a whole, hears recommendations and makes its decision.)

The education of children on an Israeli kibbutz is very different from education given to children here. Most kibbutzim are agricultural collectives: people have banded together to work in the fields or to make a product, and to make collective decisions about everything from sharing profits to raising their children.

Children from birth live in their own special quarters. Parents live apart but come to visit or take their children home with them after working hours each day. Both mothers and fathers work full-time and children are cared for by trained nurse-teachers in their special houses.

This is all very different from the American way—yet it works. When something works, even though it's different, it's worth checking into. In fact, there is a renewed interest today in kibbutz education primarily because of the new book, *The Children of Dream*, but also because we have problems that need solving. Can the kibbutz approach help us?

Much of the kibbutz system is inappropriate for American education because of our society's emphasis on individual rather than group concerns. But it is possible to select from the kibbutz approach, to copy and adapt techniques that can be useful to us here.

Aliza Brandwine, an Israeli, has taught on a kibbutz and has been director of the St. Mary's County, Md. pre-school program. She feels Americans can learn from kibbutz education:

A kibbutz school is run by the community. The entire kibbutz selects members to serve on the education committee and sends its

most qualified people to be trained as teachers. To decide educational issues the kibbutz meets as a whole, hears recommendations and makes its decision. For example, if one child has a special talent, a meeting is called to decide whether that child should be sent to a special school.

Here parent programming in schools is based on what principals or P-TA boards think parents want or need. And often only a handful of people show any interest. On a kibbutz everyone knows that he can be effective, that he has a say. Here the tendency is to either leave it to the experts or to feel what's the use.

Kibbutz child-care facilities enable parents to go to meetings and carry out plans. A mother who wants to take a course or go to a meeting here must first find a place to leave her children.

Parents and children have a great deal of time together in spite of living apart. The hours after 4 p.m. each day are devoted to the children. How many American parents spend that much time playing with their kids each day?

All children receive equal educational opportunities. If music or art or dance is thought appropriate for children, then all receive the benefits of this training.

Competition is de-emphasized. Without the push to be first or be best, there are fewer pressures on the child. For example, says Dr. Brandwine, no one on a kibbutz worries if a child isn't reading at age 6.

Personal relationships between people are stressed. If you have a problem about a child, you talk it over. You don't send a note home.

The whole way of life on a kibbutz supports the educational process. Education is used to perpetuate the goals and ideals of the group; the goals are definite and everyone has a stake in seeing them achieved. Children assimilate this sense of "we—not just me" with their milk and their lessons. Another point about growing up in a kibbutz is that youngsters are expected to do real work. With this real involvement in the life around them, there is no juvenile delinquency.

On a kibbutz, everyone is needed and feels it. On a kibbutz, education is really a vital part of the community life. These are the important lessons for American education and the American way of life.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Nov. 25, 1969]

RFK'S MEMORIAL

(By Elizabeth Shelton)

The memorial being built to assassinated Sen. Robert F. Kennedy is no marble monument that the tourist will visit, camera in hand. Instead, it engages people skilled in solving social problems.

Fred Dutton, executive director of the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial described details of the relatively unpublicized project yesterday for the Woman's National Democratic Club. He told how in its first year of operation it already extends from Appalachia to California's vineyards and from Western Indian reservations to Eastern urban ghettos.

Dutton who directed Kennedy's final campaign, described how a VISTA-like corps of 33 RFK fellows, most of them in their mid-20's and trained as professional specialists, are working on subsistence stipends for poverty organizations.

Louis C. Baldanza, 24, of Garfield, N.J., is an architect designing the expansion of existing homes of poor Mexican Americans in San Antonio, Tex. The houses are overcrowded with large families and the remodeling is being done on the frames while the families keep on living there.

David C. Bellows, 25, of Little Silver, N.J., is developing consumer cooperatives and group buying among the Appalachian poor.

He is also trying to find handicrafts that are marketable to raise money to meet some of the needs of the poor whites living in poverty.

Duane T. Bird, 21-year-old Hidatsa Indian from Mandaree, N.D., is in Denver trying to slow the high dropout rate of Indian college students.

Dorothy Foster, 20, from Tuscaloosa, Ala., is developing an experimental black studies curriculum for a tutorial project in Newark, N.J.

Marian Moses, 33, a registered nurse, is assigned to the grape pickers' labor leader, Cesar Chavez, to develop a health services program in Delano, Calif., for migrant workers and to recruit a medical staff.

Mr. and Mrs. David Robinson, 26 and 25, of Tarrytown, N.J., are at the Rocky Boy, Mont., Indian reservation trying to work out a system that will give the Chippewas community control of their children's education. The children are transported 500 miles to an educational system Dutton described as being "as regimented as 'Oliver'."

Part of the memorial is headquartered in Washington. Thirty-five lawyers in private practice are donating free time to the rural and city poor, acting to intercede in their behalf with the federal bureaucracy.

Assisting Chavez' United Farm Workers in attempts to stop Defense Department buying of grapes is one of their projects. Another is helping Navahos set up a bookkeeping system to keep accurate records of their tribal funds.

A Citizens Communications Center has been set up in the Washington office to work toward better and more representative local news coverage by radio and television, particularly in Southern cities where Negroes receive little or no air time.

The RFK Memorial provides day-to-day counseling and assistance to community groups and also administers several grants, one of which is from the Stern Family Fund, to study and evaluate the tactics and strategy of student efforts to change university policies.

The memorial is working with the Center for Community Change, which it helped to initiate. Under a Ford Foundation grant, the center, headed by Jack Conway, is working on development of a Trans-Southern rural economic program; on a project to encourage youths to do research and seek action on social problems; and on a forthcoming report on the problems of American Indians.

A CALL FOR A REEVALUATION OF OUR AFRICA POLICY

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from one of my constituents—Mr. Chris L. Siegler of Elmsford, N.Y.—who has recently completed a 27-month assignment with the Peace Corps in Sierra Leone.

I read this young man's letter with considerable interest and believe that he has not only presented some insight into the current situation in this critical area but has also raised some important and pertinent questions regarding the efficacy of the U.S. policy in Africa.

