

President Nixon specifically linked the two in his August 8 message on domestic program reform.

This tax-sharing proposal was pledged in the campaign; it has long been a part of the platform of many men in my own political party—and men in the other party as well. It is integrally related to the national welfare reform. *Through these twin approaches we hope to relieve the fiscal crisis of the hard-pressed State and local governments and to assist millions of Americans out of poverty and into productivity.* (Emphasis added.)

The tie between these two proposals is attributable to:

1. A philosophical kinship, involving the decentralization of power and initiative to lower levels of government and ultimately to individual citizens in need.

2. Fiscal complementary, with both programs providing relief from pressures on State and local budgets; and

3. Governmental systems reform, with revenue sharing strengthening political institutions and welfare reform ensuring the well-being of poor people.

Welfare is one of the largest and fastest growing areas of State and local expenditures, having risen 56% from 1965 to 1968. Removing welfare from the burner of State-local financial problem areas would, like revenue sharing, free both monetary and personnel resources to better cope with other problems.

Assuming State and local governments devote the same relative share of the resulting increase in funds to education as in the immediate past, it is reasonable to expect that roughly two-fifths of revenue sharing funds would find their way into education.

To summarize, the Administration's welfare reform, Food Stamp, and revenue sharing proposals in their first five full years of effect are designed to channel an estimated \$40 billion to \$45 billion of the Federal Government's growth dividend into the solution of the stubborn social problems of the poor and the alleviation of the fiscal problems of hard-pressed State and local governments.

Thus, I think it can be demonstrated that the Nixon Administration is committed to solving problems—not just talking about them. With your active support, we can look forward to:

- More effective programs;
- More responsive institutions; and
- More involved citizens.

TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13270), the Tax Reform Act of 1969.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, what is the pending business as the Senate prepares to recess?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the amendment of the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF).

RECESS UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, December 6, 1969, at 9 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 5, 1969:

NATIONAL HIGHWAY SAFETY BUREAU

Douglas William Toms, of Washington, to be Director of the National Highway Safety Bureau, vice William Haddon, Jr., resigned.

U.S. ATTORNEY

John L. Briggs, of Florida, to be U.S. attorney for the middle district of Florida for the term of 4 years, vice Edward F. Boardman, resigned.

William J. Schloth, of Georgia, to be U.S. attorney for the middle district of Georgia for the term of 4 years, vice Floyd M. Buford, resigned.

Eugene E. Siler, Jr., of Kentucky, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Kentucky for the term of 4 years, vice George I. Cline.

U.S. MARSHAL

William M. Johnson, of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Georgia for the term of 4 years, vice James E. Luckie, resigned.

U.S. CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

John J. Gibbons, of New Jersey, to be a U.S. circuit judge, third circuit, vice Gerald McLaughlin, retired.

U.S. MARSHAL

Loren Wideman, of Florida, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Florida for the term of 4 years, vice Guy W. Hixon, resigned.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of section 8962, title 10 of the United States Code:

Lt. Gen. James W. Wilson, ~~xxx-xx-xxxx~~ FR (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

IN THE NAVY

Having designated Rear Adm. Eugene P. Wilkinson, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Vice Adm. Arnold F. Schade, U.S. Navy, for appointment as Navy senior member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 711.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate December 5, 1969:

U.S. ATTORNEY

James H. Walsh, of Florida, to be U.S. attorney for the middle district of Florida for the term of 4 years, vice Edward F. Boardman, which was sent to the Senate on June 11, 1969.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

William R. Ford, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, vice William H. Crook, which was sent to the Senate on December 1, 1969.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate December 5, 1969:

U.S. MINT

Hildreth Frost, Jr., of Colorado, to be assayer of the Mint of the United States at Denver, Colo.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NEW SCHOOL HONORS MEMORY OF TWO CONGRESSMEN BATES

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, tributes continue to be paid to our late beloved colleague, the Honorable William H. Bates of Massachusetts. On Veterans Day, November 11, 1969, the cornerstone for the new Bates Elementary School was laid in appropriate ceremonies in his home city of Salem.

Not only does this school honor the memory of Bill Bates, whose death on June 22 last, deeply saddened all of us, but it also honors his distinguished father and former mayor of Salem, Congressman George J. Bates, whose sudden

death in a plane accident here in Washington on November 1, 1949, led to his son's election as his successor.

I am advised that the Bates Elementary School is being constructed on Kernwood Avenue land donated to the city of Salem by the Kernwood Country Club. The \$2,500,000 structure is scheduled for completion and dedication in September of 1970 and will be one of the most well-appointed schools in Massachusetts. Its 22 classrooms will provide for three kindergarten classes and 19 classes from grade one through grade six.

In addition, there will be several rooms for special type classes and guidance purposes, a large community hall-gymnasium, and another hall combined with a cafeteria lunch area. Indeed, it appears that this new Bates School will fulfill the hope expressed at the cornerstone laying, that it will be a "worthy

monument" to the memory of two outstanding public servants, Congressmen George and William Bates.

Mr. Speaker, I feel the RECORD should include the following newspaper account of the Veterans Day ceremony at Salem, Mass.:

[From the Salem (Mass.) Evening News, Nov. 12, 1969]

MANY AT BATES SCHOOL CORNERSTONE PLACING

SALEM.—Despite turbulent weather a cornerstone ceremony for the new Bates Elementary School was held on Veterans Day with many members of the municipal family present.

The ceremony marked the first new school to be started in this city since 1962.

The family of the late Congressman George J. Bates Sr. and William H. Bates were present for the event.

U.S. Rep. Michael J. Harrington and Mayor Francis X. Collins also turned out for the historic moment.

Keynote speaker was School Committee-woman M. Ruth Norton, who said that the placing of the cornerstone of the Bates School "will stand as an indication that Salem is not asleep in handling its educational needs."

Mrs. George J. Bates and Mrs. William H. Bates placed a sealed box in the cornerstone, while surrounded by members of their families.

(Miss Norton had compiled a scrapbook consisting of clippings from the Salem Evening News, School Department memos, pictures of the School Committee and specifications for the building which was placed in box.)

Miss Norton said:

"It is very gratifying to see so many here this morning joining with us in the cornerstone ceremony of the new Bates school.

"This is our first new school since the Bentley was opened in 1962. The new Bates school, when built, will stand as an indication that Salem is not asleep in handling its educational needs.

"Your school committee has as its goal, constant improvement of our education facilities and services. We are fortunate in Salem that Mayor Collins and our city council are aware of the importance of a good educational program and are willing to consider the requests and needs of our schools as presented by the School Committee.

"As we all know this school has come about through the cooperation of these two groups . . . The Salem City Council and the Salem School Committee.

"Indeed we are pleased that our new school honors two distinguished Salemites: Congressman George J. Bates Sr. and Congressman William H. Bates.

"Their untimely deaths, at the peak of their careers in public life, were the cause of much sorrow . . . our city, our state, and our nation lost two great men and many lost valued friends.

"This school is affectionately dedicated to them with the hope that it is a worthy monument to their memory."

Among those attending were: Capt. Raymond H. Bates, Mr. and Mrs. Francis Bates and son, Francis Jr., Mr. and Mrs. George J. Bates Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Edmund B. Stanton, Mrs. Catherine Bates Ginty, Theodore Simons of the Kernwood Club, Dr. May Berman, president, Kernwood Club Association.

School Committeemen present were: Miss Norton, Morley Piper, S. Steve Salvo, Dr. James P. Ryan, and Ronald G. Plante.

Representing the City Council were: Bruce J. McLaughlin, George F. McCabe, Louis A. Swiniuch, and Joseph R. Ingemi Jr.

School Department personnel included: Supt. Lawrence J. Fitzpatrick, Assistant Supt. Joseph Salerno, Business Mgr. John J. Grady, Principal Philip J. O'Donnell and Secretary to the Superintendent Dorothea Barry.

Architects John M. Gray Sr. and Francis Gray were present.

PINKVILLE: A LONE CITIZEN WRITES AND A TRAGEDY IS EXPOSED

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard many people say, "Don't waste your time writing to public officials—it does not do any good. Nothing will happen."

If young Ron Ridenhour of Phoenix, Ariz., had believed that, it is very unlikely the world today would have heard of Pinkville, the South Vietnam village of Mylai and scene, allegedly, of one

of the most horrible massacres committed by American troops.

I was one of those who received a letter from Mr. Ridenhour dated March 29, 1969. In recent days I have received a great number of inquiries about the letter and I am taking the liberty of having it printed in the RECORD so it will not be lost to historians. I think anyone reading Mr. Ridenhour's account of what he suspected had happened at Pinkville will be struck by his caution and his sincerity. He did not know, for sure, what occurred. But his conscience dictated that he make an effort to have someone find out because the evidence indicated "something very black indeed" did occur.

He was not directly involved. He could have remained silent. That would have been the easy way. Let someone else worry about crime. He could have told himself, "Forget it, no one will listen" and thus save his conscience as a citizen.

But instead he wrote to me, to some other Members of Congress, to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and to several other parties. About 30 people, he told me, received the same letter and some of us responded by asking appropriate authorities to investigate the allegations he presented.

First, my staff immediately contacted Mr. Ridenhour to verify the authenticity of the letter and to get some measure of the man for these were very grave allegations. I then brought the matter to the attention of Defense Secretary Laird and Chairman RIVERS of the House Armed Services Committee. Both of them informed me the matter was being looked into.

From time to time in the succeeding weeks we talked to Mr. Ridenhour and to the Army investigators and to others to maintain an eye on the investigation. We were interested in thoroughness, not speed.

I do not know what the eventual outcome of Pinkville will be. But this much is certain: A letter from a citizen, a veteran of Vietnam, has spurred not only a worldwide outcry but, within many, a deep self-questioning about the nature of man, his institutions and his future.

Following is the text of Mr. Ridenhour's letter and some of the immediate correspondence which followed:

PHOENIX, ARIZ.,
March 29, 1969.

The Congress of the United States:

GENTLEMEN: It was late in April, 1968 that I first heard of "Pinkville" and what allegedly happened there. I received that first report with some skepticism, but in the following months I was to hear similar stories from such a wide variety of people that it became impossible for me to disbelieve that something rather dark and bloody did indeed occur sometime in March, 1968 in a village called "Pinkville" in the Republic of Vietnam.

The circumstances that led to my having access to the reports I'm about to relate need explanation. I was inducted in March, 1967 into the U.S. Army. After receiving various training I was assigned to the 70th Infantry Detachment (LRP), 11th Light Infantry Brigade at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, in early October, 1967. That unit, the 70th Infantry Detachment (LRP), was disbanded a week before the 11th Brigade shipped out for Viet Nam on the 5th of December, 1967. All of the men from whom I later heard reports of the "Pinkville" incident were reassigned to "C" Company, 1st Battalion, 20th

Infantry, 11th Light Infantry Brigade. I was reassigned to the aviation section of Headquarters Company 11th LIB. After we had been in Viet Nam for 3 to 4 months many of the men from the 70th Inf. Det. (LRP) began to transfer into the same unit, "E" Company, 51st Infantry (LRP).

In late April, 1968 I was awaiting orders for a transfer from HHC, 11th Brigade to Company "E," 51st Inf. (LRP), when I happened to run into Pfc. "Butch" Gruver, whom I had known in Hawaii. Gruver told me he had been assigned to "C" Company 1st of the 20th until April 1st when he transferred to the unit that I was headed for. During the course of our conversation he told me the first of many reports I was to hear of "Pinkville."

"Charlie" Company 1/20 had been assigned to Task Force Barker in late February, 1968 to help conduct "search and destroy" operations on the Batangan Peninsula, Barker's area of operation. The task force was operating out of L. F. Dottie, located five or six miles north of Quang Nhai city on Viet Namese National Highway 1. Gruver said that Charlie Company had sustained casualties, primarily from mines and booby traps, almost everyday from the first day they arrived on the peninsula. One village area was particularly troublesome and seemed to be infested with booby traps and enemy soldiers. It was located about six miles northeast of Quang Nhai city at approximate coordinates B.S. 728795. It was a notorious area and the men of Task Force Barker had a special name for it: they called it "Pinkville." One morning in the latter part of March, Task Force Barker moved out from its firebase headed for "Pinkville." Its mission: destroy the trouble spot and all of its inhabitants.

When "Butch" told me this I didn't quite believe that what he was telling me was true, but he assured me that it was and went on to describe what had happened. The other two companies that made up the task force cordoned off the village so that "Charlie" Company could move through to destroy the structures and kill the inhabitants. Any villagers who ran from Charlie Company were stopped by the encircling companies. I asked "Butch" several times if all the people were killed. He said that he thought they were, men, women and children. He recalled seeing a small boy, about three or four years old, standing by the trail with a gunshot wound in one arm. The boy was clutching his wounded arm with his other hand, while blood trickled between his fingers. He was staring around himself in shock and disbelief at what he saw. "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 RTO (radio operator) put a burst of 16 (M-16 rifle) fire into him." It was so bad, Gruver said, that one of the men in his squad shot himself in the foot in order to be medivac-ed out of the area so that he would not have to participate in the slaughter. Although he had not seen it, Gruver had been told by people he considered trustworthy that one of the company's officers, 2nd Lieutenant Kally (this spelling may be incorrect) had rounded up several groups of villagers (each group consisting of a minimum of 20 persons of both sexes and all ages). According to the story, Kally than machine-gunned each group. Gruver estimated that the population of the village had been 300 to 400 people and that very few, if any, escaped.

After hearing this account I couldn't quite accept it. Somehow I just couldn't believe that not only had so many young American men participated in such an act of barbarism, but that their officers had ordered it. There were other men in the unit I was soon to be assigned to, "E" Company, 51st Infantry (LRP), who had been in Charlie Company at the time that Gruver alleged the incident at "Pinkville" had occurred. I became determined to ask them about "Pinkville" so that

I might compare their accounts with Pfc Gruver's.

When I arrived at "Echo" Company, 51st Infantry (LRP) the first men I looked for were Pfc's Michael Terry and William Doherty. Both were veterans of "Charlie" Company, 1/20 and "Pinkville." Instead of contradicting "Butch" Gruver's story they corroborated it, adding some tasty tidbits of information of their own. Terry and Doherty had been in the same squad and their platoon was the third platoon of "C" Company to pass through the village. Most of the people they came to were already dead. Those that weren't were sought out and shot. The platoon left nothing alive, neither livestock nor people. Around noon the two soldiers' squad stopped to eat. "Billy and I started to get out our chow," Terry said, "but close to us was a bunch of Vietnamese in a heap, and some of them were moaning. Kally (2nd Lt. Kally) had been through before us and all of them had been shot, but many weren't dead. It was obvious that they weren't going to get any medical attention so Billy and I got up and went over to where they were. I guess we sort of finished them off." Terry went on to say that he and Doherty then returned to where their packs were and ate lunch. He estimated the size of the village to be 200 to 300 people. Doherty thought that the population of "Pinkville" had been 400 people.

If Terry, Doherty and Gruver could be believed, then not only had "Charlie" Company received orders to slaughter all the inhabitants of the village, but those orders had come from the commanding officer of Task Force Barker, or possibly even higher in the chain of command. Pfc Terry stated that when Captain Medina (Charlie Company's commanding officer Captain Ernest Medina) issued the order for the destruction of "Pinkville" he had been hesitant, as if it were something he didn't want to do but had to. Others I spoke to concurred with Terry on this.

It was June before I spoke to anyone who had something of significance to add to what I had already been told of the "Pinkville" incident. It was the end of June, 1968 when I ran into Sergeant Larry La Croix at the USO in Chu Lai. La Croix had been in 2nd Lt. Kally's platoon on the day Task Force Barker swept through "Pinkville." What he told me verified the stories of the others, but he also had something new to add. He had been a witness to Kally's gunning down of at least three separate groups of villagers. "It was terrible. They were slaughtering the villagers like so many sheep." Kally's men were dragging people out of bunkers and hootches and putting them together in a group. The people in the group were men, women and children of all ages. As soon as he felt that the group was big enough, Kally ordered an M-60 (machine-gun) set up and the people killed. La Croix said that he bore witness to this procedure at least three times. The three groups were of different sizes, one of about twenty people, one of about thirty people, and one of about forty people. When the first group was put together Kally ordered Pfc Torres to man the machine-gun and open fire on the villagers that had been grouped together. This Torres did, but before everyone in the group was down he ceased fire and refused to fire again. After ordering Torres to recommence firing several times, Lieutenant Kally took over the M-60 and finished shooting the remaining villagers in that first group himself. Sergeant La Croix told me that Kally didn't bother to order anyone to take the machine-gun when the other two groups of villagers were formed. He simply manned it himself and shot down all villagers in both groups.

This account of Sergeant La Croix's confirmed the rumors that Gruver, Terry and Doherty had previously told me about Lieutenant Kally. It also convinced me that there was a very substantial amount of truth to

the stories that all of these men had told. If I needed more convincing, I was to receive it.

It was in the middle of November, 1968 just a few weeks before I was to return to the United States for separation from the army that I talked to Pfc Michael Bernhardt. Bernhardt had served his entire year in Viet Nam in "Charlie" Company 1/20 and he too was about to go home. "Bernie" substantiated the tales told by the other men I had talked to in vivid, bloody detail and added this. "Bernie" had absolutely refused to take part in the massacre of the villagers of "Pinkville" that morning and he thought that it was rather strange that the officers of the company had not made an issue of it. But that evening "Medina (Captain Ernest Medina) came up to me ('Bernie') and told me not to do anything stupid like write my congressman" about what had happened that day. Bernhardt assured Captain Medina that he had no such thing in mind. He had nine months left in Viet Nam and felt that it was dangerous enough just fighting the acknowledged enemy.

Exactly what did, in fact, occur in the village of "Pinkville" in March, 1968 I do not know for certain, but I am convinced that it was something very black indeed. I remain irrevocably persuaded that if you and I do truly believe in the principles, of justice and the equality of every man, however humble, before the law, that form the very backbone that this country is founded on, then we must press forward a widespread and public investigation of this matter with all our combined efforts. I think that it was Winston Churchill who once said "A country without a conscience is a country without a soul, and a country without a soul is a country that cannot survive." I feel that I must take some positive action on this matter. I hope that you will launch an investigation immediately and keep me informed of your progress. If you cannot, then I don't know what other course of action to take.

I have considered sending this to newspapers, magazines, and broadcasting companies, but I somehow feel that investigation and action by the Congress of the United States is the appropriate procedure, and as a conscientious citizen I have no desire to further besmirch the image of the American serviceman in the eyes of the world. I feel that this action, while probably it would promote attention, would not bring about the constructive actions that the direct actions of the Congress of the United States would.

Sincerely,

RON RIDENHOUR.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1969.

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed letter from Mr. Ron Ridenhour of Phoenix, late of Viet Nam, is deeply disturbing.

He is not saying that he positively knows the bloody events as related did indeed take place. But the suspicion is very strong and certainly deserve to be looked into very closely. Would it be possible for your committee to look into this so we can get at the truth?

Sincerely,

MORRIS K. UDALL.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1969.

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Secretary of Defense, The Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I'm told a copy of the enclosed letter from Mr. Ron Ridenhour has been sent to you.

Mr. Ridenhour's suspicions as to what happened in "Pinkville" deserve the most careful investigation.

I urge such an investigation to be made at once and please share with me the depart-

ment's findings if such an investigation is conducted.

Sincerely,

MORRIS K. UDALL.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D.C., April 14, 1969.

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. UDALL: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 4, 1969 enclosing correspondence received from Mr. Ron Ridenhour, of Phoenix, late of Viet Nam, regarding alleged events at "Pinkville" in Viet Nam.

I am taking the liberty of forwarding this correspondence to the Department of the Army, requesting that they investigate these allegations and furnish me with a report. Upon receipt of information I will be in touch with you.

Sincerely,

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, OFFICE
OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., April 15, 1969.

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. UDALL: The Secretary of the Army has asked me to make an interim reply to your inquiry addressed to the Department of Defense in behalf of Mr. Ron Ridenhour who wrote of alleged incidents occurring at "Pinkville".

Information has been requested from the appropriate field agency and upon receipt thereof you will be further advised.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND T. REID,
Colonel, GS Office, Chief of Legislative
Liaison.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, OFFICE
OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., April 24, 1969.

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. UDALL: The Secretary of the Army has asked me to make an interim reply to your inquiry addressed to the Secretary of Defense on behalf of Mr. Ron Ridenhour concerning actions alleged to have been taken by an Army unit in Vietnam in 1968 in the vicinity of the South Vietnamese village identified as "Pinkville".

As you were previously advised, the Commanding General, United States Army Vietnam, was requested to investigate the alleged circumstances and provide this office with appropriate information. We have now been advised that as the circumstances related in Mr. Ridenhour's letter concern events of a year ago, and as the people involved have since departed Vietnam and are now widely scattered, it is not possible for that command to provide a responsive reply. Faced with these circumstances and considering the gravity of the allegations, it has been determined that a complete investigation will be required. This matter, therefore, has been referred to The Inspector General for appropriate action.

Our final reply concerning this matter cannot be expected for some time inasmuch as investigations such as this one are extremely time consuming. You may be certain that as soon as the results of the investigation are available I shall provide you with a complete response to the allegations.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND T. REID,
Colonel, GS Office, Chief of Legislative
Liaison.

On November 29, Tony Tselentis, assistant managing editor of the Tucson Daily Citizen, wrote an eloquent column which expresses the feelings of many of us. I commend it to my colleagues:

[From the Tucson Daily Citizen, Nov. 29, 1969]

THANKS TO THE MAN WHO REVEALED SONG MY
(By Tony Tselentis)

The continuing revelations about the massacre at Song My (also referred to as My Lai) are sickening.

The slaying of defenseless men, women and children by American soldiers in no way can be condoned or justified.

Ronald L. Ridenhour, the young man who was responsible for bringing about the investigation of the massacre and forcing it into public view, deserves our thanks.

This is not the sort of thing that can be shuttered away if America is to remain true to her ideals. Brutal and unnecessary killing—even during war—undermines the nation.

How much more pleasant Thanksgiving would have been if we didn't have to read or hear about Song My, many will say. Rot.

It was a better Thanksgiving Day if thoughts of Song My drove home the lesson of the brutalizing effects of war. And if citizens of this nation concluded that they must stand more firmly than ever against all war.

The White House statement issued Wednesday called the massacre "abhorrent to the conscience of all the American people."

Secretary of State William P. Rogers says that those responsible for Song My will be court-martialed "to show the world that we do not condone this."

It is fitting that those responsible for the massacre should be called to account for their actions. And if there were attempts to cover it up, as charged, those responsible also should be held accountable.

It would be even more fitting if the system that made such an atrocity possible be called to account. Something went wrong terribly in the military climate that gave birth to Song My.

Awful tragedies occur during wars. But it's too easy to say, "That's part of the game—it can't be helped." This just won't do. Anyone who believes in the American concept of justice cannot abide the cold-blooded slaying of innocents.

For this very reason, the United States joined in the Nuremberg trials at the conclusion of World War II. It was just and proper to call Nazi war criminals to account.

Yes, North Vietnam and the Viet Cong will reap a good deal of propaganda value out of Song My. Those who seek to pull our system of government down already have rushed forth to compare Song My to Nazi atrocities. A news analyst gave the proper answer to such demagoguery:

"The Nazi atrocities," he said, "were carried out as national policy; what happened at Song My is directly contrary to the policy of the United States."

There is no way to equate the two.

The United States cannot accept in any way what happened at Song My. The day it does, all our victories will have been in vain.

THE SILENT MAJORITY

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the following letter to the editor of the Chicago Tribune, written by Lt. Col. John H. Bickley, Jr., included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE SILENT MAJORITY

CHICAGO, November 13.—Last night I visited my best friend and his wife in Arlington Heights. It wasn't a happy occasion—they had just received word that their son had been killed in an ambush in Viet Nam.

As I left my car I noticed a flagpole in front of their home where one year earlier the family had raised our flag with pride to commemorate their son's entry into the armed forces. Every day since, they have flown that flag. Yesterday it was at half mast.

I was met at the door by the deceased's 20-year-old widow and another son, home on emergency leave from the army. I saw my friend, who 25 years before had been a tall gunner in the torpedo squadron Eight. After courtesies we sat down to dinner and my friend said grace and gave thanks. They talked about the plans that their son and daughter-in-law had made for his R&R leave, which was to commence on Nov. 17 in Hawaii. However, no one really knew what to say.

I was asked as the family lawyer as to my opinion about the trial of "the Chicago 8" and why people took part in moratoriums. "Didn't these well-meaning people have the common sense to realize they were aiding the enemy that killed their son?" All I could think of were politicians using the war issues for partisan gain, "effete snobs," and bleeding heart writers tearing down the very institutions that allow them to print their drivels in opposition to their country's stated policy.

As I left that evening their Cub Scout son took down the flag outside their home and folded it. My friend turned to me and asked, "John, do you really think there is a 'silent majority' in this country?"

After saying yes, I thought of the words in the telegram, "The secretary of the army regrets to inform you . . ." To whom was the telegram addressed? To one family who make up a part of the silent majority of this great nation. Thank God for them, and God bless them!

JOHN H. BICKLEY, JR.,
Lieutenant Colonel, USMCR, retired.

MAIL SERVICE IN RURAL AMERICA

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the main reasons I have opposed a complete transition of the Post Office Department to a postal corporation is the implied threat in the corporation bill to postal service for those who live in rural America.

This threat is especially dangerous to those of us who come from the great wide open spaces of the Rocky Mountain States. But the fear of diminished service under a corporation, I find, is prevalent in most rural areas of the country.

One letter I recently received from Scottsboro, Ala., contains the feelings of many rural Americans, and I commend it to my colleagues for their edification:

SCOTTSBORO, ALA.,
Nov. 11, 1969.

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. OLSEN: I want to ask you to use your influence to try to defeat the Postal Corporation proposed by Mr. Blount. I do not think a corporation will be good for the American people, especially rural Americans. I fear postal service will be cut out for many rural people and that postage rates will be so high that many people can not afford them. Of course it would affect everyone but some would be hurt more than others. I see no reason for rural people to be deprived just so a few folks can get richer. There would be no limit to the graft that would

result if the Post Office is converted to a corporation. And the next order of business for Congress would be an investigation of the corporation. If you will use your influence now perhaps this can be avoided. We need the Post Office kept under the control of Congress. Please do the American people a favor and vote against the Postal Corporation.

Sincerely,

MRS. JAMES BRANDON.

CHALLENGES TO HIGHER EDUCATION IN A TIME OF CHANGE

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor on Thursday, November 20, 1969, as the representative of the George Washington University, to participate in the inauguration of Arthur Gene Hansen as the new president of the Georgia Institute of Technology.

Dr. Hansen, in his address on that occasion, "Challenges to Higher Education in a Time of Change," seems to accurately assess the challenges which are of particular concern to the university system today. He offers an excellent analysis of the reasons for the existence of these challenges and guidelines by which he feels they can be met.

It is gratifying and rewarding to see a man with the ideas and positive attitude of Dr. Hansen become the president of the Georgia Institute of Technology, especially at a time when the role of the university in our society is rapidly changing and under such great scrutiny.

I feel confident of the continued success of this fine institution under his able leadership. I wish him great success as he attempts at Georgia Tech to meet the challenges to higher education which he has so clearly identified.

Dr. Hansen's remarks follow:

CHALLENGES TO HIGHER EDUCATION IN A TIME OF CHANGE

(By Arthur G. Hansen, president, Georgia Institute of Technology, Nov. 20, 1969)

It is doubtful that there is an institution of higher education in this land that does not look toward the future with some degree of concern. Today's plans, knowledge, and values may be inappropriate or irrelevant in the world of tomorrow where tomorrow is but a few brief years away. Perhaps, as never before, the university is faced with challenges that truly test its capacity for renewal and its ability to maintain the position of esteem and leadership it has so long enjoyed.

I would like to outline for you certain of the more important challenges to higher education as I see them and present what I hope will be one institution's response to these challenges.

The first challenge that I would describe is one faced not only by higher education but by every social structure in our land. I would designate it as *The Challenge of a Worried World*. To provide proper perspective for the basis of this challenge, let us go back in time.

At some point in the dim past, primitive man discovered the first tools and eased his labor. At another time, he wrapped himself with skins to protect his being. At still another time, he grew his food. Through these simple, yet extremely important, discoveries, his mode of existence on this planet was altered and improved—he had found ways to

satisfy his basic needs. This ability to satisfy his needs grew with the passage of time. Man increased his leisure. And with this leisure the creative powers inherent in man bore fruit. He pleased himself and others with art. He altered his environment further to provide comfort, and, with characteristic inquisitiveness, he sought to understand more completely his world. Perhaps this first conscious effort to comprehend the external world marked the beginning of man's true ascendancy.

As the external world and its governing laws were better understood and as man learned to channel the earth's abundant energy, the ability to create change increased.

With every addition to knowledge and with every discovery that reduced labor, the capacity for gaining new knowledge and causing further modification of man's physical environment grew.

Today the evidence seems clear. If we measure the growth of stored knowledge or measure by some standard man's technological advances or his utilization of the earth's energy, we find that the indices of measurement exhibit an exponential increase with time. Moreover, the rate of increase also shares this quality. Thus, it is almost trite to say that we are living in times of rapid change. However, we must be careful in using this word, "change." Man is a creature that adapts readily to change in a physical sense. It is not clear that he adapts with the same ease in an emotional or spiritual sense. In fact, the deep sensitivities of man, his emotional needs, and his basic sense of values seem to have a constancy. External change thus becomes disturbing to our souls.

The mood of our time and the impact of change has been the topic of many writers and assessments of this mood have appeared in current periodicals. Writing on "The Mood of America" in one popular magazine, reporter Fletcher Knebel recorded the opinions of a cross-section of the nation. Unfortunately, he found strong currents of pessimism. From his own point of view, Mr. Knebel had this to say:

"My own pessimism, deeper than that of most people with whom I talked, is linked to the machine's relentless march across the land, mutilating the green hills, paving the valleys, fouling the sweet air, contaminating the waters and forcing people to spend their working hours tending the very mechanical contrivances that are supposed to serve them. The machine does give something in return: comfort and convenience. And for these twin sirens, a nation's soul is being lost."

Against this backdrop of change, of a nation and a world restless and searching its soul for meaning, in a time of rising expectations that may or may not be fulfilled, we view the university with particular interest and concern. We view it in this manner because of the exalted position it has held and the claims that it has made to justify its existence. It claims to be the preserver of the finest of man's heritage and the instrument through which this heritage is transmitted to the future. It claims to be the critic of society and the pursuer of truth wherever it may lead. We do not doubt that it has been true to these claims within the limitations and inherent weaknesses of any human enterprise. But it has become more. It has become a significant agent of change. Through its discoveries, through the application of its knowledge, it has contributed significantly to the shaping of our present world. Its scholars are sought for advice in the highest levels of government. Its participation in the manifold activities of every phase of our national life has been thorough and significant.

But now a time for reflection is in order. Has the university contributed to the worry of the world or kept us from being even closer to the edge of despair? Has the university been more self-seeking than society-

serving? Has the university clung to the outmoded values of the past, unwilling to change, or is it the leader in creating new values for the future? Has truth and its high pursuit been tempered by expediency or is the display of truth unrecognized for what it is? Is the mission of the university the same today as it was at the time of its creation? Does it have a new role and a new mission, not yet articulated, that once set forth will make it more able to serve a society searching for values, and a way of life commensurate with man's deepest needs and desires?

The answers to these questions are not simple. But I would propose that the questions be asked.

The university has cherished the need to be apart from the world—to provide the long view. The fact of the matter is that the university is now very much a part of the world and will continue to be so. This is the reason why *The Challenge of a Worried World* is one of great significance that must be recognized and met.

The next challenge to the university that I would describe are more in the nature of harsh realities. They must be recognized for what they are on the part of any university looking toward the future. I would categorize the first of these as *The Challenge of Numbers*.

There is little doubt that the average American feels a desire to send his daughter or his son to college. With growing affluence this desire is being realized within an increasing number of families. College enrollments have grown at a fantastic rate. The medium size universities of the 1940's have become multi-universities. Junior colleges and four-year colleges have sprung up in almost every center of population.

As disquieting as this growth in higher educational enrollments has been to those who must provide for it, the end may not be in sight. One cause is that the concept of higher education is changing. A vice-president of one of our large corporations commenting on this changing concept remarked:

"College becomes the only gateway to rewarding jobs in the adult world. Some adults criticize student rebels on the grounds that these young people do not understand that a college education is a privilege. They are mistaken. They are thinking of a world in which they were brought up, not today's world. A college education is no longer a privilege. It is a necessity."

Whether or not you may agree with a college education being a privilege or necessity, the demands for greater educational service from the universities will exist in the years ahead.

The Challenge of Numbers goes beyond enrollment figures. There are other numbers that must be reckoned with and these numbers have dollar signs in front of them. In the last ten years, expenditures for higher education have risen by a factor of three and in the next five to ten years, proportional increases are anticipated. In the last eight years, state tax support of education has risen an incredible 214 percent to meet the rising costs. Still the picture looks bleak and certain experts viewing the future have stated that colleges and universities may very well be facing what they term a serious financial crisis.

In more specific terms, what will *The Challenge of Numbers* mean to us in higher education? First, we all suspect that a greater cross section of our taxpayers will want the benefits of a college education for their children. They will not be put off readily by claims that these children are not prepared for college because of inadequate preparation in elementary and secondary schools. Yet, colleges wishing to maintain admissions standards will be hard pressed to respond. They will be increasingly pressured to find answers to this problem, even

though its causes may be beyond their direct control.

Whether the admissions problem will grow remains to be seen. But one fact is certain—the taxpayer will be asking hard questions. He will want to know the nature of value received from the tremendous expenditures being made. The public educational enterprise will be scrutinized as closely as other public agencies. The day when colleges and universities could stay aloof from continually demonstrating their worth to the people who underwrite their operation has passed.

I would like to call the third challenge that the universities are now facing, *The Challenge of Meaningful Service*. This challenge relates to the role of the university in producing new knowledge through research and then employing this knowledge to benefit society.

First, let us note that the universities have not had any lack of support for this activity. The rate of expenditures for research and development in the United States has, until recently, been higher than the growth rate of the gross national product. But unless all of our resources are to be used eventually for research and development, a time for leveling off must come. This is apparently beginning now and with it has come a very careful look at how available resources are being used. Can we predict at this point in time what the support for research might be like in the immediate future? Not easily, but I surmise that the emphasis on basic research will be reduced in favor of programs that relate to problems of immediate public concern. This seems especially evident as social problem areas multiply and funding becomes more limited.

Dr. James A. Shannon, Special Advisor to the President of the National Academy of Sciences, puts the matter like this:

"It seems likely that the period 1945-1965, particularly in the last decade, will be viewed in retrospect as the time when U.S. science reached the summit of broad uncritical public support—what might be called the 'Augustan Era' of American science."

In describing the tasks that currently face the scientific community, he goes on to say:

"... The scientific community must devise means of fostering a broader understanding of the revolutionary technological forces that can be unleashed by vigorous science for the betterment of society."

Dr. Myron Tribus, recently appointed Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology, echoes the same sentiment:

"People are the urgency. They have backed massive spending for research and development because technological change has enriched their life. They will turn against research and development if technological change begins to encroach on their health, their comfort and their pleasure in the environment. Technological change will encroach in these areas unless a new breed of engineer learns to design for compatibility between man, machine, and environment. It is that simple."

Thus, those educational institutions concerned with science and technology in particular should keep one primary thought in mind. Science and technology must serve for the betterment of mankind. Dr. René Dubos put it quite succinctly when he said:

"We must not ask where science and technology are taking us, but rather how we can manage science and technology so they can help us to where we want to go."

The Challenge of Meaningful Service will place strains on many university structures where research is often a personal activity conducted for the recognition of peers. It will put strain on the high walls between departments that have programs of a specialized nature. Clearly, problems that concern mankind cannot be put into neat compart-

ments. It will cause a reevaluation of basic research. We hope that this most important activity will not be seriously curtailed. But we may have a separation of the trivial from the essential and this, unquestionably, is overdue.

The final challenge I would touch on today is *The Challenge of the Students*. Discounting that relatively small group of students who feel that the educational establishment is an evil that must be destroyed, let us recognize that there is on our campuses a new breed of students. These students are voicing certain concerns that the universities should heed.

Let me preface these remarks by saying that a greater number of young people than ever before now reach the status of adulthood while still in the university environment. They share the concerns often voiced by the adult population. They have the capacity to be productive economically and are capable of responsible action relative to a family life or in service to society.

These capacities and capabilities were often realized by non-college youth of former times. For today's college population, the direct involvement in full adult life is limited by the university environment. The sense of direction and purpose often found in earning a living or raising a family is often lost in this environment. This loss is more keenly felt by youth who are being informed, more mature and better educated, and hence more capable of functioning in adult roles than youth in previous generations. It should not be surprising, therefore, that they feel resentment toward paternalistic control of lives by university authorities. It should not be surprising when students question the relevance of educational offerings. It should not be surprising when students who are concerned with justifying their way of life or who are seeking meaning and direction as young adults ask that a university define its goals and objectives.

Above all else, we now have a generation of students who are attempting to be honest and who ask candid questions that drive to the heart of basic issues. If a university is indeed a place where ideas are examined with objective rationality, where change is encouraged, and the status quo is open to critical analysis, then it should indeed be willing to engage in dialogue with its students. This does not mean abdication of responsibility, disregard for faculty wisdom, or change for the sake of change. It is simply a recognition of a new context and tone, an indication of a responsive attitude toward those whom it hopes to educate.

Thus, we have the four challenges: *The Challenge of a Worried World*, *The Challenge of Numbers*, *The Challenge of Meaningful Service* and *The Challenge of Students*. Looking at this particular institution, the Georgia Institute of Technology, are we meeting these challenges? The signs indeed are hopeful. There are activities in a number of quarters relating to ways of broadening student life. There are those on the campus who are trying to find ways of building spiritual anchor points and who are attempting to instill meaningful views of life in our students.

The Challenge of Numbers is being met by action to review the broad spectrum of educational activities in the State and to see how these activities might be coordinated to better serve a wider population. Planning for more efficient use of resources is under way and action is being taken to utilize the total strength of the educational community existing beyond the confines of our campus. *The Challenge of Meaningful Service* is being met through broad programs that have as their goal the improvement of our society.

The Challenge of Students is being answered through curriculum revision, student participation in service activities, and student involvement in planning. We will pro-

vide greater opportunities for our student to express his concerns. We will listen and respond. Fortunately, we are blessed with an exceptional, positively-oriented student body that adds to our total strength.

We have not met all of the challenges in a satisfactory manner. But, we are aware of their significance and are moving ahead to respond. We must and will demonstrate that we are capable of self-renewal and positive action.

Keeping in mind the need for growth and change, I would, nevertheless, voice a hope and a warning. I would hope that the universities of this land do not lose sight of their uniqueness and true mission. We must keep in mind that a university cannot be all things to all people. It is not a social agency capable on its own of resolving every social ill. It should not be so sensitive to its critics that it loses sight of its primary mission of education and its unique contributions in the realm of service and research that result from scholarly activity and reasoned inquiry. It must not become a willing whipping boy of the alienated and disenfranchised members of our society. It must not allow itself to be wrenched from its position of prestige because it is particularly vulnerable to pressure. In spite of its obvious shortcomings, and I am surprised that there are not more, the university has been an island of free inquiry and debate for scholars. It has kept excellence in disciplines through the process of continual review and accreditation. It has preserved the freedom of the individual instructor through a carefully guarded tenure system. Higher education has allowed great flexibility of program choice through the offering of multiple degrees. It has encouraged the development of a variety of colleges and universities that have wide ranges in standards. Campus freedom has improved. The student newspaper, often extremely critical of an institution, has enjoyed the benefits of freedom of the press. In spite of the present turmoil, the university remains as an institution where the student who wishes to study and discipline his mind has the opportunity to do so.

My fear is that faculty, administration, and students may lose sight of the good that has been achieved over the past centuries. Perspective must be kept. To yield to every demand for the sake of "keeping peace," and to forget the basic principles by which any society lives and works together in a state of harmony will destroy all that has been gained.

Recognizing, then, the qualities that have merit and should be preserved, let the university restructure that which needs restructuring, plan with optimism, and have the courage to pursue objectives well-defined and relevant to our day and time.

And so to the faculty of this great institution, I would say, consider with care your personal commitment and its meaning. Think through thoroughly the nature of your educational programs. Are they indeed serving the best interests of our students? Ask yourselves how you will determine that these needs are being satisfied. Measure the significance of your scholarly output in a time that cries for meaningful contribution from every member of society. Reevaluate your relations to your students. Are you indeed willing to share with them, heed their needs for personal recognition, and be willing to work with them in ways that develop dignity, responsibility and independence?

To all of us who serve the public through the medium of education and receive its support, I ask that we keep uppermost the highest principles of stewardship. Let responsibility and honesty be perpetual watchwords in all that we do.

To the public I say, in turn, that it will be our purpose to satisfy many of the multiple needs that you have placed on our doorstep, yet respect our desire for excellence, our

limited capacities to satisfy all demands of a single institution, and to meet every request with equal capacity and skill. We will be sensitive but steadfast in pursuing those endeavors that we do uniquely and best.