I deeply appreciate Mr. Siegler taking the time and trouble to share his experience and observations with me and I feel his comments deserve our close and careful consideration. I am pleased,

therefore, to submit Mr. Siegler's letter herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

ELMSFORD, N.Y.,

November 21, 1969.

Hon. Congressman RICHARD L. OTTINGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN OTTINGER: I have just returned from 27 months with the Peace Corps in Sierra Leone, West Africa. This period was an education more significant to me than my entire four years in college. It has provided me with a stimulus to act and a perspective by which to assimilate, judge and evaluate future events. My experiences and my convictions compel me to write this letter to you.

The approach of the Nixon Administration to Africa as outlined by the Secretary of State, Mr. Rogers, to a group of Peace Corps in-country directors was, "The U.S. as a nation is entirely self sufficient without the continent of Africa. Therefore, our policy goals are short term; a commitment to the protection and promotion of American interests on the African continent. We shall revise this policy only under crisis conditions." Congressman, what I seek to urgently convey to you is that this year, this day, this hour is that critical time. Now is the time for positive action. The fires of hate and misunderstanding have been kindled and the wind to enrage and sweep the flames is now blowing.

The African is and has always been a man of great pride. This has always been misunderstood by the white man looking through the eyes of his own white culture. They first saw the African selling his own "brothers" to the white trader, but they did not discern this as the right of the conquering over the conquered. Slaves had been systematized as economic and political institutions in the African society ages before the white man made his appearance. The authority the African chief had over his subjects was a source of pride to his subjects. The African today looks at the achievements of the white civilization. He compares these with his own situation after 200 years of domination by the white man. He senses powers within him which have been denied expression. He believes, and with much justification, that the colonial white is at fault; the colonial white must bear the blame for his present condition... the colonial white.

America as a young nation suffered under colonization. Her people fought and died to attain the freedom and opportunities of independence. The African sympathizes with the American struggle and empathizes with her victory. Yet, today's America confuses him. Today, he sees the great heritage of our country standing side by side with the colonials—Portugal, Britain and France—and sanctioning directly or indirectly the actions of South Africa, Rhodesia and Angola infringing upon the inherent proprietary right of the black man to his own land. To the African America is a picture of jagged contradictions: John F. Kennedy and hope; Nixon and indifference; freedom and independence; Viet Nam and imperialism; Peace Corps and help; the CIA and interference; "liberty, equality and fraternity"; Martin Luther King and racial hatred. They go on and on. The African wants to understand. He wants to believe in America and what we should stand for. But everywhere he looks we are darkening this picture. We grant token acceptance to the Smith government in Rhodesia by maintaining a consulate ("status under consideration"); a Pan American plane is boarded in Ghana's international airport and Mose Tshombe is arrested; Julius Nyerere (perhaps the most progressive and dynamic leader in Africa) makes a visit to Canada and gets not an invitation to Washington but a greeting by

a city Mayor during a stopover at Kennedy airport. The African reads "American aid to Africa to be cut back"—perhaps explained by our embassies, but understood? or, "Nixon makes no mention of Africa in major address to the United Nations." With these evasions as his references the proud but insecure Africa leader asks "why is the United States in Viet Nam?" and "what was the involvement of the CIA in the Dominican Republic, Nkrumah's Ghana or Viet Nam?" These are serious questions to the African demanding and deserving meaningful honest answers from the United States.

A new era is kaleidoscopically unfolding on the dark continent. This is the post independence generation. The bright young people who have been educated overseas but recognize no allegiance to the former colonial masters of their parents. They see, somewhat vaguely, America and Russia (and more so now, Red China)—capitalism vs. communism. Some are bitterly partisan, but many withhold judgment for lack of evidence. This is why I say the critical period is now. These young Africans, the future leaders of their countries, seek a model for themselves and their countries. Russia and communism already have the advantages of not being aligned with former colonial nations and possessing a showpiece of rapid technological advancement in a brief period of time.

The African leader is perched on the edge of a bare framed structure with little or no foundation and exposed to violent pressures from all sides constantly threatening his hold. His country is besieged by myriad economic, social and psychological problems with no sign or hope of immediate rectification. Politically this is an impossible situation. He seeks an intellectual commitment to progress from his people that is neither understood nor accepted. Therefore, he descends to the more basic instinct of pride. He strives for an emotional commitment, to build a personal charisma which rejects any suspicion or his methods while articulating the consciousness of belonging to a particular nation, a pride in the heritage of that nation and a commitment to the protection of that nation through a total effort toward progress of her entire population. Development is necessarily slow as theories are many and untested, and the resources not immediately available. Verbally rebuffing a great nation like America temporarily placates the self-conscious ego of the underdeveloped nation. Most of the African leaders realize they can speak with impunity about either of the great powers as we patronizingly accept any abuse, afraid of losing our already tenuous acceptance on their continent. These affronts enhance the charisma of the leader. One has only to look at Secou Touré of Guinea. He accepted Kennedy, then rejected him in favor of the Russians. When the Russian commune system failed, the Red Chinese were waiting. Now with the economy stagnating and possibly worse than in the beginning, the diplomatic feelers are again going out to the West. And we are standing at the doorstep, flowers in hand (witness the re-invitation and acceptance of Peace Corps). Development in Guinea is stumbling but the personal prestige gained by toying with the world's great powers has entrenched the charismatic Touré. America has never understood the hate and mistrust her mismanaged and misused loans and aid have bred because she has never suffered the humiliation of being forced to ask for or accept charity. Foreign aid from a great power is often construed by the acceptor as a piece of small change rewarded to the beggar for his subservience. This does not have to be the case.

Let us examine some forms of aid sponsored by our government. West Africa contains perhaps the classic example of America's foreign aid futility—Liberia, the laughing stock of West Africa. Liberia is the one nation to which all others can point as being

worse off than they are. America has invested millions of dollars attempting to prime the Liberian economy. We have succeeded in giving Monrovia perhaps the highest cost of living of any black African city excluding Dakar. We have also succeeded in protecting the most preposterous despot and corrupt government on the African continent. In other countries we have stuffed the pockets of thousands of petty political figures by making them the beneficiaries of lucrative AID contracts. We have wasted millions of dollars on thoughtlessly prepared schemes for material aid most of which never reached the people. People sent over as development experts experiment with their theoretical models at the expense of these underdeveloped countries. (I can cite examples for these charges.)