To our students I say that it will be our hope to give you the finest education possible and to make you competent, contributing members of society. We will often appear to be slow in our response for reasons that are not clear now but will become more clear to you as you fully participate in the world beyond the frontiers of college. We welcome you as partners and in doing so expect maturity of judgment, respect for reason, responsiveness to the demands of scholarly inquiry, and a willingness to have ideas tested in practice. When we, as fallible human beings, fall in following these same precepts, we hope that you will be our benevolent critics.

Above all else, I hope that many of you, as students, retreat from positions of extreme seriousness and pessimism. The pessimistic person cannot be a future leader of our society. Somewhere deep in the soul of this nation is an unquenchable ray of optimism. At the beginning of this talk, I referred to an article on the mood of America. More important than the sense of uneasiness discovered by the writer of this article, was the unshakable conviction that this nation has the capacity to solve its problems and move to higher ground. If we who educate do not impart this sense of optimism, do not temper despair with hope, do not in some way point out to you that the victory is worth the battle, and do not convey the thought that life has ultimate meaning and is empty without a sustaining faith, then all of our efforts will, in the final analysis, have been in vain. Education should make clear that each man has a high mission on this earth and that each of us must carry in his heart a dedication to serve with humility, reverence, and joy.

These are, after all, but my personal aspirations and admonitions. No college president can guarantee that they will fall on fertile ground and bear fruit. He is but one worker in the field. Together, with all working and sharing, the vision of what the Georgia Institute of Technology might be, free from doubt, receptive to change, committed wholly and completely to the resolution of the difficult problems that lie ahead, the ground shall bear fruit. Let this, our segment of the total society, never be characterized by disillusionment and despair. We have a job to do. With joined hands and lifted, willing spirits, let us be on with it.

PREVENTIVE DETENTION II: THE CRIME OF PUNISHMENT WITHOUT TRIAL

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, Attorney General John Mitchell has long contended that the Nixon administration is committed to a war on crime, particularly street crime. Only criminals would disagree with that policy. How to fight that war, however, is another matter.

One of the primary weapons which Mr. Mitchell wants to employ in reducing crime is preventive detention. Masquerading as a crime-stopper, preventive detention is really a justice-stopper. In allowing the detention of accused persons before being adjudged guilty, this procedure itself perpetrates a "crime of punishment without trial."

I do not doubt that the Attorney General desires to reduce crime. What I do question are the methods he advocates to do this. So that my colleagues may have the benefit of different perspectives on the issue of controlling pretrial crime, I would like to insert three items.

The first is an article by Attorney General Mitchell which sets forth the administration's position in support of pre-trial jailing of "dangerous" defendants. The second, a corresponding article by the Democratic Senator of North Carolina, SAM J. ERVIN, JR., argues against preventive detention as a threat to historic constitutional guarantees. These two articles appeared together in the Wall Street Journal on October 30, 1969. In response to this important exchange I wrote a letter to the Journal expressing my own opposition to preventive detention and arguing for the constitutional alternative of speedy trials and pretrial release conditions.

The respective items follow:

BAIL REFORM

(By John N. Mitchell)

This Administration is firmly committed to a vigorous and comprehensive action program to combat crime in America, particularly street crime.

As you know, the present law—the Bail Reform Act of 1966—was passed as part of a nationwide movement to eliminate the financial inequities in the money bail system. It was premised on the supposition that the financial condition of a criminal suspect should not be a consideration in the application of criminal justice. I fully support this policy. I believe that the indigent defendant and the rich defendant must be given equal treatment if our system of justice under law is to have any relevance in today's society.

The Bail Reform Act of 1966 modified the historic money bail system by permitting release on personal recognizance of any suspect whose character and community ties would reasonably assure that he would remain subject to the jurisdiction of the court and would not flee. We now have had three years of experience with the Bail Reform Act and we have come to the conclusion that there is sufficient evidence to warrant substantial modification.

The amendments we propose will apply to all Federal jurisdictions, but their primary impact will be in Washington. No other Federal judicial district faces the high volume of street crime that we face here in Washington and, although there are bail reform experiments in more than 125 cities, in no other city is the risk of flight used in practice as the sole criterion for release of suspected robbers, muggers, rapists, narcotics addicts and other street criminals. There is no doubt at all that a significant number of serious crimes are being committed by those released on bail although the exact number of these offenders is subject to wide divergence of opinion, depending on the studies undertaken.

In view of (the) enormous increase in reported crime, the limitation of pre-trial detention to capital offenses makes no sense at all. The addict-robber, the professional burglar, the confirmed rapist are all far more dangerous to the community than the husband charged with first degree murder of his wife. Though precise statistics on crime committed on bail are not available because of the very low arrest rate for violent crimes (under 10% of all crime) many law enforcement experts—judges, prosecutors and police investigators—believe that crime on bail is a major factor in all street crimes.

In light of all available evidence, I believe that the pre-trial release of potentially dangerous defendants constitutes one of the most serious factors in the present crime wave. I believe that danger to the community must be made a significant consideration in the ultimate decision to release a suspect. I believe that we need a more flexible approach which will offer a range of possibilities—pre-trial release without close supervision; pre-trial release with close supervision, and other conditions such as employment; and no pre-trial release at all for those suspects who clearly present a potential for committing another serious crime.

Under the proposal no one will be held in pre-trial detention unless (1) he comes within one of a group of carefully chosen categories of defendants who may pose a danger to society, (2) the judge finds that he cannot be released on any condition that would assure community safety, and (3) there is a substantial probability of his ultimate conviction.

There are four categories of detainable defendants in the bill. The first category covers certain dangerous crimes—robbery, burglary, rape, arson and drug sales. These are crimes of grave dangerousness, or, like drug sales, they are crimes that serve as breeding grounds for other and more violent crimes.

The second category covers the entire range of crimes of violence. The mere charge of a violent crime is, however, insufficient. In addition, the defendant must be out on bail on another charge of a crime of violence when arrested or have been convicted of such an offense within the last 10 years.

Narcotic addicts charged with a crime of violence comprise the third category. Probably no act is more predictable than the commission of a crime by an addict driven by his habit.

The final category covers those persons who, irrespective of the offense charged, obstruct justice by threatening witnesses or jurors.

Only when the defendant fits into one of these categories may a motion for a pre-trial detention hearing be made by the U.S. Attorney. At this hearing the judicial officer has to find, on the basis of information available on the defendant and the facts of the offense charged, that there are no conditions or release which will reasonably assure the safety of the community.

Some have said that this finding makes the judge into a prognosticator of future behavior and that this is unprecedented and unreliable. The short answer to this is that our system has always called on the trial judge to make numerous predictions of future behavior from the first appearance after arrest until final sentencing. No one, for instance, has objected to the judge's predicting, under the Bail Reform Act, the likelihood of flight. When a capital offense is charged, the very same judge is directed by the Bail Reform Act to take danger to the community into consideration and thus predict whether the defendant will present a danger to the community if released.

Moreover, every time a judge imposes or suspends a sentence or grants or denies probation he makes a prediction of future behavior and the possibility of rehabilitation. If a judge can predict with some reliability without Constitutional prohibition in these areas he can also predict the dangerousness of a defendant before him.

The proposal also contains a number of strong procedural protections to safeguard the rights of the defendant. He will be entitled to an expedited trial and will not be held in pre-trial detention for more than 60 days unless the trial has started or he is delaying his trial.

The proposal I have outlined would thus amend the Bail Reform Act to establish selected pre-trial detention on a limited basis

with strong safeguards against abuse. The bill will hold for pre-trial detention only those persons who appear to be so dangerous that their release pending trial would probably result in the commission of other crimes. It will provide our courts with a number of indispensable weapons and procedures to combat the scourge of crime in our streets. Crime on bail does exist and those who are faced with it on a day to day basis know that it is a major factor in the rising crime rate.

BAIL REFORM

(By SAM J. ERVIN, JR.)

Initially, I want to make it clear that I am deeply concerned about the crime problem in this country and about the safety of our law-abiding citizens. The increasing rate of criminal activity in our land is appalling. I am especially disturbed by the crime problems besetting us each day here in the District of Columbia. The existence of these problems, however, should not prompt Congress towards enacting unconstitutional and unwise and deceptively appealing legislation. Rather, it should provide us with the opportunity to make those difficult legislative decisions which are essential if our courts and corrective systems are to cope with the demands of modern society.

I believe our search for a solution to the problem of crime on bail should begin with an acknowledgement of three facts. First, crime on bail, though the exact extent is uncertain, represents but a small part of the overall crime problem. Second, the problem, irrespective of its precise magnitude, could be substantially eradicated if trials were conducted between 30 and 60 days following arrest and release. Third, the Bail Reform Act of 1966 has been inaccurately and unfairly cited as the villain responsible for crime on bail.

The Eighth Amendment prohibits excessive bail. Clearly, if bails set at a higher level than necessary to insure appearance, it is excessive and is serving a function not consonant with its historical purpose. The result of excessive bail is pre-trial detention violative of the Eighth Amendment. In my judgment, the Eighth Amendment implicitly guarantees a right to bail in all non-capital cases. I am personally satisfied that preventive detention substitutes the purpose of bail and runs afoul of the Eighth Amendment.

Fundamental to due process of law is the tenet that a man is presumed innocent until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Under our system of justice the Government cannot deprive a man of his liberty on the basis of a mere accusation or assumption that he has committed a crime or is likely to do so. In practical effect, preventive detention legislation convicts individuals of "probable" guilt and "dangerousness" and sentences them to 60 days' imprisonment without trial and conviction of a crime. Such flagrant violation of due process smacks of a police state rather than a democracy under law. It is reminiscent of similar devices in other countries which have proved all too useful as tools of political repression.

Preventive detention rests on an untested theory of predictability. A judicial officer must be able to pick out with precision the suspect who will commit new crimes while on bail. Yet there are no standards for determining dangerousness and no statistical guidelines on which to base the prediction which must be made under the proposed law. We should remember that only a small percentage and number of suspects actually commit crimes while on bail. When that fact is coupled with the fact that judges have nothing to guide them other than some enigmatic power of prophecy, the law will most assuredly result in the imprisonment without trial of many persons who are not dangerous and who are innocent of the charges.

If the preventive detention law is judged by its susceptibility to abuse, plainly it is an evil law.

The proposed solution would impose heavy additional administrative burdens on the already heavily backlogged courts. (It) would, in many instances, take as much time as would actual trial of the principal case. Court congestion would get worse. Delays in criminal trials, now running 10 to 12 months, would increase. The suspect will be in the streets eight to 10 months awaiting trial after his 60-day detention period is over. Thus we have the curious situation where our failure to give defendants and the public their Constitutional right to speedy trial has spawned legislation which will further burden the judges, and make speedy trials even less likely than at present. Yet the professed goal of protecting the public will still remain unrealized.

We should examine the impact upon the individual with the utmost care. It is obvious that 60 days' preventive detention will cost the detained individual his job. Loss of employment plus physical absence from his home will unquestionably have a detrimental effect upon his family. Probably the most serious blows to be dealt the individual will stem from his subjection to the physical and psychological deprivations and degradations of prison life. Criminal suspects in the District of Columbia will bear the brunt of the preventive detention law. The jails of this city are already a national disgrace. Yet the advocates of preventive detention would inject untold additional individuals, many of them innocent, into our problem-ridden, overcrowded prison system.

A period of 60 days or more of preventive detention in such a system is not likely to improve an individual's reputation. It will make securing employment difficult. It will, in all probability, exacerbate rather than reduce any existing criminal tendencies. And it will sharply detract from the defendant's ability to secure a fair trial, or a probationary or suspended sentence in the event of conviction.

In my judgment, the real answer to the immediate problem of crime committed by persons on bail, and, indeed, the solution to the general problem of crime, lies not in the preventive detention of individuals presumed innocent but in the speedy trial of the accused and the swift and sure punishment of the guilty. To attain that objective we must bring major improvements, long overdue, into our system of criminal justice. We must have more judges with adequate staffs and facilities, more prosecutors with sufficient supporting personnel, a more efficient system of defense for suspects financially unable to obtain counsel and a more enlightened approach to penal reform.

Given the choice between a course of action fraught with Constitutional perils and one clearly Constitutional, let us choose the latter. Let us reject this facile and desperate detention device which repudiates our traditional concepts of liberty and pursue instead the goal of speedy trial of criminal suspects. That objective does not depend upon Constitutional affront but rather plainly preserves and enhances the rights of us all under the Constitution.

NOVEMBER 5, 1969.

EDITOR IN CHIEF,
The Wall Street Journal,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: I commend the Wall Street Journal's policy of presenting both sides of the Administration's controversial preventive detention proposal by printing side-by-side the positions of Attorney General John Mitchell and Senator Sam Ervin. I am troubled, however, by Mr. Mitchell's presentation which is based on some rather facile assumptions about present bail practices and which seems

to imply that there are easy answers to the problems of administering a fair criminal justice system in a free society.

As to the Bail Reform Act of 1966, Mr. Mitchell implies that the only recourse of a judge faced with a "dangerous" defendant in a non-capital case is to release him on his own recognizance without further controls. This is not true. The Bail Reform Act provided a whole arsenal of controls over a defendant released prior to trial including supervision by a person or organization into whose custody he is released, and "any other condition deemed reasonably necessary to assure appearance . . . including . . . return to custody after specified hours." (Emphasis added) Thus the Bail Reform Act already provides a variety of measures which judges may use to control the pre-trial activities of defendants.

It is true that the statute permits these conditions to be used only to assure appearance. Mr. Mitchell argues that the District of Columbia is thus the only jurisdiction in which "the risk of flight [is] used in practice as the sole-criterion for release of suspected criminals." He also argues that there is little difference between predicting risk of flight and predicting "dangerousness." I believe he is wrong on both counts.

First, saying that only risk of flight and not "dangerousness" is considered by federal judges in determining pretrial release conditions ignores the fact that criminals who present a high risk of flight are often, if not always, the same as those who present a risk of danger to the community. No judge is unaware of the danger which a defendant released prior to trial may present to the community, and the same factors which make a man liable to flee are often those which make him dangerous. The difference is that if a judge considers only a defendant's "dangerousness," he files in the face of both our legal traditions and the presumption of innocence. Moreover, although Mr. Mitchell cannot distinguish the differences between predicting risk of flight and "dangerousness," there are differences—historical, constitutional and practical—which any judge would recognize immediately, even if the Attorney General does not.

One may well ask if all these controls are available to the judge and if he probably does consider danger to the community in selecting among them, why is there still such a high incidence of pre-trial crime committed. In the first place, as Mr. Mitchell admits, no one really knows how much pre-trial crime there is. (It is interesting to speculate, this being true, why there is "no doubt at all" that crime committed by men on bail is a significant problem.) One must be careful here to distinguish statistics on recidivism, which normally refer to crimes by persons convicted of prior crimes, not persons who commit crimes while on pre-trial release.

But the question of why the pre-trial controls available to judges have not worked, to the extent that they have not, really brings us to the heart of the matter. The fact is that there are simply not enough resources for courts and judges to draw upon to insure that the pre-trial release conditions which they impose are really effective. For years we have starved our courts and corrections systems of resources while grossly overloading them with cases. Now we act surprised when they cannot do the job which the criminal justice system was designed to do. To deal with the problem of supervising defendants released prior to trial what is needed is speedier trials, more bailiffs, more marshals, pretrial release supervisors (which do not even exist in most jurisdictions), and money enough to make this whole system work. This is not as simple an answer as throwing "dangerous" defendants in jail before they are found guilty, but it is the only way to solve the problem while pre-

serving our traditional notions of constitutional due process.

The question boils down to this: we have a criminal justice system which presumes one innocent until proven guilty in a jury trial; we surround the criminal defendant with safeguards to insure that he has a fair chance to prove his innocence; we have a Constitution which specifically guarantees a right to reasonable bail in non-capital cases and which mandates speedy trials. Now it is proposed that we adopt a measure which circumvents the careful safeguards of a criminal trial before we have even attempted alternatives such as pre-trial release conditions (backed with enough resources to make them effective), speedy trials (which would also increase the deterrent effect of the criminal sanction which is now almost totally lost because of pre-trial delays), and limited pre-trial custody such as is already authorized by the Bail Reform Act. We can choose preventive detention if we don't want to spend the money to make our criminal justice system work the way it was intended to. But we should know when we do so that we are making a choice which changes the fundamental nature of our system from what it has been for almost 180 years.

The way we determine a man's "dangerousness" in America has always been a trial, not a judge's pre-trial determination based on fragmentary information about the man and the act of which he is accused. We can take this determination away from a jury of citizens and give it to an official of the state if we want to, but I think it is a change in our system which most citizens will want to take only as a last resort, and only after we have thought long and hard about its implications for the kind of society in which we live.

Sincerely,

ABNER J. MIKVA.

THE TV DEBATE

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to obscure the accuracy and pertinence of Vice President AGNEW's criticism of network news coverage, the networks are trying to divert the American public's attention by distorting Mr. AGNEW's remarks.

In an excellent editorial, the Indianapolis News penetrates this network smokescreen and draws attention to the real issue cited in the Vice President's address to the people.

The editorial follows:

THE TV DEBATE

The lamentations of the TV network bosses and commentators over the recent remarks of Vice-President Agnew would be funny if they were not so deadly serious.

To hear the TV spokesmen tell it, they are being made to pay the price for "reporting" bad news, daring to criticize those in power, and being fearlessly independent. They will, they inform us, fight on for honest reporting and freedom of the press. As anyone can testify who has followed their labors in recent years—and as they have themselves on some occasions admitted—this is so much hogwash.

The issue at stake in this discussion, which the TV spokesmen are carefully avoiding, is not the right of TV or any other part of the press to criticize the President or anybody else in our government. Nor is it the

"reporting" of bad news, or the privilege of exemption from censorship. These are important issues but they are not the issues in the TV debate.

The real issue, quite simply, is the fact that the TV moguls and news commentators, wielding nationwide power in which realistic options to their views are excluded, have for years been busily at work stuffing the American public with liberal-left opinion. They have insistently played up liberal causes and left-wing personalities, and have just as insistently blocked out conservative opinion and conservative spokesmen.

What this means is that the "bad" news which gets reported, the fearless criticism being expounded, and the "talk shows" which get offered to the public come overwhelmingly from one direction—from the left. As Fred Freed of NBC has admitted, "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." Those sacred liberal views shape "news" reporting in all the national media, but nowhere more uniformly than in television.

It is relatively easy to name the obvious liberals who have appeared in recent years on network television—Edward P. Morgan, Howard K. Smith, Chet Huntley, Sander Vanocur, Edwin Newman, Eric Sevareid, and many others. Can anybody name a conservative newsmen on network television?

It is this pervasive bias which needs discussion, and the effort of the TV brass to cry up their "independence" cannot conceal that fact. Angew's criticism on this score was all too obviously correct.

PARNELL LEGION AUXILIARY SHOWS STRONG SUPPORT FOR MRS. NAUGHTON

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter signed by members of the Parnell, Iowa, Legion auxiliary, indicating their support for Mrs. Peggy Naughton, wife of Lt. Robert Naughton, who was shot down over North Vietnam. Mrs. Naughton has received no word as to the whereabouts or condition of her husband. This is a tragic story which has been repeated altogether too often by the cruel and heartless North Vietnamese captors. I am happy to join these good ladies from Parnell in expressing to Hanoi the indignation and outrage felt by all Americans on this point. I have gone one step further and cosponsored a resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 335, which expresses more formally the indignation of the Congress and condemns Hanoi for their action. The resolution urges the President to take diplomatic action to:

First. Identify prisoners whom they hold;

Second. Release seriously sick or injured prisoners;

Third. Permit impartial inspections of all prisoners of war facilities; and

Fourth. Permit the free exchange of mail between families and prisoners.

The text of the letter from Parnell follows:

PARNELL, IOWA,
November 17, 1969.

HON. FRED R. SCHWENGEL
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. SCHWENGEL: In support of Mrs. Peggy Naughton we wish to join her letter writing campaign that she may learn of her husband's fate, Lieutenant Robert Naughton, shot down May 18, 1967 in North Vietnam.

We as members of the American Legion Auxiliary Vincent Carney Unit 369, Parnell Iowa are asking you to use your distinguished influence to let Hanoi know the American public is concerned about treatment of our Prisoners of War and through this same influence may you touch the organ that will reverse decision of the law to the extent that they will at least let our American wives know their husbands are still among the living.

We here at Parnell are particularly interested in Mrs. Naughton's plea since Lieutenant Naughton's father is a native of Parnell and his mother is a Williamsburg girl—Mr. and Mrs. Roland Naughton, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

Thank you,

Hanora McDonald, Vera Spratt, Irene Wombacher, Alice McDonald, Coleen Weldon, Bridgie Kuddes, Teresa Donahoe, Rita Murphy, Katie McDonald, Maude Hall, Evelyn Weldon, Anna Weldon, Helen Leahy, Marguerite Lawler, Madge Wickham; the American Legion Auxiliary.

VICE PRESIDENT RECEIVES VOTE OF CONFIDENCE

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, Clinton Research Services of Philadelphia recently conducted a poll seeking to find out how the public thinks Vice President Agnew is doing his job.

For those of us who admire the Vice President for his courage and forthrightness, the results of that poll were most gratifying. I call them to my colleagues' attention:

VICE PRESIDENT RECEIVES VOTE OF CONFIDENCE

RNC Deputy Chairman Jim Allison announced on Friday the result of a poll that shows 64% of the American people approve of the way Vice President Agnew is handling his job. The telephone survey, conducted for the RNC by Chilton Research Services of Philadelphia, also showed that a dramatic 71% of those surveyed agreed with the VP that the news media should re-examine its standards of objectivity.

The Survey results were as follows:

(1) In general, do you approve or disapprove of the way Mr. Agnew is handling his job as Vice President?

	Percent
Approve	64
Disapprove	24
Do not know	12

(2) Have you read or heard about anything that Vice President Agnew has recently said about TV networks?

	Percent
Yes	65
No	33
Do not know	2

(3) The Vice President said the networks should separate their commentary from the news itself when they are reporting the news on TV. Do you agree or disagree with what he said?

Agree	58
Disagree	29
Do not know	13

(4) He also said that the TV networks should reexamine their procedures for making sure their newscasts are objective and unbiased. Do you approve or disapprove of this statement by the Vice President?

	Percent
Approve	71
Disapprove	20
Do not know	9

HARRY BROOKSHIRE GOES HOME

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Harry L. Brookshire ended a career in Washington of 30 years October 31 when he retired as House minority clerk and moved to a new home near Iberia, Ohio, near the scenes of his first political activities.

The major daily newspaper which circulates in the Iberia area is the Marion Star, published in the Seventh Ohio Congressional District. The Star recently printed an excellent feature article, chronicling Harry's life in politics. I include that article in the RECORD. I include that article in the RECORD to be read and enjoyed by Harry's many friends in the House:

HARRY BROOKSHIRE FINISHES 30-YEAR CAREER IN CONGRESS

(By David Lacey)

A political career which began in Marion in 1935 along with that of eventual Congressman Dr. Frederick C. Smith has ended after a solid 30-year "run" in Washington, D.C.

Harry L. Brookshire isn't "hopping" back to his Iberia home anymore from busy Congressional sessions.

This month Harry came home for keeps, retiring from the position of floor assistant to the minority, U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. Brookshire had held the \$28,000-a-year post since Feb. 3, 1958.

His wife, the former Ruth E. Adams, a native of Indiana who grew up and attended schools in Marion, had retired on June 30 of this year after a 30-year Washington career of her own. She had been an employee of the House Merchant Marine Committee since 1953 and prior to that had served in the late Dr. Smith's office.

Recent Congressional records have been well-dotted with references to Mr. Brookshire's long service.

Harry L. Brookshire was born June 2, 1902 in neighboring Hardin County at Forest where his father was a blacksmith. The Brookshire family moved to Kenton where Harry attended his first two years of grammar school.

The family moved to Marion where he continued in school until his sophomore year when his father died. He quit school to help support his family.

Young Harry went to work on the railroad, first as a helper and later worked his way up to a machinist's job.

The most vivid memory he has of Warren G. Harding is a tragic one. He was one of the men who helped drape the locomotive which carried the President's body back home to Marion.

Harry was over 21 when he returned to high school to complete graduation require-

ments after which he went on to Miami University at Oxford.

After two college years his mother died in 1926 and he dropped out of school for four more years. He returned for one final year of schooling but left before earning a degree.

Mr. Brookshire recalls today:

"I was offered a good job with the Osgood Steam Shovel Co. in Marion as a public relations man, so I took it."

"At that time—1935—the city of Marion was in bad financial shape. Taxes were high and so was bonded indebtedness.

"City Council was proposing the purchase of a water plant. One of the leading opponents to the purchase was Dr. Frederick Smith, who up to then had kept busy enough with his practice and private clinic. Council ignored Dr. Smith and his supporters and voted to buy the water plant.

"I'll never forget going to visit the doctor the next evening. He was sitting on his front porch, swinging back and forth and snoring. As soon as I stepped on the porch Doc started storming about how the new water plant couldn't go through.

"He said that the people have a right to vote on it. So I asked him how he was going to stop council's action. He said he'd run for mayor . . . he did and was elected."

And like that—on the spur of the moment—began two political careers that reached all the way to the U.S. Congress.

Before Dr. Smith walked into the "bear trap" that was the mayor's office in those depression days—\$80,000 in unpaid bills filed away in bottom drawers—he persuaded the then 33-year-old Brookshire to work for his administration.

Mr. Brookshire recalls that he moved into city hall reluctantly but soon caught Mayor Smith's enthusiasm as one problem after another was tackled.

In 1937 Dr. Smith became the first Marion mayor to be re-elected in over 20 years.

In 1938, Mayor Smith became Congressman Smith. Harry went along to head up his Washington office. They remained a team until illness forced the congressman to exit the rigors of Washington life in 1949.

The Republican nomination race to fill Dr. Smith's seat saw Mr. Brookshire carry five of the six counties, but losing by a couple of hundred votes in the overall tally.

Next came service with Rep. Howard Buffet as administrative aide.

The 1952 Eisenhower presidential campaign was the busiest time of Brookshire's life as he acted as part of a two-man team of advance men for the campaign train of Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Brookshire recalls with a shudder:

"I was supposed to keep 10 days ahead of the train, but I'd wake up at night thinking I heard the train whistle blowing—some days I was 5 or 6 days ahead—when the campaign was over I was ready to fall into bed and stay there for a month."

But he was not allowed to take it easy as he was immediately drafted to work on the Eisenhower inaugural.

"I remember sitting in inauguration headquarters on New Year's Eve—holding the phone in my hand and trying to track down Republicans all over the nation to confirm their hotel accommodations—or whatever it was I needed to talk to them about."

With the campaign and then the inauguration out of the way, Mr. Brookshire looked forward to taking some time off from the political wars.

He couldn't. He was named a confidential assistant in the Post Office Department and then he was appointed a special assistant to Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield. In October 1955 he became the postmaster general's executive assistant.

He recalled his advancement to the elected position of floor assistant to the minority in the House as "the toughest political fight I was ever involved in during 30 years in Washington."

However, he won and held the position since 1958 under three minority leaders.

His duties were to direct and coordinate activities of minority employes, and to be the control point on the House floor for all inquiries and requests that had to do with legislative matters and minority employes.

For a man who had little interest in politics as he grew up in a city that helped produce a president, Harry L. Brookshire, spent a virtual lifetime at the country's very heartbeat.

Minority leaders were shocked when they learned of Harry's decision to step down, even though the pay for the job was being raised \$8,000 per year to \$36,000.

"It was time to come home. We started building this home two years ago and it's ready to be lived in now. So here we are," he added.

From the hustle and bustle of Washington to life in Washington Township, one mile south of Iberia, is quite a change of pace.

Mr. and Mrs. Brookshire both agreed that the change was good and they were extremely happy to settle down next to their longtime friends, Rudolph "Rudy" and Jayne Forry, former Marionites who own the neighboring farm.

Miss Lela M. Brookshire of Marion, a teacher at Eber Baker Middle School, is Mr. Brookshire's sister.

BIG TRUCK BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my editorials for today are from the Knoxville, Journal, the Nashville Banner, the Commercial Appeal of July 21, 1969, the Nashville Tennessean, the Commercial Appeal of July 14, 1969, the Memphis Press-Scimitar, and the Jackson Sun, in the State of Tennessee. The editorials follow:

[From the Jackson (Tenn.) Sun, Sept. 22, 1969]

NO TRUCK TRAINS, PLEASE

The trucking industry, engaged in a determined campaign for the last year or so to persuade the government to give even larger trucks the run of the nation's roads, has come up with a new argument.

Industry spokesmen asserted in congressional hearings that the size and weight hikes desired would actually contribute to highway safety.

Their reasoning is that by abandoning the present weight limit—73,280 pounds—for trucks on the interstate system and adopting instead an axle-spacing formula, weight distribution would be improved.

Trucks might be heavier—up to 92,500 pounds—and wider, but also better-balanced, and therefore less of a hazard to truckers, passenger car drivers, bridges and the roadways themselves, it is claimed.

There is no question that trucking is an important element in the transport system of a consumption-happy society or, perhaps, that there are valid arguments for bringing existing regulations into line with changing needs of the industry and public, improved technology and highway facilities.

But this is one that is likely to be difficult to sell to drivers who have had white-knuckled experience maneuvering around and among present width and weight trucks, or struggled to keep a car on the road in the gale-force winds frequently created by trucks.

Besides, the volume of traffic on the nation's highway system has already increased to such an extent that coping with other vehicles of reasonable size and length is task enough to require any motorist's most careful attention and driving skill—without the added danger and difficulty of having to contend with giant-sized "truck trains," as these highway behemoths are so well described.

The truck industry's argument about axles may be valid with respect to weight distribution, but it fails to solve the more important problem that truck trains would create—the problem of worrying and endangering the motoring public.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal, July 12, 1969]

BIG TRUCK SOPHISTRY

The trucking industry is now claiming that longer, heavier and wider vehicles will provide more safety not only for truck drivers but for motorists as well. To us this contention is incredible.

In Washington the House of Representatives public roads subcommittee heard testimony to that effect Thursday from William A. Bresnahan, managing director of the American Trucking Association. He was appearing before the group in support of a bill which would allow trucks using interstate highways to weigh up to 92,500 pounds loaded and to have six more inches of width and maximum length of 70 feet.

Bresnahan argued that the bill's formula for spacing axles would spread a truck's weight better on the road, resulting in a higher safety factor and also more protection of bridges. He said the extra width would give trucks more stability.

It is hard to see how the proposed specifications could yield much more safety for motorists except possibly in the sense that fewer truck wrecks would present fewer hazards to other traffic.

Wider trucks would be made difficult to see around from vehicles behind them. Longer trucks would be more difficult to overtake.

The trucking industry will answer that those considerations are not so important on the multiple-lane interstate highways.

Of course, the reply to that argument is that there is no practical way to allow longer, wider and heavier trucks on interstate highways and at the same time prohibit them from using other roads and streets. The monster trucks must deliver their loads either to consignees or to terminals off the interstate system.

The proposed legislation should be defeated. In our judgment it would add to hazards for the public on interstate highways and multiply the perils on lesser roads and city streets.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, July 16, 1969]

ON BIGGER HIGHWAY BOXCARS ANSWER STILL IS NO

Back and forth—between the state legislatures and Congress—the trucking industry goes continuously, pressing at each level for legal enlargement of weight and size for its vehicles. And it is no surprise to learn that it is angling at Washington again for federal authority to that end. As noted in the news columns, it was attempting last week to prove that the use of "truck trains" carrying gross weights of up to 108,000 pounds—nearly 36,000 pounds more than is legal in Tennessee—would improve traffic safety and cause less damage to highways and bridges.

Thanks to Reps. Fred Schwengel, R-Iowa, and Richard McCarthy, D-N.Y., the contention was sharply challenged in the House Public Works subcommittee, before which that pitch was made. Counteractive testimony was cited by Schwengel showing that

if the "big truck" bill is enacted, the life of highways will be shortened by 35 to 40 percent; and McCarthy dwelt on the enlarged traffic hazard, along with the added construction and maintenance costs occasioned by heavier wear and tear.

Most States, at their own responsibility level, have recognized both aspects—and public opposition is clear at the grassroots level. That showed strongly in Tennessee at the 1969 session of the General Assembly when the trucking industry sought unsuccessfully to put through its measure for twin-trailer rigs, exceeding the present length and weight limitations. Though the proposal was simply left dangling, the opposition remains—and the same objection applies, whether the approach to legalization of longer, wider, heavier trucks is through state legislatures or the national law-making body.

Rep. Richard Fulton was speaking to that very point, and in the public interest Monday, in urging the Public Works Committee to kill the measure proposed.

That is something for Congress, hearing from home, to bear in mind. Members representative of district by district and state by state cannot, in reason disregard that obvious public objection.

Highway construction and maintenance are expensive enough without increasing that cost, present or future, needlessly. They are built for safety as well as convenience, and the public interest wants no encroachment on the safety factor. Mindful of these facts, Congress should have all the incentive it needs to reject this encroaching legislation.

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, July 21, 1969]

TRUCKS—THE SAME OLD STORY

This year's effort by owners of the biggest trucks on the highways to get congressional approval for states to accept longer, heavier and wider rubber-tired freight cars is mostly a continuation of last year's campaign.

The outcome should be the same as in 1968. After the Senate had approved, the public became aware of opposition by the American Automobile Association (AAA), and of warnings issued by qualified highway engineers, when newspapers took an intense interest in the trucker plans. Eventually both presidential candidates took note of the doubts and the House put the plan on a back shelf.

The main change in the truckers proposal this year is a 70-foot length limit. There was no limit in last year's proposal and visions of truck trains of three and four trailers alarmed the public. But the present limit in most states east of the Mississippi River is 55 feet, a length on which there is little reason to haul double bottoms. The added 15 feet would encourage tractor-and-two-trailer rigs. The proposal is also to leave present laws allowing longer lengths in Western states.

The truckers want a maximum width of 102 inches, six inches more than at present. Standard width of traffic lanes would remain, which means decreased space for passing.

This year's emphasis is on a maximum weight of 34,000 pounds for each tandem axle. But the gross weight limit of 73,280 pounds has been abandoned in favor of a weight that could group with the number of axles to 108,500 pounds on nine axles.

Two witnesses this year have made an extra impression. George F. Kachlein, executive vice president of the AAA, pointed to 1.8 billion dollars as the 10-year added cost of highway repairs due to the proposed allowance of 34,000 pounds on a tandem axle.

Newer is the testimony of Richard J. Bocabella of Belmont County (St. Clairsville), Ohio, president of the National Association of County Engineers. He told Congress that

71.4 percent of Ohio's county highways are unsafe for even the present vehicles, much less bigger ones.

This is another year but there is the same old attempt by owners of about 1.5 percent of the vehicles on the road to use still bigger trucks.

As to safety they are involved in 11.6 percent of the fatal accidents.

As to cost, they shorten the life of billions of dollars of pavements built with taxes, even though extra taxes have been put into surfaces that could be constructed at much less cost, such as parkways on which trucks are barred.

It's an old story and it needs the same ending it had last year.

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Aug. 3, 1969]

PUBLIC DREADS 70-FOOT TRUCKS

The trucking industry lobby, which has been having less and less success in badgering state legislatures with special interest legislation, is asking Congress again for bigger trucks.

The truckers are proposing that they be given permission to operate trucks up to 70 feet on interstate highways, with an increase in the present maximum weight, which is already over 36 tons.

Tennessee now limits trucks to 55 feet, although the average motorist might question whether it is enforced. The legislature recently turned down truckers' requests for 65-foot twin trailer rigs on interstate highways.

The truckers, of course, argue that longer and heavier trucks would be safer and more economical. Opponents have told Congress bigger trucks will increase hazards to the average motorist and cost billions in road repairs.

After the completion of the interstate system, the states will take over the cost of maintenance, and the damage could be a substantial burden on already overloaded taxpayers.

But an even more compelling argument is the sheer terror of a motorist passing, or being passed by, or colliding with, such a monster. Congress turned the truckers down last year, and it is difficult to see how their proposal is any more in the public interest this time.

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, July 14, 1969]

BIG TRUCKS ARE FEW

The fact that only a few owners of heavy trucks oppose multitudes of automobile owners is gradually becoming known.

This is an opposition in which a frequent dispute is how much cost is added to highway building for benefit of trucks, or how much of the added cost should be paid by truck owners. The basic fact is that parkways, on which trucks are forbidden, can be constructed for a fraction of the cost of major highways.

But the number of trucks on the new highways give a false impression of frequency because they're concentrated on the most modern routes and because they run a 24-hour day.

When a legislature is in session there is another false impression of vast numbers because owners of big trucks have enlisted help of those who own the fleet of ordinary farm trucks, delivery vehicles and others of a weight that can easily be handled by pavements.

Now the Department of Transportation shows 101,048,000 motor vehicles registered last year. Counting all sizes, only 16,998,000 of these were trucks.

That is a fast increase from the 12,659,000 of five years ago and the rate of increase last year was greater than for automobiles.

But most of these were of sizes for which older pavements were designed. The pave-

ment troubles, and the questions about protecting investment of tax dollars in highways, come from a smaller number of vehicles, the 1,153,000 tractor-semi-trailers on the roads when 1968 ended. They are only seven percent of the trucks.

Even this is a much too large indication of the number of trucks of doubtful size.

Combinations of five axles or more sold last year numbered only 216,000. That was a mere 1.36 percent of truck sales.

This is the little fragment of truck owners—the tiny sliver of automobile-bus-truck owners—that produces the constant pressure for longer, wider and heavier freight carriers on highways.

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Press-Scimitar, July 18, 1969]

THE TRUCK BILL AGAIN

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

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

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

These factors, the truckers contend, also would promote safety by permitting improved braking ability for big rigs and better road visibility for their drivers.

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

But that interest must be weighed against the public's interest in the use of the interstate system—a \$60,000,000,000 taxpayer-financed project—and the other highway arteries onto which it empties.

Executive Vice President George Kachlein of the American Automobile Association, which opposes the bill, charges the extra truck weights permitted (up to 108,500 pounds for a nine-axle truck) would cost \$1,800,000,000 for road repairs in 10 years.

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

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

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

ENVIRONMENT—ISSUE OF THE 1970'S

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, much has been said recently regarding the activism of our youth toward efforts to preserve

and protect our planet's environment. This new activism on a relatively non-political issue foretells that environmental protection and enhancement will indeed be the issue of the 1970's.

An example of the concern of youth for this issue was received by me just recently. Kent Hubbs, a freshman at Acalanes High School in Lafayette, Calif., sent me the following poem reflecting his views on this subject:

Look all ye men, at the miracles of life which
God has laid before you.
He laid a carpet of green life over the barren
hills.
He filled the seas with abundant fish.
He covered the earth in a blanket of crawling
creatures.
He made Human Beings with a brain for
them to use at their will.
Now look God, at the wonders which man,
the creatures with the brains, has put
before the Earth.
Men took lush, green hills and laid down
ribbons of rock called asphalt. On this
rock he put machines that eat more
oxygen in twenty minutes than five
million people do in one day.
Man dipped huge nets into the seas God
made, and drained them of their life.
Man pulled the life out of the once-living
Earth for no other creature but him-
self.
This—man calls Progress.

ABM IS NOT THE ANSWER

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, while this House has completed authorization of the Safeguard ABM system for this fiscal year, the debate over the merits of an antimissile defense is by no means over.

The Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., has long been closely involved with the controversy over the ABM and has devoted much of its news and editorial space to an exploration of the pros and cons of this issue. Most recently, an editorial appeared in this newspaper commenting on just released secret debate on ABM in the other body. If, as the testimony on the Senate floor indicated, the Soviet's SS-9 missiles are aimed directly at our ICBM's, then, according to the Standard-Times, our proper course is to develop less vulnerable offensive weapons rather than seek the deployment of inadequate defensive missiles.

In light of this the Standard-Times concludes that our best course of action is to further the development of Polaris subs armed with Poseidon missiles. As the editorial states—

If we need a weapon, why not spend the money on a sure one—Polaris-Poseidon?

Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, Nov. 29, 1969]

ABM IS NOT THE ANSWER

Previously censored congressional debate and testimony, recently made public, are credited with having produced the administration's knife-edge victory for the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system last summer.

It now is revealed that ABM supporters contended the Soviet Union's SS-9 missiles, thought previously to be aimed in the general direction of U.S. Minuteman bases, actually are zeroed in on them.

This thesis, attributed to U.S. intelligence sources, added support to the claim by Defense Secretary Laird that the U.S.S.R. is trying to achieve a first-strike capability that would enable it to knock out U.S. offensive missile bases and prevent retaliation for an attack.

At about the same time, Lt.-Gen. A. D. Starbird, systems manager for the ABM, told a House subcommittee that U.S. intelligence experts believe that within five years, SS-9 with multiple warheads will be accurate within a quarter-mile. Presumably, this is a related evaluation, based on the same data, and the general presented it in arguing for expansion of the Safeguard program.

Assuming the intelligence information is correct, building an antiballistic missile system is no answer to the SS-9 threat against the Minuteman.

First, Safeguard will not work, according to some of the best authorities in the field that we have. At least 11 scientists of national reputation from Harvard and MIT, including Prof. Steven Weinberg, MIT physicist, have informed Congress that the Safeguard missile site radar—designed to track incoming missiles and aim the defensive missiles at them—would be housed in an exposed structure that could be destroyed by a nuclear explosion 2½ miles away.