There are, however, some favorable examples. The recent efforts of the World Bank appear to be the product of the recipient country's initiative and a careful analysis by Bank officials. If the execution of these proposals can be accomplished with even minimum efficiency this system would have to be rated the most effective distribution of large aid funds. In a cost analysis the Peace Corps is extremely effective both as an agent of development and a form of good will. The distribution of U.S. embassy aid funds or the supervision of smaller AID schemes by the volunteer insures against the charge of token bribery and facilitates the execution of plans. Perhaps there are even better ways?

What I am pleading for is a re-evaluation of our approach to Africa or more generally the underdeveloped nations of the world. We stress democracy and because of their political heritage they can't understand it. They stress money without stipulation and we can't understand or accept. "From those to whom much is given, much is expected." America must bear the responsibility for understanding the African situation.

The understanding and acknowledgement of the Africa world by John F. Kennedy did more to support America's image as a nation committed to freedom than all the billions of dollars of foreign aid we have squandered. It is now we must renew the challenge of understanding, of extending the symbolic USAID handshake without the palmed dollar bills.

Sir, in these pages, I have tried to present and share something of what my experience taught me. It is something that distresses me deeply—it is an unnecessary situation. I can only hope that I have aroused your curiosity or reinforced your convictions. I thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

CHRIS SIEGLER.

HOUSE TV PROBE BACKS AGNEW

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, when Vice President AGNEW took the TV news media to task in his recent Des Moines speech the anticipated hue and cry from the parties involved was not long in coming. An excellent example of the unfair packaging of news to which the Vice President referred to was illustrated by an article, "House TV Probe Backs Agnew," which appeared in the November 22 issue of *Human Events*, the long established and alert newsweekly here in Washington. The probe cited by the article was a year-long investigation by a special subcommittee of the House Com-

merce Committee which looked into TV's role in the coverage of the 1968 Democratic National Convention.

As is often the case in efforts at misrepresentation, what is omitted is often as important as positive distortions. Selective editing to emphasize a particular theme, as was pointed out in the House report, is a powerful propaganda weapon in the hands of a comparatively few. Selective interviewing is another device extremely useful in slanting a news package.

The Human Events commentary on TV abuses is important as background to be considered in the present controversy over TV news packaging, and for this reason I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

HOUSE TV PROBE BACKS AGNEW

Network officials, liberal senators and much of the East Coast press were in a state of apoplexy last week after Vice President Spiro Agnew's stinging verbal assault on the bias of the TV news media. Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, always warmly treated by the "Nets," decided that Agnew's speech was "an attack designed to pit American against American," because it didn't agree with Teddy's view of the way things are. The network presidents shouted "Censorship!" or its equivalent, though Agnew clearly called for only a fairer presentation of the news. And Thomas P. F. Hoving, a Lindsayite who heads the National Citizens Committee for Broadcasting, proclaimed that Agnew's attack was "disgraceful," "ignorant" and "base."

Yet no amount of hysteria aimed at Agnew could hide the fact that the vice president was right on the mark, as the results of a year-long probe by a special subcommittee on investigations of the House Commerce Committee make clear. Touched on by Agnew in his sizzling spanking of the networks, the report, briefly mentioned on these pages last week, details the prejudiced manner in which TV covered the 1968 Democratic National Convention.

Worked on by a number of staffers and compiled by counsel Daniel Menelli and chief investigator James P. Kelly, the report concludes that: "In an attempt to give an overall impression, it might be said that the coverage presented over the air does, in retrospect, seem to present a one-sided picture which in large measure exonerates the demonstrators and protesters and indicts the city government of Chicago and, to a lesser degree, the Democratic party."

The report strongly suggests that the TV commentators—the same ones that Agnew was discussing—were biased against the "Establishment" from the outset, not only because of ideology but because they were annoyed at the security arrangements and the inconvenience caused by the transportation strikes and lack of facilities.

TV reporters repeatedly condemned the convention arrangements and, as if to bolster their own partisan feelings, would collect remarks assailing "oppressive" police tactics from such left-wing liberals as Shirley MacLaine, Jules Feiffer, Theodore Bikel, Arthur Miller and Paul Newman.

From the facts gathered by the staff investigators, the Menelli-Kelly report avers, "... it would be possible to conclude that the networks had deliberately sought out for interview those with known biased feelings against the conduct of the convention and the city government, some of whom would appear to have questionable credentials as political commentators."

The staff paper also singles out both CBS and its principal commentator, Walter Cronkite, for special criticism. Unlike the other networks, for instance, CBS even "declined to provide the names of the film edi-

tors" so they could be interviewed by House probers. Cronkite, furthermore, not only somberly and monotonously criticized the convention setup but may have distorted the news in other ways as well.

"In viewing the videotape of the CBS convention coverage," the report contends, "the investigators noted a passage in which Mr. Cronkite stated that the police were 'severely manhandling a minister.' The accompanying action shows police merely attempting to get a man dressed in clerical garb into a patrol wagon, using what the investigators felt was reasonable force to overcome the man's resistance."

A review by subcommittee sleuths of the "outtakes"; i.e., film that was taken but never used, "left the investigators with the impression that the significant outtakes contained a predominant amount of material which would have been unfavorable to the demonstrators."

Reel No. 236-109, taken by CBS but not used over the air, was a display of weapons used by the demonstrators against the police. Film No. 236-292, also not used, contains shots of police being stoned.

One of the most astonishing examples of CBS's curious scissoring techniques was in connection with CBS reel No. 20-5, taken on the evening of August 28. The title of this reel was "Arresting of Hippies and Rough Line Between Police and Hippies, No. 2." Says the report: "This presents a night scene in front of the Hilton Hotel, with a live microphone located in a mobile unit. One of the announcers says: 'They are assaulting police lines.' Investigators note that this was the first indication found of any recognition by those covering the event of television that provocation of the police was involved in the subsequent altercation between the demonstrators and police in front of the hotel.

"Because of the communications difficulties arising from a communications strike, this taped material could not be presented over the air until about 45 minutes after the event occurred. When the material was presented over the air, no reference was made to the above-quoted remark, nor was any scene of such an assault visible. Shots of material raining down from the Hilton Hotel onto the heads of the police and news camera crews was also available but not broadcast. The investigators also noted footage showing police cars being stoned by the demonstrators with the police pursuing and capturing at least one of the stone throwers. . . .