Principally, this is because, unlike missiles, which can be housed in protected silos underground, the radar installations would be partly above ground.

Second, the sure answer to the Soviet SS-9 threat is stepped-up improvement of the Polaris-Poseidon missile-carrying submarine fleet. Although Secretary Laird, presumably to strengthen his ABM case, has expressed some doubts about the invulnerability of this effective U.S. deterrent, those most intimately familiar with it have not.

As recently as Nov. 24, in an interview with U.S. News and World Report, Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, chief of naval operations, implicitly responded to this doubt when he rated the Soviet Navy, including its submarine fleet, "the second-best in the world."

In an exclusive interview with James H. Ottaway Jr., publisher of The Standard-Times last May, Rear-Admiral Levering Smith, director of Navy strategic systems, was even more specific.

Admiral Smith said, "I am quite positive that Russian submarines cannot and are not following any of our Polaris submarines under water. I am also quite positive that the new generation of Russian submarines that are getting close to operational status, that are now being tested, will also not be able to follow our Polaris submarines."

If we need a weapon, why not spend the money on a sure one—Polaris-Poseidon?

IRVING MACHIZ—FEDERAL TAX COLLECTOR HAS FAITH IN PEOPLE AND COMPUTERS

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, knowing of your interest and the interests of our colleagues in the Congress in the manner in which Government officials function, I wish to invite your attention to a truly outstanding man who is the District Collector of the Internal Revenue Service in Baltimore. This dedicated official is

Irving Machiz, whose service to both the people and the Government has attracted wide notice in creating a very favorable impression of the people in the Federal Government. His aim is to help citizens, and in this worthwhile endeavor he has achieved success.

The Evening Sun of Baltimore, in an article which appeared on December 2, 1969, published an account of Mr. Machiz's faith in people and computers. Believing this to be of considerable national interest, I now insert it at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article is as follows:

MACHIZ, A TAX COLLECTOR WHO HAS FAITH IN PEOPLE AND COMPUTERS
(By Anne S. Philbin)

What manner of man is the modern-day tax collector?

In Baltimore he's a man with strong faith in people and computers.

Irving Machiz, director of District 11, Internal Revenue Service, has had nearly 35 years in government service to assess the nature of the American taxpayer.

Mr. Machiz has been a deputy collector internal revenue agent, group supervisor in the audit division, chief of field audit branch, chief of collection division, assistant district director, and district director since 1958.

"The voluntary compliance with income tax laws by 97 per cent of the American people is a tremendous tribute to the honesty of our citizens. It's the highest of any country in the world," he said.

SERVICE EMPHASIZED

A short man with graying dark hair, Mr. Machiz emphasizes the "service" in Internal Revenue Service.

"We're here to help people, not just collect taxes. During the filing period we handle 4,000 calls a day, plus hundreds of inquiries from people who walk in off the street.

"We have from 40 to 50 extra phone lines and extra help on the counter. There are always taxpayers' service representatives in our 11 offices in the Maryland-District of Columbia district.

"Between May 1 and October 31 we've answered 123,990 phone inquiries and 35,714 over-the-counter questions."

Mr. Machiz can always quote exact figures on any phase of his district's operation; his "desk companion" is a large yellow paper filled with up-to-the-day columns of statistics.

In IRS he's his well-known for "getting around." He goes through "the plant" which covers much of six floors in the Federal Building, talking with the employees, most of whom he knows by name. At peak filing periods he'll often answer the phone himself to find out what questions taxpayers are asking most.

To him, all people including the 984 who work for him, are VIP's. The President of the United States is one of his district's taxpayers, too.

Mr. Machiz sees his "mission" like this: "It's my job to encourage and improve voluntary compliance with the nation's income tax laws and to maintain the highest degree of public confidence in the integrity and efficiency of the department. I also like to think, in assessing my time here, that I've established a much better climate in terms of people understanding not only what they must pay but also what they're entitled to in the way of deductions and refunds."

As to his faith in computerized tax collection, Mr. Machiz says data processing has resulted in substantial improvement in the system and enabled IRS to do "a much better and more efficient job."

"In the filing period that ended April 15 computers found the nation's taxpayers

made \$131 million worth of mathematical mistakes. This was returned to the taxpayers. "On the other hand, computers also uncovered \$267 million worth of errors favoring the government.

PLAYS TABLE TENNIS

"Computers have substantially diminished the number of non-filers, prevented duplicate refunds from being issued, and are bound to ensure everyone pays a fair share," Mr. Machiz said.

Born and educated in New York, Mr. Machiz obtained an accounting degree in Washington, and became a certified public accountant in Maryland in 1948. He is married and has three children, Stephen, an Air Force doctor, Edward, and Sharon.

He's a theater-goer, jogger, and plays table tennis, particularly enjoying those rare times when he can win a match from his young grandson.

Come the day after Christmas, you'll be hearing from the Internal Revenue Service with its new Form 1040. It's a one-page individual income tax return which replaces both old forms 1040 and 1040A, and to which schedules can be added to cover any particular tax situation.

If you need help, remember what Mr. Machiz said: IRS is here to help you.

FATHER OF HERO PROTESTS
MISUSE OF WAR DEAD

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, 1st Lt. Garland D. "Skip" Whitmore was an armored combat platoon leader serving in the Army in Vietnam. He was killed in action September 1967. Posthumously, he was awarded the Bronze Star for valor, and other citations.

He was an outstanding young man in many ways and his death was deeply mourned by his friends and especially his family.

This young man was a resident of my congressional district and his surviving family make their home in Harrisonburg. His father has been a leader in our State against the misuse of the names of servicemen killed in action by those who protest and demonstrate against the American effort in South Vietnam.

In a poignant newspaper interview which appeared in the Daily News Record published in Harrisonburg, Va., on November 8, 1969, Ellen Layman gives the reader an insight to Mr. Don Whitmore and how he feels about using his deceased son's name in antiwar protests.

I call it to the attention of the other Members:

"If my boy had the courage to stand on the firing line in Vietnam, then I've got the courage to stand on the firing line at home."

And on the firing line stands a pleasant-looking man, late fortysix, with a graying crew cut and wearing a bow tie.

He might be any man proud of his son, but a gold star emblem in his lapel sets him apart. His oldest son died in Vietnam in September 1967.

In the closing days before the Oct. 15 moratorium, the man with the gold star stood on the firing line virtually alone.

Now with the second moratorium ap-

proaching next week, he's still there, but he's not by himself.

The governor of Virginia joined him just before the first moratorium. The President of the United States has written him a "very personal letter." Telephone calls, letters and telegrams identify others ready to stand with him on the firing line.

And now the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion are being asked to lend their support to his cause.

His cause is his opposition to having his dead son's name used as anti-war demonstrators hold moratorium ceremonies.

His stance on the firing line is one of determination for G. Don Whitmore of Harrisonburg. Since his plea for having his son's name removed from the list gained the support of Gov. Mills E. Godwin Jr., Mr. Whitmore has heard from about 100 other people—mostly those who have lost sons or husbands in the war.

"Many have paid high compliments to the governor for his stand," Mr. Whitmore says, "and many say there must be some way to stop it (the reading of the war dead)."

"Since the October moratorium, their replies and the whole problem has just kept eating at me, just eating at me."

So Mr. Whitmore began contacting other people for their suggestions as to what he might do to make his opposition more effective. And he's launched a plan he believes will spread the campaign nationwide.

Friday, Mr. Whitmore, through a local VFW post, telegraphed the national VFW headquarters in Washington, D.C. asking for the organization's help in removing his son's name—1st Lt. Garland D. (Skip) Whitmore—from the lists of war dead used by protesters.

He's also extended an appeal to relatives of other servicemen killed in Vietnam to send wires to the national offices of either the VFW or American Legion—through local posts or by direct wire—and give the full name of the person killed, his rank, branch of service and address, requesting that his name not be used in the protests.

Other persons also can express their support of the program by wiring the two service organizations. Mr. Whitmore said.

As leader of the movement, Mr. Whitmore says he is "not being disrespectful" to the demonstrators with anti-war sentiments.

"Our boys are fighting for them to have the right to protest. And I feel I have the same right to ask them not to dishonor my son and my family."

He also plans to express his opposition to the moratorium by displaying the American flag at his home, keeping lights burning through the night and driving with the headlights on through the three-day moratorium period which begins Tuesday, Veterans Day.

Mr. Whitmore says his family supports the efforts he's taken during the anti-war demonstrations. "Of course it brings back sadness, but we sat down as a family and decided this had to be done."

He says his son Paul, a senior in the cadet corps at Virginia Tech, agrees with the stand, "believing as I do that they have no right to use his (Lt. Whitmore's) name. I've given no one my permission to use his name."

And the Whitmores' teenage daughter Kathryn has planned an anti-protest of her own. When other students wear black armbands on moratorium days, she and some of her friends have prepared red, white and blue armbands to show their support of the men fighting in Vietnam.

Mr. Whitmore wears his own symbol.

The gold star.

"I wear it with sorrow, but more and more I'm wearing it with pride. It keeps me conscious . . . makes me realize what this all means."

ALERTNESS OF WORTHINGTON
PLANT APPLAUDED

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fine public service performed by the employees and management of the Campbell Soup Co. packing plant located at Worthington, Minn.

According to an article in the Wall Street Journal of November 28, workers at the Worthington plant detected a number of turkeys that contained harmful pesticide impurities even though the birds had received the U.S. Government's stamp of approval. Had it not been for the self-policing policies of the Campbell plant in Worthington, it is entirely possible that these turkeys would have wound up on the dinner table.

The company's action in alerting the Agriculture Department's Consumer and Marketing Service of the source of contamination is most commendable. The incident illustrates the undeniable value of the food processing industry's own enormous effort to produce only the best and most wholesome things to eat. Certainly, this is an example of the kind of industry responsibility and cooperation that is fundamentally important to the successful operation of our Federal consumer protection programs.

I include the full text of the Journal article at this point in my remarks:

PESTICIDE AMOUNTS IN FOOD MAY BE HIGHER THAN U.S. TESTS HINT, TWO INCIDENTS SUGGEST

(By Burt Schorr)

WASHINGTON.—How much pesticide did you eat for Thanksgiving?

If you judge by the Government averages, any amounts of unwanted chemicals in those heaping servings of turkey were too small to worry about. Yet, two major incidents this year—one of them involving New York State chickens which has received scarcely any public notice—suggest there's more pesticide in our foods than Uncle Sam's random sampling methods might disclose.

Federal, state and local tests for pesticides do prevent quantities of milk and produce from reaching market. In one widely publicized case last April, the Food and Drug Administration seized 15,000 pounds of frozen Lake Michigan Coho salmon found to contain prohibited amounts of DDT. The incident was a factor in the Nixon Administration's subsequent announced intention to sharply curb DDT use.

Nevertheless, public health experts here agree that pesticide surveillance by government and industry remains far from foolproof, particularly for poultry.

Domesticated fowl may ingest only tiny amounts of pesticide with each peck of feed or soil. But DDT, dieldrin, heptachlor and other persistent chlorinated hydrocarbons can soon accumulate to undesirable levels in their skin and other fatty tissue. At the end of the food chain, Man, such "magnification" intensifies, especially if he dines on contaminated products several times in a short period.

There isn't any solid clinical evidence that continuing small doses of these long-lasting pesticides harm humans. Experiments with

laboratory animals suggest, however, that such chronic exposure could damage a human's nervous system, and could reduce the effectiveness of drugs he takes to cure disease.

PUBLIC GUARDIANS

Presumably on guard against such risks is the Agriculture Department's Consumer and Marketing Service, which shares food-wholesomeness responsibilities with FDA through its regulation of meat and poultry crossing state lines. This year, the eight CMS regional laboratories are expected to analyze about 3,000 poultry carcasses for pesticides. This sampling, however, when measured against the year's slaughter of 2.3 billion turkeys and chickens, is far too small to identify all local pesticide hotspots, CMS officials concede.

"The sampling they do isn't intended to locate particular birds with pesticide in them. It's more like sticking thermometers in rivers and lakes around the country and coming up with a national average water temperature," says Rod Leonard, who headed CMS during the Johnson Administration and pushed through several poultry-inspection reforms. Declares a Nixon man, Assistant Agriculture Secretary Richard Lying, "We should have a valid statistical sampling technique to give quality assurance in this area, and I'm going to find out why we don't."

Evidence of the present system's inadequacy surfaced three weeks ago when the Agriculture Department disclosed that for almost a month it had been investigating heptachlor epoxide contamination of turkeys, most of them originally destined for the nation's Thanksgiving tables.

At the outset of the turkey emergency, officials feared it might be nationwide. But a crash testing program, kept under wraps until the announcement, found that it involved only growers supplying a single slaughterer, Arkansas Valley Industries, Inc., Little Rock. Arkansas growers apparently spread heptachlor epoxide on their turkey ranges to hold down chiggers, despite label warnings that it could harm livestock. (Reportedly, when one grower was asked if he'd noted these warnings, he replied: "Hell, I ain't raising livestock. I'm raising turkeys.")

Heptachlor epoxide, a poison prescribed for use against fire ants, fleas, termites and other insect pests, is three to five times as powerful as DDT. The Agriculture Department requires the destruction of slaughtered poultry and poultry products containing one half part or more of heptachlor epoxide per million parts, on the ground that it's never been demonstrated why a higher level should be permitted. At latest count, about 350,000 Arkansas turkeys apparently exceeded this limit. Most of these birds contained one to three parts of the pesticide per million, but one shipment traced to Kansas City measured nearly 17 parts. (The total of contaminated turkeys includes 124,000 live birds being fed a special high-protein ration in the hope of purging the heptachlor epoxide from their bodies.)

U.S. "WHOLESOMENESS" STAMP

The Government is embarrassed about the quantity of carcasses at Arkansas Valley Industries that Federal inspectors unwittingly stamped "inspected for wholesomeness by the U.S. Department of Agriculture." If Campbell Soup Co.'s packing plant at Worthington, Minn., hadn't been among the consignees of Arkansas Valley turkeys, Uncle Sam might never have learned about the impurities—or might have found out too late to prevent the birds from reaching the table.

For nine years, Campbell has operated a "residue monitoring" system intended to detect chemical traces in the ingredients for its soups, frozen dinners and other products.

Several food companies do the same, but many other concerns buying poultry apparently rely on the Federal stamp as assurance of wholesomeness. An Arkansas Valley official, noting that his company lacks such equipment, says he knows of only one laboratory in Arkansas able to conduct pesticide tests.

Another embarrassment arises out of the department's long-standing policy of withholding public information about incidents like this. Not until Arthur E. Rowse, a consumer columnist, got a tip and asked for an explanation did the department issue its Nov. 7 press statement—four weeks after Campbell alerted CMS that a large number of frozen Arkansas Valley turkeys exceeded Federal pesticide limits.

The food industry may find the department less tender in the future. "There's a tradition in the whole agricultural community, not just the USDA, of getting jobs like the turkey problem done without alarming the public," comments an aide of Agriculture Secretary Hardin who helps formulate pesticide policy. "But this is a different public. It has to be alerted," he says, promising that "there are going to be some changes."

However, the department still hasn't informed the public that, for a while last June, CMS thought as many as 630,000 laying hens in upper New York State might contain prohibitively high levels of the pesticide dieldrin in their fatty tissue. Many of these chickens, their egg-laying years over, had been sent to a Delaware food-processing plant where they were converted into nearly 57,000 pounds of chicken also used some of these birds inadvertently, but hasn't yet determined exactly how many pounds of its products it will have to destroy. The Government traced the shipments promptly and none of the contaminated meat reached retail stores.

THE CONDITIONS IN RHODESIA

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, discrimination in Rhodesia is intensifying. The practice of minority rule over the vast majority is a threat to peace which cannot and must not be ignored. If something is not done to change the direction of events in Rhodesia to make possible African advancement and social justice, those responsible will pay in blood for their indifference.

On October 16, 1969, the House of Commons in Great Britain debated the issue of Rhodesia. The statement of Mr. Frank Judd, Member of Parliament, succinctly describes the current travesty in Rhodesia and outlines the necessary steps to insure freedom and equality for the people of Zimbabwe.

Mr. Judd's speech is of vital interest for all persons opposed to racial persecution and is particularly timely to bring to the attention of subscribers to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, since the Subcommittee on Africa, House Foreign Affairs Committee, which I am privileged to chair, has just completed hearings on United States-Rhodesian relations. Mr. Judd's speech follows:

STATEMENT OF MR. FRANK JUDD, MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT

At the time of this crucial debate, as we approach the fourth anniversary of U.D.I., I

think it best, as my right hon. Friend has suggested, that we try to look at the immediate situation in Rhodesia in the perspective of developments over the past year.

The first point which I think we should accept is that we have clearly failed to reach our objectives in Rhodesia. The Smith regime still rides high; police State methods are still employed; many hundreds of people are detained without trial simply because of their political beliefs. There is political manipulation of the educational content in schools and universities; *apartheid*, with all its ghastly implications, is about to be written into the constitutional basis of the country, and getting on for 5 million people living within Rhodesia are still denied their elementary civil and political rights, while 250,000 people alone prepare to entrench supremacy on the basis of a ruthlessly exploited majority.

Perhaps one of the most serious criticisms of the Government is that, throughout the Rhodesian crisis, they have failed to deploy effectively in terms of the education of British public opinion, the mass of detailed evidence available of the human stories, the human tragedies, involved for the ordinary people of Rhodesia in the system which is followed by the Smith régime. It is my conviction that, if we are to maintain in Britain the enlightened public attitudes which are essential to sustain the Government in their policy, we should use this information in simple terms to counter the distorted propaganda of the Anglo-Rhodesian Society and others.

We are not only faced with failure in the context of events within Rhodesia; we are also faced with a fundamental, qualitative change in the international situation. Immediately following U.D.I., it was possible to argue that, whatever the rather superficial emotional reaction of "good old Smithy" slogans among the white electorate of South Africa, there was reason to believe that the political leaders of South Africa were extremely embarrassed by Smith's declaration of independence, that the last thing which the political leaders of the Republic of South Africa wanted was to see their internal security problems strained by having to take responsibility for security in an area in which there were approaching 5 million Africans and only 250,000 Europeans.

But now, as a result of the vacuum created by our failure to deal effectively with the situation, Rhodesia finds itself, and we find Rhodesia firmly in the South African orbit. Economically, Rhodesia is underwritten by the Republic of South Africa. Militarily, she is firmly in alliance with the Portuguese authorities and the Government of the Republic. South African security forces, we know, are operating as far up as the Zambesi. Even if, initially, it was right to attempt to handle Rhodesia on its own, it is now impossible to have a viable policy toward it separate from policy toward Southern Africa as a whole. There are different forms of action which will be necessary toward different areas within Southern Africa, but all that action, different as it may be in differing areas, is inextricably inter-related.

First, let us examine for a moment the policy of sanctions in Rhodesia. It is clear from all the evidence available that, while sanctions have punished the people of Rhodesia—and one can argue about which section of the community they have punished more than another—they have not endangered, as yet, the Smith régime. They have also in certain respects been counter-productive, in that they have encouraged, for example, the development of import substitute industries. But it would be wrong, in my view, to suggest that the policy of sanctions as such has failed. What has failed has been the endeavour by the international commu-

nity to apply a full-blooded policy of sanctions. We have so far seen, at best, only a half-hearted attempt.

How can we strengthen this policy of sanctions? Much more could be done. First, we could do a great deal more to focus world public opinion on sanction breaking, wherever it is located. If we focus world opinion in this way, it will acutely embarrass those involved in the operation and make their endeavours more difficult to fulfill.

Next, we should be pressing at the United Nations for an international inspectorate. It is quite clear from some of the episodes already reported in sanction breaking that Governments are reluctant to come into headlong conflict with important commercial interests within their territory if they are expected to take the initiative in locating sanction breaking. If an independent United Nations inspectorate were employed on this operation, Governments would be relieved of a great deal of their embarrassment, because they would then be following up the initiative of an objective international agency.

We should also be pressing for United Nations action to persuade member countries to make it illegal, as we have made it illegal, for ships carrying their flags to carry Rhodesian cargo. We should also press for international action to ensure that ships carrying suspect cargoes should be expected to produce evidence of where the goods were manufactured, copies of rail notes showing from where the goods were originally shipped and official certificates of origin.

We come now to the difficult question whether we should attempt to extend sanctions. I listened with great interest to the sound observations made by the right hon. Gentleman opposite on the extension of sanctions to communications, and I believe that the points he made are not to be dismissed lightly. What I have been sad to hear is the view expressed in this House, particularly from benches opposite, that it would somehow be inhuman to break family links between people in this country and white people living in Rhodesia. This is an emotional argument and completely irrelevant. We are concerned with the rights of 5 million people, oppressed and suppressed by a mere handful of 250,000 Europeans. There is one practical step which I believe we could take in the extension of sanctions, at this juncture, and that is to consider more effective ways of boycotting international airlines which are operating services to Rhodesia.

I want at this stage to say that I endorse the argument that sanctions of themselves are unlikely to secure fundamental change. At best, they will create an environment within which, sadly but inevitably, more drastic political upheaval can occur within Rhodesia itself. On the other hand, the consequences of dismantling sanctions would be disastrous. To embark upon such a policy would be a blow to the morale of enlightened liberal groups of all races within Southern Africa. It would lead inevitably to our increased economic involvement in the economic life of Rhodesia.

It would mean that we were increasingly finding ourselves with a vested interest as a nation in a political and economic system based on exploitation. It would lead inevitably to pressure, both in this country and abroad, for diplomatic recognition, and it would mean that, finally, we had become identified, and in the last resort—a sad but possible prospect—we might even be indirectly supporting a fight on the wrong side.

Meanwhile, there are much more positive things we could be doing. Nowhere is this better illustrated than in education and training for Rhodesians in exile. It is true that we have been doing a certain amount in this respect, but our efforts have been at best half-hearted. For example, one hears evi-

dence of students who have been denied an opportunity to reach the A-level equivalent in Rhodesia, but who are perfectly able to reach that level if given an opportunity, being denied the chance to come to this country with support to get their A-levels in order to go on to higher education here. If we are committed to a programme of education and training for Rhodesians in exile, one of the things we should be considering is extending the range of educational opportunities which we are supporting within this country.

As I have already argued, Rhodesia cannot be seen in isolation. My conviction is that the Government, the British people and especially the House must decide whether they are opposed to racism, Fascism and exploitation or whether they are not. Prevarication and double-talk can do nothing but harm Britain's interests. If we are opposed, and if we accept our special responsibilities in Southern Africa because of Rhodesia, we must go on to recognise that in our post-imperial phase we cannot possibly envisage military engagement, at least alone, and that it would be very wrong to encourage anybody within Southern Africa to believe the contrary. This would have been possible in the case of Rhodesia immediately before or after U.D.I., but now it is too late. That does not mean that we are neutral. The main drive for political change must and will come from within the area itself. We for our part must identify with those forces of change.

A major tragedy in the story of Southern Africa is that our self-proclaimed impotence has made Communism synonymous with all the legitimate aspirations of subjected peoples. In approaching Southern Africa as a whole, one of the things which we must do is to think through the issue of our trading relationship with the Republic, because unless we do that, we cannot hope to be effective in our pressure on the Rhodesian issue itself.

The fact is that even if we cannot as of now envisage economic confrontation with the Republic, while it is one thing to accept that, it is quite another to go on to argue that we see increased trade and increasing economic relations with the Republic as a future pillar of our economic well-being. It is inevitable that if we increase our economic involvement in the Republic, we will increasingly find ourselves committed to a social and political system in the Republic which is based upon exploitation and increasingly identified with the wrong side in the context of Southern Africa as a whole.

In any case, there is no need for us always to be so passive and defensive. As my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister has said of Europe, some will say that South Africa needs us as much as we need her, but I say that South Africa needs us more than we need her.

Secondly, I am convinced that we must go on to exert whatever pressure is possible upon Portugal, our ally, supposedly, in N.A.T.O. and to make it absolutely plain that we cannot tolerate and allow within N.A.T.O. an ally engaged in wars of colonial repression, as is Portugal in Southern Africa.

We must also make it far more clear than we have in the past where we stand on the issue of South-West Africa. I was extremely sad to see the muted criticism which was forthcoming from the British Government at the time of the recent illegal trials of the freedom fighters in South-West Africa. We should speak more clearly on this issue.

I come now to the issue of the freedom fighters themselves. I have the most profound respect for many of my colleagues on this side of the House and for many of those in the Government who recoil from the concept of violence, from the concept of the use of force as a means of settling any dispute, but I ask Members of both sides of the House to consider whether there has ever

been an area of the world in which passive resistance has been more patiently tried over decades than within Southern Africa. We have at least to understand and appreciate why, in absolute frustration, the political leaders of the majority are increasingly compelled to feel that there is now no alternative to violence.

I am not suggesting that as of now we should become engaged in military support for the freedom fighters, but that we have a direct responsibility for supporting civil administrations within the areas of the Portuguese territories which have been liberated by the freedom fighters.

Finally, in this programme of positive action I am certain that in the context of a debate on Rhodesia it is right to say that we cannot do enough as a nation economically to support the development of countries like Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland, Zambia and Tanzania. This is essential if we are to have a viable policy towards South Africa of which Rhodesia is a part. For too long debates on Southern Africa have been dominated by the crude voice of vested interest on one side as represented by the Verkramptes and the Verligtes of the party opposite, and on the other side by the confused voice of well-meaning compromise. To save our self-respect, let alone our international reputation, we must decide where we stand and, having decided in the only way possible for a nation with the ideals on which we pride ourselves, we must follow consistently the policies which that decision dictates.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE
HENRY S. REUSS

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, recently the Honorable HENRY S. REUSS was the featured speaker at the Small Business Investment Co.'s annual convention. On this occasion our colleague made very significant observations on this important segment of our economy as well as on general challenges facing America today.

I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full text of Mr. REUSS' address and commend it for study to all Members of Congress:

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES IN THE 70'S

We teeter, tonight, midway between the 60's and the 70's, and midway between the first and the second decade of Small Business Investment Companies. I want to look back with you at the first decade, and forward to the second.

Of the 70's, I hope that they will be better for you than the 60's. Of the 60's, about all you tough old birds can say, when asked what you did during the decade, is what the Abbe de Sieyes said when asked what he did during the French Revolution: "I survived." As charter members of the only really new financial institution since World War II, you can tell your grandchildren with equal pride that you survived.

And not without difficulty. You have been bountifully administered. Since we in the Congress passed the Small Business Investment Act back in 1958, you have been administered by Administrators Barnes, McCallun, Horn, Davis, Foley, Boutin, Moote. As Chiefs of the Investment Division you have had Chiefs Read, Fine, Parris, Kel-

ley, Greenberg, Brown. All were fine men, and many stayed long enough to find out where the mail room was, and how to get a cup of coffee. But continuity of administration, to say the least, left something to be desired.

Another cross you've had to bear is capricious administration. It has been almost standard operation procedure for SBA to issue a regulation the industry would then object; thereupon, SBA would rescind or alter the regulation.

As the result of on-again off-again administration, some SBIC's were licensed with insufficient screening of the qualifications of the applicants. When the stock market broke in mid-1962, SBIC stocks took their share of the battering. In the period after 1962, a number of companies were liquidated, or turned back their licenses.

As the decade ends, the problem of putting SBIC's in possession of sufficient funds remains unsolved. The Small Business Investment Act Amendments of October, 1967, had a useful provision allowing SBA to make subordinated loans to SBIC's. Congress authorized two-to-one SBA lending to both smaller and larger SBIC's. We provided additional incentive loans to SBIC's which placed at least 65 percent of their funds in venture capital.

But almost immediately after the amendments became effective—on January 9, 1969—SBA ran out of money for its subordinated lending.

Two other proposals for getting lending capital into the SBIC's have been made. The idea of a capital bank was floated, with 17 co-sponsors, in the Senate early this year, but floundered on the rock of administration opposition.

Legislation now before the House Banking and Currency Committee would permit SBA guarantees of loans obtained by SBIC's from private financial institutions such as insurance companies. Hearings before the House Banking and Currency Committee have been scheduled for early December.

Whether by subordinated debentures, or by a capital bank, or by guarantees, SBIC's do need additional investment capital. If the principle behind the SBIC's is a good one in the first place—as I believe it is—we must find ways of putting SBIC's in funds, particularly in periods like the present of extremely tight money.

The industry, too, needs reconsideration of its system of taxation. Tax reform has occupied the time of the Congressional tax-writing committees this year. But I hope they will be able to come up for air in a few weeks, and I'm confident that the House Ways and Means Committee will give early attention to the SBIC tax measure—with particular reference to a statutory bad debt reserve and to certain technical corrections.

Amid all this tale of hope deferred, it is encouraging that SBIC's face the new decade in better array than ever before. Industry profit levels are at their highest, far outperforming small businesses generally. A number of weak-sister SBIC's have departed, and thus improved total performance. SBIC officials are better investment analysts and better management advisers. Since June, 1968, SBIC's have been full time operations, with regular offices, open at regular business hours and regular personnel.

If we profit by the lessons of the past, we ought to be able to produce the kind of environment in which SBIC's can thrive.

That kind of an environment would be characterized by growth. The Joint Economic Committee has estimated that we can attain a gross national product of \$1.3 trillion by 1975. This would be at least one-third greater than our present GNP. This target assumes an annual growth rate from now to then of around 4.5 percent—quite a target, when you

consider that our growth rate averaged only 3 percent during the long period from 1900-1966.

To hit the higher 4.5 percent growth rate figure requires that we achieve what we have never before quite achieved—full employment without inflation. The 1950's were characterized by at least three recessions and three serious inflations. The early 1960's saw a much improved employment picture, with unemployment moving down from around 7 percent of the work force to 3.3 percent; expanding growth; and stable prices. After 1966, unhappily, Vietnam plus bad fiscal management conspired to produce the inflation which still dogs us.

In fact, my 1975 prediction of a \$1.3 trillion GNP, full employment, and a stable cost of living is altogether too rosy if we continue to practice our current economic policies. Instead of 4.5 percent annual growth, we are experiencing close to zero annual growth, and close to zero increases in productivity. Instead of price stability, we have had inflation at a rampaging 6 percent annual rate. Instead of a steady reduction of unemployment, we have kept some 400,000 workers from finding jobs, and unemployment is up from 3.3 percent to 3.9 percent of the work force.

The fact is: the Administration is on its way to achieving at one and the same time a continuing inflation and a recession. By its meat-axe, super-tight-money attack on inflation, it is not only failing to curb inflation, it is cutting so much deeper that it is seriously increasing unemployment. Instead of reducing the supply of new money to a modest level, the Administration has thrown the money supply into reverse. And President Nixon's new Federal Reserve Board Chairman, Arthur F. Burns, says "We will not budge."

The Administration justifies this meat-axe approach on the ground that it is necessary to call America's attention to the fact that the Administration is serious about fighting inflation. This recalls the farmer who, about to feed his mule, hit it a crashing blow on the nose with a two-by-four. "Good heavens, I thought you were going to feed your mule." "I am, but I have to get his attention first."

Deliberately causing unemployment and stagnation may get industry's and labor's attention. But, since it fails to indicate any real intention to combat inflation, business and labor go merrily on their way, each trying to get theirs before the inflationary bubble bursts.

If the Administration wants to convince business and labor that it is serious about fighting inflation, it should take serious steps. Instead of relying exclusively on fiscal-monetary measures, it should use its whole armory of weapons for fighting high prices—a price-wage-incomes policy, credit controls, increases in manpower training programs. Using the full complement of anti-inflationary weapons would permit a less restrictive fiscal-monetary policy—one that produced neither inflation nor deflation but just plain "flation", enough to contain price increases, but not so much as to stop economic growth and increase unemployment.

The Administration must get rid of its dogma and get on with the job given it by the Employment Act of 1946—maximum employment, maximum growth, and maximum price stability. The silent majority of Americans believe these goals can be attained. They will not be silent much longer.

So bringing inflation under control will remain a major problem. Extricating ourselves from Vietnam, and moving toward a civilian economy which produces goods that can be sold to consumers—and thus sop up purchasing power—is one way. Another is to

adopt what almost every other industrialized country of the Western World has adopted—a wage-price-incomes policy, as a supplement to fiscal and monetary policies.

The private sector of the economy will probably account for an even greater proportion of the national product by 1975 than it does today. Federal revenues today take up about 20 percent of the national income. With national income increasing by some \$60 billion a year, federal revenues should be growing by at least \$12 billion a year. Dr. Walter Heller estimates that this should yield a "fiscal dividend" of around \$35 billion a year in the mid-1970's—a "fiscal dividend" being the amount yielded by projected taxes and spending rates. The "fiscal dividend", of course, must be spent by someone—private persons, or some level of government, if the economy is to continue its forward momentum. Dr. Heller suggests a redistribution of the \$35 billion with \$10 billion in federal tax reduction, \$20 billion for increases in federally funded programs, and \$5 billion for revenue-sharing with the states and localities. One notes that this would diminish the present federal proportionate role.

Of course, every item in this project is subject to human intervention. Congress has already moved to set up its tax cuts for the 1970's. So I should think that that part of the prediction is conservative.

\$20 billion for increased federal spending sounds like a lot, but in fact, the \$20 billion is already over-subscribed. It would take \$6 billion just to fund presently authorized programs in education, housing, pollution and health; it would take \$4 billion for necessary cost-of-living increases. This would leave just \$10 billion of the \$20 billion. And a Cabinet Coordinating Committee for Post-Vietnam expenditures reported last December that there are some \$40 billion of projected spending demands competing for this \$10 billion.

I would hope that something could be saved for revenue-sharing, because I believe this could provide the necessary jar to nudge our federal system off dead center.

So we can look forward to a vastly larger economy, and probably to a greater private share within that economy.

SBIC's can thrive in the climate I envisage for the mid-70's. More than that, I believe they have an important role to play in bringing that climate about. It is necessary for small businesses to survive, for both social and economical reasons.

You must keep small business strong and growing, as a counterweight to the increasing bigness in our economy. There is no doubt that the big are getting bigger. In 1950 the top 200 companies of the nation controlled 46 percent of all assets. Today they control more than 55 percent, and the trend is continuing. In this same period, large firms added 1.5 million new jobs, while smaller plants lost nearly one million jobs; large manufacturers increased their sales and their before-tax earnings at double the rate of small manufacturers.

Today the large corporation, with assets of \$10 million or more, holds 84 percent of all the industrial assets of the country, up from 70 percent ten years ago.

Bigness is something we are going to continue to have with us. But even if big business were always more efficient than smaller businesses—and it's clearly not—Americans still want to preserve a place for small business. Millions of Americans don't want to be simply a number on the corporate organization chart. They want to own their own business, to be fully responsible for its success or failure, to be their own man.

So there is a job for you.

You have survived the 60's. With a little luck, you can thrive in the 70's.

SONGMY

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the disclosure of the reported massacre of Vietnamese women and children in the hamlet of Mylai IV in the village of Songmy has shocked and disturbed the conscience of our Nation.

There must be a searching investigation which puts all of the facts before the American people.

However, the fixing of individual guilt will not resolve the question of the collective guilt which the Vietnam policymakers must bear for a war which has refuted the professed principles for which it is being fought.

I have urged that a Presidential Commission be appointed to investigate the events at Songmy and have called upon the President to appoint a high level independent commission to conduct a thorough and objective investigation not only of the actual events in Songmy, but also of the breakdown in command control and responsibility which could permit such atrocities to occur. Furthermore, it is essential to ascertain the reason for the prolonged delay in the Army's own investigation.

Such an investigation would not reflect in any way upon the patriotism and bravery of American servicemen who have served honorably and with dedication in this tragic war. Rather it is the only way in which the serious questions involved can be answered to the full satisfaction of the American people.

I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two items dealing with the Songmy tragedy: an editorial from the November 27 New York Times entitled "Abhorrent to Conscience," and a column by Mary McGrory which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on November 25:

ABHORRENT TO CONSCIENCE

Restatement yesterday from the White House deploring the alleged massacre of Vietnamese civilians by American troops as "abhorrent to the conscience of the American people" expressed feelings universally shared throughout the United States. It would be even more appropriate, in view of the sickening evidence that has been brought forward by eye-witnesses and the profound impact and implications of these disclosures at home and abroad, for President Nixon personally to express his concern as Chief of State and Commander in Chief of the armed forces.

More important than public statements, however, will be the diligence with which the Government pursues its investigations not only into the events of March 16, 1968 at Songmy but into the circumstances which kept the facts hidden for so long. Americans must beware of prejudging individual guilt, but enough is known already to require a complete public accounting and prosecution of those responsible—at all levels of authority.

It should not be forgotten that, unforgivable as it is, the apparent face-to-face shooting of civilians in a village street by American foot-soldiers took place in the context of

widespread slaughter of equally innocent civilians from a distance by air and artillery. Every war is terrible; and certainly the Second World War had more than its share of wholesale civilian destruction. But even more than most other modern wars, the Vietnam war has been particularly hard on civilians because of its essentially civil nature. At the time of the Songmy incident, civilian casualties from all causes were running at the rate of 9,600 a month, according to official South Vietnamese sources.

Granting that the innocent suffer in all wars and that the Vietnamese on both sides have shown far less concern for human life than have United States forces, this country still needs to ask itself whether the ends it seeks in Vietnam justify the terrible cost in human suffering. And if the investigation into Songmy bears out the present indications that an unconscionable atrocity has indeed taken place, it will only reinforce the deep-seated doubts of millions of Americans today that the stated goals of this war can ever be achieved when Americans can be reduced to such bestiality and American power results in indiscriminate destruction of the communities of the very people in South Vietnam whom we are trying to protect.

SILENCE GREET'S VIET MASSACRES

(By Mary McGrory)

The reaction to reports of mass murder in a Vietnam village by American GIs has been outrage in London, silence in Washington and dismissal in Saigon.

In Britain, the alleged atrocities have created a government crisis and Harold Wilson summoned Ambassador John Freeman home to help him avert a debate on U.S. Vietnam policy in the House of Commons.

The Army announced that Lt. William J. Calley Jr. will face court-martial on charges of killing "109 Oriental human beings, occupants of the village of My Lai." The South Vietnamese government repeated its contention that "no massacre occurred."

The President gave out three Medals of Honor, and chatted with the returned astronauts. The Senate debated the tax bill and the House of Representatives talked about a subway system for the District of Columbia.

Two requests have been made for investigations by military committees of Congress. The public, busy writing letters in support of Vice President Agnew's attack on the press, has not been heard from.

The grisly story is being told in bits and pieces, as GIs around the country stand up to tell what they know about an event that was kept secret by the Army for 20 months.

Last night, a former GI named Paul Meadlo told a CBS audience that he had shot "about 15 or 20 villagers—and babies" under specific orders from Lt. Calley. He felt it was the right thing at the time because he had lost "a damned good buddy, Bobby Wilson," but later felt, after he had stepped on a land mine that God has punished him. It has been on his conscience.

The country's conscience, so far, has not been touched by these and other recitals. The indignation is all imported. It could be a case of "all passion spent." The last weeks have brought the President's speech, the peace demonstrations, the hardening of attitudes. Is the public resigned, callous or indifferent, to an incident that has been compared in the European press to the Nazi savagery at Lidice? Is it an inability or a refusal to believe that American GIs would kill women and children in cold blood?

Even the bare charges against Lt. Calley do some damage to the President's contention that our continued presence is imperative to avert a "bloodbath." Already the Sept. 26 boast that "we have reversed world public opinion" is eroded.

The Pentagon has withheld comment "to avoid prejudicing the lieutenant's case. But it withheld publication of the incident since March 1968. Its first investigation led to the current Saigon conclusion that it was artillery fire. Its second was precipitated by the personal inquiry of Richard Ridenhour, a Vietnam veteran now studying at California's Claremont College. Neither a participant nor a witness, Ridenhour interviewed other GIs who knew about "Pinkville" and reported his findings in letters to high government officials, including Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird.

The story was broken by Seymour M. Hersh, a 32-year-old Washington free-lance writer, who was brought up in Chicago's "Front Page" school of newspapering. Hersh, a fast-talking, fast-moving former Pentagon reporter, was briefly Sen. Eugene McCarthy's campaign press secretary, and is the author of a book about chemical and biological warfare.

Hersh is against the war, but resents a London newspaper's designation of him as a "left-wing nut." He first heard of "Pinkville" through the tip of an old friend in the Pentagon who told him early in October merely that "the Army has a man in court-martial at Fort Benning, and they have accused him of killing 75 Vietnamese civilians."

Hersh was horrified, dropped work on a book about the Pentagon, "The Ultimate Corporation," and started out on the trail. He got the name of George W. Latimer, Calley's counsel, flew to Salt Lake City to talk to him.

He got no specifics from Latimer, only "a sense of the dimensions of the story." He applied for and got a \$1,000 grant from the Philip M. Stern Foundation for investigative journalism and started flying around the country to find sources.

He went to Fort Benning and trudged around for two days before he found Lt. Calley, who in a lengthy talk told him, "I'm for the Army." He wrote his first account on Nov. 13. The next day, Ridenhour called the Los Angeles Times and told them he had much more information. Ridenhour had offered his story to Life and Newsweek which had turned it down. Hersh dashed to Los Angeles to talk to Ridenhour, who gave him the names of the GIs he had interviewed.