"While many of the commentators spoke at length concerning the shock they felt concerning what was happening to the young demonstrators downtown, little or no comment was made concerning profanity, obscene signs and gestures, and physical abuse employed by the demonstrators to provoke the police. . . .

"... Scenes were recorded by the cameras which, at least arguably, might have put a different tone on the broadcasters' coverage of the convention. Crowds were shown in violent and ugly moods. Police were shown being stoned and pelted with rocks and bottles. Obscene signs and language were discernible, both of which might have diminished any sympathy felt for the demonstrators by the average viewer. . . ."

The staff report noted that in the process of fighting a provocative blow can be omitted showing only the counterblow. Thus, an incident may be transformed into the appearance of an unprovoked arrest or attack by the police officer.

"Just such an incident," says the report, "was alleged to have occurred. An informant, who was personally present to witness a disturbance at the corner of Michigan Avenue and Balbo Drive, informed the staff that he observed a demonstrator pick up a wooden sawhorse and hurl it against a police officer. The officer immediately charged the demon-

strator, struck him and took him into custody.

"The informant relates that he and a friend, who also witnessed the event, saw the incident covered on a television news program later that evening. He stated that the coverage did not show the action of the demonstrator in throwing the sawhorse, but showed only the police officer making what now appeared to be an unprovoked assault on a demonstrator followed by an arrest. . . .

"The incident is shown . . . in a book entitled *Chicago Eyewitness* by Mark Lane. [Lane, who has an affinity for far-left causes, is perhaps best known for his efforts to clear Lee Harvey Oswald of any guilt in the assassination of President Kennedy.] This book, which is critical of the Chicago authorities, is illustrated by a number of photographs. One sequence of photographs shows a segment of the crowd, including a uniformed police officer and a plainclothes detective.

"The sequence shows the sawhorse in the process of being thrown, and the subsequent arrest of the demonstrator. The captions to the photographs, however, assert that it is the police officer who is hurling the sawhorse at the crowd. The incident is discussed in Mr. Lane's book, and again it is asserted that the police officer for no apparent reason hurled a sawhorse at the crowd and then arbitrarily arrested a demonstrator.

"Upon inspection of the photographs, however, it seems clear that it is the police officer who is the target of the flying sawhorse. His arms are shown outstretched as if to ward off the object. His hands are extending through the rungs of the sawhorse, in such a way that it appears impossible he could be throwing it. The caption underneath, however, reads: 'Policeman throws sawhorse at crowd.' The 'sawhorse incident,' then, apparently received the 'Lane' treatment when it appeared on TV—just another incident supporting Agnew's thesis of the towering bias in TV news coverage.

TV's distortion of events was also proved earlier this year by FBI and other investigators doing work for the House Agriculture Appropriations subcommittee chaired by Rep. Jamie Whitten (D-Miss.). Delving into the background of CBS's documentary, "Hunger in America," committee investigators discovered that much of what the film claimed was untrue. A CBS narrator, for instance, in perhaps the most dramatic scene in the movie, solemnly stated that a baby he was viewing had just died of starvation. Yet the doctor who pronounced the baby dead told House investigators the baby was not even undernourished and had died from other causes entirely. (See *Human Events*, June 14, page 421.)

EVEN LIBERALS LIKE THE VEEP

The liberal news media is fond of zapping the vice president, but his outspoken opinions have, so far only appeared to increase his popularity. The Gallup poll shows a rise in positive opinion for the Veeep, and he is fast becoming the toast of even Washington, D.C.

Vice President Agnew has asked the public to write the networks and their local stations urging them to present the news in a fair and impartial manner. For your convenience, we are again listing the addresses of the major TV networks:

American Broadcasting Co., 7 West 66th Street, New York, N.Y. 10023. President: Leonard H. Goldenson. ABC News: Elmer Lower.

Columbia Broadcasting System, 51 West 52nd Street, New York, N.Y. 10019. President: Frank Stanton. CBS News: Richard S. Salant.

National Broadcasting Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10020. President: Julian Goodman. NBC News: Donald Meaney.

Reporting on Agnew's reception in the Nation's Capital—before his denunciation of the

TV networks—the *Washington Star* noted in its society pages that while the sympathizers make fun of him for "foot-in-mouth disease," more and more the people on the party circuit are calling him the "voice of common sense in the wilderness."

At the John Slocums supper party to honor historian Dr. David Boorstin, new head of the Museum of History and Technology, the vice president's admirers, said the *Star*, "apparently way outnumbers his detractors.

"And this was no right-wing gathering of Birchites or even one-time Goldwater supporters. A lot of these people were admirers and supporters of Adlai Stevenson. At a table for 10, nine persons agreeing with Agnew's stand on demonstrators and his belief in discipline within the family included Mrs. Dillon Ripley, wife of the progressive head of the Smithsonian; Prof. Alexander Victor of Yale University and his wife, and John Slocum.

"Heyward Isham, a diplomat for whom David Bruce and Nicholas Katzenbach vied when the latter was under secretary of state and the former ambassador to Great Britain, said he was inclined to agree with the vice president."

WHEN IS A SILENT MAJORITY NOT A SILENT MAJORITY?

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, we recently have been treated to an incredible administration propaganda barrage designed to demonstrate that a silent majority of the American people support the President's Vietnam policies. Like all historic governmental propaganda efforts in every country, this administration has shown itself fully willing to distort facts, take inconsistent positions and bully the press to "prove" the correctness of its position. This is, indeed, an alarming phenomenon in our free, democratic society.

The discerning of silent majorities is an occult art which deserves careful scrutiny by Congress and the public.

For example, using one professional telephone poll right after the President's speech to show that 77 percent of the American public supports the President's plan while blithely ignoring the previous in-depth poll taken immediately prior which shows public approval of Senator GOODELL's scheduled withdrawal plan is highly questionable on grounds of simple honesty. Ignoring as well the Harris September 29 poll showing only 35 percent for the President's handling of the war hardly adds to the administration's credibility.