Meantime, Hersh also visited hawks on military committees on Capitol Hill—"doves are never told anything." They had heard of Pinkville and believed it, but advised him not to write anything because "it won't do much good for the Army."

Hersh had, from his Pentagon days, no trouble believing that the "Army could know about a case like this and was proceeding to do nothing about it."

"They were shipping nerve gas around like it was going out of style, running it through the countryside without telling people, at night, through cities. I thought it was an unspeakable act."

Hersh thinks that the country is suffering a delayed reaction to the horrors now unfolding, partly due to the official denials.

"But this is so clear," he says, "we're doing exactly the things we went into the war to stop."

THE CRIME—POVERTY MYTH

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, it is a proven fact that the crime rate in the United States during the great depres-

sion of the 1930's was vastly lower than today when we have considerable affluence and little unemployment in the United States.

Yet the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence concocted a report that blamed poverty for America's skyrocketing crime rate.

The more obvious and reasonable cause of crime is the fact that our lenient courts have decreased the probability of punishment as a deterrent to criminals.

In two penetrating editorials, the Indianapolis Star and the Kokomo, Ind., Tribune probe the real causes of crime in the United States and offer a rebuttal to the scrambled thinking of the National Commission, which has added to the problem by excusing criminals because of social conditions.

The editorials follow:

THE CRIME-POVERTY MYTH

The diagnosis of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence that poverty has caused the United States to have "the highest violent crime rate of all 'modern, stable nations in the world'" is wrong.

The commission reported this week that more than 5 million families, one-sixth of the nation's urban population, live in slums, and that most crime is committed in ghetto slums by persons at the lower end of the occupational scale.

This might seem to be convincing proof that "poverty causes crime." But consider the hard facts of the poverty-crime relationship.

In 1932, at the height of the Great Depression, more than 15 million breadwinners totaling more than one-third of the nation's work force were unemployed. Thousands of families were homeless. There was widespread hunger and poverty among some 40 million Americans—one-third of the nation at that time.

A comparison of the rates per 100,000 population of major crimes in 1932 and 1968, on a nation-wide basis, plus the percentage of increase of each from 1960 through 1968, follows:

	1932	1968	1960-68 increase (percent)
Murder.....	5.7	6.8	36.0
Rape.....	5.5	15.5	64.9
Robbery.....	29.2	131.0	118.7
Aggravated assault.....	29.2	141.3	66.8
Larceny.....	178.4	636.0	125.3
Auto theft.....	37.3	389.0	114.3
Burglary.....	80.1	915.0	82.8

Aside from the questionable supposition that poverty could be a three-times multiplier in rape cases over the period, can it be said with any degree of honesty or integrity that 1932-68 increases from three to 10 times in the wide catalog of crimes listed are attributable to poverty?

Is it possible to say honestly or reasonably that depression-era poverty, with its lack of readily available relief and welfare funds—poverty from which there was practically no escape—was from three to 10 times better than current poverty?

More than \$40 billion has been spent on welfare alone in the 1960s, providing a safety-margin against hunger and homelessness. The amount has risen steadily each year. Why, then, has violent crime risen 85 per cent and all crime 100 per cent in the 1960s?

Many responsible Indianapolis merchants are convinced that excessive leniency by the courts is to blame for much of the crime that is sometimes ruining their business. The same complaint is being made in major cities all over the nation.

Murder, rape, assault, robbery and other crimes have swung up sharply as penalties have been softened and prosecution has been hamstrung by the permissive rulings of the United States Supreme Court and by the often hair-splitting, logic-defying decisions of lower courts. The response of many conscientious jurists to such innovations was expressed by Justice Walter J. Fourt, Los Angeles District Court of Appeals, when he said:

"Many of the courts are lost in a fog of unreality. The Supreme Court of the United States and the Supreme Court of California have departed from their customary function and have become revolutionary in their seeming desire to uproot all that has been accepted in the past. They have turned upside down the legal concepts of constitutional interpretation and ventured into political and social areas beyond their jurisdiction. They have turned upside down the legal concepts of constitutional law. They have in many instances destroyed first lines of defense of the public against vicious criminals and have built a shelter for the guilty. Some of the absurd rulings have turned loose hardened, admitted felons to go out and prey on society again and again, all under the guise of newly-discovered or newly-found constitutional rights."

Evidence strongly indicates that the commission has conducted a narrow, unscientific, over-controlled investigation based on canons of a doctrinaire "liberalism" which found exactly what it intended to find by concentrating its attention on partial data and ignoring larger, more probing questions. If the prescription is to sluce more billions into the slums, the results can be expected to be the same as they have been throughout the decade—crashing failure.

[From the Kokomo (Ind.) Tribune, Nov. 28, 1969]

REASONS FOR CRIME WAVE

The National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Crime, in its latest report, says that there is a link between crime and poverty. The crime rate has skyrocketed, it holds, because of conditions in cities that breed crime.

Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, chairman of the commission, says "the correlation is not of race with crime, but poverty with crime." The report declares that the United States leads the civilized world in violent crimes and that "our homicide rate is more than twice that of our closest competitor."

Poverty must be one cause of crime, if not the main one, for poverty breeds frustration and frustrated individuals often turn to violence.

But another body of opinion disputes the theory that economic deprivation spells crime. As these students of social disorder see it, the real reason for the zooming crime rate is that crime has been made easier to commit and get away with, and it has turned out to be an increasingly paying matter.

In other words, many individuals are turning to robbery, extortion, assault, etc., because deterrence has been eroded and they have found that crime is profitable with the risks being more and more minimized.

You can take your choice of the two theories. There is an element of truth in both of them, and probably more in the argument that it increasingly pays to break the law.

When punishment has softened to a great degree, as it has in America, the crime rate rises.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S PROPOSED WELFARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY REFORMS

HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, there has already been a great deal of criticism of the President's proposed welfare and social security reforms. Much, if not most of the criticism, has been constructive in nature. I, too, desire to add my voice to the chorus of critics.

The most obvious fault one finds immediately in the reform proposals is their patent inadequacies. Indeed, Mr. Finch, in his statement of explanation of the bill said:

For those who cannot work, there is a more adequate level of Federal support.

Mr. Finch, through his use of the words "more adequate," seems to concede that the proposals are, indeed, inadequate.

The President in his August 8 address to the Nation accurately noted "that it—the present welfare system—is failing to meet the elementary human, social, and financial needs of the poor." It is my contention that the proposed new reforms will continue, not ameliorate, our present problems. The true issue is whether or not we should provide an adequate income for both the working and the nonworking poor. We have only rarely hesitated to provide adequate subsidies for both domestic and foreign private business enterprise in order to insure economic health. Is it not reasonable, therefore, to provide adequate support for those private individuals, who for various reasons are unable to work?

It sounds as if the administration is preparing to allow the newly proposed welfare reforms to die in the same way that it allowed black capitalism to die.

If they were allowed to die it would not be a great disaster—except for the Southern and rural States that stand to benefit most by the proposal.

Let me try briefly to explain some of my oppositions to the proposed reforms.

First, as most of us already know, \$1,600 is a patently inadequate amount. Forty-three States already pay more than that; recipients in only eight or 10 States, mostly Southern, would experience an increase in benefits.

Second, the compulsory work aspect smacks a bit of involuntary servitude; even more it would seem to be founded on nothing more than the assumption that welfare recipients do not want to work. That simply is not true.

In 1967, the research department of the City University of New York released a report entitled "Families on Welfare in New York City," authored by Lawrence Podell. The major findings of the report were that seven out of 10 welfare mothers indicated that given suitable employment or training, they would work; further two out of three indicated that they had definite plans to work in the future.

But there is more wrong with the work requisite factor in the proposal than the false assumption that it is based upon.

The Nixon proposal would provide some \$828 per child per year for day-care facilities. That is \$172 less than the minimum estimate of \$1,000 per child advanced by some authorities. My own experience as a day-school administrator leads me to believe that even the \$1,000 figure would not be sufficient to provide more than barely adequate care and facilities.

That, of course, means that the difference will have to be provided by the low-income family or recipient, as the case may be. The Nixon proposal does not seem to have considered that point and the possible eroding effect it would have on the families' income.

Also there is no doubt that the 150,000 new jobs that Mr. Nixon proposes is woefully inadequate. The recent rise in unemployment has removed at least that many old jobs from the economy already. And before the spring of 1970, it is estimated that the administration's tactics against inflation will produce some 1 million more newly unemployed. The official figure for nonwhites is expected to rise to about 8.5 percent while the figure for whites is expected to hold at a steady 4 percent.

Then consider the fact that New York State alone could use over 300,000 jobs for present welfare recipients and one begins to have some idea of the extent to which the administration's proposal misses the mark.

There is also the unanswered question of the food-stamp program that must be considered when evaluating the proposed reforms. Early this year, the administration proposed to extend the program; then the President's initial welfare reforms proposed to do away with it entirely; now administration officials are again proposing that it be retained.

They are now saying that a recipient family of four should be allowed \$480 with which to purchase stamps which could be redeemed for \$1,200 in food. That figure, \$1,200, is presumably arrived at because USDA figures indicate that as a minimum for an adequate diet. The proposal does not seem to take into account at least two factors: First, food money is the only flexible item in the recipients' budget, and second, food as a budget item assessed by the Government figures would be 30 percent of the \$1,600 minimum. On this point Senator McGovern has pointed out that the average family of four spends only 17 percent. As a result, we would be asking the recipient to spend 13 percent or almost half again as much as a nonrecipient. In short, it becomes in reality a way to further penalize the poor for being poor.

The final question one must raise in considering the scope and the impact of the proposed welfare reforms is the question of adequate income.

The U.S. Department of Labor considers a yearly income of \$6,207 as necessary to maintain a low but acceptable standard of living for a family of four in an urban area.

In New York City the figure is held to be \$6,201, slightly lower. The typical recipient family of four receives only \$3,756 with sanctions against their attempting to maintain that necessary flooring while striving to raise to the "acceptable" lower standard based on \$6,000. The Nixon proposal clearly does not begin to resolve this situation.

What it does, instead, is attempt to force the poor into accepting low-paying, dead-end jobs and as a consequence encourages industry to provide them.

Almost every one from Dr. George Wiley of the National Welfare Rights Organization to George Meany of the AFL-CIO has criticized the proposals, but, by and large, the criticism has been constructive in nature. The proposed reforms do represent a step in the right direction. But they just do not go far enough.

Similarly, neither do the manpower proposals. First of all, our minimum wage of \$2 per hour produces only \$4,160 per year; only some \$404 per year above the welfare average in New York of \$3,756 per year. From that perspective, it becomes inadequate as incentive.

Viewed from the perspective that it takes—according to the USDL figures already mentioned—\$6,207 to maintain a decent standard of living in an urban area it must cause one to wonder whether or not we intentionally maintain a class of people we euphemistically tend to call "the working poor."

The basic strategy of the Nixon administration's manpower policy has been keyed to the State operation of most aspects of the manpower programs.

I am, and have been, against this strategy on the basis that the State programs have been traditionally more bureaucratized and intransigent to change. It has also been pointed out, and with some just cause, that they have traditionally provided a source of cheaper labor for business and industry. And finally, there is their traditional relationship with minority-group unemployed. Therefore, I consider the administration's position as a regressive one.

A LETTER ON PRESIDENT NIXON'S SPEECH

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter to the editor from one of my constituents to an area newspaper in response to its editorial expressing a lukewarm reaction to President Nixon's November 3 speech.

What makes the letter so interesting is that it was written prior to the remarks of Vice President Agnew about television and press coverage of the President and his administration. Mrs. Moore would seem to share Mr. Agnew's concern for the preoccupation of the press

with peripheral matters such as how the President looked or whether he gave a dramatic reading to the speech. Mrs. Moore did not say that "10 minutes of Roy Wilkins should be more highly regarded than 1 minute of Rap Brown," but she might well have expressed herself in that way just as the Vice President did.

Both Mrs. Moore and the Vice President—and in point of fact, even the newspaper editorial to which she referred—seem to be seeking the same result: More maturity and responsibility on the part of all Americans in the consideration of the great issues of today. It is a message we could all take to heart, and she and the Vice President both stated it eloquently in their own way.

The letter follows:

To the Editor:

I here make a plea that those news media as well as those individuals whose basic concern admittedly is to preserve, protect, and promote the welfare of this country, be more selective in their comments about President Nixon—in fact about anyone who occupies high office.

The case in point: your editorial, "The Unexciting Mr. Nixon", which appeared Wed., Nov. 5. I cannot help but wonder why your emphasis is on peripheral aspects rather than on the substance of his address. Why, at a time when disrespect for authority of all kinds is rampant, do you not, as a "shaper of public opinion", exhibit a greater respect for our highest of all offices—especially when the one who occupies it, in your own words, has "undeniable virtues", is "decent-minded" and has, again to quote you, followed "the solo course open to him now"?

Why, instead of employing such terms as "unexciting", "dull as dishwater", "stale", "uninspired", do you not extol those virtues of quietness, steadiness, and sobriety, which he has demonstrated in the handling of that keg of dynamite, the Vietnam War, handed to him at a point of escalative momentum? Should a good leader allow himself to be stamped into a course of action he considers unwise for his country? I could not have confidence in the kind of person who vacillates under pressure.

This is not a time for recriminations, a time for bemoaning the fact that we're sick and tired of the war—which indeed we are. We must not forget, either, our corporate responsibility for permitting escalation during the previous Administration virtually without protest. It follows that President Nixon should not be made the scapegoat for a war he did not create, one which at present is of such size and momentum as to preclude easy solution. Instead, we should encourage him in every possible way as he seeks to end the war.

As to our "right . . . to expect . . . an act of leadership," we Americans do have this right, and that's exactly what we saw demonstrated in President Nixon's talk on Vietnam. He showed himself to be every inch the leader worthy of the great responsibility vested in him when he dealt with this explosive matter wisely, and in a calm and serious manner, stripped of emotionally flamboyant words and rhetoric, so that listeners might address their thoughts to the real issues involved. Is it right that we, the listeners, should expect entertainment and titillation from our leaders? To my mind, editorials which emphasize lack of these qualities do tend to so condition their readers. They cloud the real issues, and contradict the goal of a free press in a free country, which is to turn the light of truth upon situation as nearly as is within the power of the printed word, and to choose

words with careful restraint and with full cognizance of the awesome responsibility of the press in shaping public opinion.

I heartily agree with you that it is "exasperating to live in a world where deceit and vice are forever in colorful array whereas sincerity and rectitude are made to seem drab." Isn't the press responsible in large part for this distortion?

The time has come when each of us—press and individual citizens as well—must think more deeply and responsibly about the far-reaching effect of our words, printed or spoken, upon our society and members thereof.

Because I have always decried those who only "talk against" people and things, I want now to commend you on the usually good content of your editorials. But I do urge all of us who call ourselves American to strive ever more diligently for truth in word and deed, and to avoid indulging in destructive pettiness.

NATION'S FISHERIES IGNORED BY ADMINISTRATION'S FIVE-POINT PROGRAM

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am keenly disappointed that the marine activities announced by the President as a five-point program do not include a special program for fisheries.

Under Secretary of Interior Russel Train has told my House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee that the administration is committed to a fisheries program, but it certainly was not in the President's five-point program of coastal zone management; coastal laboratories; lake restoration; ocean exploration; and Antarctic environmental research.

Mr. Speaker, I offer no criticism of the program, as such, but if we are considering priorities and what may be of utmost importance to the American public in the future, then the fisheries should have been included as one of the first priorities in this report.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, the oceanographic commission of Washington State has passed a resolution urging the administration to include fisheries as a priority item within the coastal zone management program.

For the information of my colleagues, the aforementioned resolution, without objection, appears at this point in the RECORD:

OCEANOGRAPHIC COMMISSION
OF WASHINGTON,
December 1, 1969.

Representative THOMAS M. PELLY,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Whereas the Office of the Vice President of the United States has enumerated the administration's five point program to strengthen the nation's marine activities, with which this Commission concurs, and,

Whereas fisheries are a fundamental part of our coastal zone management program, and,

Whereas the United States fisheries face increasingly serious problems which require urgent national attention, and,

Whereas food from the sea is potentially the greatest of all underwater wealth, and,

Whereas world population pressures indicate the increasing need for protein from the sea, which would require a major effort in fisheries ocean exploration,

Now therefore be it resolved that the Oceanographic Commission of Washington urges the administration to include fisheries as a priority item within the coastal zone management program.

JON M. LINDBERG,

Chairman, Oceanographic Commission of Washington.

A COMMISSION TO PROMOTE THE STUDY OF MEXICAN-AMERICAN HISTORY AND CULTURE

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that would establish a Presidentially appointed Commission of 11 experts in various fields who would conduct a comprehensive study of all aspects of preserving, collecting, and ultimately integrating evidence of Mexican-American history and culture into the mainstream of American history.

There is most clearly a need for such a Commission. For too long the history, culture and present plight of Mexican Americans has been ignored, misunderstood, or denigrated. The Commission which I propose would make a valuable contribution toward remedying this.

Some 6 million Mexican Americans live in the United States. Studies by the Bureau of Census, the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, and the Interagency Committee on Mexican American Affairs, among others, vividly show them to be worse off in nearly every respect than most other Americans. They are much poorer, their housing is much more crowded and dilapidated, their rate of unemployment is much higher. The jobs they do hold are often menial, and offer little promise for the future. Their educational level is sadly lower than the rest of the population, falling 2 years below nonwhites and 4 years below Anglo-Americans.

It is necessary to improve the quality of the housing, jobs, and education available to Mexican Americans, just as it is necessary to emphasize the unique contributions that the Mexican American has made to the culture and history of this country. These contributions have been neglected by the communications media and the schools, and are not adequately described and displayed in books and museums. Mexican Americans deserve our respect, not just our welfare.

An understanding of Mexican-American contributions would strengthen their sense of community, and would help eradicate false stereotypes and misinformation within the Anglo-American community. The U.S. Civil Rights Commission, in a paper entitled "The Mexi-

can American," quoted a Los Angeles high school student as recently saying:

The teachers negative opinion of Mexico would not bother me so much, except that this is the only image portrayed to us here in America of what we are. We look around for something to be proud of, we question our parents, but all they tell us, "just be proud you are Mexican," because they are too busy working or taking care of the little kids to tell us all we have to be proud of . . . all the thousands we have to be proud of. And since they cannot tell us these things, and the schools will not, we begin to think that maybe the Anglo teacher is right, that maybe we are inferior, that we do not belong to this world, that, as some teachers actually tell students to their faces, we should go back to Mexico and quit causing problems for America.

The curriculum in schools, the textbooks, and the mass media all neglect to inform both Anglo and Mexican American of the substantial contributions to the Southwest made by Mexicans and Mexican Americans, and the rich culture of the Mexican people. The U.S. Civil Rights Commission report quotes a school counselor in Los Angeles:

They're told they're Americans and yet they're treated as Mexicans.

The Commission paper notes:

Denied full status as Americans, the Mexican American students are also deprived of the chance to gain understanding and pride in their heritage.

Mr. Speaker, Mexican-American educators, parents, and students are asking for textbooks, courses, and media presentations which give a more balanced view of Mexican-American history and culture.

They are asking for literature, art, and sculpture in museums and libraries which is relevant to the Mexican-American community. Therefore, in addition to researching, collecting, and preserving historical materials, the Commission would examine the possibilities for establishing a museum or center of Mexican-American history and culture. The Commission would examine possible locations for such a center or museum, and investigate methods of financing. Finally the Commission would consider various techniques for disseminating information so that the Mexican American is more accurately depicted.

Mexican Americans have been one of the most exploited and neglected groups in this country. They are a proud people with a heritage and culture that is rich and unique. Now they are struggling for national visibility, for recognition and a fair share of American life, which they have been denied for so long. Increasingly, young Mexican Americans are seeking to change their image and cultivate greater respect from both the Anglo-American community and their own community.

A number of expressions convey the change, such as the word "chicano" and phrases of racial solidarity such as "Viva la Raza." The Commission I propose would both further a balanced portrayal of Mexican Americans and enhance their pride. I urge strongly the creation of this Commission.

SENATOR MURPHY ON EDUCATION

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an interesting article on cooperative education by Senator GEORGE MURPHY. Senator MURPHY as a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Education, is an enthusiastic supporter of this fine "self-help" program. I commend the following article from the August issue of San Francisco Business to the membership of the Congress:

SENATOR MURPHY ON EDUCATION

About 70,000 specialized students in the United States will earn \$125 million from American industry this year.

Too little of the background of these students, and the role played by our business community in this joint venture, has been told. The concept is called Cooperative Education and the 70,000 students engaged in such curricula attend 136 colleges, universities and community colleges throughout the United States.

More than one-third of these students work as assistants and aides to scientists and engineers in laboratories supported by the \$20 billion our society will spend in 1969 on research and development. Other students work as assistants to teachers in public schools, libraries, in the field of health, and countless other areas.

Students today insist that curriculum be relevant and meaningful. And it is a time when we should realize that artificial barriers separating students from society must be reduced. It is also a time when education costs skyrocket as educational institutions strive to build facilities and acquire the necessary facilities to meet rising enrollments.

During the past few years, as a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Education, I have had an opportunity to observe and study the projects and processes by which we hope to better prepare our young people for a fuller, more meaningful life. I have concluded that certain qualities are most essential: pride in oneself, respect for others, and self-reliance.

Here is where cooperative work-study programs—which permit students to alternate periods of full-time study with periods of full-time employment—can fill an important role in society. By definition, cooperative education is that form of higher education which alternates classroom theory, discipline and study, with related work experience.

It is not a new concept. It was first inaugurated in 1906 at the University of Cincinnati. However, cooperative educational programs are still not widely known. Not enough colleges are convinced that industry can provide an important supplement to a college education and, in turn, not enough businessmen are aware of the material and intangible benefits available to them. In California, for example, only seven colleges or universities offer cooperative education programs. Nevertheless, just ten years ago, there were none.

Recently, I had the opportunity to co-host, with President Norman Topping of the University of Southern California, the first California Conference on Cooperative Education, organized by the National Commission for Cooperative Education. The conference was attended by many interested members of the business, financial, and academic communities of Southern California. I feel this meeting did much to encourage the serious exploration of the potential of cooperative edu-

cation by those who attended the symposium.

My interest in this subject results from personal experience working and going to school. As a boy whose parents died when I was quite young, I was faced with the usual problems of growing up—getting an education, and going out into the "cold, cruel world" to find a job and make a living. I attended good schools and a fine university, and I took odd jobs during the school year and in the summers to help pay my way. By the time I left college, I had plenty of work experience—in auto shops in Detroit, coal mines in Pennsylvania, selling real estate on Long Island, jerking sodas, waiting on tables, shilling for a tailor shop and even working as a bouncer in a dance hall.

I was not an exceptional student. But I was able to acquire quite a variety of job experiences and practical knowledge which I would not have traded for anything. And by the time I left the campus for good, that "cold, cruel world" looked a little warmer, a little more inviting.

So, too, will students in cooperative education programs see our so-called establishment a little differently when they return to the campus after working at a job.

Their jobs can move them up the career ladder. Ford Motor Company, for example, employs 800 co-ops from 30 colleges. Drexel Institute's 3,500 co-ops earned \$7.5 million last year. Of the \$125 million in total earnings, the co-ops pay at least ten per cent in taxes to the federal and state governments—a fact which I am certain is of special interest not only to members of Congress, but to all of us as individual taxpayers.

I do not want to neglect the reasons why cooperative education is so important to industry.

James Godfrey, as Coordinator of the Cooperative Education program of Lockheed, at Sunnyvale, made this very clear during an Oregon Conference on Cooperative Education when he stated the reason why Lockheed participates in this program:

"We do it, somewhat perhaps, out of a feeling of benevolence, and perhaps this is the way we started. It is an idealistic view, and we still maintain that. . . . However, I think this is the main reason—we want these students back as fulltime professional employees when they graduate. And we get them in sufficient numbers and proportions to make it worthwhile for us. It's good business—especially in today's highly competitive professional manpower market. Also, we found the graduates of a co-op program are superior to the graduates of the normal four-year curriculum and are more productive; they are immediately productive; they are technically better qualified. . . . they appear to have found their niche in life much sooner than the graduates of a traditional curriculum."

We in the Congress think that expansion of the Cooperative Education Program can be extremely important. I am pleased to be the author of an amendment, now incorporated in the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, which provides for federal financial assistance to the states, to encourage and expand cooperative vocational education programs. An amendment to the Higher Education Act of 1968 authorizes the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to institutions of higher education for planning, establishment, expansion or carrying out by such institutions, a program of co-operative education which alternates periods of full-time academic study with periods of full-time public or private employment. This amendment, which I strongly supported, is intended to enable those institutions which find it desirable to consider restructuring their academic programs to establish cooperative education. Such institutions can apply for federal grant funds of up to \$75,000 a year for three years to meet the cost of starting and operating a program. Support can also be provided to enable

institutions with existing programs to expand them or to expand into new curricular areas. In enacting the amendment, Congress authorized \$8,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970. If it is now adequately funded for a period of five to seven years, this amendment could enable more than 400 additional institutions to move vigorously into cooperative education programs. This would provide opportunities for an additional 250,000 students to take part. While I am not a member of the Appropriations Committee, I intend to work for adequate funds for this program.

I recently asked Robert H. Finch, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to approve an application under the program authorized by my amendment, for cooperative education programs made by two Orange County and three San Mateo County junior colleges. The program would provide work-experience for 1,000 students in its first year and would increase at a rate of additional 1,000 students yearly. Both business and the California Junior College Association warmly endorsed the plan which I hope might help this important concept catch fire at the growing community college level.

So, the message is getting across. There's an old saying that "nothing is so powerful as an idea whose time has come." I believe honestly, that cooperative education is such an idea.

OKINAWA—A NEGOTIATED VICTORY FOR COMMUNISM?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the national news media has been playing on the generosity and benevolence of Americans as if we have some kind of moral obligation to give Okinawa back to Japan.

Presumably, this act of generosity is prompted by the overwhelming sympathy and in gratitude for past favors to the United States from our friends, the Japanese.

Our Government leaders apparently vacillate in a fog of "guilt sickness" for having once won a war.

We have other former enemies. Perhaps our leaders will want to atone to them as well for our past arrogance in having defeated them. What about the Germans and the Italians—should not we give them something also?

Will the news media and network commentators clamor for talks to negotiate with our new-found Soviet friends to give Germany back to Germany, and perhaps encourage negotiation to restore Germany's territorial losses such as Southwest Africa, German East Africa—which today comprises Kenya and Tanzania—Danzig and the Polish Corridor? Would not they wait to give Italy back Ethiopia and Libya? Never fear such an event. The clamor for the return of Okinawa which is nothing less than a euphemism for disarming the major bastion of freedom in the Pacific, is from the domestic left. It is part and parcel of the internationally orchestrated clamor for unilateral disarmament, unilateral withdrawal, and unilateral pledges not to use weapons such as CBW armaments.

Just ask a proponent of the return of Okinawa about the return of the Kuriles.

Mr. Speaker, I include several related news articles:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 2, 1969]
SATO GIVES PRE-ELECTION PLEDGE ON OKINAWA
(By Selig S. Harrison)

TOKYO, Dec. 1—Prime Minister Sato inaugurated Japan's national election campaign today with a firm pledge that the United States would remove nuclear weapons before returning Okinawa—and a more guarded assurance that Japan would keep nuclear arms permanently off the island following its reversion to Japan by 1972.

Sato made a formal report on his recent Washington talks with President Nixon in an address opening a two-day special session of the Diet (parliament). Opposition leaders will be given time for speeches Tuesday but will not be able to cross-examine Sato in the brief plenary session preceding formal dissolution of the lower house.

The governing Liberal Democratic Party is seeking a fresh mandate on Dec. 27 in the first lower-house elections since January, 1967. Upper-chamber deputies are chosen for six-year terms at staggered three-year intervals and will not be up for election this year.

Opposition spokesmen charged today that Sato must have something to hide or he would not have "rigged" a lightning session with no time for questions on his Washington talks either in the plenary session or in committees. They point to the fact that the election has been scheduled during the busy year-end holiday season for the first time in Japanese parliamentary history as evidence that the Liberal Democrats hope to benefit from a low voter turnout.

DISCUSSION LATER

Liberal Democratic leaders respond that there will be plenty of time for discussion on Okinawa and security issues in the regular January Diet session after the election. Sato will tell the voters frankly that he plans to extend the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty following expiration of the current 10-year treaty term next June 23, his supporters say.

In his report today, Sato declared that the security treaty would be applied to Okinawa "in exactly the same way as in the homeland, without any modification." This can be interpreted in one way by the Japanese public and in quite another way by U.S. officials.

Most casual Japanese TV listeners may have gotten the impression that Sato was reaffirming his intention to extend the same ban on nuclear weapons now applying in the home islands of Okinawa. But strictly speaking, as opposition leaders point out, he simply said that Okinawa and the home islands would be governed by the same requirement for "prior consultation" with Japan if the United States ever sought to introduce nuclear weapons. He did not categorically rule out the reintroduction of nuclear weapons under all circumstances.

THE COMMUNIQUE

The joint communique issued by Sato and Nixon following their Washington talks 10 days ago indicated that the United States would remove nuclear weapons from the island prior to reversion, but that this would be "without prejudice" to the U.S. treaty right to seek Japanese approval for their reintroduction through the "prior consultation" machinery.

By referring twice to Japan's anti-nuclear "policy," key U.S. officials explain privately, the communique made clear that there was no law or treaty binding Japan and that the policy would change in the face of any future nuclear threat.

Sato has carefully avoided completely closing the door to possible U.S. requests for the reintroduction of nuclear arms in statements

since his return, while at the same time seeking to neutralize the nuclear issue in the election campaign.

Pressed at his first post-Washington press conference here to explain why the "prior consultation" issue was mentioned at all in the communique, Sato replied that while this inevitably stirred suspicion "there would be equal basis for suspicion if it had not been mentioned."

In the absence of a clause clearly stating that Okinawa would be subject to "prior consultation," Sato declared, his critics could point to a loophole permitting the United States to sneak nuclear arms into the island. While stressing that Okinawa and the home islands would be on the same footing, however, Sato sidestepped statements explicitly ruling out reintroduction of nuclear arms under all circumstances. Now the opposition is grumbling that his statements could be taken to cover a uniform policy permitting nuclear entry in both Japan and Okinawa.

The speech today was notable for its omission of any mention of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. American officials have expressed increased hope since the Sato visit that Japan will sign the treaty early next year after the elections and an expected cabinet reshuffle.

The Japanese Foreign Ministry is pushing for early signature as a gesture to Washington, arguing that Japan can seek revision of the contested clauses on peaceful atomic development as the price for ratification.

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader, Nov. 19, 1969]

KEEP OKINAWA—BOUGHT WITH BLOOD

A ghastly total of 12,521 United States soldiers were killed while capturing the island of Okinawa from the Japanese in World War II. A total killed and wounded of 49,151, the loss of 763 aircraft, 36 ships sunk and 369 ships damaged was the price we paid for that island.

Okinawa was bought and paid for with American blood. It should not be turned back to a former enemy from whom we had to take it, following the attack on us at Pearl Harbor.

But, there are other pragmatic reasons for not turning Okinawa over to the Japanese.

Okinawa is essential to the defense of this nation. Today Okinawa is our most important single military base complex. Only last year, the United States government spent \$260 million developing it.

If we give up Okinawa, we give up a very important military stronghold and retreat farther toward the United States and toward the eventual necessity of fighting for our liberty on the beaches of California.

It is all very well for us to want to keep the political situation in Japan stable and to keep a pro-United States administration in power. It is well recognized that the Communists in Japan can make a great deal of propaganda and trouble if Okinawa is not returned to the Japanese.

And, we have, as is well known by our citizens, a group of leaders both Republicans and Democrats, who always think of how trade treaties and such will benefit a foreign power. They are the greatest give-away artists in the history of the world.

Fortunately, Senator Harry Byrd of Virginia introduced a bill—it passed the United States Senate by a whopping 63 to 14 vote—which provides that any change in the Japanese peace treaty must first be presented to and ratified by the Senate.

It is to be hoped that President Nixon will take a more realistic view of the situation and not surrender our prime military base in the Far East. It is hoped also that he will consider the amount of American blood that was shed before the flag of the United States was raised on this island bastion.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, OKINAWA MEMORIAL POST NO. 9723, NAWA, OKINAWA,

November 6, 1969.

HON. JOHN R. RARICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. RARICK: The VFW of U.S., Okinawa Memorial Post No. 9723, the largest VFW Post in the world with over 6500 members from every state and territory in the United States joins with the Okinawa Morning Star to furnish you with the local viewpoint of Americans on Okinawa.

For fifteen (15) years, Robert Frosser, Editor of the Okinawa Morning Star has written on the local problems with humor, compassion and understanding. His editorials form this fourth special issue of the Morning Star.

Much of the news which appears in the U.S. press concerning Okinawa has been filtered through a reporting process which records voices without evaluating or properly estimating the situation. The speakers in most cases frequently selfseekers and emotionalists who choose to ignore the basic reasons why the U.S. has found it necessary to remain on Okinawa.

We know that this local course of first hand information will be very helpful as background in preparing you for the upcoming U.S.-Japanese talks regarding the future of Okinawa.

Sincerely,

RALPH S. ALTMAN,
Post Commander.

[From the Okinawa Morning Star]

DEFENSE CAN'T BE GUARANTEED BY JAPAN:
ASIA ALLIES WORRY ABOUT POST REVERSION SECURITY

"Supposing Japan said 'no,'" President Chung Hee Park of the Republic of Korea asked when being interviewed on the possibility of the Americans maintaining a military base on Okinawa under conditions similar to those under which American forces must operate in Japan.

The Korean president was adding his doubts to the already considerable skepticism which surrounds Japanese happy talk to the effect that the U.S. would have nothing to worry about if the Americans would only allow the Japanese Diet instead of the U.S. President and the American military institutions to direct the fate of American troops based on Okinawa. Militants from the Japanese Socialist and Communist parties have demanded that Okinawa be returned to Japan under the same circumstances that restrict American troops currently stationed in Japan under the U.S. Japan mutual defense treaty.

This would be something like making Mao Tse-tung military advisor to the Kremlin or giving Gamal Abdel Nasser the job of chairman of the joint chiefs of staff for the Israeli armies. It is not that the Japanese aren't lovely people but they do tend to become blinded by selfish interests when it is hinted that they might be nice if they would make a few sacrifices for the welfare or safety of their neighbors.

The chief executive of Yara-land perhaps expressed the views of the Japanese and the Okinawans both most vividly when he told a group of Japanese and American newspapermen that Okinawa is for itself and that the Okinawans don't care what happens to anyone else. Americans ask themselves uneasily what would happen if the Japanese had the same generous outlook on the day when the Americans needed permission to mount a military assault from Okinawa in order to save their own and possibly Japan's bacon in a future squabble in Asia.

Korea's President Park asked the \$2,000 million question about Japan immediately after he had offered the South Korean island of Cheju to the U.S. as a substitute for the American military base on Okinawa. This is the \$2,000 million question because that is the sum of American investment in the Ryukyus to date, an investment that would be worthless if the effectiveness of the American military base on Okinawa were to be negated.

Advocates of the "it only hurts when I laugh" school of reversion downplay a number of important and possibly dangerous side effects when they speak of the heady pleasures of the political feshpots on Okinawa under the Japanese constitution. At present the Okinawans do not have access to the Japanese constitution, a document that is new in both theory and application to the Japanese themselves.

If Okinawa were to fall under the rule of the Japanese constitution the way would be opened for Okinawans to sue the Japanese to demand that Americans on Okinawa cease and desist, pay up or else or join the cultural revolution. Suing the government is all the rage in Japan today, a splendid example being the summons served on the Emperor the other day by a young man who claimed that his human rights had been violated because he flunked out of college. Lawyers contend that anything that is good for the law profession is good for mankind thus lawsuits are the breath of life for lawyers except on Okinawa. Okinawan lawyers, unfortunately, are not as equal before the law as Japanese lawyers because only a tiny minority of Okinawa's lawyers have qualified before the Japanese or any bar association. These unhappy bengoshis might be able to sue the government of Japan because of their status as second class citizens in their own country if Okinawa were under the Japanese constitution and providing, of course, they could find a good, cheap Japanese lawyer who would be willing to handle their case.

Considering all of the things that could happen if Okinawa were under the Japanese constitution including the Japanese government saying "no" to the Americans in case of an emergency, now might be the time for the Americans to say "no" before the situation becomes critical. The biggest "no" should be said when the advocates of reversion begin spilling about the advantages of having Okinawa under the Japanese constitution and Japanese administration.

HOW TO KILL TWO BIRDS WITH ONE STONE: JAPAN-RUSSIA SECURITY PACT SOVIETS' DREAM PACKAGE

If Moscow's brand of brotherly love were ever in need of clarifying now might be an appropriate time. The Japanese might be just the audience that the merry Muscovites would require to get their newest sleight of hand and illusion show off to a fast start. First night audiences can be critical and it is best to give the initial performance away from home just in case the whole affair bombs.

According to diplomatic sources in Moscow, the Russians are hoping to form a mutual security pact among the Pacific nations. Both Japan and the United States would be eligible for this new alignment and just to show that they are particularly impartial the Russians are reported to be willing to let the Communist Chinese join the club. The main function of the organization, of course, would be to give the Russians a little extra leverage in containing the Communist Chinese and perhaps a few extra friends at court just in case the Russian-Chinese shooting war in Outer Mongolia becomes any more urgent.

The exact nature of the proposed pact has not been explained to the Japanese or to anyone else for that matter. The mutual

security pact between the United States and Japan says that the U.S. will come to the aid of the Japanese in case they are attacked or menaced by a third party. The pact says nothing about the Japanese coming to the aid of the Americans in case we are attacked but that's the way that the old treaty bounces.

Of late the Japanese have been demanding concessions from the U.S. in the form of the return of Okinawa for the privilege of allowing the U.S. to continue to guarantee Japan's security. The U.S. could, of course, forfeit the right to protect Japan without suffering any great hardship or danger to the security of the U.S. This would have no bearing on the U.S. bases on Okinawa whose presence are guaranteed by the U.S.-Japan peace treaty, an agreement that was made by the two governments several years before the U.S. decided to subsidize Japan's industrial development by relieving her of the necessity of protecting herself.

Japan might kill two birds with one stone by listening to a Russian proposal for a mutual security pact. After all the loudest grumblers against the U.S.-Japan security treaty are the leftists and they should be pleased as Punch with a security pact with the Russians. They might be almost as pleased as the Czechoslovakians have been with their security arrangement with the Russians. It is true that you rarely hear any complaints in Czechoslovakia against the Russian security measures from the Czechs any more and if this isn't proof of a nation of satisfied customers then what is?

Of course, a mutual security pact with the Russians might bring criticism from the pro-Peking Socialists in Japan who might justly claim to have been as bitter about the U.S.-Japan security treaty as their rivals from Moscow. This would more than likely work up considerable bad feeling and perhaps a riot or two against the Russian-Japanese security treaty but then, you can't please everyone. If you don't think that this is true then check the record of diplomatic give and take between the U.S. and Japan.

There is another aspect of a mutual security pact between the Japanese and the Russians that has not yet been considered, let alone explored. If the Japanese and the Russians had a mutual security treaty which placed the Japanese heavily into the Russian debt then the Japanese could begin hounding the Russians for the return of Sakhalin and the Kuriles islands and territory to the north of Hokkaido which the Russians took from Japan at the end of their five-day war against the Japanese in 1945.

The Japanese have not yet been able to attract the attention of the Russians to this subject but if the Japanese can get the Russians to do them a few favors then what would be more natural than to demand that the Russians pay for the privilege?

Chances are, however, that the Russians wouldn't buy this arrangement. After all who would? Unless possibly it would be the Americans.

LEFTIST CLAMOR OVER REVERSION TAKES SPOTLIGHT OFF REDS' FEUD

Whenever the Communists and the Socialists show signs of disgracing themselves in public through their vocal and physical belligerency they are rescued from shame by the world's best trained choral group. This human jamming system is made up of grass roots Communists and Socialists who direct attention away from the main arena by starting an argument about something else. Anything else. This season the return of Okinawa to Japan is the favorite subject for heroic oratory by the faithful who wish to distract the world from the spectacle of Soviet Russia accusing the Chinese Communists of preparing for a conventional and nuclear war against the Russians.

Unhappily for most of the participants in this vast propaganda affair, they don't realize that they are being used for purposes that are not in their best interests.

Soviet party leader Leonid I. Brezhnev recently appeared before a congress of Communist parties to denounce the Chinese Communist party which had denounced the Russian Communists at an earlier Communist conclave in Peking. Brezhnev accused the Chinese of planning both a conventional and a nuclear war. Brezhnev quoted from Chinese state operated newspapers which described China's "preparation to fight Soviet revisionism in conventional as well as the great unclear war." Patriotism in China today means going hungry in order to prepare for war against Russia, the Soviet quoted the Chinese government of having claimed.

The Chinese are further accused of teaching Chinese children that surrounding lands are really Chinese territory that is to be recovered through war in the near future. Chinese schoolbooks and maps are doctored to support these Chinese Communist claims.