Then, there is the administration's handling of congressional action as an index of public sentiment. The President and Ambassador Lodge loudly proclaim the sponsorship in the House by 300-odd Members of a resolution supporting his "pursuit of a just peace in Vietnam" as a sure-fire reflection of American support. On the other hand, when the Senate rejected the Haynsworth Supreme Court nomination 55 to 45, the President showed no hesitation about taking to the airwaves to announce his certainty that the decision was not supported by the

silent majority of Americans. The President really cannot have it both ways, at least not believably.

The gulf of the credibility gap grows wider daily, challenging the incredibility of the Johnson administration in its frequent proclamations that we were winning the war. The situation would be humorous if the issues involved were not so deadly serious. When the government in a democratic society cannot be believed, the state of freedom of that society is rendered highly insecure.

The icing on the mud pie is the production by the U.S. Information Agency of the propaganda film proclaiming a silent majority supporting the President on the war. The film is so blatantly distortive and propagandistic as to render it ludicrous. Besides undermining our credibility with the 104 countries in which it is to be shown, the film will do great damage to the acceptability of all of our other information activities. Those foreigners who have been relying on our news broadcasts for their only factual presentation of world events will be given good reason to doubt their authenticity.

The propriety of the American Government producing films editorializing on the grandeur of the Vice President and the infallibility of administration policies is highly questionable, to say the least. I think it does our interests untold damage.

The issues presented by the administration's foray into propagandistic bombast is well analyzed in the article by Clayton Fritchey in the New York Post of November 24, 1969, which I submit herewith for insertion in the RECORD:

THE SEMI-SILENT

(By Clayton Fritchey)

WASHINGTON.—The most remarkable thing about that new U.S. Information Agency film, which shows that President Nixon's Vietnam policy is backed by the "great silent majority" of Americans, is not so much what went into it, as what was left out.

The star of the USIA production, which will be seen in 110 countries, is Dr. George Gallup. He is described in the film as a "researcher respected for his objective approach," and as the author of a public opinion poll taken after the President's Nov. 3 speech on Vietnam.

Gallup is shown telling a USIA interviewer that his poll found that "a large majority of the American people supported the President's policies," and that "a large majority of the public favored the President's program for troop withdrawals." But Gallup was not asked about, nor did he refer to, another poll he took several weeks ago which showed just the opposite.

In October, Gallup tested reaction to the resolution introduced by Sen. Goodell (R-N.Y.) calling for the withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Vietnam by the end of next year. The proposal was promptly denounced by Nixon as "defeatist." Nevertheless, Gallup found the public approved the Goodell plan by almost 2 to 1, or 57 to 31 per cent, to be exact.

Now, however, Gallup is reporting that his organization made a snap telephone survey of 501 adults after the President's speech, and discovered that 77 per cent favor Nixon's stand against any time limit for troop withdrawals.

With Vice President Agnew denouncing television and the press for lack of "objectivity," the USIA did not choose the best moment to produce and distribute this dubious example of thinly disguised administra-

tion propaganda. It will not improve the agency's reputation for credibility, nor Gallup's either, for that matter.

On Nov. 13, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge told the Communist delegation at the Paris peace talks that, "recent opinion polls in the U.S. make it clear" that the "vast majority of the American people" supports Nixon's war policy. But Lodge must know by this time that Hanoi makes a point of monitoring U.S. public opinion polls for itself.

On Nov. 12, the day before Lodge spoke, Gallup reported as follows: "The extent to which the public's views on the Vietnam war have changed over the last two years is dramatically seen in the shift from the 'hawk' to 'dove' position since 1967. Hawks outnumbered doves in a December 1967 survey, 52 to 35 per cent . . . In the latest Gallup survey . . . almost the exact reverse is true: doves outnumber hawks 55 to 31 per cent."

In the USIA film, Gallup tells the world that the American public by a 6-to-1 ratio "thinks demonstrations do more harm than good." Almost simultaneously, pollster Louis Harris reported that Americans "by a relatively narrow 45 to 37 per cent were not in sympathy with the first Moratorium Day demonstration on Oct. 15" but a large majority has had second thoughts. He says 81 per cent have since concluded that "the anti-war demonstrators may not be entirely right, but they are raising real questions which ought to be discussed and answered."

Last month, Gallup reported that Nixon's "popularity rating had declined over four consecutive surveys." Harris (on Sept 29) said: "In his handling of the Vietnam war, the President has hit a new low with the public of only 35 per cent positive, down 12 points since June."

So what is the truth about the majority, silent or otherwise? Nobody knows for sure. Almost anything can be "proved" by the polls; and it might be noted that LBJ also flaunted them when they were favorable and spurned them when they weren't. Nixon displays 50,000 telegrams to show he is right. His critics produce 250,000 marchers to show he is wrong. And so it goes.

TENNESSEANS RALLY TO AGNEW'S CALL FOR OBJECTIVE NEWS BROADCASTING

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, despite the frenzied reaction of the national networks, and hostile editorials in some Washington papers, Vice President Spiro Agnew's recent speech on the need for fairness in network news coverage has been enthusiastically applauded by many responsible members of the press, and by thousands of concerned citizens.

As evidence of this, I cite the two following editorials. The first appeared in the November 15 issue of Mr. James Stahlman's outstanding Nashville Banner, the second in the November 14 Chattanooga News-Free Press, a highly respected newspaper from my home city. I can affirm that these two excellent editorials reflect the feelings of a majority of Tennesseans on the basis of the many letters, wires, and phone calls my office received supporting the Vice President and applauding his speech. The editorials follow:

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, Nov. 15, 1969]

THE GREEKS HAVE A WORD FOR IT—
SPIRO T. (FOR TIGER)

Vice President Spiro T. Agnew dropped the other shoe Thursday night; and by screams of anguish from the TV network people you know it landed squarely on target. Without pausing for station identification, or a gas-pain commercial, they went into instant replay of self-interview to exonerate their simon pure, impartial, and wholly objective selves.

They don't care for Mr. Agnew. He does not lend himself to the pliability required of their favorite political heroes—and on camera has what is to them the nasty habit of speaking his own mind, and adhering to his own script. Besides, he doesn't believe either that a handful of sponsored thespians—photogenic or not—acquire infallibility with the broadcasting license granted; or are employed in that capacity to advise on policy or run the country.