While Moscow and Peking thunder at one another through their separate propaganda medium the two Communist-Socialist nations are shooting at each other across the river that separates their two territories in Outer Mongolia. Neither side can decide what to call the river and the territory where the shooting is taking place because the Russians insist on giving the terrain Russian names and the Chinese have their own nomenclature for the same area.

Under the circumstances it would seem that the various apostles of peace, both armed and unarmed, would be denouncing both the Chinese and the Russians for their warlike attitudes and for what the Russians claim is Communist China's preparation for war of conquest. But this has not happened. Instead the Communists and the Socialist have renewed their chorus for the immediate removal of the American military base from Okinawa and its return to Japan in a condition that would make it useless as a base from which to repel aggression from either Communist China or Russian. This is known as creating a diversion.

From his fuesherbunker deep in the heart of beautiful downtown Naha the chief executive of the Ryukyus dutifully joins the chorus and helps to drown out sounds of discord from the Communists and the Socialists each time the concert masters in Tokyo need an extra voice. Japan's Socialists, who could induce a case of sleeping sickness into a man with chronic insomnia with their dreary arguments, begin talking of a new election for the Japanese Diet whenever the remainder of the performers begin to complain of sore throats in the service of diverting attention from the sounds of battle from the peace-loving Communists and Socialists.

A great deal of the flurry about Okinawa and the urgency of its return to Japan is emotional. The remainder is a calculated program of diverting the attention of the people of Japan and the rest of Asia from what is going on between Peking and Moscow. And what is going on between these two mortal enemies should reinforce the determination of both the U.S. and Japan to maintain a strong posture on Okinawa no matter what the chorus boys and girls from Peking and Moscow might say.

SLOGAN VERSUS FACT IN REVERSION TALK

The manufacturing of catch phrases and simple, instant solutions to complicated problems is a prime function of politicians. Japanese politicians, particularly, excel at this art. The catch phrase out of which the politicians are getting the most mileage these days is the one which describes the return of Okinawa to Japan as the greatest

single problem that faces both Japan and Okinawa.

To back up this statement Japanese politicians say that unless the United States sacrifices Okinawa to win the next election for Japanese Prime Minister Eisaku Sato, the dread leftists will come into power. The political situation in Japan has been oversimplified so as to present the world with a yes-no answer revolving around Okinawa.

If the U.S. buys the elections for Sato by giving up Okinawa and a two billion dollar military base, according to the believers in political simplicity, the Japanese leftists will go back to their lairs and forget all of their future ambitions for taking over the government of Japan.

This is nonsense. Okinawa is but a single facet in the complicated plan that the Japanese leftists have to unseat the Liberal Democratic party from control of the Japanese Diet. If the Japanese leftists didn't have Okinawa as an excuse for attacking Sato they would find another excuse. Any excuse. And there are many.

Japan's leftists have no particular love for Okinawa nor do they have any immediate use for the Ryukyus other than to neutralize them as a military base in the defense of Japan and the free nations of the Far East including Free China and the Republic of Korea. In the past, any excuse, no matter how flimsy, has been sufficient for the leftists to attack the government of Japan. Trade with Communist China, the flying of the Communist Chinese flag, the price of train fares and the authority of the police to quell disturbances on the college campus have all provided Japanese with excuses for attacking the government with rocks, brickbats and staves. There are so many dissident groups at large and battling the police and the government in Japan today that printed programs setting forth the cast of characters are necessary before a riot can be truly appreciated. Okinawa's role in contributing to political unrest in Japan today is a politically inflated issue that the Japanese are using to give themselves extra leverage against the United States.

It is fine for the United States to attempt to take care of its friends and Japan's Prime Minister Sato is definitely a friend of the U.S. At least he is a friend of the U.S. until that friendship gets in the way of his political ambitions. Then he becomes a politician. No matter how badly the U.S. might like to help Sato, the U.S. can only do so much and the U.S. cannot eliminate all of Sato's political foes through American sacrifice.

The slogan makers have been busy over simplifying the issues which surround both Sato and Okinawa. In the process they have created a situation in which the slogan misses the truth by considerable distance.

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Nov. 19, 1969]

SOVIET STAND ON KURILES EMPHASIZES IMPORTANCE OF STRATEGIC ISLE: OKINAWA BASE VITAL TO UNITED STATES

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Premier Eisaku Sato, arriving here to recover the island of Okinawa and thus bearing Japan's hottest political potato, is looking at Japanese politics. "I have staked my political future on this," Sato stated on leaving Tokyo. But Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr., blessings be, has been looking at our Soviet threat and the best interests of the United States.

Senator Byrd disclosed to me that on Sept. 4, in Moscow, Soviet Premier Aleksei N. Kosygin secretly but scathingly rejected Japan's attempt even to discuss Tokyo's claims to four Kurile-chain islands Russia seized as a result of America's world War II Pacific victory.

The U.S.S.R. and Japan signed a declara-

tion ending their technical state of war on Oct. 19, 1956—11 years after hostilities. And Byrd found that the Japanese negotiating in the Kremlin quote Kosygin as stating that the balance of power established after the war "is imperative for world peace today." Soviet-minded Kosygin gave the Japanese a toothy scowl and a total "No" before they were even warm in their chairs.

Byrd, although a strong supporter of better U.S.-Japan relations, questioned how this allows us to give up Okinawa safely while the Soviet does the reverse. "That's the fundamental question—and danger," he told me.

Moreover, Byrd is disturbed by the one-sided atmosphere symbolized when the Johnson Administration approved a project to erect a monument on Guam honoring the World War II Japanese soldiers who died there. Guam is an unincorporated territory of the U.S. Government and its people are U.S. citizens. Byrd questions how this travesty could be considered when there is no monument on Guam to the Americans who died fighting to defend the United States and to liberate the island.

On Okinawa, in the terrible battle that lasted 83 days, we suffered 49,151 casualties—12,521 Americans killed in action. We lost 763 aircraft; 36 ships were sunk and an additional 369 ships were damaged.

The present status of the strategic island, the largest in the 73-island Ryukyu group, was determined by our 1951 Treaty of Peace with Japan, effective April 28, 1952. Article 3 gives the United States complete administrative authority. And today Okinawa is our most important single military base complex in the entire Far East. We poured \$260 million more into it only last year.

Beginning with President Eisenhower, each administration since 1952 has firmly maintained that Okinawa's unrestricted use is vital if we continue to have Far Eastern obligations.

"How can we support our Pacific guarantees, as we claim we will and also surrender our facilities?" is the agonized question Byrd asked. "If we didn't have the obligations, fine," he told me, "but we do have them and we do know what the Soviet is doing about the Kuriles."

WANTS GUARANTEES

On Secretary of State William P. Rogers' recent Far East visit, able Premier Sato acknowledged to him that with our gradual withdrawal from Vietnam Japan must pay more (and costly) attention to Japan's military responsibilities, especially if she gains sovereignty over Okinawa, thereby extending Japan's frontier 400 miles southward to embrace a million more citizens. But Premier Sato also told Mr. Rogers in advance that the Tokyo government wants us to continue to guarantee the safety of Japan, continue to guarantee Okinawa's safety and continue to spend hundreds of millions of our taxpayers' dollars on Okinawa.

Nevertheless, the Tokyo government seeks to remove the strategic island from our nuclear shield—a "nuclear-free" Okinawa—and have a veto over all U.S. actions affecting Okinawa. This outlaws our use of the vast, vital base for combat operations without prior consultation with Japan.

SENATE RESOLUTION

So, with the arrival of Premier Sato, Senator Byrd introduced a Senate resolution. It requires that any change in our Japanese peace treaty be first presented to, and ratified by, the Senate. He also coordinated an amendment to a House bill (HR 12964), expressing Congress's requirement that the President not agree to changes in any territory's status described in Article 3 without the advice and consent of the Senate.

The Byrd bill passed the Senate by the whopping vote of 63 to 14. And President

Nixon's Okinawa negotiating hand is immensely strengthened in view of the fact that dangerous, Soviet-minded Kosygin laughed the Japanese Kurile negotiators right out of the ball park.

EARTH RESOURCES AND POPULATION

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of Sunday, November 1, 1969, carried an article of special interest to me as chairman of the House Republican task force on earth resources and population. This article describes a phenomenon which has impressed task force members during their visits with college-age youth. The problems of environment and the quality of life are fast becoming an issue of top priority among our Nation's youth.

This interest in the environment is a healthy and encouraging sign, for it is only when public awareness and understanding of the problem are increased that we can hope to have effective programs to achieve an ecological balance. Our Republican earth resources and population task force has been impressed during its study, not only with the enormity of the problem, but also with its complexity and the many interrelationships that exist between various environmental problems.

The challenge which the Congress and the youth, who are becoming increasingly concerned about this issue, must face is that we must not fall into the trap of excessive emotionalism and appealing slogans. Nor will we make progress by accepting simple though appealing solutions and spending our time looking for scapegoats. We are dealing with an extremely complex problem, and we must seek to deal with it in a manner that will encourage understanding and a problem-solving approach to the many faceted issue of improving our environment. The crusade to improve our environment must be a positive and constructive movement. I am confident Congress, the administration, and our citizens—particularly our young people—will approach the problem in this manner. I welcome youth's interest and involvement in this issue. Their interest and commitment merits the attention of all Members of Congress.

This country's fantastic industrial growth of the past 60 years, particularly the past 20, has provided our society with more jobs, bigger paychecks, more leisure time and affluence previously unknown to man. We are healthier. We live longer. We are better educated. Our esthetic values are changing.

Having achieved an abundance of material wealth at the expense of nature we need to search for a practical balance so that we can live within nature's ecological boundaries without sacrificing or destroying our economic means of survival.

I include Gladwin Hill's article, "Environment May Eclipse Vietnam as College Issue," in the RECORD:

ENVIRONMENT MAY ECLIPSE VIETNAM AS COLLEGE ISSUE

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES, November 29—"We want to stop the war, end pollution—and beat Stanford!" yelled a Berkeley pep leader at last weekend's big football rally.

The mention of pollution brought a roar of approval from a University of California crowd of 5,000 that almost drowned out the reference to the big game.

Rising concern about the environmental crisis is sweeping the nation's campuses with an intensity that may be on its way to eclipsing student discontent over the war in Vietnam.

This is indicated by interviews with students and faculty members from any campuses and with leading conservation authorities around the country.

There is a strong feeling on the campuses that the war will be liquidated in due course. Meanwhile, it is physically remote. And, in the wake of the big protest marches, many students feel Vietnam offers only limited scope for student action.

But the deterioration of the nation's "quality of life" is a pervasive, here-and-now, long-term problem that students of all political shadings can sink their teeth and energies into. And they are doing it.

A national day of observance of environmental problems, analogous to the mass demonstrations on Vietnam, is being planned for next spring, with Congressional backing.

From Maine to Hawaii, students are seizing on the environmental ills from water pollution to the global population problem, campaigning against them, and pitching in to do something about them.

"A ground swell of concern is starting, on everything from population and food supply to the preservation of natural areas," commented Dr. Edward Clebsch, assistant professor of botany at the University of Tennessee.

"I've been floored by the intensity of their actions and feelings," said Dr. Vincent Arp, a Bureau of Standards physicist close to the University of Colorado at Boulder. "The student group is going like a bomb."

"They can see it, they can feel it, they can smell it. And they think they can change it," said William E. Felling, a program officer of the Ford Foundation, which contributes to many conservation activities.

In Los Angeles a fortnight ago, a student bloc stole the spotlight from 1,000 older participants in a gubernatorial environmental conference. Last week in San Francisco, at a meeting of the United States National Commission for UNESCO, something similar happened.

WORDS AND DEEDS

In Massachusetts last week, Boston University students put on a two-day campaign of public education in ecology. In Seattle, the University of Washington Committee on The Environmental Crisis was staging a similar "learn-in".

Words are only the surface of the iceberg. University of Minnesota students, fresh from a mock funeral demonstration against the fume-belching automobile engine, were planning to dump 26,000 cans on the lawn of a beverage manufacturer to protest use of such packaging. Northwestern University students were campaigning against a controversial regulatory proposal of the Chicago Sanitary District, and against the waste discharges of a big drug manufacturer.

At Stanford and the University of Texas, law students were researching new courtroom stratagems against despoilers of the environment. University of Arizona students in semisecrecy, were collecting data on the fume emissions of copper smelting operations.

EFFORTS GET RESULTS

Already the student environmental front can point to many accomplishments. Student activists had significant roles in the campaigns to "save" San Francisco Bay and the northern California redwoods, and to block new dams on the Colorado River.

The University of Wisconsin's Ecology Student Association was active in the campaign against the recently truncated Project Sanguine, the Navy's high-power communications development; and provided important logistical support for the Environmental Defense Fund in the months-long Madison hearings on DDT.

At the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana, Students for Environmental Control sailed forth in freezing weather 10 days ago and extracted six tons of refuse from nearby Boneyard Creek. They persuaded city officials to follow up the effort, and are working on a beautification plan for the creek.

A University of Texas student is launching a state environmental newsletter. University of Washington students, on their own time, are preparing an 80-page report on ecological problems of Puget Sound. At the California Institute of Technology, students organized an intercollegiate summer research project in environmental problems that already has attracted nearly \$100,000 in foundation financing.

On some campuses—Vassar, the University of Oklahoma, and the University of Nebraska are examples—there are no evidences of organized environmental concern. But they are far outweighed by the ferment elsewhere.

On the University of Texas campus at Austin there are at least six environmental groups, with interests ranging from water pollution to conservation law. One group, in the College of Engineering, has filed 58 formal complaints against the University itself for pollution of a nearby creek. At the University of Hawaii, there are close to two dozen groups, each organized around a particular cause.

ACTION IS KEYNOTE

Some groups, like Boston University's Ecology Coalition have as few as a dozen members. Others have hundreds. But with causes on every hand, mass membership and parliamentary formalities means less than action, which can be initiated by a handful of people. Then the causes gather their own following.

A few groups cherish the designation of "radical" and are indirect offshoots of the leftist movements like the Students for a Democratic Society and California's Peace and Freedom Party.

"Capitalism is predicated on money and growth, and when you're only interested to maximize profits, you maximize pollution. We need a system that takes maximum care of the earth," said Cliff Humphrey, the 32-year-old leader of Ecology Action, one of several groups at Berkeley.

But generally the aura of the environmental "new wave" is conservative, with coats and ties as conspicuous as beards and blue jeans. "There's a role for everybody in ecology," said Keith Lampe, a cofounder of the Yipple movement, who puts out an environment-oriented newsletter from Berkeley. "People with widely different styles and politics can talk to each other with no more tension than a Presbyterian talks with a Methodist."

FEW ANARCHISTS

"I doubt if you'll find many anarchist ecologists," commented Steve Berwick, a 28-year-old Yale environmentalist. "Ecology is a system, and anarchy goes against that."

A typical group is Boston University's Ecology Action, whose 75 members are led by Bruce Tisney, a 20-year-old junior geol-

ogy major. Edwardian rather than hippie in appearance, he has a trimmed red beard, wire-rimmed spectacles, and affects such sartorial accoutrements as a blue plaid vest and matching bow-tie, white shirt, and gold watch and chain.

Ecology Action's two-day educational program last week included "friendly" picketing of the state capitol, a pollution film festival, pamphleteering and lectures, and a mock award of a pollution prize to a local power company. The group has been conferring with state water pollution officials about doing spare time "watchdog" work, and is planning to set up dust-catching devices to monitor air pollution.

There have, across the country, been incidents, but mostly minor—such as the arrest last month of 26 University of Texas students who tried to block the felling of some trees for a campus building extension.

LOCAL ORIENTATION

Some of the campus groups are branches of national organizations such as the Sierra Club (which has just installed a campus coordinator at its San Francisco headquarters), the Wildlife Federation, and the newly established Friends of the Earth. But most of them are spontaneous local movements. Many tend to shun the established national organizations as being dedicated to old-line "conservation" rather than the environmental crisis. They also feel the older groups are wary of "direct action" for fear of losing the tax-exempt status that is their financial base. Ad hoc student groups don't have this problem.

"We don't want to be labeled as 'conservationists' or 'antipollution,'" said Wes Fisher, a 26-year-old ecology student at the University of Minnesota. "Pollution and overpopulation are like a web, and pollution is just the symptom."

The students are employing the gamut of communications and political-pressure techniques—meetings, lectures, rallies, picketing, research, pamphleteering, letter-writing, petitions, legislative testimony, collaboration with public agencies and contacts with politicians.

Last month, Illinois' representative William Springer, Republican, felt student heat when conservationists from the University of Illinois picketed a testimonial dinner for him because he backed a controversial dam project.

IMPETUS IS RECENT

The environmental "new wave" gathered in California as far back as 1965, when Berkeley students staged a sitdown protest against a freeway and Stanford students became involved in campaigns for San Francisco Bay, the redwoods, and Point Reyes National Seashore.

But most of the organizing is recent, and is proceeding unabated. A Boston University group was sparked by a recent Ramparts magazine article by Stanford's Dr. Paul Ehrlich, the "population bomb" crusader. San Francisco State College students were galvanized by a speaker from the Planned Parenthood organization. Bob Hertz, an organizer of the University of Minnesota's Students for Environmental Defense, said his inspiration came from Zen Buddhism and its emphasis on the interrelationship of man and nature. A student group gathering strength at Ohio State was motivated by concern over the Army Engineers' Clear Creek Dam project in southern Ohio, which threatened to flood a pristine natural area used by science students.

In more instances than not, students are welcoming faculty collaboration and counsel. In some places, faculty members have taken the lead. At the University of Arizona in Tucson, a philosophy professor, David Yetman, and a recent law graduate, William Risner, organized "GASP" (Group Against

Smelter Pollution) to do battle with the copper companies. The group now includes students and townspeople.

ACADEMIC GROWTH

A University of Illinois engineering instructor, Bruce Hannon, has been a leader of the Committee on Allerton Park, opposing a \$70-million Army Engineers dam project near Decatur. Students joined in a campaign that led to the University's commissioning of an engineering firm to produce an alternative plan.

The environmental ferment caused Ohio State to establish a School of Natural Resources last year. Its original involvement of 180 has grown quickly to 300. An introductory conservation course that had 147 students last fall had 210 this fall. The college's perennial Biologists Forum, which used to draw 20 persons to its meetings, has been attracting hundreds. The University of Tennessee reports an enthusiastic reception for a new course in "Biology and Human Affairs." Colby College in Waterville, Me., has organized two special seminars in January and February on pollution problems and conservation law.

Students are taking the initiative in some environmental teaching. At Stanford, Jeff Bauman, a 22-year-old senior majoring in biology, this fall has been attracting 20 to 40 students to an informal after-dinner dormitory seminar.

OVERSHADOWING VIETNAM

There are differing indications on the campuses about how soon environment may overshadow Vietnam in student interest, but the trend is evident.

"A lot of people are becoming disenchanted with the antiwar movement," said Boston University's Bruce Tiffney. "People who are frustrated and disillusioned are starting to turn to ecology."

"I think environment is a bigger issue than the war, and I think people are beginning to sense its urgency," said Robert Benner, a 22-year-old geology student in the University of Colorado conservation movement.

"The country is tired of S.D.S. and ready to see someone like us come to the forefront," remarked Alan Tucker, a member of Ecology Activists at San Francisco State.

"Environmental problems will obviously replace other major issues of today," said Terry Cornelius, president of the University of Washington's committee on the environmental crises. "This is not just a social movement for Biafra or Vietnam, but for everybody and our closed system, Earth."

"Environment will replace Vietnam as a major issue with the students as the Vietnam phase-out proceeds," commented A. Bruce Etherington, chairman of the University of Hawaii's architecture department. "And it will not be just a political lever to be used by radicals."

Many of the over-30 environmentalists see the student movement as the catalyst, if not the main driving force, that will get environmental improvement rolling, and overcome the older generation's tacit resignation to the status quo.

"These kids are really remarkable in their understanding and maturity," said 52-year-old Dr. Barry Commoner, the prominent Washington University ecologist who has been addressing many student groups.

Campuses are seen as representing a greatly broadened base for the "conservation constituency" needed to jog bureaucrats and support the politicians through whom environmental reforms generally must clear.

Conservation lawyers look to campuses for the scientific expertise vital in pressing environmental battles in the courts, and for the energy necessary to raise funds for the usually expensive legal proceedings.

Indications are that coming months will see the student conservation tide swelling

and manifesting itself in an arresting variety of ways.

Already students are looking forward to the first "D-Day" of the movement, next April 22—when a nationwide environmental "teach-in," being coordinated from the office of Senator Gaylord Nelson, Wisconsin Democrat, is planned, to involve both college campuses and communities.

Given the present rising pitch of interest, some supporters think, it could be a bigger and more meaningful event than the anti-Vietnam demonstrations.

APARTHEID IN SOUTH AFRICA

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, South Africa's unyielding and intensified policy of apartheid is an open and continued denial of the principles of human equality. A courageous expose of the effects of the South African system of government on both white and black South Africans is contained in "Our Country, Our Responsibility" by Duncan Innes. Mr. Innes was president of the National Union of South African Students during 1968-69.

This essay presents responsible views on a topic that is important to every freedom-loving American. I include it herewith:

OUR COUNTRY, OUR RESPONSIBILITY

(By Duncan Innes)

(NOTE.—Duncan Innes was President of the National Union of South African Students in the year 1968-69.

(NUSAS has long been the most vocal of South Africa's student bodies. Student Representative Councils are affiliated to the Union, and its support lies in the English-language universities and training colleges as well as in African and Indian colleges. Through these Student Councils NUSAS represents some 25,000 South African students and is the largest non-racial organization in South Africa. Until his death in 1967 Chief Albert Luthuli was its Honorary President. For several years NUSAS has come under increasingly heavy pressure from the South African Government as well as from the Special Branch, and several of its supporters have had restrictions imposed on them or rights withdrawn.

(For example, Mr. Innes was refused a passport when he wished to take up a two-months travel bursary. Two Rhodesian members—one of whom was a Vice President—had their residence privileges withdrawn, and another who qualified for both Rhodesia and South African citizenship was deprived of the latter because he had travelled to Rhodesia on a Rhodesian passport. A former Vice President was placed under house arrest until finally he decided to leave South Africa on an exit permit, which denies him the right to return.

(This pamphlet is the text of a speech made by Mr. Innes at a NUSAS meeting earlier this year. We publish it because it is a courageous exposé of the effects of the South African system of government on both white and black South Africans.)

INTRODUCTION

Some people may wonder why I, as a student, have chosen a topic such as this for my talk today; these people may ask why as students we are concerning ourselves with

our country and not concentrating on our studies.

To these people I would say that I believe firmly that a university can only reflect the aspirations of the society in which it exists, and thus to study the one without the other is to do only half the job. Each one of us here will shortly be leaving our university to take our places in our society, and it is, therefore, imperative that we are aware of the state and health of that society. Furthermore, with the present political trend in South Africa, students stand clearly in the political spectrum of our society and so a proper understanding of the society in which they operate is essential.

But first let us analyse briefly our own position—the position of the student in South Africa. For example, how many students are there studying at universities in our country?

In 1968 there were 74,330 enrolled students. Of these students the racial breakdown was as follows:

Whites	65,745
African	1,530
Asiatic	3,219
Coloured	3,836

Total, nonwhites..... 8,585

This means that of the total percentage of students studying at institutions of higher learning in South Africa only 11.5 per cent were non-white, and of that percentage 3 per cent were Africans.

Why is the rate of education of the non-White and particularly the African so low? The Government submits again and again that it is doing all it can to increase educational facilities for the non-White. They point to the establishment of the University College of Zululand, of the University College of the North, of the University College of the Western Cape, and they cry, "look what we are doing for the non-White!" And indeed, giving credit where credit is due, we will admit that the establishment of 3 non-White colleges, which are now almost fully-fledged universities is a fine record. But when we study the enrollment figures at some non-White institutions we see that:

University college	Student enrollment		
	1960	1968	Increase
Zululand.....	41	368	327
Western Cape.....	161	669	508
Fort Hare.....	360	451	91

These figures we feel do not denote great progress, but giving the Government the benefit of the doubt, we presume that universities simply grow slowly, so we look at the White universities to see how they have increased their enrollment in the same eight years.

University	Increase by 1968
Natal.....	2,008
Witwatersrand.....	3,081
Cape Town.....	2,058
Potchefstroom.....	1,547
Pretoria.....	4,103
Stellenbosch.....	2,735

It would seem that, from these figures, the Government is doing all it can to improve the opportunities for Whites to get a university education while neglecting the non-Whites almost entirely.

But Mr. Harry Lewis, newly-appointed Nationalist Party MP, tells us that this is not so. Almost confidentially he gives us the reasons. "You see," he says, "the Black man unfortunately just isn't up to university

standing. He can't absorb all that knowledge, poor chap. Just look at the school failure rates", he tells us. So like good South Africans, we look at the figures. We see that of all African children of school-going age, 78 per cent are attending schools. This, we agree, is impressive.

We see that in Sub A there are 580,533 African children. But by the time we reach Matric we see that there are only 2,075.

We look at the overall picture and we see that out of an African population of 12,750,000 in 1967 only 17.49 per cent were at school. That is 2 million children. Of these 2 million over 1 million, or more than half, are in Sub A, Sub B, Standard 1 and Standard 2. Why do so many African children fail to get any further?

The answer is very simple, Government sources inform us. They just cannot keep up. They just do not have the brain-power to match us Whites. But what the Government doesn't tell us is that the ratio in these classes is 1 teacher to 58.8 children. What we are not told is that the reasons why there are more children per teacher this year than there were last year is because an African teacher gets paid less than half the salary of a White teacher with equal qualifications. The Government does not tell us that a non-White artisan with a Junior Certificate can get a larger salary than a teacher with a Senior Certificate and 2 years' training. For the non-White, Mr. Chairman, where is the incentive to teach? This is why last year there were 1,750 teaching vacancies among non-Whites.

Our helpful Government sources forget to tell us that although books are free at Government Schools for White children, non-White children have to pay for theirs; and that the parents of most of these youngsters live in abject poverty so that they just cannot afford to let their children go on educating themselves. They have to go out and work or the family will starve.

Thus, although the Minister of Bantu Education can proudly claim that 78 per cent of African children receive schooling, he forgets to mention that less than 30 per cent ever get over Standard 2 and in fact that only 0.08 per cent reach Matric.

If, despite all these facts and figures, our learned Government source still tries to tell us that the Government is doing all it can for non-White education in South Africa, then we must ask one last question. How much money per pupil is spent on education?

In 1960, which was the last time the Government issued these comparative figures: R144.57 was spent per White child.

R59.13 was spent per Coloured child.

R12.46 was spent per African child.

The education of the non-White, and particularly the African, in South Africa is a myth and a lie. It is something the Government can proudly point to when it is questioned in the United Nations, but when one delves into the intricate cobwebs of half-truths one is confronted with the painful fact: the Government does not want to educate the Black man.

Those who do manage an education, those who gain Matric, those who go on to get degrees and to become doctors are men and women whose courage and determination it is not easy to match. Like the medical student, who this year applied for a NUSAS scholarship: he had just completed his 2nd year; he had obtained 2 second class passes—a truly remarkable achievement. I asked him where he lived. He said he shared a one-room shack with a friend. Wasn't it awkward, I asked, if one of them wanted to work at night and the other wanted to sleep with a light shining in the room? There was no light, he said, they had no electricity. But how do you work at night, I asked? By candle-light, he said.

But now, we should ask ourselves why should the Government not wish to do all it

can to educate the African and thus enable him to raise his own standard of living? Surely, we would expect any rational government to plough as much money as possible into the education of the poor so that in this way the poor may be better equipped to enter new and better jobs, thus earn larger salaries, raise healthier, better-educated families, and surely in this way, with more and more educated men and women entering our professions our whole society would be enriched and would prosper economically. But this is not the policy of our present Government and to understand why, we must look at the whole political situation.

THE HOAX OF SEPARATE NATIONS

The policy of South Africa at the moment is one where the White group has economic and political control of the country, and they do not intend to let it go.

Now the question arises, if the White group who have this power, do not intend to lose it, what are they going to do with the majority of the people? The White group feels that whatever it does with these people it must ensure three things: firstly, that the policy has some form of moral justification; secondly, that it is economically sound; and thirdly, that it won't involve any loss of power for the Whites. And with those three aims in mind, the late Dr. Verwoerd produced the doctrine of separate nations.

Dr. Verwoerd said we will give the Africans their own nations in which they can have full rights of citizenship. But obviously since we, the Whites, have already developed certain sections of South Africa for ourselves, we will give the Africans those sections that are still largely under-developed so that they can develop those sections for themselves.

Of course those sections that are still under-developed only amount to 13 per cent of the total land space of South Africa, but after all there are only 16 million of them and 4 million of us, he said. And anyway, we can't be expected to give up what we have developed.

But, said his critics, what will happen when these Black nations develop and grow economically and politically powerful? Won't they be a threat to us? I think Dr. Verwoerd just smiled. Because he knew it was all a mammoth hoax.

Dr. Verwoerd knew that the Bantustans were agriculturally semi-impoverished, industrially useless and economically unable to pay for themselves. He knew that the Bantustans could never ever hope to absorb all the Africans in the Republic. There could never be enough work. He said, and Mr. Vorster says, that the Africans will gradually return to the Bantustans as they develop and the need for more workers grows.

REALITIES OF A BANTUSTAN

But let us look at the Government's biggest showcase, the Bantustan which has already survived 5 years of so-called self-government—the Transkei.

The Transkei consists of 16,000 square miles. It has an African population of 1.4 million. Thirteen years after the Tomlinson Report—which was the first blueprint from which Dr. Verwoerd worked—13 years after this report claimed that in 25-30 years the Transkei would be able to support 10 million Africans, we find that it cannot even support 1.4 million. There are 3 factories in the Transkei and they employ less than 2,000 Africans. There are only 32,700 Africans employed in the Transkei and in another 12-17 years, according to the Tomlinson Report, employment must be found for 10 million. Today we learn that the Tomlinson Report is inaccurate. By the year 2000 there will be 9 million more Africans in South Africa than the Report bargained for.

But, we ask, what happens to those Africans who cannot find work in the Transkei and the other homelands? They return to the Republic as migrant labourers.

And so now we can see how the great scheme really works. The homelands can never become economically self-sufficient.

Last year the Transkei had a total budget of R20 million. From its own sources, the Transkei raised R4.5 million. The balance comes from our generous Government. I am sure that should Chief Mantanzima ever wish to do anything with which Pretoria were dissatisfied, Pretoria might discover that there were certain difficulties involved in handing over the R15.5 million so necessary for the Transkei's very survival.

Thus we see that the Bantustans, because they can never be economically self-sufficient, can never be politically independent. And, although they can have all the trappings of independence, such as a Prime Minister, a Cabinet and elections, they will never be able to acquire such natural rights of any nation, as for example an army, even for self-defence. As long as the Bantustans rely on the South African Government for their funds—which they must forever do—they can never support themselves, and therefore, they will never be politically independent. Thus, the Whites' third aim, that they should lose none of their power is realised, while their first aim that their policy should also have a seemingly moral justification is theoretically realised—the lazy or indoctrinated thinker—for "one day", we are told—not in his life-time, Mr. Vorster tell us—but one day, these nations will be free.

And, of course, we must not forget that the policy must be economically sound too, which was, you will recall, our second requirement. So we have an African population unable to find work in the homelands drifting back into the Republic and supplying a constant labour force for our mines and factories. And they will go on doing this because they need work for food and we will go on receiving cheap labour and our economy will grow and grow and requirement number two has been met. Of course, we do not allow these men to bring their wives and children because we do not need them to work, and if these men grumble about poor wages we simply sack them because our system is so sound that we know that there are millions more who are so hungry that they will work for any amount of money, no matter how small.

THE OUTCOME OF APARTHEID

Apartheid presents a depressing picture. It is a picture of a cunning system that is so evil and so selfish that one wonders that human beings could ever have evolved it.

It is a system that forces over 600,000 people in Soweto, an African township in Johannesburg, to live in 70,000 houses. That is, according to the official Government figures, 9 people per 3-roomed house.

It is a system which orders 33,000 Coloured people to be evicted from their homes in District 6 at a time when there is already a shortage of 30,000 Coloured homes in the Cape Peninsula alone—at a time when 15,000 Coloured people in the Cape are waiting for homes and 66,000 are inadequately housed. These are official Government figures.

It is a system which evicts these people from their homes because, in the words of the Minister of Community Development, Mr. Blaar Coetzee, he "wants it for a White luxury area".

It is a system which causes a man to say, "I do not weep for the non-White; I weep for the White".

It is a system which allows the homes of 170 Coloured people to be bulldozed down and then leaves them sitting for two weeks on the roadside . . . without shelter. A 90-year-old man and a 2-month-old baby, we read, shared a ditch.

It is a system which enables the homes of 1,746 Coloured people, to be bought by the Government and resold to Whites, with the Government gaining a total profit of R6.8 million—and this after official Govern-

ment sources inform us that 60 per cent of the Coloured people are poverty-stricken.

It is a system that allows in one year for 12,000 cases of malnutrition diseases among African babies, 700 among Coloured babies and 9 among Whites. According to population ratios, these figures should be Whites 9, Coloureds 4 and Africans 36.

It is a system that allows 50 per cent of all African children born alive to die before they reach their 5th birthday.

It is a system which allows the Minister of Community Development to stand up and say that the Indians in South Africa must branch out willingly from Commerce or the Government will force them out. "They must branch out into other occupations", he said, "and become clerks, roadworkers and fitters and turners. This will be done", he concluded, "not only in the interests of South Africa, but also in the interests of the Indian community."

LIMEHILL AND STINKWATER

It is the policy of the mass removals of Africans from White areas which has caused the horrors of Limehill and Stinkwater. This is a description of a Government resettlement camp. Stinkwater, which lies 35 miles from Pretoria, and into which the Government has forced thousands of Africans to move. It is written by one who was there, and it appeared in the *Rand Daily Mail*:

"It consists of corrugated iron shacks, mud huts and wooden houses. Hundreds of the slum dwellers have been infected with a scourge of skin diseases. Scores of children had bloodshot eyes accompanied by a discharge of tears. A medical practitioner said the children were showing symptoms of trachoma, which could lead to blindness. Other children had their heads covered with ringworm. Some of them found it difficult to play because of swollen limbs."

But in case you are feeling depressed, do not worry, because the report noted that "there is 1 nurse in the area," and as far as sanitation goes, "a borehole is open for 4 hours a day."

But what did this place look like, we wonder, when the Department of Bantu Administration and Development forced these people to move there and said "this is your homeland"? We do not know what it looked like then, but 6 months after these people had been there in the middle of winter, we know what it looked like. There were no schools, no stores and no clinic. The people lived in tents. There was one hand pump for water which was used by over 400 people.

It is only fair, however, to present the other side of the picture too, and 3 months later there had been improvements. There was half a school, an old shack for a store, a motor-driven pump, but still no clinic. That is progress.

Most of the men who live at Stinkwater work in the cities during the week, and only come home to see their families over the weekend. Those who do come home every day arrive home by bus at 9 p.m. and have to be up at 3 a.m. to catch the bus to the city at 4 a.m. The bus fare is 45 cents per day single and R4.40 a month. In addition, money is, of course, needed for clothes and food. There are no toilets provided at all.

Then there is Limehill, where many people have died. In October of last year an epidemic broke out there, and a letter was sent to the Minister of Health, Dr. Carel de Wet, asking for an inquiry as typhoid was suspected.

On December 10th, the Minister issued a statement saying conditions at Limehill were normal. In only 3 months, from September to December, out of a population of 6,000 only 19 people had died.

On December 21st, Archbishop Hurley visited the area and claimed that he had evidence that between October 1st and December 10th at least 45 people had died. He informed the Minister of Health. The Minister then issued a statement admitting that in 5

months 73 people had died, but this, he said, was also normal. If 19 deaths in 3 months is normal, and 73 deaths in 5 months is also normal, I shudder to think what the Minister would regard as abnormal.

At this stage dozens of pressmen were converging on the area to attempt to ascertain the truth. The Minister was quick to slap a ban on any pressmen visiting the area. But he could not stop members of Parliament going there, and he could not stop doctors going there.

Eventually, after 35 deaths had occurred in 2 weeks, the State ordered inoculations and set up medical "checkpoints". The Natal Regional Director for State Health issued the following statement: "We have established contact with the disease. The picture is not entirely clear, but it is apparently the result of insanitary conditions." A spokesman for the State Health Department said that between 15-20 per cent of the children at Limehill have contracted gastro-enteritis and the disease was spreading to adults. But he added "this is quite normal at this time of year because of the heat and the flies".

What really happened at Limehill, we will probably never know, for while people died, the Government banned the Press from going there; while people died the priests who tried to save them were interrogated again and again by the Special Branch; and while people died, White South Africa went about its business.

What we do have, though, is the report of four doctors who did voluntary medical work in the area before the Government went in and who delivered a "factual account" of their findings.

Between December 28th and January 19th, 760 patients attended one clinic. The size of the community which that clinic served was 2,000. Among the cases examined were: diarrhoea and vomiting (68), suspected typhoid (4), confirmed typhoid (8-1 death), pneumonia (9-2 deaths), tonsillitis (19), otitis media (8), eye infections (21), salpingitis (3), cystitis (43), pellagra (53), kwashiorkor (28), vitamin deficiency disease (20), scurvy (8), rickets (3), scabies (27), worm infestation (7), and suspected TB (5).

Fifteen of these patients were pregnant. What, we might ask, would have happened to those people if doctors had not voluntarily gone there to treat them?

One of the diseases mentioned was typhoid. Of this disease the doctors say "it spreads in conditions of poor hygiene . . . In a normal, healthy community the acceptable incidence of typhoid is nil. Thus in a community the size of Limehill, 8 confirmed and 4 suspected cases would in any medical sense be called very serious."

"Diarrhoea," the doctors say, "was the commonest reason for consulting us. Just over 50 per cent of all patients who came had these complaints. It is most serious in babies and young children who form a very large percentage of the cases. Sudden deterioration and death may occur within hours."

The doctors continue: "From the disease we saw, it is self-evident that the water and waste disposal facilities were inadequate." They conclude: "We understand that the men are, to a large extent in other areas. We would indicate that this is unsatisfactory and a further factor in continuing the vicious cycle of disease, poverty, ignorance, disease."

This report was published before the Limehill debate began in Parliament. Let us see what occurred there. Dr. de Wet said that in one year there were 18 cases of typhoid and asked what was so abnormal about that. He went on to criticise the United Party, the Press and all those who had attacked Limehill as being "enemies of South Africa". Blaar Coetzee, replying to a barrage of Opposition questions, asked: "Does the U.P. want caviar for the people of Limehill?" Another Government spokesman, amid roars of Nationalist

laughter, said that he thought everyone was making a mountain out of a Limehill.

But not all Nationalist comments were sickly witticisms. Sometimes they tried to defend it. There are 2 ambulances available which come in from outside, they cried, and a district surgeon visits the clinic once a week, and there is one district nurse on duty all the time. When their critics said there were 6,000-8,000 people there spread over many miles with no proper toilet facilities, only a pit system, and not one house, Government MP's claimed that these conditions were due to the fact that the people there have done nothing about them. They had, after all, been supplied with tents and equipment to dig pit latrines when they were originally dumped there. It was Dr. Radford, the United Party MP who pointed out that there were no men there—they were working in the cities. "Surely", he said, "you do not expect women with babies on their backs to dig 20-ft. latrines in the hard soil of Northern Natal?"

Dr. Radford went on to say that of the many cemeteries in the area, he had only visited 2, and he had counted 40 graves, not 19 as the Minister had said. He had been shown 750 medical cards of children suffering from gastro-enteritis. And amid jeers and cat-calls from Government benches, he added: "And if you want the names on the graves, I will show them to you."

And so the tragedy of Limehill was laughed out of Parliament and the Minister of Health refused to set up a commission to investigate it. We will never know how many people died there. Some people say they have seen hundreds of graves; the Minister has only seen 19. We will probably never know how many hundreds of other Limehills have occurred, are occurring, and are going to occur. Perhaps it is just as well, for as the Nationalist Party newspaper, *Die Transvaler* so aptly put it:

"Limehill was never presented as a utopia to the thousands of outcasts who were shifted there, although it undoubtedly must have seemed like one to many of them. The area offers reasonable living conditions and the residents are happy because their living conditions there are infinitely better than the places they come from."

Yes, it is true, the residents are happy. Their happiness is the eternal stillness of the grave. But their passing was not a happy one, their last desperate agonies were not happy, and their deaths have labelled South Africa with a terrible guilt.

The guilt for those deaths lies with the Nationalists who jeered and lied to smother the truth. The guilt lies with the public that didn't care. The guilt for those deaths lies with you and I who read the newspaper reports, shook our heads in horror, and then threw the newspaper aside. The guilt, fellow-students, is ours, because we have done nothing.

I have touched very lightly on the topic of apartheid. I have revealed certain horrors and certain injustices, but I have only scratched the surface. Beneath the surface lie a million further tragedies, human tragedies all of them. Tragedies of discrimination, of despair, of selfishness.

The tragedies of over 12 million Africans who must carry passes with them like dog licenses for fear that they, like dogs, will be impounded. The tragedies of 72,936 Africans who have been uprooted from their homes and forced into barren resettlement areas. The tragedies of 92.5 per cent of an Indian group of 99,000 who have been affected by Group Areas. And these are just the facts and figures. They are statistics. Government official statistics, and they cannot tell of the many other horrors that are caused by this system.

They cannot tell the terrible harm that malnutrition does to the mind and body; they cannot tell of the destruction of minds

and personalities which the horrors of Limehill perpetrate, they can only record the deaths. It is impossible to estimate the drunkenness, the poverty, the prostitution, and other vices which this system forces onto the people who are subjected to it. Our only knowledge that this sort of thing occurs is when we see the battered tramp in rags staggering drunkenly down our dirty streets only to be hurled brutally into the back of a waiting van. And then the reaction of the White population is as certain as ever: "You wouldn't want your daughter to marry one of those, would you?"

This is a story of a people with no rights and no future. This is the story of South Africa today. Behind this lamentable story lies a quiet philosophy: a philosophy which the rulers of our land have nurtured and long cherished. It is the philosophy which today steers South Africa on its present course. It is the philosophy which has entrenched itself in our society, our heritage, our way of life. For the last 15 years young South Africans have been subjected to Christian National Education, which pervades our school textbooks and governs the order of our thinking.

But what is it? What is this Christian Nationalism?

I could not define it better than did our own Prime Minister, Mr. B. J. Vorster, when after he had been appointed a general in the Ossewa Brandwag in 1942, he said:

"We stand for Christian Nationalism which is an ally of National Socialism. You can call this anti-democratic principle dictatorship if you wish. In Italy it is called Fascism, in Germany, German National Socialism (or Nazism), and in South Africa Christian Nationalism."

THE STUDENT ROLE

South Africa is our country and our responsibility. If we are concerned for the future of our country, as I am because I do not believe she has a secure future, then we must ask ourselves what we can do for our country and for our future. We must ask ourselves what we, as students, as tomorrow's leaders, can do. We must ask ourselves what NUSAS can do.

This is a question which NUSAS leaders have asked themselves for many years. Some of their answers have not, I feel, been either sensible or realistic. One such answer was the one which the President gave five years ago. In 1964 Jonty Driver, speaking of NUSAS, said, "To be brutally frank and utterly honest, NUSAS is a front for the liberation movement in South Africa." Speaking in 1969, I must say to you that to be brutally frank and utterly honest, Jonty Driver was talking nonsense. NUSAS is not and cannot be any sort of subversive organisation, nor can we house or protect subversives. We are a national students' union and we must remember this. This is all we are and this is all we can claim to be. The duty of a national students' union must be to reflect the views of the students it represents and to carry out such functions as the students wish it to carry out. This is all we can do.

At the same time the views of these students will give the national body certain principles and a certain basic policy. That policy we might refer to in South Africa as our social conscience. That basic policy or guide has already been discussed, agreed upon, and accepted by the students within NUSAS. It is the internationally acclaimed Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a document signed by all the countries in the world except eight—South Africa, Portugal and some countries of the Communist Bloc. Not unexpectedly then, the basic thoughts of the Declaration stand directly opposed to the policies of the Government at present.

Our role then, as I see it, the role of NUSAS, the role of South African students,

is to hold our basic policy before us as an ideal and to work with all our strength for the implementation of that ideal. Our role must be to point out the injustice of our society. This is our duty, to do both as citizens of South Africa and as members of the community of mankind. Let the South African people never be able to say, as the German people said after they had seen the mangled horrors of Auschwitz and Buchenwald, "We did not know this was happening." In 10 years' time, let this not be the pathetic cry of White South Africa. We know! We are aware of what is happening! It is our duty to make South Africa aware of what we know.

There are those who would say that all is peaceful in South Africa. Let them remember the thousands of banned men and women, who lead twilight existences in our land.

There are those who would say that the African is happy in South Africa. Let them remember Sharpeville.

There are those who would say that the African is well-treated in South Africa. Let them look to the filth of the African locations.

There are those who would say that South Africa is a sunny, healthy land. Let them look to the dead in Limehill.

And when they say to us, as they will: Why do you point out these things? Are you a Communist? Are you a Leftist? Are you an enemy of South Africa? Then reply to them that you are none of these things. Tell them that you are someone who believes that every man who is born has a right to life, that every man who is born has a right to develop himself to his full potential. Tell them that when you point out injustices in your country, you do so not because you wish to harm your country, but because you wish to remove the injustices and thus improve the image of your country.

There is much in this country that needs to be improved for in a land such as this, where the majority have no freedom, none of us can be free. If a Government can condemn one section of the population, there is no reason why it cannot condemn another. The African who struggles for equal rights and equal opportunities is condemned; the White man who defends the African's rights is also condemned. The 180-day law, banings, passport removals, and deportations are the order of the day. And we must remember that because one person has lost a passport, all of our passports are in jeopardy. We must remember that because one man has been banned, all of us can suffer the same fate.

There is no criterion by which we may judge whether we are safe or not. The law can be no criterion because the courts are discarded by our rulers. You do not have to commit a crime to be condemned by our Government. You simply have to do something that these enlightened dictators do not like at one particular time. With that criterion no one is safe. Not even the verkramptes, or ultra-conservatives, who are harassed as much by the Special Branch as we are.

There are those who say that one can have freedom in South Africa just as long as one keeps quiet and does not say or do anything that will upset the Government. We must ask these people what sort of freedom do you think you have if you are scared to exercise it? What sort of freedom is it when people are scared to do what they wish to do for fear of losing freedom? This is no freedom. This is a pathetic malprocess which stunts the growth of the mind, the personality and the character of any human being who is subjected to it.

And what freedom do we, in South Africa, have today anyway?

Do we have the freedom to love whom we choose? No! It is against the law to love someone whose skin is of a different pigment to ours. We can only love those whom our rulers have by law approved. Do we have the freedom to go wherever we choose in our country or can we go only to those places which are marked by our Government for Whites only? If we are in a hurry, do we have the freedom to catch the first taxi or bus that arrives, or must we wait for one that is marked for Whites only?

Do we have the freedom to invite the MCC cricket team to visit our country or must we first dictate who their team is to be? Do our athletes have the freedom to compete internationally, and I mean all our athletes? Do we have the freedom to read great books and see great films or are we only allowed access to those our rulers deem fit for us?

These are but a few of our unfreedoms. They are only the beginning. There will be more unfreedoms for us to chalk up on our "Book of Rules".

We can, of course, sit back and accept all of this. We can argue that there is nothing we can do now, and that in time all these problems will sort themselves out. This is a fallacy. Time alone can change nothing. It is through our efforts now that time will eventually reflect change. But we must make the effort now!

We must look around us and ask ourselves what we can do. We do not have to look very far. At this very moment a drama is playing itself out, a drama that once again involves the futures of men and their destinies. I refer to the injustice of unequal pay for South African doctors.

The position is clear. Pay for doctors is not on a basis of merit or amount of work being done. It is on the basis of race. We have already seen that the South African non-White labours under far greater difficulties than the White to educate himself. Yet we see that when he eventually achieves this success, he is condemned to less salary than his fellow doctor who is White. Why? These doctors save the same lives, they heal the same sick, they work the same hours, yet they do not receive the same pay.

The Government tells us that it is because non-White doctors do not have the same needs as the White doctors. It is the right of the individual to decide what his needs are, and no Government has the right to decide for him.

At university at present, there are White and non-White medical students studying together. Their futures are involved here. And they are students. They are our fellow-students. The futures of some of them are tainted with injustice, and I believe that we have a duty to stand by our fellow students, and to defend their rights just as they would defend our rights.

At the end of May almost 200 doctors will resign from hospitals in South Africa, because of unfair treatment. I do not believe that we should encourage them to change their minds because their decision is uncomfortable for us. I believe that we should stand by them because they are right.

A few days ago, the NUSAS executive and Standing Committee of SRC Presidents issued a joint statement in which we expressed our concern at the present situation. We pointed out, as has Professor Chris Barnard, that it is unjust to pay a man according to the colour of his skin. We pointed out that this was of direct concern to NUSAS because there were thousands of medical students studying at centres affiliated to NUSAS and their futures would be affected by this. We pointed out further than NUSAS is the largest medical scholarship agency in the coun-

try, and thus we are even more concerned. In our statement we called on the Minister of Health, Dr. Carel de Wel, to take steps to rectify the matter immediately. That is what we have done so far.*

I have spoken at length on our country and our responsibility. I have spoken of our aims and our hopes. If at times we lose heart because we are not making the progress we would like to make then we take courage from the words of the late Senator Robert Kennedy, who said in 1966:

"Each time a man stands up for an ideal, or strike out against injustice or acts to improve the lot of others, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope, and these ripples meeting each other from a hundred different centres of energy and daring will build a wave which will be so strong that it can sweep down the mightiest walls of oppression and hate."

Let us stand up for our ideals. Let us dare to struggle and let us dare to win. Let us dare to dream of a future in which all the people of South Africa will be able to join hands together and to cry out in the words of the old Negro spiritual:

"Free at last, free at last; thank God Almighty, we're free at last."

WHAT HATH GOD RUNG?

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly attacked the reduction in interstate telephone rates which was announced jointly by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and the Federal Communications Commission on November 5, 1969, as placing an increased burden on users of local telephone service since there are requests pending in 16 States for local rate increases far in excess of the announced interstate long distance rate cut. New York State alone has a rate increase request before the Public Service Commission for hikes totaling \$175 million.

It seems particularly disturbing that such local rate increases be requested in New York at a time when the quality of telephone service has declined to a well publicized all-time low. The December 5 issue of Life magazine contains an interesting article by Bill McWhirter entitled, "What Hath God Rung?" The article follows and I commend it to all readers of the RECORD:

*Non-White doctors withdrew their services in April 1969. A month later the Government announced salary increases: the salary scale for Indian and Coloured interns was doubled from R1380 to R2760 a year; the maximum scale for Indians and Coloureds—chief specialists and professors—was raised from R5400 a year to R7500. African interns would earn R2400 compared to R1260, while African chief specialists and professors would get R6900 compared to R5160. The salaries of White medical personnel were to be improved within the framework of the new scales for the professional division of the public service. In this case the minimum salary would be R2400 a year for the lowest ranks, rising to R10,800 for the highest ranks. The non-White doctors immediately resumed their posts.

WHAT HATH GOD RUNG?

(By William A. McWhirter)

The symptoms began appearing some time ago. In disbelief, we kept them to ourselves, hoping vainly that it was only our dial tone, our busy signal, our repairman, our operator that was faulty, not everyone else's. Nor could we even be sure what was happening. Its faults often looked as if they were our faults. We dialed one number, reached another and assumed we were growing absent-minded. . . . We had no dial tone and assumed someone had left a receiver off the hook. . . . We received no calls and assumed no one was calling. . . . We called, the number was busy and we assumed someone was there and talking. . . . We called, the phone rang, no one answered and we assumed no one was there. We had our doubts, of course, when people later said they were there when their phones clearly said they weren't; or when entire insurance companies occupying 40 floors of office space did not answer; or when, one day, calling a cartoonist, we reached the mayor's home and, after staring at the dial, slowly turning each digit hole to the very end, promptly removing the finger so as not to let it drag back across all the other digits, and carefully watching as we did this seven times, we still got the mayor's home. It was, at times, like dialing M for Murder and getting C for Chicken Delight.

These were not the kinds of occurrences we felt compelled to share with anyone. Nor could we believe after years of telephone service unrivaled anywhere in the world that the worst would be confirmed. But with every passing day, we now know that the telephones are going out all over Manhattan—the suburbs, The Bronx and Staten Island too.

The dimensions of this breakdown are unlike any other. The New York Telephone Company, largest of the 24 operating companies of A.T. & T., the American Telephone & Telegraph Company, has some 80% of its total capacity concentrated in the metropolitan area. Here it handles some 43 million calls a day and services 2.9 million customers—nearly as many customers within New York City as the city itself has taxpayers.

New York, where A.T. & T. keeps its headquarters, has historically been the model city for the "Bell System." As early as the turn of the century, A.T. & T. preceded the rest of the country's growth and set its sights on becoming a city-centered company, leaving the backwater areas to the "independents." Today, it provides nearly 85% of all telephone service in the U.S. while confining its operations to only 15% of the land area. The cities made the Bell System into the world's largest private enterprise, with assets of \$45 billion. With the most extensive franchise ever granted to an American corporation, A.T. & T. has complete control, without competition, over phone operations in its service areas from production by its wholly owned subsidiary, Western Electric, to sales, accounting, installation, maintenance and repair.

It is one of the more ironic effects of what has happened in New York that the company which had so much to do with shaping urban life should now be so harassed by it. It was in New York this year that customers began to complain in record numbers of service failures and incredible delays in response from the company. Phone traffic became so heavy that overloaded switching facilities simply broke down. One Manhattan exchange, PLaza 8, became infamous as it reached blackout conditions. But not only the prestige exchanges, the DiGby 4s and Hanover 1s of Wall Street and Madison Avenue, were affected. So was the common man. At the approach of winter this month, many New Yorkers were even unable to call the city's complaint office about another living

condition—the lack of heat in their buildings.

New York Telephone has admitted it had been unable to forecast the demand adequately, and that neither its equipment nor its work force was able to cope with the snarl. On an emergency basis it reactivated 45-year-old switching equipment that had been retired only last year in PLaza 8 and other exchanges and brought 1,500 craftsmen into the city from other Bell companies. The state utilities commission convened a service investigation, the Federal Communications Commission has called in A.T. & T. representatives to discuss telephone service, and several members of Congress are considering an inquiry of their own.

The failure of telephone service in New York may have widespread effects throughout the Bell network. These repercussions extend to the type of companies both A.T. & T. and New York Telephone have become, the type of markets that are opening up for direct competition, the type of services the public is demanding, and the type of changing philosophy appearing within the regulatory commissions. The telephone company might have withstood any public challenge even after so massive a breakdown in service as New York's so long as it was big, a monopoly, and faced no competition. Today, the company is that big and a monopoly, but the difference is that it faces a number of challengers asking to compete. And it seems all too vulnerable because of the misadventures of trying to place a call in New York.

A suburban wife gives up trying to reach her husband by phone and calls a friend in an office blocks away from his to walk over and tell him to bring home 12 bratwurst for dinner. A mother calls her home and hears a stranger insisting that it may be her number, but he is in his house and it's also his number. A militant lady lawyer testifies that, considering her clientele, she expects to have her lines tapped, but she objects to having to listen to her tappers talk in the background. A New York State utilities commissioner hears how his doctor tried to call Syracuse, N.Y. only to be told to contact the overseas operator.

The results have often been more serious than semicomical. A well-known handbag manufacturer, in moving office locations, had his old phone disconnected, and while waiting weeks for his new one to be installed was without service. His customers, informed by a recording that the phone had been disconnected, began to worry; suppliers withheld their shipments and the rumor rapidly spread that he had gone out of business.

There is obviously more at stake in the New York crisis than handbags, and that is one of its most peculiar and perplexing aspects. Not only does the individual not always know what, if anything, is wrong, but no one has yet been able to detect just how wrong or widespread the troubles are. The company insists that the problems are, more or less, localized. Yet, at random, it seems that virtually everyone has been affected in some way by it. What it amounts to is a disquieting invisibility where none of us can any longer be sure what the instrument on our desks is doing to us at any given moment. Altogether, however, the incidents have created an embarrassing focus at a particularly sensitive time. New York Telephone is seeking a \$175 million annual rate increase, which would raise phone bills an average of 10.50%.

The company would have preferred to explain its case in the bloated terminology that it affects at hearings and on other solemn occasions (a phone dial, for example, is identified as a "Network Control Signaling Unit"). Instead, it is being forced to answer to a lot of funny stories. That has hardly upheld its public dignity, which has traditionally resembled that of Benedictine monks, the chosen custodians of a vast mys-

tery whose inner workings are too wondrous to explain. This stance worked well enough when the telephone was the American invention. But the telephone is no longer the miracle of an age, and the company finds itself under increasing attack both by the public and by its peers in the space, computer and electronics industries.

It is unfair, perhaps, that so much of this should have been exposed by what has happened in New York. But New York has never been judged like other cities. Its ailments, much like its fashions, are not unique; they are simply seen here first. Just as the fads begin in California, so the problems surface here. Those are the rules, and no one knows them better than A.T. & T. itself, which has organized a top-level committee to review all aspects of the New York case—not only, it says, to correct what's happened in New York, but also to prevent it from occurring in other cities. LIFE correspondents, however, report troubles already appearing along the line, especially in Miami, Washington, Chicago and Los Angeles.

The A.T. & T. review committee, drawn from throughout the company and headquartered in the "think tank" Management Sciences Division, is headed by Henry M. Boettinger, a bow-tied author, structural analyst, assistant comptroller, spokesman and house philosopher. "There's more than a premonition in the Bell System that we're headed into troubled waters," he muses ruefully. "Do you know the adage about the reputation lost in an afternoon?"

The reputation, until now, had stayed remarkably immune from the other common ailments and breakdowns afflicting us. Nearly everyone, from its customers to the men who both managed and worked for the company, basked in its infallibility. When trains did not run, repairers did not repair and workmen did not work, the telephone became the last symbol of one lonely function doing what it was supposed to do.

No other piece of gear had ever assured us we could live miles from where we worked and even work in high, confined spaces hundreds of feet off the ground to which we rose and from which we fell once a day, all the while keeping in touch with friends, business associates and loved ones. As other things stalled, shorted and blew their fuses, it sustained us as much as heat and light, in their day, ever had. As physical movement of any sort became increasingly difficult, costly and sometimes hazardous, it became—even more than the automobile in Los Angeles—indispensable, the only instrument we could not truly do without. It traveled for us, walked, shopped and bought for us, conveyed our anxieties and paid our little social calls. It persuaded us actually to move around less than we ever had. The most prominent men among us, in fact, often moved not at all.

The proportions of this performance reached the area where reality often becomes myth—making believers, in this case, of both the men who worked for and ran the company and the public they served. "You have to understand the heroic ego," says Boettinger. "There's an unwillingness to admit there is anything we can't do."

Few companies these days are so small that an employee talks to the president or even the assistant vice president for employee relations. But then few companies have swelled as has the phone company to the size of a corporate state, with its own by-laws, ruling class, uplifting slogans and customs. In theory, workmen report to foremen and foremen report to supervisors and supervisors to district superintendents and district superintendents to divisional heads and divisional heads to assistant vice presidents and assistant vice presidents to operational vice presidents and operational vice presidents to the president, Cornelius W. Owens, whom few outsiders ever see. Mr. Owens, for such varying reasons as company precedent, a

busy schedule and a death in his family, made no public appearance or statement or agreed to a single interview for four months during the New York breakdown. But even that was not viewed as very extraordinary within the company. "The interesting thing about the Bell System," explained a spokesman, "is that probably everyone knows as much about what is going on as the president. You'd like him quite a bit though. He's a very outgoing Scotsman, very hale, very frank."

The various offices of the New York Telephone Company are strewn apart like so many landholdings collected through the ages, their managers jealously at watch over their chunk of the empire. Visits between departments have all the niceties of an Open House Night on Embassy Row. The representatives greet each other giving name, branch and official purpose of the visit. The register book is signed, the inspection is begun, trooping the line of model workers. *Hmmm, very nice, I see, I see.* No secrets divulged. Handshakes all around.

Jobs have become so minced into specialties that installers trained on one-station phones are not always qualified to hook up five-button ones, and cable splicers who can work on one kind of cable cannot work on another. Still, the company likes to think of itself being as affably interconnected and goal-sharing as the combined choirs of some Fellowship of Man. The craftsmen have their union, which is large and powerful, but the company rebuffed a growing association of supervisors that began to look like a union and fired the organizers, claiming "all management people are already members of an 'association'—the management team."

Still, some team members feel the coaching has been a little heavy-handed. One sales manager resigned after being told to meet his quota of visits to A.T. & T. shareholders in his spare time. It became apparent two years ago, some employes say, that demand for the entire spectrum of phone services, from installation to repair, was already increasing beyond their ability to meet it. Yet repeated requests by foremen and supervisors for additional overtime and manpower went unheeded by the company. In February 1967, a 44-hour week was cut back in one plant, despite the job load, to 42 hours, and the allowances for service growth were lowered. "It's the old story," says a 40-year veteran of New York Telephone, "of sawdust being added to the meal for a horse and then more sawdust until finally the horse dies."

Despite the cutbacks in budget, the company still expected its departments to meet their performance objectives. Throughout New York Telephone, promotions and performance records are determined by grade and rating objectives. The goals are set impressively high—95% perfect service or better in most categories. Down the line, however, the figures are not taken very seriously. "Let's face it," a supervisor said, "numbers can always be taken care of." A former repair foreman was more explicit: "People in the local repair bureau can doctor the report. The company has a staff to audit these reports and sometimes it finds them wrong by as much as 40%—yet the company still goes on publishing the reported figures, not the audited ones."

A survey released by the company last month reports that in Manhattan 97.5% of all calls receive a dial tone in three seconds or less; on a call to Information, 91% reach an operator in 20 seconds or less; 98% of all numbers given out by information operators are correct; 98.3% of all attempts to place a call are effective, and 99.7% of bills are accurate. Because these surveys are submitted from a lower-management level, there is some feeling within the company that the senior officers were as taken aback by the seriousness of the breakdown as was the public. "If you had told me a year ago that we would have had this problem," says Wal-

ter K. MacAdam, vice president, engineering, "I would have told you that you were out of your mind." Somewhat belatedly they have begun the most massive recovery effort in the company's history.

The question still plagues the officers, however—a recovery from what? They compare the present crisis to the severe shortages following World War II—except that, this time, there is no world war to fall back on. It is as if they have been struck by a phenomenon as irrational as any act of God, an earthquake in which only the statistics collapse. "We have seen some social shifts beyond our own data," says Boettinger. "What this really indicates to me is that our insights into this have to be developed. Is there an objective reality beyond these subjective manifestations? Has the anxiety over crime created a blip?"

The day the New York Telephone Company lost its reputation might be fixed rather precisely with the appearance of an extraordinary advertisement last summer. After five weeks of having its switchboard nearly shut down, Benton & Bowles, the advertising agency, took a full-page ad in the New York Times of July 14. Over the names of its 801 employes was the headline: "These are the people you haven't been able to reach at PLaza 8-6200." The ad for the first time exposed that their troubles may, all along, have been our troubles, and our troubles everybody's.

Two weeks later New York Telephone announced it was bringing in the 1,500 out-of-town workmen, to help until service was back to normal; they will stay on, if the union consents, until at least mid-1970. Three weeks later, the state Public Service Commission announced that during the first 200 days of 1969 the telephone company had piled up 4,317 complaints—more than three times as many as had been received in 1968. The PSC then opened the first investigation into phone service—which would parallel its rate hearings—in the commission's history.

New York Telephone has labeled its emergency program the System Resources Operation (SRO). It has included heavy overtime demands, up to 80 hours a week; an intensive internal recruiting program—spearheaded by "People Make the Difference" committees and merchandise prizes; a stepped-up training program that has put its schools on a three-shift, 24-hour basis, while cutting course time in half; and a two-year "critical" production program at Western Electric that will push New York Telephone orders to the head of every possible assembly line. The company says that beyond the \$1 million it is spending monthly for food and hotel expenses of the out-of-town workers, it has no idea how much the SRO program is costing. But its eight-month payroll has jumped 29% in the metropolitan area to \$181 million.

The company has staked its hopes for recovery by the end of 1970 on the combined impact of all these measures. Its construction program, it forecasts, will result in an excess capacity for 317,131 telephones and it has expanded other projections accordingly. "It will be very unlikely that our new forecasts will be exceeded," says one vice president. "We're on a new track. We're determined—every one of us—that it won't happen again."

The SRO program, however, has already run into serious trouble; local telephone employes, miffed at the out-of-towners appearing to stay on indefinitely, made it a key strike issue last month. Western Electric does not yet know the effect New York's priority will have on equipment shortages in other major cities over the next two years. And desperately recruited, hastily trained employes have caused antagonism as deep within the company as outside it.

New operators, for example, nearly 75% of whom are no longer even from the New York area, are barely able to cope with the city,

its geography, its quick tempers and its bewildering array of accents. As a result, Directory Assistance (formerly Information) and Long Distance services have become a puzzle to callers (the phone company refers to them as "subscribers") and operators literally unable to communicate with each other. Numbers once at tongue-tip cannot be found in an archaeological search and several spellings of Waldorf-Astoria. William G. Sharwell, vice president for operations, claims some new employees have never used a telephone directory or placed a long-distance call before. "You know we monitored one girl in Directory Assistance, blurted Mrs. Gladys Zalkowski, chief operator of the Bowling Green Director Assistance Bureau, "and to 10 different subscribers in a row she gave out the same number. Can you believe that?" In frustration, 59% of the company's New York City operators quit their jobs this year.

Among the craftsmen the instant admission of teen-agers and high-school dropouts into the coveted "top" crafts that once took years to reach may have done the worst injury of all. Technicians down the line feel their reputations are being lost in the avalanche of new orders from above and the mistakes of the newcomers being made below. "It causes me real mental anguish to hear about Plaza 8," says one cable splicer. Almost a third of the company's craft force has 20 years' service or more but fully another third has five years or less.

In the field, the school training is supposed to be touched up with close supervision by the foreman. But the foremen say they don't have time. "With this accelerated program," says Bill Meiner, a splicing foreman, "the way they're throwing these cables in here—they don't always do them right. They put one in yesterday, turn it on today, and start service tomorrow."

Edward Berberich, a splicing foreman with 18 years' service, took over one of the accelerated training classes. "You used to hang around for years, go through all the crafts, helper, frameman, lineman, repairman, installer—and these fellows jump all of them right off the streets. Where in the hell can you earn \$145 a week and not know anything? I've only had one student out of 50 who's washed out—after he fell asleep 11 times."

New York Telephone has repeatedly referred to the breakdown as the result of a sudden, "unprecedented" and "unpredictable" demand for service. There have been, in fact, 10% more calls daily in 1969 than in 1968, and 24% more telephones installed monthly. Yet a Western Electric manager says that the first emergency requirements for the Wall Street area were obvious as far back as 18 months ago, and for the midtown area a year ago. The company's own records show that in 1968 it installed additional circuits for only 102,000 more phones when actual requirements were nearly 300,000.

For a company literally wired to as many elements of its own community as New York Telephone, its ability to understand or forecast the demands of that community has been badly out of focus. Its estimates for new service were too low by 22% in 1965, too high by 14% in 1966, too high by 19% in 1967, and too low by 20% in 1968. How public use of the telephone has changed and subsequently affected the demands on the system seems a central reason behind what has happened. The company does know that we are calling each other more than ever (the rate of increase in the number of calls last year was two or three times that of previous years). Yet it has not investigated the other usage factor—whether we are also talking longer. So far, it has only a cursory survey of some central offices in two boroughs (Brooklyn and Queens) that show conversation time has increased by no more than .03% since 1965.

The company has committed itself to "community action," sharply increasing its black recruitment programs in recent years.

Yet it has badly failed to either understand or train its new force of operators, who are mostly black, or young craftsmen, a good many of whom are not. The company has just started a seven-week "sensitivity training" experiment combined with a remedial education course (called "The World of Work") for new operators. In the past, the company too often assumed that any involvement in its own community, like its investment in it, was risk-free. It could hire as many men as it needed, whenever it needed them, train them as it wished, and turn each one out as The Telephone Man. Nations and heiresses have made similar mistakes.

Just as it chose to ignore the fact that its management "team" is now the size of a small city, the company has steadily refused to look at other consequences of its growth. As long as there were men and cable, there would be telephones without limit; buildings could leapfrog into the sky with the promise that phone cords would follow fast behind, families could put phones in every room so as never to be more than a foot away from the next ring. Only in the midst of the breakdown in New York did the company reluctantly suspend its sales advertising, and it refuses, with heroic ego, to consider controlling the demand for new phones. The public, they say, wouldn't stand for it.

When the telephone company was much smaller, it was relatively painless to grow, as it did, fully 140% between 1902 and 1907. Now, each installation in New York has its own special agony. The once simple task of laying cable between a phone and a central switching office has become an arthritic labor pushing through manholes that are clogged to the choking point, some of them so full that crews can no longer climb down them. As a result the direct route from one place to another is no longer available and cable has to be carefully charted in underground chess patterns that cost more to plan and carry out. One supervisor says jobs may require two or three times the splices they once did; although a splicing machine was finally developed about four years ago, most manholes were already too cramped to use it.

Partially because any conversion requires planning in the dimensions of a troop movement, other traditional procedures have proved equally resistant. The changeover in New York to electronic switching (ESS) which reduces connection time by 50% is under way, but will take 30 years to complete. No Bell company will even have a centralized record-keeping system until sometime in the mid-'70s.

Under the present system, one employee collects the phone sets from a former customer at one address, another installs separate sets at the same address for the new customer. The duplication of what might easily be one job, if the orders could be coordinated, adds up: in the metropolitan area last year, 2,135,000 phones went in; 1,732,900 phones came out.

Cable pairs, which are the lines between a subscriber and a central office, are still assigned to each customer from massive, handwritten books. As a result, frequently cables listed as available are not, customers assigned cables already in use are randomly given another pair by the man in the field, the switch may or may not get recorded in the cable book, the errors roll on, and repairmen one day looking for customer troubles can't find them. The entire PLaza 8 exchange was so ensnared this year that a complete central-office-to-customer survey of every connection had to be made just to find out who was being served by what, and how well. The books themselves are "scrawled, scribbled," says Gordon Thayer, director of the new computerized record-keeping system. "God, they're a mess. You'd hate to depend on them."

At lunch one day, two New York Telephone executives were trying to characterize the reasoning behind some of the practices, "The

system has to sustain itself," one of them said, noting that he had never fired anyone in any department he had ever managed and did not know of any manager who had. The other executive also had never made a change in any of his departments in 16 years, saying, "It's a feeling corporation." Both of them agreed that not even the president had made any changes when he had taken over the company. One of his vice presidents, they remembered, did leave to become president of Michigan Bell. They were not sure whether anything was behind that and so they could not say if that had been a shakeup or not.

"It's not a company where you accomplish anything by tearing a system apart," said the second executive. "The character of a Bell executive is that he would lean on a department instead." The first executive agreed. "The president would say that himself. Yes, I've heard him say lean."

It seldom just happens these days that for a customer to get something from the telephone company, he has only to call up and ask for it. Still, most customers dutifully report their complaints, put in their requests and make their appointments. What else is there to do?

A few, however, have turned the tactics of fighting the phone company into an art. Their various systems are the closely guarded secrets of all successful men, but their approaches may be generally summed up in three classes:

The lobbyist. Firms known as "communications consultants" function primarily to advise large telephone customers on the kind of equipment they ought to have. They are often, however, of even greater service to their customers in helping them get it shipped, installed and repaired. Many of them employ former telephone men, whose success depends on working their way through equipment shortages and service delays by courting contacts still within the company. In the past few years, the consultants have grown from three to 20 in New York City alone and to perhaps 75 others across the country (the field is so new that one consultant checks on its growth by looking through the yellow pages in airports between planes). "I don't advertise. I don't do anything," says a consultant. "It's all word of mouth and it's getting more complicated all the time. It used to be we could settle things at the local level. Now we have to go right down to the executive suites. It used to be that someone you knew could help you. Now, he can only recommend you to someone who might help."

The pressure group. In May 1968, the Hospital Communications Association, consisting of about a dozen prominent Manhattan hospitals, was formed. It has become an inspiration for other professional and industrial groups whose sole purpose is to present their grievances collectively to the telephone company. The hospital association does not like to talk about exactly what it does or how it does it. "We've had to befriend some high officials in the telephone company," a spokesman vaguely admits after finally agreeing to outline the organization. "We've learned in detail what their obligations are. When they fall down, we invite the man who is responsible to come visit us. If that doesn't work, we invite one of the vice presidents. We've gotten preferences on some things. I suppose it's like putting oil on a squeaking wheel." The group meets once a month and the oil so far is reportedly \$150,000 refunded by the phone company for services not rendered. Refunded? The group will not say more.

The VIP. Perhaps the most successful of this breed is Daniel J. Bernstein, whose firm is a member of the New York Stock Exchange with offices in the city and suburban Scarsdale. Bernstein says he began complaining about his service in 1955 and that conditions since have been so unreliable that the company finally provided him with his own di-

rect line to the repair bureau. "The only trouble," he says, "is that it is also out of order most of the time."

There have been attempts through the years to regulate the telephone company, none of them very successful. Immediately after the founding of the Federal Communications Commission, in 1934, a spectacular investigation was carried out under a congressional mandate. It lasted four years, cost \$1.5 million and concluded: "Attempts at this late date to develop a strong, independent telephone system to compete with the Bell System would be futile." That investigation set the pace in both size and frustration for those who have tried to follow.

Last December a presidential task force issued a comprehensive report on U.S. communications policy that urged a pilot program to develop voice transmission by domestic satellite. Alan R. Novak, staff director of the task force, recalls that when they went to A.T. & T. for research, the reception was something usually given only to poachers and party crashers.

"We had to assemble our own base of information," says Novak. "There simply wasn't any data that didn't belong to the phone company. They were as antagonistic as hell. We couldn't have been in a leakier ship. As soon as we had so much as a rough draft finished, the phone guys had a copy. We thought they had to be running a Xerox in the basement."

The past failures of similar encounters have led some FCC staff members and several commissioners seriously to consider whether the phone company can be regulated at all. In addition, they say, the policy of consolidating virtually all communications services under a single "natural monopoly" may have already served its purpose. A.T. & T. is the primary source not only of voice transmission, but of television and the growing computer data field as well. The regulators are now willing to consider opening up the field of competition in these areas, and the outcome may mark the first period of genuine utility reform since the early 1900s.

Two of the most recent cases decided by the FCC finally ease restrictions that A. T. & T. has traditionally placed on the attachment of non-Bell (A.T. & T. calls it "foreign") equipment to its lines, and on the use of the lines themselves. As a result, competitors estimate by 1974 there will be a \$500 million market for their telephone equipment against Western Electric's.

Last month one company filed with the FCC a proposal to create its own common carrier consisting of 36 major cities linked by a microwave network for the computer and data-processing market. This market has been growing by 100% annually, and by 1975 the information volume of data transmitted should exceed the volume of voice communications. Any such long-distance network will have to connect with A.T. & T. lines so that customers may use their phones to link up with it. Most of A.T. & T.'s past objections to such access—is based on the damage "foreign" equipment or transmitters might do to its circuit quality—have been overturned by the FCC. For the first time in history, the FCC has gone outside its own staff to create a 15-man panel, backed by the National Academy of Sciences, to consider A.T. & T.'s final barriers to unrestricted access.

The first authoritative study of a new era in communications, *Computers and Telecommunication: Issues in Public Policy*, by Stuart L. Mathison and Philip M. Walker, will be published in February. The era may release unparalleled choices that will allow virtually every public and private interest in the nation to arrange its own system, much as it might casually arrange a roomful of furniture today. "Obviously we all can't have

50 telephones on our desks," says an FCC economist, "but if IBM wants to build a communications system and G.E. wants to put up a satellite, let them."

When there are changes to be made, they are more likely to be made in Washington than in Albany, N.Y., headquarters of the New York State Public Service Commission. The commission is supposed to regulate all of New York Telephone's intrastate service—the source of about 75% of the company's revenues. The PSC battled the phone company 12 years ago during the last rate proceedings. But it has since allowed the company to earn anywhere from 1/2% to 1% annually above the maximum ceiling for earnings which was determined then. In return it asked little of the company, although it did at one point order the initial installation charges for color telephones reduced from \$10 to \$5.

The PSC has only two field inspectors and two engineers to patrol all of New York Telephone, as well as 62 other independent phone companies in upstate New York. Most of the commission staff and members heatedly defend themselves against charges that their surveillance of the phone company has been inadequate. They say they see no reason to change any of their practices. "This consumerism that's sweeping the country ought to concentrate on things other than the regulated industries anyway," says Thomas J. Brady, chief of the PSC Telephone Bureau.

Neither were they much stirred to concern by their own service hearings. "You invite people to complain in the metropolitan area and you get a response," says John D. McKechnie, director of the utilities division. "This flood of complaints helped nobody out. It involved a considerable amount of time." One commissioner, Ralph A. Lehr, even suggested the problem in New York has been due "to a lot of people leaving their phones off the hook when they go out, because of the crime situation."

At times, the regulators appear mystically happy and serenely reconciled to the infinite impossibilities of their task. They have adopted the naive fatalism of mountain villagers living at the mercy of a volcano, truly believing that no one will ever really control the telephone company. "To say that we could improve our efforts here implies that we could parallel what the company already has in the most preventive surveillance anywhere, and that we could find civil servants with more perception, more sensitivity and more aggressiveness than the phone company has," says Commissioner Edward P. Larkin. "And if you think that, then I'll spare you any further comment. We got a guy at \$15,000 a year who's looking at a guy in the phone company making \$50,000. What kind of answers is he going to get? It's inconceivable anyway that the world's coming to an end. Who amongst us has never made a mistake?"

A STATEMENT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF NEW YORK TELEPHONE COMPANY

(On the day this article went to press, Cornelius W. Owens, president of the New York Telephone Company, agreed to be interviewed. The following is his first public assessment of the situation.)

Q. Mr. Owens, some people have called the situation in New York a crisis or breakdown. Is that how you would describe it?

A. Absolutely not. We've had some pockets of trouble in some critical areas, but that's about all. No question about it.

Q. Where have the pockets been created? And why?

A. In the Wall Street area we got into the 20-million-share days in the winter of 1968, and that put a tremendous burden on our offices. Then, the East Side of Manhattan has had its call rates increase markedly—about 15% or some figure like that. Then

traffic went up in the marginal areas—the ghetto areas especially. Where we began to have full employment and the ability of people to have phones on welfare, the ghetto areas really took off. To put it bluntly, they started to use phones like everybody else.

Actually, you know, the New York Telephone Company, up until 1967, was really one of the most slow-growing in the Bell System. We were about 4% in annual growth until we hit this period lately. Everybody says we can see the buildings going up; why weren't we ready? But we don't see the alterations that go on—like the compressing of space because of high rents. Instead of expanding, an office with four girls on phones will just squeeze in two more.

Q. The recent complaints against the phone company, however, have had to do with virtually all your services?

A. What most people don't understand is how everything gets affected by demand. High demand has cut down all the margins that used to cushion our other areas. Before, for instance, you might get out there and find that the cable pair that was assigned to your customer was already in use, so you'd take another one. Now, there just might not be another one there. So you can't make the installation, and the customer may or may not find out about it or understand why, or a customer can't get a dial tone right away and doesn't want to wait, so he reports his phone out of order.

Our service orders pile up. When we have a margin, we have ability to maneuver. But when you're at capacity, you don't and you get slow testing, slow repairs.

Q. When do you expect these margins to be returned and will they be sufficient to fully restore service?

A. We were there two years ago and we will be there again. At least, with the money we're spending, we ought to be. Some places will be relieved in the next few months and some will be relieved in many, many months.

Q. Have you seen in the past few months where the company made its mistakes?

A. We've gone back in hindsight and asked what we could have done. Finally, we decided that with what we knew then, what we did was right. We were a flat company, year after year. As far back as you'd want to look, our construction budget was right around \$400 million. When the surtax came in, we could have been much more bearish. Actually, we thought we were putting in plant that was sufficient. Now, we'll spend \$740 million this year and \$880 million next year and probably \$10 billion in the next decade.

But I don't think we'll ever have this sharp a growth as we've had in the last couple of years again. With the picturephone and all the computer services coming in, we'll have a different demand for our services entirely in the 1970s, but I've been in this business a long time and nothing like this is ever going to happen again. Today, you have the railroads in trouble, and the power companies and all of a sudden we popped up. Let me tell you, we're popping down fast.

Q. You mean this has only been an episode in the company's history and will not recur?

A. Yes. Episode's a very good word.

Q. In addition to increasing your construction budget, have you considered making any other changes in the company's operations in the next few years?

A. I will say that when we get ourselves shaken down this year and next year, we'll be operating just the way we were before—only at a higher plateau. I ask myself if there is something that if I had known two years ago that I know now I would have changed about the company. The answer is no.

UNLOCKING THE SECRETS OF AGING

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, Frances Spatz Leighton is one of this Nation's finest feature writers. We Ohioans are particularly proud of the prestige that she has brought to our State by her great constructive writing in this country's leading magazines.

Mrs. Leighton, formerly with the International News Service, is now writing for the Metropolitan Sunday Newspapers. She is author of many fine books—the latest on the bestseller list.

Just recently this outstanding Ohio author wrote a very thought-provoking story that appeared in the Sunday magazine of one of my home State's largest newspapers, the Columbus Dispatch, one of the Metropolitan Group.

All of us are constantly looking for ways to aid the aged. In her article, Mrs. Leighton points out methods that we may in the future take to slow up the aging process. The experiments that she refers to are being conducted by the National Institutes of Health.

I believe that this fine article will be of interest to all of my colleagues. It follows:

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch, Nov. 2, 1969]

UNLOCKING THE SECRETS OF AGING
(By Frances Spatz Leighton)

Fascinating facts are turning up as scientists probe the mysteries of aging. Researchers are learning that diet and body temperature have a lot to do with growing old, but only under certain conditions and at certain times in life. Also, though it has long been known that the body loses certain cells as it ages, doctors are finding out more about the rate of cell loss and how function diminishes because of it.