And he says so bluntly—not via the lifted eyebrow, the quizzical smile, the sneer, or the nuance of a word in tones from the mellifluous to the sepulchral. He comes right out with it, as in his speech at Des Moines. He took these self-appointed oracles apart, and, though the network technicians went swiftly and frantically to work to reassemble the fractured vanities, even to their fan clubs they will never be the same again.

Previously he had pricked the bubbleheads in general, their rivals and kindred policy-needlers in that "intellectual" miscellany; and millions cheered that overdue public deflation. But he saved the best for the last, blowing the fuse on three channels simultaneously.

There is nothing wrong with television, per se, that a recovered sense of responsibility and perspective on the part of network management and big name commentators could not correct. The Vice President was not assailing it as an industry—and certainly, as he made perfectly clear, was not advocating government censorship. He was pointing out the aberrations inflicted and the dangers through reckless abuse of self-appropriated prerogatives, by those seeking in it to wield a power never delegated by law or license.

"The purpose of my remarks tonight," he said, "is to focus your attention on the little group of men who not only enjoy a right of instant rebuttal to every presidential address, but more importantly wield a free hand in selecting, presenting and interpreting the great issues of our nation. . . . We cannot measure this power and influence by traditional democratic standards, for these men can create national issues overnight. They can make or break—by their coverage and commentary—a moratorium on the war. . . . Certainly, it represents a concentration of power over American public opinion unknown in history."

Vice President Agnew has rendered his nation a service—via the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

The instant yelp from network television's side indicates that he hit his mark. A concerned America applauds. As David won't be saying to Chet, "Good Morning, Spiro."

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) News-Free Press, Nov. 14, 1969]

AGNEW'S MOST IMPORTANT SPEECH

It had needed saying for a long time. Vice President Spiro T. Agnew showed last night that he was just the man to say it well.

He called attention pointedly to the frequent unfairness of the three television networks in their coverage of public affairs.

Often, the handful of network newsmen distort and disparage by indirection. Mr. Agnew said it this way: "A raised eyebrow, an inflection of the voice, a caustic remark

dropped in the middle of a broadcast can raise doubt in a million minds about the veracity of a public official or the wisdom of a government policy." This is the way the attack is most effectively carried on, by snide implication. Sometimes however, it is more direct, with stacked presentations, propagandistic rebuttal or the showing of only one side.

Why is this so important, important enough for a Vice President to speak on it?

The importance is that America runs on public opinion. And since there are only three national TV networks, they have great power to mold public opinion, and they do not always do it fairly.

It is not just that "one side" has been victimized. As Mr. Agnew said, "Every American has a right to disagree with the President of the United States, and to express publicly that disagreement. And he made it clear he is not seeking censorship. He raised the vital question, however, of "whether a form of censorship already exists when the news that 40 million Americans receive each night is determined by a handful of men responsible only to their corporate employers and filtered through a handful of commentators who admit their own set of biases."

That's why it's important.

Some newspapers are unfair, too. But most newspapers present their views on their editorial pages and offer straight news in the rest of the paper. And there are thousands of newspapers, with the influence of most of them being limited to their localized circulation areas. With TV it's different. When only three networks blanket the country, presenting programs that may be received broadly and effortlessly, their power to propagandize and influence is tremendous.

Mr. Agnew asked how many "marches" there might have been if there had been no TV cameras. Undoubtedly, the availability of TV and other news coverage has encouraged many demonstrators. But it must be recognized that though this is a fact, marches and demonstrations and other events—though distasteful—cannot go unreported just because their perpetrators are news conscious. News is any significant variation from normal standards, whether the variation is for good or bad. No one should ask that certain type of news be covered and certain types be ignored, but only that there be fairness and accuracy in covering it all.

Some news is, by its very nature, partisan. Mr. Agnew's speech, for example, certainly expressed his opinion, just as a speech by former Vice President Hubert Humphrey would express a different attitude on many issues. The desire is not to have either viewpoint ignored but to have each given honest presentation. Unfortunately, on too many occasions that has not been done. Or when coverage of the event has been given, an effort to refute or twist or rebut or discredit often has been closely connected with it.

The networks, of course, didn't like Mr. Agnew's appropriate criticism.

CBS President Frank Stanton called Mr. Agnew's remarks "an unprecedented attempt . . . to intimidate a news medium which depends for its existence upon government licenses." It was nothing of the kind. Is any criticism of network news "intimidation?" Is TV propaganda and brainwashing and forced feeding of the public supposed to go unmentioned so no one will cry "intimidation?"

NBC President Julian Goodman said the Vice President's speech was "an appeal to prejudice." Quite the contrary, it was an appeal for TV news not to be prejudiced.

ABC President Leonard H. Goldenson was less committal, saying he is "fully confident in the ultimate judgment of the American public." The first expressions of judgment by the people indicated applause and approval of Mr. Agnew's speech and appreciation of its importance.

The three networks are in a constant battle for pre-eminence, each jealously and covetously seeking to attain and retain high ratings of public attention to their schedules. The news programs of the networks often are the most interesting of their presentations, the most important of all they do.

Isn't it a wonder, then, that at least one of the networks—if not all three—has not come up with the ultimate "gimmick" to attract and hold the top TV news audience? What is the one thing that a network might possibly do to gain the greatest confidence and loyalty of the news-viewing public? Why, it's very simple.

Why doesn't at least one network just "go straight" and present a clear news report giving fair and full expression to all sides, with no hatchet jobs, no brainwashing?

It might be surprising how popular this honest approach would be with the American people.

POLITICAL PERSPECTIVE: MONEY AND POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

HON. FRED SCHWENGL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGL. Mr. Speaker, the League of Women Voters believes that part of the citizens' political education is learning the facts of life about the costs of political campaigns. "Political Perspective: Money and Political Campaigns" is a taped interview with Dr. Herbert Alexander, director of the Citizens Research Foundation and former Director of the President's Commission on Campaign Costs, bringing out some of the reasons political campaigning now runs into big money and what new methods are being used to tempt political contributors to help meet rising costs.

A transcription of the League of Women Voters' program on this subject follows:

POLITICAL PERSPECTIVE: MONEY AND POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

Participants in the program in the order they are heard:

Dr. Herbert Alexander, Director of the Citizens Research Foundation and former Director Presidents' Commission on Campaign Costs.

Torrey Baker, former broadcaster Voice of America.

ALEXANDER. Political costs in this country have increased in the past few years. . . . In 1964, we estimated all political costs at all levels were about two hundred million dollars. This includes running for office from the White House to the state house to the court house. Many people think this is a lot of money. Actually, it is much less than we spend each year in this country on chewing gum or cosmetics.

BAKER. The voice you just heard was that of Dr. Herbert Alexander, Director of the Citizens Research Foundation. I am Torrey Baker speaking to you on behalf of the League of Women Voters and bringing you Political Perspective—Money and Political Campaigns.

A major problem of political parties—and individual candidates—is raising money—money for billboards, for spot announcements on radio and television; money to rent offices and hire speech writers; money to get from place to place. Money is always a problem.

Or perhaps the problem is making the giv-

ing and using of political money respectable. Many people still think that those who contribute money to politicians do so only to buy favors ranging from the fixing of a parking ticket to an assignment as ambassador to some glamorous country. Dr. Alexander does not entirely agree.

ALEXANDER. Some people may want a particular job, may want contracts; some individuals do have axes to grind in the contributions they make. Many of the people who do contribute seek not necessarily a specific appointment or policy but rather the good will of the party or of the individual who will be in public office. Often what the individual who contributes in large sums seeks is access to the U.S. Senator, to the Governor in order to be able to present, to articulate his point of view, to receive what he hopes will be a sympathetic hearing and to insure that his voice will be heard in final determination of public policy.

I think the contributor gets some kind of gratification for his contribution even if it is only a five or ten dollar contribution. He may believe in the policies that are advocated by the candidate or just one policy that is of prime importance to that individual, and he would like to see it carried out.

Many contributors give to the party out of habit. Contributing is a form of political participation. In our affluent society it is sometimes easier for a person to contribute money than it is to contribute time, and money can be considered a substitute for volunteering service and time to the candidate or party of your choice.

BAKER. So people give to a political party or candidate for a variety of reasons—through habit—because they want to get something for themselves—or because they truly believe in a particular candidate or a particular political party. We asked Dr. Alexander how many people give and who are they?

ALEXANDER. In 1964 there were about 12 million contributors to candidates and parties and committees at all levels. This may seem like a lot. It's about 17% of those who voted. There were more than 70 million voters at the presidential level in 1964. Nevertheless the 12 million who contributed at some level in 1964 represent a tremendous advance over the handful of wealthy individuals who may have supported the candidacy of a president . . . at the turn of the century when politics was supported largely by a few wealthy individuals or before that by a few wealthy corporations.

BAKER. In spite of the improvement, Dr. Alexander does not believe that enough people give.

ALEXANDER. I believe that it is important that we increase the numbers of contributors. It is not an impossible task in our affluent society. In 1964 political costs were two hundred million dollars. If twenty million individuals gave an average of ten dollars each, we would have been able to achieve that result without undue reliance upon special interests or large contributors. The system has been such in the past that the bulk of the money has come from the large contributors, but it would minimize regulatory problems; it would minimize ethical problems for the parties and candidates if we were able to achieve larger numbers of small contributors.

BAKER. If it would minimize ethical problems for the parties and for the candidates to have the bulk of the campaign money come from a large number of small contributors, what have the parties done to encourage this, and what has happened?

ALEXANDER. It happens that the Republican National Committee . . . has a very successful mail drive for ten dollar contributors. . . . It has good success in attracting large numbers of contributors and in 1966 and 1967 raised more than three million dollars from more than two hundred and fifty

or three hundred thousand contributors. This is the largest number of contributors that any party at any level has ever had in American history. The Democrats have not been as successful as the Republicans in mail drives. The problem with mail drives is that while the national committee may carry it on successfully it is a costly effort. And it is not conceivable to me that the national committee of a party can successfully raise money through mail and that the fifty state committees, and three thousand county committees of that same party can also competitively be successful in raising money through the mails. There are certain advantages at certain levels to certain kinds of fund raising campaigns. I think the effort at the national level can be directed toward mail campaigns. State parties are most successful probably in running large fund raising events at perhaps a hundred dollars a ticket. At the local level, the parties can organize door-to-door drives and both parties have had these sometimes successfully. The "Dollars for Democrats" program is known to Democrats throughout the country, and the Republicans have had successful "Neighbor to Neighbor" drives in which the local party organizations recruit solicitors to go door-to-door to raise money for the party.

One of the greatest problems is—as in all fund raising personal solicitation is the most effective and the problem is to get enough solicitors—that is to recruit enough volunteers to ask enough other people to give to the party or the candidate of their choice. There are in this country, for example, a hundred eighty thousand election districts. If each party had an average of ten solicitors in each election district across the country, this means that each party would need a minimum of one million eight hundred thousand solicitors. We simply don't have the volunteered manpower available for this kind of massive solicitation.

BAKER. A discussion of raising money for politics brings up the question of restrictions on the amount that can be given.

ALEXANDER. There are under federal law limitations on the amount that any one individual can give to any one candidate or committee, that is, a five thousand dollar limitation. Actually an individual can contribute up to five thousand dollars to as many candidates and as many committees as he desires. So it is still possible at the federal level to contribute fifty or one hundred thousand dollars to, for example, a presidential campaign by the device of contributing up to the maximum of five thousand dollars to a number of committees, to the farmers for candidate Jones, to the lawyers for candidate Jones, to the doctors for candidate Jones, and so on.

BAKER. There are restrictions on the amount that can be spent as well. Dr. Alexander doesn't believe such restrictions are wise. Instead he urges a more positive approach.

ALEXANDER. I don't think there should be restrictions on the amount that can be spent in politics. I think we have sufficient restrictions and prohibitions and limitations and . . . we'd be better off if we thought rather in terms of establishing minimal floors so that opposing candidates will have at least minimal access to the electorate. I think we have got to think in terms of some—achieving some equality of access for candidates to the electorate rather than putting artificial limitations on the amounts that can be spent.