Since 1958, the Gerontology Research Center of the National Institutes of Health has been testing and keeping records on some 700 male subjects, ranging in age from late teens to over the century mark. Loss of function and effect of this loss are noted in volunteer subjects every 18 months by means of a rigorous series of tests. Through this program, and collateral studies on lower forms of life, scientists hope to offer a program for longevity that will give people a chance for 50 years more of active, healthy life.

"Very few people die of old age," says Dr. Nathan W. Shock, head of the Gerontology Center's new multi-million dollar facility in Baltimore, where over 125 experts are engaged in research on aging. "People tend to die from diseases or organic weaknesses due to progressive loss of vital cells."

In experiments with rotifers (minute multicellular aquatic animals) it was revealed that lowering the temperature 10 degrees could prolong the life span of a specimen by as much as four times its normal expectancy. Cutting in half its food intake could enable it to live three times longer than groups which were fed a full diet.

According to Dr. Charles H. Barrows, who is in charge of the rotifer study. "This would indicate that life is programmed, but you can run the film at different speeds. You can slow it down, you can speed it up. How these findings apply specifically to humans is too early to say, but at least we know that with

rotifers, you can slow down deterioration in later life by means of temperature control. You can also slow its demise by nutritional control, but this has to be instituted early in the specimen's life."

Similar findings turned up in rats. Diet control when begun at an early enough age, prolonged a specimen's life, but when started at middle age, it proved ineffective.

In experimenting with mammals, it was found that lowering the external temperature required certain corresponding adjustments to be made in the body chemistry. Dr. Shock explains: "According to one theory of aging it is believed that collagen, a protein vital to connective tissue, undergoes chemical changes with age. These changes can be experimentally prevented in some cases by means of chemical agents.

"There is also some indication that within the cell similar transformations also occur, transformations that might be forestalled chemically. What we're trying to do is find out first of all what aging really is, how it takes place, what happens within the body and at what rate for various individuals. We want to know if there is a time clock within the body and, if there is, how it operates. Then we will be able to tackle the problem of how to slow down the clock. We don't want just to lengthen life, we also want to improve the quality of old age."

Although the biochemical study of life processes in tissue cells is still in its infancy, Dr. Shock foresees in the near future a full vigorous life at age 80 or 90 for most persons. He also foresees the day when most new organs will be artificial parts rather than transplants.

"Yet, this will present a problem. It isn't enough just to be alive. One must be alive to enjoy living. The future may present problems in hospitals concerning when to pronounce a patient dead. Artificial organs, like a heart for example, may continue to function, while the individual for all intents and purposes is really not there at all."

Dr. Shock then turns to the subject of what advice he has for today's elderly and middle-aged persons who want to get the most out of their remaining years. What can these people expect, for example, from exercise?

"To stimulate the growth of new blood vessels, you would have to exercise to the point of exhaustion," says Dr. Shock. "You couldn't expect to achieve such results by being only a Sunday cyclist. You would have to exercise every day and to the point where it actually hurts. You would have to feel muscle fatigue, but your heart may not be prepared to take this kind of punishment.

"If you're going to maintain an improved capillary system, you must develop it early in life and keep pushing. Capillaries disappear with disuse. Sometimes it's too late for such exercise."

Dr. Shock himself doesn't exercise and doesn't worry about it. He simply keeps busy. Five feet, 11 inches tall, and almost 63 years of age, he says he is in the pink of health. "I've maintained the same weight of 142 pounds about all my life."

What can one do to hold back the clock? Dr. Shock has a few tips for slowing the effects of aging:

1. Never get overweight. "In terms of longevity, even a few pounds make a difference. Keep protein intake as high as ever but cut carbohydrates and fats as you grow older. And avoid these deficiencies common to older people—calcium, riboflavin, iron and vitamin C."

2. Smoke very little, if at all. "The danger of cancer is only part of the story. Impaired oxygen supply ages the body."

3. Stay active physically and mentally. "Be a high achiever. The competitive person with goals and a will to live, outlives the others and enjoys life to the end. Some of our elderly test group who are retired are harder

to pin down for appointments than those who hold jobs, they are so busy being consultants to companies or traveling for fun.

"We lost one of our oldest and most dynamic volunteers not long ago, a 98-year-old, but not because of sickness or old age. It was an accident. He fell out of bed."

FACTS ON AGING

Studies on 700 males, age 18 to 103, at the Gerontology Center have led to these broad findings:

Mental Ability: Memory starts to fade at 30. Yet, such abilities as vocabulary comprehension scarcely change with age. Scientists find that given enough time, the older person still comes up with the right answers in decision-making tests. Average weight of the brain actually shrinks from 3.03 pounds at age 30 to 2.72 pounds at age 90.

Physical Powers: Based on tests involving walking a treadmill, climbing steps and cranking a wheel while lying on his back, a 70-year-old's physical capacity has declined 30 per cent from age 35. As for short bursts of energy, peak performance drops almost 60 per cent between these two ages.

Breathing Changes: Between ages 20 and 80, there is a 40 per cent decline in the amount of air that can be pumped through the lungs in 15 seconds.

Heart Function: Between the ages of 20 and 90, the amount of blood pumped drops from about four quarts per minute, per square meter of body surface to almost half this amount—just over two quarts. Also, the older heart has more trouble speeding up its pace to cope with increased physical activity.

Basal Metabolism: Thyroid activity which regulates the basal metabolism continues to function about as well among the elderly as the young. The pituitary hormone continues its performance steadily into advanced years. This partially explains why old folks seem to do well as long as they are relaxing.

Blood Sugar Level: In older people the rate at which the system removes sugar from the blood drops to such an extent that under normal diagnostic tests, 50 per cent of the aged would be considered diabetic. Through work at the Center, new techniques are currently helping the nation's physicians to prevent misdiagnosis of diabetes in the elderly.

Sense of Taste: The number of taste buds per papilla of the tongue falls from about 245 at age 25 to 30, to a mere 88 taste buds at age 70 to 75, which helps explain picky eaters among the geriatric set.

Kidney Function: One of the wonders of the aging process is the difference in kidney function between individuals. Some 80-year-olds were found to have the same kidney efficiency as the average 50-year-old. Normally, by the age of 75, the average kidney receives only 42 per cent as much blood as it did at age 30, making it more difficult for the body to throw off waste.

JUST WHO IS AMERICA'S SILENT MAJORITY?

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, for a good many years, now, M. DeMar Teuscher, the Deseret News political editor, has written an interesting and succinct weekly column entitled "Speaking of Politics." His November 13 column in the Deseret News has just been called to my attention. I wish to quote one or two paragraphs from it. Mr. Teuscher said:

Dissent is, and always has been, a legitimate mode of expression under what has come to be hailed as "the American way." But has not dissent nearly always been the tool of the activist, vocal minority rather than that of the quiescent, silent majority? This has been the case whether the dissent has been legitimate and well-founded or irresponsible and loud.

Mr. Nixon, it would seem to me, was well within his rights in seeking a response from the "silent majority." But, it would also seem to me that now is the time for this majority—if it is truly a majority—to speak out. Silence is not always a virtue. Neither is vociferous clamor. In this day, when leaders need to hear the voices of all the people, silence can be misinterpreted—by both sides.

Mr. Teuscher has called on the silent majority to speak out and set forth its views. Even if it is a "silent majority," it still must and should be heard. I feel that this column should receive wide distribution, as it will get in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD. In addition, I commend Mr. Teuscher for this well written article.

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

[From the Salt Lake Desert News,
Nov. 13, 1969]

JUST WHO IS AMERICA'S SILENT "MAJORITY?"
(By M. DeMar Teuscher)

Last week, President Richard M. Nixon rested his Vietnam case with the jury of what he termed "the silent majority." The indications are that he is now hearing more, rather than less, affirmatively, from that jury.

He has already heard from what Vice President Spiro T. Agnew has chosen to call the "effete intellectual snobs"—a group the vice president, with some justification, has termed a "militant, vocal minority."

This entire question seems to pose some rather interesting questions about our democratic system which really is, as many Americans point out, a representative republic.

For instance, who is more snobbish—the "effete intellectuals" who militantly and actively speak out, or the "silent majority" who wait until circumstances force them to discard their chosen role as the quiet American?

In a country such as ours, forged in the crucible of revolution and dissent, wherein lies the virtue of silence? Or is this "virtue" really mainly composed of the vice of apathy?

Who is the "silent majority?" Is it the over 60 per cent of the citizens who stayed away from the polls a week ago in Salt Lake City's municipal election?

Is the "silent majority" composed of those who complain of things as they are or appear to be and who vocally long for things as they were—without doing much to promote effectively a change?

In the Salt Lake City election just concluded, roughly 40 per cent of the registered voters of the community made the decisions for the other 60 per cent—the majority. In this instance, the minority decision was clearly for the status quo.

If those who stayed home from the polls are the "silent majority" referred to by the President, did not their silence indicate satisfaction with the present city government and no real indication of a need for change?

Should this be a reasonable assumption to draw from a study of the circumstances, who then were the better citizens, those who stayed home in silence, or those who registered their satisfaction—or lack of it—by going to the polls?

As I read history, those who advocated and led the violent overthrow of the British colonial government in the 1770's were, in reality, a minority. The majority either did not become involved or preferred to remain with the status quo.

However, once this nation was established, and its governing principles set forth—again by a representative minority—it was the majority who, time and time again, has been roused to either thought or deed to maintain these principles.

Dissent is, and always has been, a legitimate mode of expression under what has come to be hailed as "the American way." But has not dissent nearly always been the tool of the activist, vocal minority rather than that of the quiescent, silent majority? This has been the case whether the dissent has been legitimate and well-founded or irresponsible and loud.

Mr. Nixon, it would seem to me, was well within his rights in seeking a response from the "silent majority." But, it would also seem to me that now is the time for this majority—if it is truly a majority—to speak out. Silence is not always a virtue. Neither is vociferous clamor. In this day, when leaders need to hear the voices of all the people, silence can be misinterpreted—by both sides.

PROPOSED REVERSION OF OKINAWA TO JAPANESE CONTROL

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, Columnists Robert Allen and John Goldsmith have written a perceptive article about the proposed reversion of Okinawa to Japanese control and the role of the Senate in foreign policy. The column was published in the Farmville Va., Herald of December 3. Of particular significance are the views of the able and influential Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia.

I ask unanimous consent that the column 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 Farmville (Va.) Herald, Dec. 3, 1969]

JAPAN WANTS OKINAWA

(By Robert Allen and John Goldsmith)

WASHINGTON, December 2.—Those plans for returning Okinawa to Japan may still provoke a major controversy in the Senate, and President Nixon is well-aware of that.

No hint of trouble was discernible when Japanese Premier Eisaku Sato visited President Nixon here a couple of weeks ago. The atmosphere was one of friendship when the two leaders issued their joint communique which envisions reversion of Okinawa to Japanese control during 1972.

The communique, however, called for the 1972 deadline, subject to development of specific arrangements for the island's return "with the necessary legislative support." That is where the controversy could arise.

There is strong sentiment in the Senate for return of Okinawa—perhaps enough sentiment to assure approval for any reasonable blueprint to be developed by future consultations. There is, however, some feeling that the island, seized in 1945 by U.S. forces, should not be returned now.

There was a clear and public warning of trouble ahead before Sato arrived for his state visit. The Senate, by a convincing vote of 63 to 14, went on record that any agreement on a change of Okinawa's status should have the "advice and consent of the Senate."

That is language designed to require a treaty, of course, and ratification of a treaty requires a two-thirds vote in the Senate.

The warning of the 63 to 14 vote, on an amendment offered by Sen. Harry F. Byrd, D-Va., was not really that a two-thirds vote might not be forthcoming on the Okinawa issue. Some Senators who supported the Byrd amendment, as modified in Senate debate, strongly favor return of Okinawa to Japan.

The warning was that the Senate, seeking as never before to assert itself in such national security issues, expects to do so on the question of Okinawa.

Private Caution—Now it is reported that the President had received a private caution as well before he had his formal talks with Sato—a caution which questioned the wisdom of reversion on the 1972 schedule. That warning came early last month when the President sandwiched a private lunch with Senate leaders between impromptu speeches in the House and Senate.

On that occasion, according to informed sources, the President brought up the Okinawa question, and Sato's impending visit, over the luncheon table. The matter was then discussed briefly by the President and the other guests in the office of Democratic leader Mike Mansfield, Mont.

Sen. George D. Aiken, R-Vt., the respected GOP "dean" of the Senate, told the President he thought the Senate would support the return of Okinawa to Japan. The same view was expressed, according to our informants by Chairman J. William Fulbright, D-Ark., of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

However, Sen. Richard B. Russell, D-Ga., the influential chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, is reported to have taken a different view. Russell is said to have commented that Okinawa, with its vital bases, should not be returned to Japan while the United States is charged with responsibility for maintaining security in that part of the world.

The President, according to this account, replied—with some senatorial support—that the future of Premier Sato's government was irrevocably tied to securing the return of Okinawa.

Russell is said to have replied by suggesting that Mr. Nixon explore with Sato the response received by Japan when it tried to recover islands in the Kurile group which were given to Russia after World War II.

Meaning Clear—Russell's meaning was quite clear. While the United States has already ceded control of the Bonin Islands, including Iwo Jima, acquired the hard way during World War II, Russia is still hanging on to its acquisitions in the Kuriles.

Sato is reported to have asked, early this fall, that Russia begin talks looking toward the return of those islands. That request was "turned down cold," according to Senator Byrd.

The implication of the President's advance warnings, public and private, is that the final agreement on Okinawa should be submitted to the Senate as a treaty for ratification. Fulbright is now understood to be urging that course of action on the State Department.

Otherwise, it is argued that the issue of reversion of Okinawa could become further clouded by the Senate's new determination to play a role, with the President, in decisions which affect the foreign policy and security of the United States.

MORE FAMILY-TYPE MOVIES

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I call the attached letter from a 14-year-old boy to the attention of my colleagues in the hope that it somehow will encourage the

motion picture industry and movie theater operators to produce and show, especially on weekends, more family-type movies which are suitable for children and young people.

The letter follows:

DEAR SIR: I am complaining about the lack of decent movies in my town. It has gotten so that when a "G" rated movie comes on, which is very seldom, I have not the money to go. I'll then make up my mind to go the next week and start saving my money. When I finally have the money, I look in the paper with intentions of selecting a movie to attend. To my despair, I see "X", "X", "X", "R", and "M" rated movies. There is nothing on for one of my age or under.

People are always complaining because teenagers are always getting into something. But when they have nothing to do, and nowhere to go, what is there left for them to do? My parents won't allow me to go to some of the "teenage hangouts", so since I can't go to the movies, I stay home and die of boredom.

I'm sure that I'm not the only teenager trying to live a decent life, so therefore I am concerned not only for myself but for others as well.

Isn't it possible that the movie theaters could reach an agreement by which some could show "X", "R", and "M" rated movies and one could show a "G" rated movie?

Theaters also complain about losing money, but how can they help but lose money if only adults can go when they please? I am sure the majority of adults who have children won't go to the movies if they can't take their children along. I most certainly would not.

Very truly yours,

TERRY HARRELL.

MARY CUSHING NILES

HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, internationalist, ex-management consultant, active Quaker and pacifist, author, grandmother, and wife, Mary Cushing Niles in an interview in Baltimore magazine of November 1969, sums up the driving force of her life: "I have had a passion for leaving the world a better place than when I found it."

She already has.

Always an innovator, Mrs. Niles is the chairman of the board of trustees of the Friends World College—a college dedicated to treating the entire world as its campus and to training students to solve the problems of the world. Her originality and uniqueness is not a recent development, for in 1917 she was one "of the first debutantes in Baltimore to drink wine and champagne in public because this was the end of an era."

Perhaps Mrs. Niles, with her husband Henry Niles, is most renowned for her continual fight against war, "the enemy that we wanted to destroy with our lives. Somebody has to develop some alternative to war or we're going to put an end to life on this planet."

Mary Cushing Niles is trying to find those alternatives. I ask unanimous consent that the interview, published in Baltimore magazine of November 1969, of one of Baltimore's most outstanding women be printed in the RECORD.

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

MARY CUSHING NILES

Mary Cushing Niles can speak critically about people over 60. She was born in 1900 into a family of physicians in Cleveland, Ohio. At a very young age she developed the sense of being a "professional woman," a fairly uncommon attitude for young girls in the early 1900's.

Her father's appointment as Assistant Commissioner of Health brought the family to Baltimore. Mrs. Niles received a certificate from Peabody Conservatory and a B.S. in economics from Johns Hopkins; she completed everything but her dissertation for a Ph.D. at Columbia. She has been married 46 years to Baltimore Life Insurance board chairman Henry E. Niles. (They have two married daughters and five grandchildren.)

From 1931 to 1939 Mr. and Mrs. Niles were partners in a management consulting business in Baltimore and Toronto. Mrs. Niles is the author of "The Essence of Management" and "Middle Management," and, with her husband, wrote "The Office Supervisor," the first book dealing with white collar supervision. The third edition of this book, co-authored with James C. Stephens, has been translated into Italian. Her books have also been published in India, Japan and Turkey.

During World War II Mrs. Niles served as Assistant to the Chairman of the Federal Personnel Council developing new policies for the nearly 4,000,000 civilians employed by the government at that time. She is a charter member and fellow in the Society for the Advancement of Management, and has been active in international management activities, especially in India where she traveled 30,000 miles meeting with management groups when the country was establishing its national management association in 1956.

In her own words, Mary Cushing Niles has always been an internationalist; as early as 1928 she organized the Connecticut Council on International Relations. A dauntless traveler, she has visited 54 countries and has made extensive journeys through India and Africa where, several years ago, she and two other women crossed the Sahara desert in a LandRover.

An active member of the Society of Friends since 1950, she has served as chairman of Overseers, secretary of the Trustees and chairman of the Social Order Committee at Baltimore's Stony Run Friends Meeting. She is currently chairman of the Policy Committee of the Friends Committee for National Legislation, which spent two years working on the principles of an assured annual income now taking the form of legislation.

For the last five years, Mrs. Niles has been a driving force in the establishment of the Friends World College, with the objective of treating the entire world as a university campus. Ultimately the school will have seven centers around the world—each admitting students who would go completely around the world in the course of their studies. Current headquarters are at Westbury, Long Island, with programs also actively operating in Latin America, Kenya, India and Japan. Groups have studied in western and eastern Europe, as well as in Russia. The college is directed toward taking a problem solving attitude to the great concerns of mankind, and as a long-time enemy of war and poverty, Mrs. Niles is very much in her element as chairman of the board of trustees of this unique new school.

Mrs. Niles was interviewed for BALTIMORE magazine by Nancy B. Gabler.

What are some of the basic ideological differences between Friends World College and a standard American university?

It's something absolutely brand new under the sun that we're doing. We are directed

toward problems of mankind and we're going to train our students to do problem solving—to take a problem solving point of view toward what they are studying, which is entirely different than a historical point of view or an aesthetic point of view. We feel that once the student has studied the same type of problem in three or four cultures he's going to get over his provincial attitudes that the solution we have here in Baltimore is the correct solution for Kamchatka or South Vietnam. He would get over that feeling and see that humans do have the same problems, but how they tackle those problems is going to depend quite a lot on their physical environment, their climate, and their culture, and that we can't just patly tell them that if you do so-and-so you get such-and-such a result, because it just isn't as simple as that.

What need is the college actually fulfilling?

Well, U Thant has recently cited the need for a world university; he's issued a very strong statement as to the need for world consciousness and looking at problems from a world point of view. Here, there, and the other place these programs are springing up. I believe that we are the first one to give a degree, but there are loads of American colleges now that offer a semester or a year abroad, so it's in the air. The need is to train people to look at the world, because actually, as we sit here, we are no further from New Delhi than Thomas Jefferson was from Washington when he was in Monticello. It took him two days by carriage to make that trip. It was a two-day trip from Philadelphia to Washington or from Philadelphia to New York. Now I can leave Baltimore at night, arrive in London in the morning, take a 10 a.m. flight from there and arrive in New Delhi that evening. So in a little over 24 hours you're half way around the world. Things are different. This is the change we're trying to catch up with. The 20th century has brought us so much that's new, and we've got to prepare the minds of the young to deal more effectively with it. It was hard enough years ago to get people to look at the whole United States. Now we're up against the problem of getting people to look at the whole world. Not too long ago, Africa was called the dark continent—not because it was inhabited by black people but because so little was known about it. As for Latin America, it has been very recently that we have come to recognize its importance. There are more people in India today than there are in Latin America and Africa combined, so knowing Asia has become crucial if we're going to think about problems that really face mankind. We never had to think about the problems that faced mankind before. It was enough for us to be British or American or German. We didn't have to think of the universe. So through these educational experiments we are trying to prepare the young people to live in this kind of a world, and it's pretty exciting. It was wonderful to sit at the first commencement and feel that a number of these kids had literally been around the world in the course of their studies. We don't know of any other college that has done that for students. This is a first.

Can you really see a definite change in the students' outlook?

Oh, yes. These people can never go back and be provincial. For better or worse, they think of things now in terms of continents. If we are ever going to have a strengthened United Nations it would have to come about by having a few million people that know these things through their senses, not just by reading a book; that's the world point of view.

You mentioned the problem-solving method. What exactly is that?

We've outrun the time when any one person can know all the information about anything. What we have to know when we have a problem is how to go about getting the

information and putting it together, who the people are with the experience in that problem, and go to them. Sooner or later you piece together an answer. It's a group product. We are training people to do that and it's just as important in the long run as the world approach. When we put the two together it's really a revolutionary concept, but not the type that uses guns. It's the type that uses minds and is peaceful in nature.

What type of student is attracted to the college? Are they predominantly Quakers?

There are generally a few Friends in every class, because they are interested in this sort of thing. Of course, we do have good contact with Friends schools which tends to give us rather more Friends than otherwise. We attract the more progressive students—the ones who are more adventurous, the ones who would come to us in the first place when we didn't have any charter permitting us to grant a B.A. They said, "Well, we want this, and if we don't get a degree that's all right; we'll manage." In other words, they were venturesome. We couldn't, in any event, take any who were going into medicine or engineering or the more formal disciplines because we don't have laboratories and that sort of thing. Then, to practically all of our kids are conscientious objectors, and we even give courses to one boy who is in jail for resisting the draft for conscience sake. It is the student who has this kind of ideal who is appealed to by our experiment type of college.

What type of program or curriculum will this student find?

The first six weeks are devoted to the biggest contemporary world problems. Human rights, race relations, environmental pollution, education, world peace, will each take approximately a week's discussion. This is the broad perspective of what the college is about: to solve the problems of mankind. We don't pick too many problems, just symptomatic ones. After that, the students choose individual projects and work on them for about two months; then they're ready to direct themselves toward the world and get ready to go to their next place.

Where will that be?

Most Americans go to Latin America. But some are going to Africa, some to Japan, and two or three to India. These latter are transfer students with previous college work. Some students began the program in Africa and Japan.

With your student body spread throughout the world, how do you exercise scholastic control?

The freedoms that we have are very large—many people think too large. There are no quizzes, no exams until the final oral exam, very few formal lectures. Our critics think that the student who doesn't know what he's doing spends too much time drifting because there's nobody to go and shove him into a class and say, "Here, you're supposed to be taking Spanish II." Nobody does that, so if he doesn't compel himself to learn Spanish, the chances are he can slide through the whole Latin American semester just learning to say "good morning" and "good night," in which case he hasn't gotten very much out of his Mexican experience. On the other hand, if he's a painter and has been out in the desert painting the colors and the peasants and so forth, or if he has done construction work, as many of the students do—they go out and help the people build a schoolhouse or a barn—he won't learn much pure Spanish but he will learn an awful lot about how people live and how you can interact with people of another culture. We're really much more interested in this approach to culture than we are in turning out people who can do a perfect formal paper.

What about the teaching staff? Are they a breed apart from what one would find on most campuses?

Yes, I think so. In the first place, they have made substantial sacrifices, both in personal security and in salary. We can't pay

market rates. We ask them, what their living requirements are and if we can pay it, we do. If not, we have to turn them down—\$8,000 or \$9,000 is a magnificent salary around our place. In India and Africa we're paying market rates, because the standard there is so low that you'd be ashamed to pay less. Our instructors have to give so much more time, especially in foreign countries—their time is almost continual. Some people psychologically just can't or won't do that. The instructors get to know each student intimately. If you're off in a far part of the world with students and someone knocks on your door late at night, you don't say "go away," you say, "come on in, what's on your mind." It takes an awful lot out of people.

Can you borrow instructors from other schools just to teach specific subjects?

We really have to have our own staff, because the job of the teacher in any given place is to interpret that culture and that set of problems of humanity. So while they may be the same old problems of not enough to eat, and too much population, and threat of war, and trouble with the next province, it looks different when it's in an Indian setting or a Mexican setting. We have to have people who can interpret why people feel the way they feel and what their traditions are, and what makes it hard to change things there. For example, an economist can teach economics chained to where he started, but if you're going to teach Indian philosophy, the students want to learn this when they're in India. When I was in India last year with a group of students, seven or eight of them studied under a yogi and began practicing yoga exercises. I did too, and I still practice them. But more important, they were exposed to Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam and Indian philosophy. If we're going to be a world college, we have to understand the things that are important to other cultures. So we must have a native staff in each of the locations, and we're getting quite an international staff at Westbury.

You've been involved in so many projects, both vocational and as a volunteer. What area has been the most stimulating for you?

I would say that my peak experience in "jobs" was the period that I was Assistant to the Chairman of the Federal Personnel Council. We were making policy in the personnel field for the entire federal government. This was the time that safety programs were beginning, employee relations programs, counseling, all of these things were just beginning. We were taking the practices of the very best of city, state and private businesses and interpreting these for use by the largest employer in the country during World War II, when federal employment mushroomed from under 1,000,000 to 3,770,000 civilian employees. We had 35 councils in all parts of the country: Army, Navy, Air Force, Internal Revenue, Post Office, Agriculture, the whole works. We were blazing new trails. People would think nothing of driving 200 or 300 miles to meet with me when I was in the field.

Even with all the refinements in personnel practices that have taken place since the 1940's we still hear a lot about federal waste of manpower and resources. Do you think the government is able to give the same motivation to its employees as private enterprise?

I think it's the same thing that you'll find in any big company—here in Baltimore or anywhere else. Most people are motivated because they have to make a living—they need a paycheck. But they also become attached to their fellow workers. They become a team if they're given half a chance. Most people have this need to associate with their fellows. Therefore they do their job not only because of profits, nor essentially because of their paycheck, but because they're part of a team.

What generates this feeling of teamwork?

Well, teamwork is the result of broadening the interest of the individual to include the whole group. It springs from satisfying relationships on the job, in the daily associations

with coworkers and management. If these relationships are pleasant, cooperation is smooth and it is easy to get out the work. Most people not only meet economic needs through, but also fulfill many of their psychological and social needs through associations with their working companions.

When you and Mr. Niles were in the management consulting business, this human approach to problems was somewhat unique, wasn't it?

Yes, it was. We felt that if you think about the people doing the work and not just about cogs in a machine, you would get much better production. This hadn't been proven when I started out in management consulting. We thought it would be nice if people had more scope and were treated better, but we thought it would cost money, but far from it! We found that you can save money in a business by making jobs more worthwhile to people, because then they will do them better. It's simple really, but hard for the engineering minds to take in. They really feel, sometimes, that if you install a machine and leave the human relations out of it, things will work much better.

How does a "gentlewoman" with a certificate from Peabody all of a sudden turn up as a management consultant circa 1930? What led to this transition?

My official major was music, and I took a piano teacher's certificate from Peabody, but I also took a full major in economics and went on to three years of graduate work. You mention "gentlewoman" I suppose in the Baltimore sense. My father's family had several gentlewomen who left a very deep imprint on me. They were very attractive, cultured people, but they never did a day's work on anything. My mother had wanted to be a doctor as her father and uncle and three of her brothers had become, but things in her life prevented it. She had the talent and the drive to succeed as a professional woman and all that parked itself inside of me. My father chose my mother as his wife because she had all this talent and he was very excited about my developing mine.

How, exactly, did your parents help develop this professionalism in you?

The table talk at my childhood dinner table was a joy to the ear. My mother and father were very witty. They would spar with each other and we would laugh and joke. My father never ignored me. He always said, "Well, what did you do today that was interesting?" From the time my chin came to the edge of the table I was brought into this good conversation as a person of value who had experiences that other people would like to know about. I traveled a great deal with my family and was brought up as a world citizen. But the world was a different shape for those people. We lived, as it were, on an Atlantic lake; my family knew more about the eastern seaboard and Europe than about our own west. We were very much Europe-oriented. We were internationalists, and when World War I broke out my parents began reading extensively about the causes of it; we read aloud a great deal at home and I was listening.

With this early knowledge of internationalism and world problems, why did you go on to major in economics rather than something like political science?

I became very excited about the fact that in the '20's we had the makings of the first affluent society that had not been based on slavery or serfdom in some way. I got terribly interested in all of this affluence and also the under side of it—what happens when the business cycle breaks and you get the depressions and unemployment. I was going to study the labor movement, but I shifted to business cycles because I felt that if we could control the business cycle, then there would be enough for everybody. By this time I had been married a year or two, but this drive for an affluent society—that is a truly affluent society, in culture as well as in this world's goods—was really quite a moving passion with me and also with my husband who

had been in Europe during the year of the terrible inflation. War and poverty were the two enemies that we wanted to destroy with our lives. That's why my husband went into business. He was very torn, very eager to go into international affairs. Some people in international affairs said, "If you really want to have an impact on peace and war in your time, be a businessman, because that's where the power is in the United States."

Wasn't it highly unpopular for someone in your socio-economic setting to be so liberal at that time?

Well, my husband went into business with the idea of being a professional in business. We weren't out to keep up the family business; we didn't have some idea of a better mousetrap that we just had to polish off and sell. We were in business as professional people trying to do a good management job. I think you could say that we were a couple of young idealists with a very realistic bent. In other words, we weren't interested in building a utopia that nobody was ever going to live in. We were interested in taking the area where we were and seeing if we could improve it a few notches. These were the ideals that ran through everything we ever did.

If you were 50 years younger today with these same ideals, do you think you would be classified as a hippie?

I rather doubt it, because I had so much freedom as a child that I was under no need to rebel. For example, Baltimore girls didn't go to college in 1917, but some of us had deeply resolved that we were going and we hoped our parents would be nice and help us get there. We were determined to have an education. The next fall the United States went into the war and one of my friends heard that the Cotillon might be the last because all the young men were going into the armed forces. Her parents wanted her to make her debut and she wanted some of us to go along with her, so we did. We came home from college, bought dresses and went to the Cotillon and parties during vacation. Then we went right back to college and forgot all about this debutante business. At that time people were taking a year to do this. For us it was spare time activity, and we had fun. We were the first debutantes in Baltimore to drink wine and champagne in public, because this was the end of the world, the end of an era. Our boys were going to war, so it was "eat, drink, and be merry for tomorrow we die." It was a very curious psychology.

Do you think we have somewhat of that psychology today with the young people?

Yes, very much so. I knew security. My children knew a measure of security because when the atom bomb came they were already 14 and 18. My grandchildren know no security because when you're born after these things have happened, and you have never known a world which couldn't explode, there is a different kind of insecurity. This is why we have a "now" generation. If you can't through your own exertions carve out a little island of security for yourself, then what do you do if you're a thinking person? The easiest thing may be to say, "Well, I've got today, let me use it." If you're an optimist you may say that the world will have changed by the time you're 40, but then anything you are prepared to do now may be obsolete by then. This is a fact that people simply have not taken in. These bright youngsters have taken it in. I think that this is probably the first time in the history of mankind that young people finishing college know more about the world than their parents, because what they've got is fresher information, put together in a more realistic manner for today. They know more than their parents do, unless their parents have been in a place where they are very much in touch with what's new. This is something quite revolutionary and our young people have a right to ask

for more responsibility and more voice because they know a great deal more about a lot of things than older people do. As for people over 60, if they are not keeping up, their opinions aren't going to be very valuable.

As a person over 60 who has been keeping up, what's your opinion of the "now" generation?

Well, I see things through a very sophisticated eye having lived with these college people over the last few years. One thing that bothers the older generation is this business of smoking pot. It would be an experience I would have had, too, if I had not chosen an alternative many years ago—meditation. I suppose it was about 1934 that I started this in an organized way, but it is through meditation or prayer that one can rise into a different atmosphere. Of course, many Quakers sooner or later get into meditation. I happened to get into it 15 years before joining the Friends.

Then you weren't always a Quaker. What led you to formally join the Society of Friends?

My husband and I had been interested in Quakerism for a number of years, but in our consulting period we moved so often that it was very difficult to be in one spot long enough to join. We came to Baltimore in 1940 when our country was virtually in the war. We were conscientious people. We had been pacifists for a great many years until 1937. The combination of the rise of Hitler and the Stalin purge of 1937, where he killed a million people, made us feel that there were some things worse than war. So we were not able to hold to the real pacifist position in those years. We have gone back to it because we feel that somebody has to develop some alternatives to war or we're going to put an end to life on this planet. Now we are in the long hard task of being pacifists and trying to find those alternatives—and it's a very slow business.

Many people are familiar with Mr. Niles' group, the Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace, but do you think that Quakers in general, being a leading pacifist group, are doing as much as they possibly could?

Activists in any church are seldom more than 10%. I would say that there are easily 10% in the Society of Friends in the United States that are activists now, either on the war-peace issue or on the race issue, which are the two great issues of our time.

Did you experience much discrimination against professional women during the early part of your career, or for that matter, does it still exist today?

Oh yes, I felt discrimination right straight through and I continue to feel it. It continues to be a fact, but I think it is less. Women of ability and will have been able to smash through. Discrimination is everywhere, but I think we're pushing it back. Women have to work so much harder for things a man takes for granted. I'm not sure I would have fought as hard if I had had male children instead of girls. But with two girls coming after me I never missed an opportunity to stand up for women getting what they ought to have. Both of the girls are chips off the old block. The younger one is training draft counselors for the American Friends Service Committee in Chicago and is the author of "We Won't Go." The older daughter is managing director of the Delaware Valley Housing Association located in greater Philadelphia. I've found Baltimore to be a dismal environment for a woman to try to use her powers, but it's better now than it used to be. The thing that absolutely rolls me until I could die is this women's board thing. They have a men's board that runs the thing and then a women's board that dabbles in this and that. I wouldn't serve on a women's board for anything. In some ways we're still living in a feudal society here. I don't know whether I've had any influence on changes in

this area or not, but I kind of think maybe I have.

You've done so much in your life that I suppose you can't help but reassess it. What do you see for the future and what, if any, are your plans for retirement?

I have had a passion for leaving the world a better place than when I found it. This has been a driving force all of my life. Historically, in management, I feel the thing that my husband and I did was to stress that human relations are always as important as organization and management. As to retirement, I do draw retirement pay from the federal government. But I guess I'm one of those horses who will drop in their tracks, and it looks as though my husband will be too. I imagine that we'll always find a thing or two to do.

WHY BEEF?

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, for the past 6 months or so, there seems to have been quite a concerted campaign aimed at making the American housewife believe that the price of beef had been increased unfairly and very appreciably and that beef producers were reaping a harvest at the expense of the housewife's budget.

Some restaurants, as I recounted last week, even went so far as to raise the prices of their meals substantially and then note on the menu that the increase was caused by the increased cost of beef.

Mr. Speaker, I am a beef producer myself. I can tell you the producers are not sharing in this bonanza. In fact, I doubt if any bonanza exists.

It appears as though this campaign against the high cost of American beef was originated abroad and is aimed at securing a relaxation of American beef import regulations.

I am not the only one who has these thoughts. They were also expressed by Bill House, president of the American National Cattlemen's Association in an editorial in the American Beef Producer.

Mr. Speaker, with your leave, I would like to insert the editorial by Mr. House in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I highly recommend its reading to all of my colleagues who have read about and are concerned about our beef prices.

The editorial follows:

WHY BEEF?

In a nation that in this year is spending \$83 billion for leisure, a sum that is rapidly approaching the total food bill of the entire population, why should our industry be faced with sporadic outbreaks of boycotts zeroing in on the price of beef, and beef alone? These movements are led by women whose husbands are earning far more than the average farmer or rancher can possibly realize by feeding or raising cattle.

With interest rates up 30 percent in the last 12 months; with the biggest price rise in years posted for '70 model automobiles and trucks; with coffee up 4c a pound and restaurant managers predicting a 5c rise in the price of a cup; with 1970-model appliances being marked up 3 percent to 4 percent officially; with construction workers being awarded wage increases of 10 percent to 30 percent—why aren't the boycotters lining up in front of the banks, automobile

agencies, restaurants, appliance dealers, and union headquarters?

Did it all begin with a combined Australia-New Zealand campaign against meat import restrictions planned by Trade Minister McEwen of Australia? The sequence of events in the United States leading up to our present problem with consumers certainly points in this direction.

In the January 23 issue of the "Queensland Country Life," which announced the proposed McEwen campaign it is reported, "There is a long-term prospect of organizing American consumer opinion against restrictions." In March, officials of ANCA became aware of a drive by the Importers' Council to enlist the members of the National Restaurant Assn. in a campaign to lift import restrictions on beef. Interviews with NRA's lobbyist in Washington convinced us that there was a coalition already formed between the two groups and that they planned to attack the price of beef and enlist consumer assistance in driving it down.

This summer the formalized clip-on notices began to appear on the menus in restaurants across the nation calling attention to the price of beef and announcing increases of 50c to 75c for steaks, chops, and roasts, and promising to reduce the charge when beef decreased in price. Then came the "house-wife" boycotts, amply covered by newspapers and television, stirring trouble for the industry primarily along both coasts where the importer's representatives are most active.

The latest development goes back to Australia, their meat board and producer's organizations. Recognizing that 80 percent of their voluntary quotas had been shipped already this year (trade papers say 90 percent) the Australian Meat Board as of August 11, ordered shipments to the United States curtailed. ANCA has just received a letter written September 1 by the Australian Beef Producers' Assn enclosing their request to Trade Minister McEwen to propose to President Nixon that the import quotas be raised or suspended entirely. They further are seeking the consent of ANCA officials for such a removal of the beef quotas so that shipments can continue in greater volume through November 15. In the letter to McEwen they are suggesting that we are short of beef in the United States, that our prices are too high, that we are alienating the consumers here and giving the importers reason to ask for a lifting of the barrier. Full Circle?

USE OF WORDS "POSTAL PATRON" BY EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill which would authorize the transmission of mail by executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government under a simplified form of address in emergency situations.

This bill, if enacted into law, would allow agencies to use only the words "postal patron" and the name of the city, rather than the now mandatory street number and city. This authority, to be used only in emergency situations, is similar to the privilege extended to Members of the House of Representatives.

The need for this type of legislation came to my attention during the recent effort to eradicate the destructive oriental fruit fly which had been discovered in several gardens in the El Monte, Calif. area. The U.S. Department of Agricul-

ture, in cooperation with the county and State governments, wanted to send an important warning mailer to all El Monte residents. In order to do this they had to obtain mailing labels containing the names and addresses of all El Monte residents.

USDA went to the county registrar of voters and used their list. Unfortunately, the mailer went only to those households where there was a registered voter. Another problem encountered in the USDA mailing was that many people no longer lived at the address shown on the envelope, so the mail was forwarded. This meant that the new residents at the address did not have the benefit of a warning notice.

Another course open to the agency would have been to purchase a mailing list from a private supplier. This, of course, is expensive, and private lists for entire areas are not always available.

To assist agencies in these emergency situations, I believe it is important that we give executive departments the "postal patron" mailing privilege. It is true that the situations are few and far between when this type of mailing is needed; however, when the need does arise, it is important that our agencies be able to act quickly, accurately, and inexpensively.

BIG TRUCK BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENGL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGL. Mr. Speaker, my editorials for today are from the El Paso Herald-Post, the Fort Worth Press, the Houston Chronicle, and the Big Spring Herald, in the State of Texas. The editorials follow:

[From the El Paso Herald-Post, July 18, 1969]

THE TRUCK BILL AGAIN

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

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

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

These factors, the truckers contend, also would promote safety by permitting improved braking ability for big rigs and better road visibility for their drivers.

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

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

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

And even if the bigger rigs could operate

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

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

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

[From the Fort Worth Press, July 20, 1969]

THE TRUCK BILL AGAIN

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

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

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

These factors, the truckers contend, also would promote safety by permitting improved braking ability for big rigs and better road visibility for their drivers.

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

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

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

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

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

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

[From the Houston Chronicle, July 25, 1969]

TRUCKS ARE BIG ENOUGH

If the bill permitting even bigger trucks on our nation's highways is passed by this Congress, the space for passenger cars and buses on our nation's highways eventually could be denied. There simply must be a limit to the sizes of the motor vehicles which traverse our roads. And while not trying to hamper the growth of this important indus-

try, it must be noted that a practical limit has been reached.

The bill has been denounced as an "anti-safety bill" by the American Automobile Assn., but safety, however important, is not the only factor to be considered. The extra damage some 300,000 trucks larger than those presently plying the highways would do is significant. It has been estimated that the trucks would add \$1.8 billion in repair and construction costs to the interstate highway system during the first 10 years. Even if the truckers are willing to pay the taxes to defray these costs, the inconvenience of constant repair to highways would be intolerable to the average motorist.