BAKER. There are several ways of helping candidates and parties get their message to the public on an equitable basis. Dr. Alexander mentions some of them. Free time on radio and television, for example . . .

ALEXANDER. Since the cost of radio and

television is so high. I think it might be desirable that stations be encouraged to give more time.

BAKER. State subsidized brochures and literature . . .

ALEXANDER. I think that Oregon has an interesting practice of distributing to every registered voter a publicity pamphlet which includes a page which is made available to each candidate for each office. . . . This is done in both the Democratic and Republican primaries separately . . . and it is also distributed through the mail at the cost to the state of Oregon for the general election period to each registered voter.

BAKER. State action giving tax incentives for political contributions . . .

ALEXANDER. Four states of the Union—Minnesota, California, Missouri, and Hawaii—permit inhabitants of the state to deduct from their income tax, from their state income tax, amounts up to one hundred dollars contributed to political parties or candidates. There have been many similar proposals at the federal level for either tax deductions or tax credits.

Another way in which governments . . . can assist parties and candidates is through providing subsidies. . . .

The subsidy need not necessarily take the form of a direct grant of cold cash. It can take the form of provision of services . . . For example, the British subsidy is, in part, through the provision of a mailing privilege for each candidate so that he can make one mailing to each potential, to each registered voter.

Other ways in which the government can provide services rather than cash are through government systems to register voters and to get them to the polls.

I think that the act of government encouragement dignifying and sanctioning the act of contributing would be an important one in instilling the notion that it is the duty and responsibility of every individual in a democracy to contribute in some way to the party or candidate of their choice. If not in the volunteering of time, in the volunteering of money to help support the political system.

I happen to believe that politics is important. I believe that it is important that candidates and parties have the opportunity to reach the electorate. . . . I think we should have our politics all the time and I think we've got to come to the point of recognizing that it requires substantial support from the American people.

BAKER. It is on this positive attitude—that the expense of nominating and electing officials is an inevitable cost of democracy—that we conclude our interview with Dr. Herbert Alexander of the Citizens Research Foundation.

This is Torrey Baker speaking to you on behalf of the League of Women Voters, bringing you Political Perspective—Money and Political Campaigns.

BLYTHEDALE CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 25, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the rehabilitation of injured and chronically ill children is a vital part of our national health effort, but it is a part which too often goes unnoticed. An institution which has led the way in caring for handicapped and injured children is Blythedale Children's Hospital in Val-

halla, N.Y. The very human story of Blythedale was told in an excellent New York Times article by Nan Ickeringill and I present it herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

BUT WHEN THEY'RE BETTER, SOME CHILDREN HAVE NOWHERE TO GO

(By Nan Ickeringill)

VALHALLA, N.Y.—Carol Anne, 7 years old, who has suffered from arthritis since the age of 3 months, was taking her first wobbly steps supported by crutches.

Jeff, 16, paralyzed from the waist down as the result of an accident, was propelling himself toward the dining room on his stretcher-on-wheels, driving with the careless expertise of a sports car enthusiast.

Lorraine, 7, victim of a hit-and-run automobile accident that had left her with some brain damage, was singing "Ring Around a Rosie" as she danced unsteadily around a stack of trays.

And all 92 beds at Blythedale Children's Hospital were empty.

The accent at Blythedale is on living, not on illness. Even one day in a hospital is too long, and these children have already spent long periods in other hospitals before coming to Blythedale for an average of 130 days of rehabilitative care.

Because movement is freedom, every child is given some form of wheeled conveyance. If he can only move a finger, he can move around Blythedale's gaily colored corridors in an electric wheel chair. And everything from schoolwork to sports can be accomplished from the stretcher-on-wheels known as the Blythemobile.

STREET CLOTHES FOR SCHOOL

There is school every day from 9 to 3, interrupted, as necessary, by therapy. The children wear street clothes, not pajamas, so that huge casts and braces become somehow less obvious. All meals are taken in the dining room, not in bed. And there are recreation periods when the children play anything from pool to Ping-Pong, adjusting the rules according to the degree of handicap of the players.

All the bedrooms lead directly out-of-doors, where fresh air and kite flying help blow away thoughts of hospital.

It is not unusual to find babies, dogs, cats and even goldfish visiting the hospital at all hours of the day. This is part of an effort to keep the hospitalized child feeling like an active member of his family. It is all too easy to consider a hospital stay some form of punishment.

The children also go off on home visits whenever possible. This has a two-fold purpose: To keep the child from being cut off from his home and to help the family adjust to his increased capabilities. If a mother continues to do everything for a child who is learning to dress himself and even walk with the aid of braces, then hospital's efforts could be wasted.

The patients range in age from a few months to 18 years. The youngest child ever admitted was three weeks old. He had some 15 fractures just caused by the birth process.

Preschool children live in a more circumscribed world than the older patients—a nursery full of blocks and rocking horses and playpens. Here, as in the rest of the hospital, the sounds are generally joyful, so that it is easy to overlook the fact that the little boy tensely balancing blocks has both legs in braces spread apart by an iron bar; that the baby in the playpen has a huge cast beneath his diaper; and that the child caroling "Old MacDonald Had a Farm" in recognizable form was so badly injured by a truck that when he arrived from his previous hospital all he did was grind his teeth and dig his nails into his palms until they bled.

A majority of the children are from poor families. Robert Stone, executive director of the hospital, thinks this is because private physicians are not as aware of Blythedale as are the social service departments of hospitals to whom the poor must apply for help.

FINANCIAL AID FOR PATIENTS

The cost at Blythedale is \$55 a day, so almost no one pays his own bill. The care is covered under Medicaid's catastrophic illness

clause—to the extent of \$46 a day. The balance is made up partly by the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies and partly by personal donations from members of the hospital's board of directors.

The problem of caring for victims of chronic and long-term illness is becoming greater all the time, as medicine saves more and more children who, in the past, would have died from such diseases as cystic fibrosis and cerebral palsy.

Another pressing problem is that of children with nowhere to go when they are ready to be discharged. Some of the patients at Blythedale are there because of parental abuse; some have families that don't want to have anything to do with a chronically ill child. As lovable little Keicia, age 3½, wound her arms around him, Mr. Stone looked helplessly over the child's shoulder. "I could release her tomorrow if only she had somewhere to go," he said.