The bill before the House Public Works subcommittee would allow an increase in maximum width by six inches and contains a formula which would increase the maximum loaded width to almost 110,000 pounds from the present 73,000. The bill, for the first time, contains a length limit—70 feet—but testimony indicates that a "grandfather clause" in the bill would make this limit meaningless.

A similar bill passed the subcommittee and almost made it through Congress last year. It was stopped only by a public outcry at the prospect of non-commercial motorists fighting for a spot on the road with these projected behemoths.

President Nixon, during last fall's campaign, reassuringly promised to "take a hard new look" at the trucking bill to "make certain the interest of the traveling public and the life of our highways are protected." But rather than leave advocacy up to the Nixon administration, better the "traveling public" once again raise its voice and make its feelings known.

[From the Big Spring (Tex.) Herald, Aug. 11, 1969]

WHAT OTHERS SAY

The trucking industry is back before Congress this year with a bill to permit the operation of heavier and bigger trucks on the nation's interstate highway system. Congress, as it did with a similar measure last year, should reject the proposed changes.

Foremost among the opponents of the legislation is the American Automobile Association, whose executives testified recently before the House Public Works Committee. The AAA's opposition is based on two points. The first is that bigger trucks will constitute a hazard on the highways because their bulk diminishes the visibility of the other drivers and their length makes passing more risky.

The second point the AAA stresses is that the increased weight of tractor-trailers and tractor-tow trailers will punish pavements and bridges and increase not only the costs of upkeep but also the construction of new roads built to withstand the heavier loads.

Highway costs warrant concern, but the argument Congress should find most persuasive is the likelihood of greater danger on the nation's already unsafe roads. A 70-foot truck, more than eight feet wide and weighing as much as 15 tons, is an intimidating object. To allow such snorting behemoths on the public roads is not in the public interest.—Boston Herald Traveler.

CHANUKAH

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, tonight, members of the Jewish community everywhere will mark the start of Chanukah, which in Hebrew means "rededication." This holiday can be traced

back 21 centuries, to the time the Syrian King Antiochus defiled the temple at Palestine by stripping it of every vestige of Judaism, enthroning a likeness of Zeus within it, and ordering pagan incantations spoken instead of the customary psalms. The outraged Jews declared war, and after 3 years of fierce fighting, the untrained and outnumbered legion of the Jews overcame the mighty Syrian Army.

The final victory over the Syrians occurred to the eve of the Jewish festival of light, a rite which had been customary during the season of the winter solstice when cold and darkness prevailed. The Judeans would then say in their prayers, "Let us have light," and would kindle tapers in the eight-branched menorah of the Temple.

The Jews decided to rededicate their temple to Jehovah at the same time they would normally celebrate their feast of light. They had but one problem. The supply of oil needed to keep the lamps lit was insufficient to last the day, yet the lamps did not flicker or go out but lasted and blazed for 8 days. To the Jews, this was an impressive sign of God's concern for them.

Chanukah has meaning to all God's children that light, faith, and freedom must always be preserved and appreciated. The candles which will be lit tonight and for 7 days thereafter to mark Chanukah are an impressive symbol to the world that the light must be kept aglow to prevent darkness from prevailing. To which I say: "Amen."

THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ACT OF 1969

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, although it sounds almost impossible to believe, more than 14,000 American workers are killed every year in occupational accidents. Over 2 million other workers are injured and the annual economic loss is also staggering. Workmen's compensation payments alone amount to \$2 billion a year and billions more are lost in earnings, medical expenses, production, and time that can never be regained.

I am convinced that if legislation is enacted that would create Federal safety and health standards, many of these shocking and appalling injuries, deaths, and occupational diseases, would be prevented.

A bill that would establish such urgently needed standards was introduced by that able and courageous fighter for progress, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA), and is being cosponsored by many other Members, including myself. Hearings have been held and the measure is now being considered by the Select Subcommittee on Labor headed by another brave champion of advance, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS).

The goal of the bill is a challenging, but just one: To assure, as far as possible every working man and woman in

the Nation safe and healthful working conditions.

Besides establishing mandatory occupational safety and health standards, the proposal would provide:

Effective enforcement of the standards.

Research relating to occupational safety and health.

Training programs to increase and improve personnel engaged in occupational safety and health areas.

Federal grants to States to help identify their needs and responsibilities in these fields, to develop plans, and to conduct experimental and demonstration projects.

Mr. Speaker, I hope a strong and effective bill will be passed this year that will finally give the workers of America the safety and health protection they deserve. This is a right every worker should have.

TAXPAYERS WILL LOSE BY WILLOW GROVE MOVE

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, all of us concerned with effecting economy in Government recognize that our military expenditures must be trimmed if we are to meet our many other commitments. I think we all realize that we must also maintain a strong defense posture.

I am disturbed that some of the proposed economies bear no apparent relationship to the overall economic picture and do not effectively protect previous commitments to military establishments and personnel. I point specifically to the Air Force's proposed inactivation of the 913th Tactical Airlift Group at the Willow Grove Naval Air Station in Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania, a major urban State, again finds itself tagged for "economy" measures. Whether it is the naval base and shipyard, Frankford Arsenal or Willow Grove, Pa., gets hit while other States with manpower and housing shortages, and already having huge concentrations of military installations and personnel, remain unscathed.

I am vitally concerned with the need for economy in Government.

I am equally vitally concerned that a coordinated, overall national program must not and should not diminish facilities and training in our populous and problem areas and transfer an overload to our "fat-cat" areas.

After a thorough study, I have concluded not only that the reserve training at an existing facility in Willow Grove is in the interest of economy in Government, but also that the proposed transfer and deactivation only compounds other national problems.

I wrote to the Secretary of the Air Force with my concerns. I today received a reply from an Air Force colonel which I find inadequate, perfunctory, and unsatisfactory.

Therefore, I submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my letter to the Secretary

of the Air Force which states the case against the proposed Willow Grove move which, thus far, has not been answered to any reasonable degree of satisfaction:

NOVEMBER 25, 1969.

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

DEAR SECRETARY SEAMANS: After carefully studying the Air Force's recent economy decisions, I am convinced that it is a mistake to relocate the 327th Tactical Airlift Squadron from Willow Grove and to inactivate the 913th Tactical Airlift Group and remaining Air Reserve units at Willow Grove.

My concern is that such action would be a false approach to the cause of economy and, in actuality, would be a shameful waste of taxpayers' money already expended by giving up dual-usage facilities that house a top-flight combat-ready unit.

Before analyzing the disadvantages or merits of the Air Force proposals, I acknowledge the need for economy—consistent with national defense—throughout the military and in all parts of government. I object, however, to "manufactured economy" which is practiced at the expense of certain areas of the Nation while other sections luxuriate in a proliferation of military installations, bases and expanded programs.

Let me be specific about my reasons for objecting to the proposal deactivation and transfer.

First, the 913th TAG at Willow Grove is "C-1" combat ready. I understand that this means the unit compares with regular military groups in combat ready status. Its capabilities have been cited many times over a period of years by both the regular Air Force and the Air Force Reserves. This kind of reserve units is providing national defense and defense training capability at the lowest possible cost.

Second, the deactivation coupled with other parts of the Air Force proposal means that Air Reserve training will be literally unavailable to men in the most populous part of our whole Nation. Reserves are an economical way of providing defense capability, and the deactivation and transfer represent neither economy nor good sense.

Third, the Willow Grove facility itself is used by both Navy and Air Force units at considerable cost saving to the Government. The Air Force facilities were built at the base at a cost of some \$9 million. The transfer and deactivation will mean both abandonment of this investment which is suitable for C-130 use and under-utilization of the base itself which would still be maintained at taxpayers' expense. Transfer to the Air Guard is less than a meaningful justification.

Finally, it always appears that Pennsylvania, a state which needs payrolls and jobs, is one of the first hit by such reductions while other states with actual manpower shortages, Texas and California to name two, wallow in numerous reserve units.

I review for your consideration what has transpired in Pennsylvania over the past several years in eliminating Air Force Reserve units:

The Middletown Air Material Depot was closed and transferred to the western United States with millions of dollars in expenditures to house the facility at its new quarters.

The 912th Tactical Airlift Group at Willow Grove was transferred, reorganized and converted to another program in 1968.

The 512th Troop Carrier Wing headquarters in 1964 was transferred from Willow Grove to Texas, a state which, I respectfully submit, luxuriates in a profusion of military facilities.

The Air Reserve Sectors and Air Reserve

Recovery Groups and Squadrons were deactivated and discontinued in 1965 with re-
placement programs.

Construction of facilities for the 911th Military Airlift Group at Pittsburgh is reportedly delayed and, should this unit be phased out, there would be not one Category "A" Air Reserve unit and facility remaining in Pennsylvania.

I hope you will consider carefully all the evidence available and reverse the decisions relating to the Willow Group units and facilities.

I would appreciate your response when you have studied my request. It is of vital importance to Pennsylvania generally and the Willow Grove area in particular.

With all best wishes.

Cordially,

LAWRENCE COUGHLIN.

LEGISLATION TO SET UP A NATIONAL DRUG TESTING AND EVALUATION CENTER

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to reintroduce—with 12 additional sponsors—a bill to set up a National Drug Testing and Evaluation Center to scrutinize new drugs submitted for premarketing approval.

I first introduced this bill on November 6 with 18 cosponsors, but I am reintroducing it today with the additional 12 cosponsors because of the considerable interest generated by introduction of the first bill.

This bill, identical to one introduced in the Senate by Senator GAYLORD NELSON of Wisconsin, would make the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare responsible for conducting all tests to determine whether these new drugs should be approved for commercial distribution.

At present, the Food and Drug Administration must attest to the safety and efficacy of a drug before allowing it to be marketed, but does this solely by evaluating information supplied by the company seeking to market the drug.

The proposed center within FDA could do some testing itself or contract out such studies to qualified individuals, organizations, or institutions. The sponsor of any drug submitted for testing or investigation would be liable for the expenses incurred, including a proportionate share of the cost of maintaining the center.

The sponsors of the bill are, in addition to myself, Messrs. BROWN of California, BURTON of California, MINISH, MOSS, HECHLER of West Virginia, DENT, HARRINGTON, Mrs. MINK, Messrs. FULTON of Pennsylvania, EDWARDS of California, FRASER, and CONYERS.

Previous sponsors of the bill, H.R. 14716, are Messrs. KLUCZYNSKI, BUTTON, PODELL, GIAIMO, BINGHAM, KOCH, ROONEY of Pennsylvania, TUNNEY, DINGELL, REES, SCHEUER, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Messrs. HELSTOSKI, ANDERSON of California, CORMAN, MATSUNAGA, FRIEDEL, and DANIELS of New Jersey.

THE PLASTIC JUNGLE

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will require that credit cards be sent by registered mail.

Tony Benitez, of Tampa, Fla., was never able to use either of his unsolicited mailed credit cards. Tony cannot sign his own name. He is 5 years of age. If he had learned to sign his name, his cards could have been used to finance a trip to Europe or buy a new wardrobe. When his mother contacted the bank that sent him his credit cards, they told her that Tony had an excellent credit rating.

Roger Gelpy, of Marblehead, Mass., was able to use his unsolicited credit card, even though the bank turned him down when he and his father asked for a \$300 loan. Roger went next door and bought a tie. He is 9 years old.

A Lima, N.Y., widow did not buy anything with her unsolicited credit card. She never received it. But she was billed for \$1,661. Someone else had used her card. She is 96 years old and lives on a monthly pension of \$114. She leaves her home once a month to cash her \$114 monthly social security check.

The theft of unsolicited credit cards by organized crime has resulted in billings as high as \$175,000 through the use of only 20 credit cards. Two brothers in Chicago were able to accumulate a profit of \$500,000 with stolen airline credit cards.

Unsolicited credit card mailings which run into the millions have become a serious financial threat to thousands of homes. The unsolicited credit cards have fallen into the hands of alcoholics and adolescents, thieves and racketeers. When shocked homemakers receive bills and collection letters from credit card issuers, they often pay the bills to save their credit ratings and prevent garnishment proceedings. There have been estimates that 30 percent of such billings are paid.

Credit card issuers who indulge in this cheap huckstering defend the practice on the basis that this is the only way that they can get people to use their credit cards. Mailed requests for credit card applications have resulted in 1 percent favorable answers, while the mailing of unsolicited and unwanted credit cards has led to 19 percent use within a few months.

Money and credit cards do burn a hole in the pockets of consumers in an inflationary spiral when wages are demeaned by the high cost of living. Obviously the credit card companies could not care less what the results of their funny money financing does to the family budget. It is good business for them. They charge the storekeeper up to 7 percent for membership in their plans and at least an annual rate of 18 percent on the unpaid balance on bills run up on these credit cards. It is good business for them to involve families who can not afford credit

cards in credit card spending. People who can afford credit cards will not pay the 1½ percent monthly rate for an unpaid balance.

I think it is time to demand that credit card companies do their mailing of credit cards by registered mail in order to prevent theft in our larger cities from apartment house and other mail boxes. I think that it is time for the credit card companies to bear the cost of fraudulent use of credit cards from the time of loss until the time of notification of loss. After all, fraudulent checks are the responsibility of banks. The fraudulent use of the credit card is no different than the fraudulent use of the personal check by third parties. The bill I have introduced today will insure the safety of credit card mailings and save mail patrons from unsolicited, unwanted and unnecessary liability.

TELL IT TO HANOI

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, those who condemn our involvement in the Vietnam war and cry out for an immediate disengagement from that conflict are the ones who are very much in the news today.

We must be careful, however, lest we close our ears to other voices that also are speaking out on this important and delicate subject, voices that bring a message different than that of those engaged in the moratorium.

One of the most prominent organizations speaking with such a voice is the Young Americans for Freedom, which is made up of young men and women on the campuses of universities throughout our Nation. This organization points out that a desire for peace is paramount in all American hearts but that the implementation of peace requires some cooperation from the other side. The Young Americans for Freedom extend their full-hearted support to President Nixon, endorsing withdrawal from Vietnam on honorable and practical grounds and urging Hanoi to get down to brass tacks if it really wants to bring this conflict to an end.

On December 12 and 13, the Young Americans for Freedom are going to express their views on campuses throughout America, sponsoring speakers who will comment on some of the vital aspects of the Vietnam conflict. At that time, the organization also will circulate on 400 major campuses several million copies of *Tell it to Hanoi*, a tabloid which explains the reasons for our involvement in Vietnam, the consequences of an immediate withdrawal, and the need for students and all Americans to unite behind President Nixon at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily support the efforts of the Young Americans for Freedom. Here is another voice in the chorus of voices that fill the air today, a voice that rings out loud and clear, speaking

with strength rather than uncertainty. I am certain it will be anxiously listened to by a vast multitude across this land.

SHALL I OR SHAN'T I?—IS THIS
TO BE THE LAW?

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, profound problems of the most vital significance to the system of military command worldwide are involved in the suggestion that military subordinates should have the subjective right—and even obligation—to decide for themselves whether a particular military command is right or wrong. Should such a precept be recognized in law—or should civilian law seek to override military law and discipline to impose civilian penalties both civil and criminal for obeying a military command subsequently determined to be unlawful—the foundation of military control will have been destroyed, for no subordinate from the lowliest private will be able to avoid asking himself “should I or shouldn’t I?” Obviously you cannot fight a war that way, whatever may be the deplorable horrors of Mylai and its prototypes in the historical past or tomorrow’s wars.

In this connection columns by Frank Getlein and William Buckley, Jr., appearing in the *Washington Star* of December 3, are significant.

The columns referred to follow:

KILLING CIVILIANS A MILITARY “POLICY” (By Frank Getlein)

They gained entrance to the city by deception, put it to the torch, killed everyone they could, took the women as slaves and became the sources of the first great body of epic and dramatic literature in the West.

That was the Greeks at Troy.

They captured the city after a sustained hate campaign, sacked it, murdered the inhabitants, left not a stone upon a stone and sowed the site with salt to prevent a rebirth.

That was the Romans at Carthage, after which they went on to become the enduring Western model of civic virtue and civic architecture, as the buildings and the rhetoric of this city attest to this day.

Do we really think ourselves the moral superiors of these distant and revered forebears of ours? And if so, on what grounds?

From the White House to the smallest village, Americans are now said to be shocked by the revelation of the massacre of Vietnamese civilians by American troops. The President has denounced the alleged atrocity. Even the Pentagon, after carefully not having heard of the event in its command for 18 months, has moved to severe action of retribution and punishment.

Why the shock and horror? Presumably because the alleged murderers performed their act of alleged murder without a statement of Pentagon policy behind them and they did it face to face on a ratio of one bullet, one death. They saw the people they were killing and this, more than anything else, is what horrifies us all.

And yet, for the last quarter century or more, since about 1943, it has been the military policy of this country to kill women and children, old men and babies. We have killed untold thousands in each category and no one has really raised a serious protest.

The slaughter of civilians as a matter of policy was reintroduced into Western warfare by the Germans in the Great War with Big Bertha against Paris and the Zeppelins against London. These primitive efforts were refined in World War II against London, Coventry and Rotterdam, to name just the outstanding examples.

As is usual in these matters, the Germans won even while they lost, because in beating them, the Allies, including and especially the United States, became German to a degree, killing civilians, as a matter of policy, in Berlin, Dresden and elsewhere in Germany and—with our customary drive to do everything a little bit better—in Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

We are officially and unofficially horrified because a lieutenant, a sergeant and a handful of private soldiers went into a village and allegedly shot down somewhere between 100 and 400 civilian inhabitants. Yet our highest generals, our Air Force’s beardless colonels and, yes, our commanders-in-chief have been killing women and children, old men and babies by the thousand, from the air, for years, and no one said a word.

The thing about death by air is that it is abstract. It only becomes real when an abstract painter, Picasso, makes one early incident in the bloody history very real through distortion and symbolism. But even Picasso couldn’t keep up with what has been happening since Guernica. What for the Catalan artist was the unspeakable end of the long history of man’s inhumanity to man was, for the rest of us, only the beginning.

The point of abstraction, in war as in art, is to protect us from the grime and the blood of reality. If a landscape is really an arrangement of cylinders, cubes and cones, what does it matter if some of these geometrical figures are removed from the equation? Obviously, not at all.

The trouble with the infantry is that its members remain inseparably linked to reality. When they kill people, they kill people. The act is killing and the victims are people. No doubt about it. It is blood and brains on the ground, it is broken bones and broken lives, burned villages and burned babies.

With death by air, we don’t even call it death. We call it a certain number of “sorties,” that grand, faintly elegant word, redolent of chivalry and Henry V at Agincourt. We don’t call it death, we call it “tonnage,” as if it were pig-iron production. It’s all abstract and insulated from life and death.

We shall hang or shoot the infantrymen for the unforgivable crime of reminding us of reality. We shall continue to promote the beardless colonels to beardless generals, the joint chiefs to superchiefs, for their mastery of abstraction and their discretion in allowing us not to know what they know.

“War is hell,” said Sherman, in a one-liner suddenly much in vogue. “Hell,” said Dante, who thought about it more than anyone since, “is not what happens to the bodies of those killed but to the souls of those who kill, and most particularly to the souls of those who kill and kill their sense of what they do.”

SONG MY RAISES HARD MORAL ISSUES

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

The slaughter at Song My (My Lai 4) raises those mind-numbing moral questions which strike one with special force on the eve of a visit to Saigon. I go there, by the way, on official business for the United States Information Agency, but—I take the time to put it into the record—the statute is plain on the matter, the advisory commission of the USIA on which I serve was intended to work in behalf of U.S. information policy, as distinguished from working for the USIA, a distinction which even those senators who accept contributions from labor unions and

then find Judge Haynsworth unfit to sit on the Supreme Court will perhaps recognize.

What should one especially look for in Vietnam? The question plagues the individual who has no pretensions to sophistication in military matters, and who resents efforts by others to reveal what are the roots of public sentiment in a complicated situation, after a short, or even a protracted, visit to a foreign country.

What, for instance, can be said at this point concerning the appalling situation at Song My? What are the principal questions that ought to be asked? James Reston suggests the difficulty of the problem by asking what is the moral logic of a situation that calls for giving medals to pilots who bomb civilians, and court-martialing infantrymen who kill the same civilians with rifles?

A few preliminary observations:

1. What makes a killing especially abominable is the question of the necessity for it. A pilot 30,000 feet high who is ordered to lambaste a city, village, or hamlet because it is a center of enemy activity and not otherwise neutralizable, proceeds with few moral scruples. In any event, those who ponder the deed, worry not about the soul of the pilot who drops the bombs, but about the soul of the general who told him to do so.

In Song My, it was different. There, or so the story goes, individual American soldiers squeezed triggers of rifles aimed at individual civilians who could not realistically be held to be a part of the enemy's war machine. For instance children. Under the circumstances, if we are still inclined to the presumption of innocence, we examine other possibilities.

2. Could it have been panic? What is it that causes panic? It is a commonplace that soldiers who are being shot at, who do not know whether they will live to see another day, who are tired and calloused and excitable, do things which their consciences would not justify when in cool working order. Is there palpable, in the anxiety to denounce the soldiers who took part in the massacre at Song My, that old anxiety to discredit the Vietnam war by any means?

The facts may, and yet may not answer convincingly that question. Thus far it looks like simple barbarism, like bloodlust sadism. The trouble with that explanation is that it does not easily reconcile with what we know about typical Americans.

Were these atypical Americans? Were they the kind of Americans who, if they had not found themselves in Vietnam with Vietnamese to fire at, might have found themselves in Chicago or New York or Los Angeles aiming their guns at bank tellers or enemies of the local syndicate?

3, and most important. Are we perhaps, in our common rage against these soldiers, engaged, however subtly, in a circle-squaring expedition? The same week that President Nixon expressed himself as quite properly horrified at what happened at Song My, he officially proscribed the use of biological weapons by the United States even in retaliation against their use by an enemy.

It seemed so simple, so wise, so humane, that few observers paused to wonder why, if it was so simple, so wise, so humane, it hadn't been done before? By, say, President Johnson? Well, not Johnson, because we all were taught that Johnson wanted to napalm little children. Well, John Kennedy? Why didn't he come to the same conclusion? Or, before that, Eisenhower the Good?

We are, it seems to one observer, engaged, somehow, in trying to make war tolerable—which it isn't, for reasons ontological. It does not follow that war equals the massacre of civilians. But it may follow that war makes inevitable the incidence of Song My—and Hiroshima, and Dresden. The prosecution of the guilty will, then, tell us a lot about them, and not a little about us; and about those who dream of wars fought from the turret of the good ship Lollipop.

NIXON—FIRST YEAR

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in all of the concern voiced during the past few weeks over allegedly inaccurate and misleading news reporting, many have lost sight of the truly outstanding job of reporting which has become a tradition among the vast majority of the press. If a few abuse their public trust, most members of the press accept that trust and are in turn justly relied upon by their readers.

Mr. Ray McHugh, the chief of the Washington bureau of Copley News Service, has just completed an analysis of the Nixon administration's first year in office. It is not a misleading, one-sided listing of the accomplishments of the first 100 days or the first 12 months. Nor is it a tirade against the absence of instant solutions to problems which have been years, decades, and even longer in the making. Rather, Mr. McHugh recounts the careful preparations which the President has made during his first year in office to launch a concerted and sustained attack upon the major social, political, and international ills of this decade and the next. Only time will tell whether these plans will yield the fruits of success; whether the innovative ideas of the Nixon administration are indeed the long awaited solutions to many of our problems.

What definitely has been accomplished by President Nixon is that most Americans have become convinced that a serious effort is being made. As Mr. McHugh concluded:

The problems remain unsolved, but they don't seem quite so frightening. Perhaps that was the President's biggest contribution to the country in 1969.

Mr. McHugh's article follows:

NIXON—FIRST YEAR

(By Ray McHugh)

WASHINGTON.—How does one grade the first year of a president?

Is he judged on his legislative record? His appointment? His international negotiations?

Or is he judged on less tangible things—the mood of a people, their response to his policies, their reaction to subtle changes in direction that are more sensed than seen?

Predictably, Richard M. Nixon's first year in the White House has been a time of preparation, rather than final accomplishment. He has spoken to men on the moon, but he has only begun the painstaking process of communicating with the men in the Kremlin.

He has begun the withdrawal of troops from Vietnam, but not even he can forecast when the last American GI will say goodbye to Saigon.

He has trimmed a whopping \$5 billion from the budget, including \$3 billion from military outlays, but he has only kept pace with already enacted increases in welfare, social security, federal pay scales, interest payments on the national debt, etc.

He has supported the most sweeping tax reform program in 35 years and preached the evils of inflation, he has forced the bureau of the budget and the departments and

agencies of government to face up to an aggressive belt-tightening program, but as 1969 fades away, the cost of living continues upward.

He has made a dramatic move to equalize the draft by resorting to a modified lottery system that will center on 19-year-olds, but even he admits it is only the first step in what must be a sweeping reform of selective service.

He has launched the controversial safeguard anti-ballistic missile system and he has opened preliminary strategic arms limitation talks with Moscow, but the course of both remains in question.

He has traveled around the world. His visit to Western Europe last February breathed new life into a faltering North Atlantic Treaty Organization. His visit to Asian capitals reinforced American interests in the Far East. His stop at Bucharest, Romania, was a dramatic gesture to the captive peoples of Eastern Europe and a bold test of the spirit of independence afoot in some satellite nations.

But these also were first steps on what must be long highways.

In Asia, Europe and Latin America, the president has placed a new emphasis on self-reliance. He has preached partnership and an accompanying lessening of the American presence, that while well-intentioned has sometimes been so massive that it has proved stifling in various parts of the world.

How well friends and allies adjust to this new American policy remains to be seen. It has been easy for many to complain about their dependence on the United States and to criticize Washington policies. It will be less easy for many to face the responsibilities Mr. Nixon is encouraging.

The President's first year in office could be compared to the opening chapters in a book. He has laid the plot and identified the characters, but it is too early to judge their course or fate.

These winter months mark the end of the Nixon beginning and the beginning of the true measure of his presidency.

It is significant that they coincide with a massive confrontation of public views on the Vietnam war. The "moratorium" strategy has been carefully devised to present the President with a continuing series of monthly, escalating crises.

"Quit Vietnam" is the slogan of the protestors, but tangled with the war issue are such continuing topics of civil rights, east-west politics, the revolt of the "new left," student activism, suspected subversive influences, the future role of the federal government in social and urban development.

Mr. Nixon has placed his hopes squarely on what he calls the "great silent majority." He, too, identifies his slogan with Vietnam, but its political scope is much broader.

The Democratic National Committee, urged along by Chairman Sen. Fred Harris of Oklahoma, has moved during the year to an ever closer association with anti-war elements and protestors. Some political observers see the movement as an attempt by Mr. Nixon's opponents to forge a liberal-urban-Negro-campus coalition that would dominate not only the Democratic Party, but would ultimately dictate the choice of a presidential candidate in 1972.

To counter this movement, the President during his first year in office has sought to broaden his own base of support in the moderate center and among conservatives.

The year's only statewide elections in New Jersey and Virginia indicated he is succeeding, both states elected Republican governors, ending long traditions of democrat rule. Mr. Nixon campaigned personally in both states, deliberately making his prestige a factor.

The GOP success, however, was tempered by the net loss of two congressional seats in special elections during the year.

The President is expected to intensify his

political efforts in 1970 in a bid to strengthen Republican ranks in both the house and the senate.

The deliberate, sometimes reluctant, fashion with which the Democrat-dominated house and senate has handled administration bills this year could trigger a 1970 campaign reminiscent of President Harry Truman's 1948 attacks on a "do-nothing" congress.

With the exception of the nomination of Judge Clement Haynsworth for the Supreme Court, Mr. Nixon has avoided most domestic-oriented political turbulence. His White House team put together an impressive performance in the Senate ABM battle. Starting with only 23 declared supporters, it won a hairbreadth 51-49 victory in the face of one of the best-organized, best-financed public relations efforts Washington has seen.

The President's attempt to win more time for hard-pressed southern school districts staring at the reality of desegregation was cut short abruptly by a Supreme Court order for "immediate" action, but the Nixon effort was not lost on concerned southerners.

There has been no noticeable improvement in the President's relations with the Negro community, but neither has there been a worsening. The country was spared a widespread recurrence of racial violence in 1969 and Negro citizens appeared willing to give Nixon programs time to assert themselves.

The President himself acknowledged in a news conference that he had little Negro support at the polls in 1968. He added, however, that he would not make extravagant promises to minority groups, but that he would demonstrate his concern with actions. These will be judged when proposed broad housing, medical, educational and job training programs take shape.

There is a temptation to grade Mr. Nixon's first year in the White House against the background of angry thousands parading on Washington's streets. Certainly his "silent majority" has mustered no counter spectacular of such proportions.

But that is the nature of most Americans. Street politics don't appeal to kind of people who would vote for a Richard Nixon.

His critics will label 1969 as a year of inaction or inaction or even indifference. But to those who support him, the first Nixon year has probably brought a measure of relief. Government is a less overwhelming force in the lives of most citizens. The White House is still a focal point of attention, but there seems to be less urgency, less tension than was associated with the days of Lyndon B. Johnson.

The problems remain unsolved, but they don't seem quite so frightening.

Perhaps that was the President's biggest contribution to the country in 1969.

POLICE PROTECTION

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under consent to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues, a copy of a letter addressed to the Honorable Gilbert Hahn, Chairman of the City Council of the District of Columbia, which is quite similar to many I have received in which citizens and businessmen in the District of Columbia have expressed their concern and fear. In order to protect the signer of this letter from reprisals, I have had his name deleted prior to insertion into the RECORD but you can rest assured he speaks the sentiment of thousands of

others. When will our political leaders wake up and acknowledge what is going on and respond effectively?

The letter follows:

HON. GILBERT HAHN,
Chairman, City Council,
District Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HAHN: I heard you quoted this morning on WTOP Radio as awarding an accolade to Mayor Washington et al., for their wonderful handling of the crowd that was here for Mobilization.

Frankly, I am getting tired of hearing this. From where I sit, I don't think the police did very much except to direct traffic. During the daylight hours the marshals brought here by the various groups did do a good job in controlling their people, but when dusk fell and the Militants got busy, where were the police?

If there were police in the neighborhood, and there should have been, they must have known that window smashing and looting went on in the vicinity of 14th and F Streets (Beckers, Bond's and Garfinckel's). They must, also, have known that other windows were being smashed. One large window was smashed in our National Press Building Office branch opposite the Willard Hotel, and four large plate glass windows were broken on the south side of K Street in our branch at K Street, N.W. These were only isolated instances; most other downtown financial institutions sustained damage (American Savings and Loan, American Security, Home Federal Savings, Riggs, Union Trust and others). I may have missed it in the papers, but I haven't read where one single person was arrested for this marauding. If any were arrested, what penalties were meted out? This information would be interesting.

All of this talk about how well the police handled the situation leaves me cold. What are we supposed to do on December 13? The only conclusion I can draw is that the city government tied the hands of the police.

Very truly yours,

Chairman & President.

DECEMBER 7, 1969—28TH ANNIVERSARY OF JAPANESE ATTACK ON PEARL HARBOR

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure every Member of the House is aware of the significance of this coming Sunday. It is the 28th anniversary of another Sunday, another December 7, in 1941. It is a date many Americans are not likely to forget.

I am certain they recall, as I do, the shock and horror that swept the Nation when word was received Japan bombed Pearl Harbor, killing thousands of American military and civilian personnel and destroying much of the naval fleet based there. Nor are we apt to forget that solemn moment when President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in his "Day of Infamy" address, announced the Nation had gone to war. "Remember Pearl Harbor" became the rallying cry for all Americans, joined in a common cause.

Four years later the war ended. The ambitious dreams of Japanese warlords for a military empire in the South Pacific were shattered. America was victorious but it mourned the hundreds of thousands of men who died fighting for

their country and for freedom. I found strength, however, in the hope their deaths brought to the world what World War I failed to bring—a lasting peace. Unfortunately, today that hope is stained with the blood of Americans killed or wounded during the undeclared wars of Korea and Vietnam.

December 7 is not an official holiday. Perhaps it should be. But it is a day when Americans, regardless of age, should pause for a moment in memory of what happened on that date 28 years ago. Honor should be paid to the men and women who died at Pearl Harbor and to those who survived the events of the fateful day.

One who survived is David P. Bedell of Irwin, Pa., the president of the Keystone Chapter of Pearl Harbor Survivors Inc. He has called upon the public to recognize December 7, and "Pearl Harbor Day," and asks citizens to display the American flag as a gesture that they do remember December 7, 1941, and those who died first in the defense of America.

In a recent letter to the public, Mr. Bedell wrote:

From those of us who did survive will come a proud kind of feeling and deep appreciation to you who have been so kind. We will remember all of you if you should pause to remember just a few of them.

Mr. Speaker, that is little enough to ask of a grateful nation. I join Mr. Bedell in his appeal and take this opportunity to extend his invitation to Members of the House.

JUDGE CLEMENT F. HAYNSWORTH, JR.

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I was thrilled a moment ago with news from the White House that Judge Haynsworth would continue to serve on the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. We need Judge Haynsworth with his courage, experience, integrity, and ability.

Those of us who have long admired Judge Haynsworth were never more proud of him than when he displayed such a good sportsmanship and humility when he issued the following statement which appeared in the Greenville, S.C., News, immediately following the vote in the other body:

STATEMENT OF JUDGE HAYNSWORTH

The ordeal of the last two months is ended. The resolution is an unhappy one for me, but, for our country's sake, I hope the debate will prove to have been a cleansing agent which will smooth the way for the President's next and later nominees.

Under the Constitution, the Senate has a duty, as well as a right, and responsibility to exercise the power of consent to execute appointments. In a republic such as ours, this is a wise, and essential check upon Executive power. There is no choice but to accept its judgment, and I hope that my friends and supporters will recognize that the greatness of the Senate as an institution is not diminished by individual disagreement with it.

It was a great honor to have been nominated by President Nixon to a position as an associate justice of the Supreme Court. It is

the greater because the nomination was the result of an appraisal of my performance as a judge in the federal court of appeals. The honor, of course, is tarnished by the Senate's action, but I have a deep sense of gratitude for the staunch and steadfast support of the President, of many Senators, and of a host of friends and others who have worked on my behalf and who have given me great comfort by messages of confidence and support.

I must now consider whether my usefulness has been so impaired that I should leave the Court of Appeals and return to private life. I do not think I should attempt to decide that question in the emotion of the moment. I will reach a conclusion as to my future course in approximately two weeks.

A LETTER SECRETARY ROMNEY
SHOULD READ

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, one of the burdens of public office is reading and replying to mail. I suppose I receive 50 or 60 letters every day, and most of these are pretty routine. Some of them are requests for publications, short and often standardized letters on pending legislation or else correspondence from persons who have a problem with the Government.

Every now and then, however, a letter comes across my desk which is very exceptional. That was the case on October 31 when I received from Mr. Mel Boyd of Des Moines, Iowa, a copy of a letter he had written to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. Mr. Boyd, who is concerned about the Department's policy toward the neighborhood development program, summed up in three pages the feelings of many citizens who are working on the local level in an effort to solve the difficult and complex problems in our urban areas.

Mr. Boyd certainly did not write to Secretary Romney in a partisan spirit. In fact, at one point he said:

To assure you that I am not a "leftist," a "hippie," or in any sense a radical, let me tell you a little about myself. I am an elected member of the Des Moines Model City Citizens Board. I am white, 57 years old, and married. I own and operate a small business in the Model Neighborhood—have an income of under \$10,000. I am a registered Republican; I voted for Mr. Goldwater in 1964 and Mr. Nixon in 1968.

Later on in his letter, Mr. Boyd said:

With government encouragement and help a nation-wide organization of Model City residents and officials was formed representing over 150 cities. You, sir, are familiar with this organization. I believe you have addressed it . . .

Mr. Romney, at government expense poor people—black and white—have attended meetings of this organization and seminars on housing and relocation and citizens participation. They have gone from shacks and flats and crowded tenements, to comfortable, plush hotel rooms. They have seen for themselves how another part of America lives. They will not forget it.

I thought Mr. Boyd's letter was a well reasoned and eloquent argument for acting now to solve our urban problems. It

also came at a time when an increasing number of people believe there should be a greater use of rehabilitation instead of complete demolition in renewing blighted areas. I therefore wrote to Secretary Romney, pointing out that his Department had received Mr. Boyd's letter and that I thought the Secretary should take the time to read it personally. I also enclosed with Mr. Boyd's letter, as background for the Secretary, a copy of the newspaper articles which prompted Mr. Boyd's letter and a later story from the Des Moines Tribune regarding the Des Moines model cities program. The Tribune article, by Miss Julie Zelenka, included a paragraph reading:

And there remains a deep-seated suspicion that the whole thing is a glorious myth to pacify the under-privileged and that the "establishment" won't deliver the promised improvements—a suspicion that intensified when there were delays in federal money needed.

It was my hope that a personal reply from the Secretary would go a long way toward removing such suspicions. Unfortunately, Mr. Boyd's letter never reached Secretary Romney's desk and, on November 17, Mr. Boyd received a four-paragraph acknowledgment, which appears to be nothing more than a form letter.

I want to make clear that I do not blame Mr. Romney for failing to personally reply. I am sure a huge amount of mail arrives addressed to him personally, and, of course, it would be utterly impossible for the Secretary to read and reply to each and every letter. Apparently Mr. Boyd's letter was simply given routine treatment by third- or fourth-level officials in the Department.

I still feel that Secretary Romney should have the opportunity to read Mr. Boyd's letter and think others may be interested. For that reason, I am placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Boyd's letter, together with the other correspondence involved, and the newspaper articles mentioned in my letter to Secretary Romney, follow:

OCTOBER 27, 1969.

HON. GEORGE W. ROMNEY,
Secretary of Housing and Urban Development,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Although I had been hearing rumors that the Neighborhood Development Programs were to be scrapped or severely restricted, I refused to believe them until I read what seems to be unquestionable verification in a news item in the Des Moines Register of October 7th. If this report is accurate, I am certain it will prove to be a mistaken and regrettable decision, Mr. Secretary. I want to tell you, briefly, why it is a mistake and just how regrettable it might be.

To assure you that I am not a "leftist," a "hippie," or in any sense a radical, let me tell you a little about myself. I am an elected member of the Des Moines Model City Citizens Board. I am white, 57 years old, and married. I own and operate a small business in the Model Neighborhood—have an income of under \$10,000. I am a registered Republican; I voted for Mr. Goldwater in 1964 and Mr. Nixon in 1968.

Mr. Romney, we have been working on our Model City Plan for almost two years. Last Friday, October 17th, we finally received the welcome news that our Model City supplemental grant of \$2,065,000 had been approved. This was fine—as far as it went, but

you had already cut the heart out of our plan with the announcement that NDP funding is to be discontinued or severely reduced. As you well know, it is NDP funding that makes relocation from unsatisfactory housing possible; it is NDP designation that makes Model Neighborhoods eligible for special FHA programs; it is NDP funding that makes possible the physical improvements which are so needed. The citizens of our area agree that decent housing is their greatest, most immediate need. Our area needs over 1,000 new homes. 1500 homes need extensive rehabilitation if they are to be made livable.

Mr. Secretary, for over a year—day after day, night after night, the residents of our neighborhood have put their needs into words, to furnish documentation to prove the words. Hour after hour we have discussed plans and programs to solve our problems. In the heart of each citizen—moving him to work—was always the hope, the expectation, that here, at last, was a program that would help him escape the neglect and deterioration—the plumbing that won't work—the drafty rooms—the high fuel bills—the rats—the callous slumlords. Representatives of HUD and FHA and financial institutions came to our meetings and told of all the wonderful programs which would help us as soon as we became funded—FHA 235, 236, 237, etc. Oh, they certainly built our hopes high!

At the same time, Mr. Romney, employes of other governmental agencies, OEO and VISTA, were promoting dissatisfaction with the status quo—pointing out the unfairness of our economic system, training citizens in the technique of protest and organization, pointing out the value of demonstration.

With government encouragement and help a nation-wide organization of Model City residents and officials was formed representing over 150 cities. You, sir, are familiar with this organization. I believe you have addressed it. This serves as a line of communication for the people of the target areas across the country. The problems of Des Moines are no longer only our problems; the expectations of Flint are no longer only Flint's expectations. This line of communication can become a great force for good—or retribution (or irresponsible action of a variety of kinds).

Mr. Romney, at government expense poor people—black and white—have attended meetings of this organization and seminars on housing and relocation and citizens participation. They have gone from shacks and flats and crowded tenements, to comfortable, plush hotel rooms. They have seen for themselves how another part of America lives. They will not forget it.

Now, after they have been subjected to these forces for such a long time, news from Washington comes like a killing frost to spoil all the hopes and dreams and aspirations of the people. Mr. Romney, this cannot be!

I don't know whom you have been listening to, but I think there are some voices you haven't heard. I think you should put your ear closer to the grass roots. As you know, sir, the population of Model Neighborhood across the country contain a large percentage of minority people. You must be well aware of the unrest that has been moving them the last few years; the unrest is still there—and growing! America was quite fortunate that this past summer was so "cool". I hope the administration does not build false hopes upon this. I feel that the "militants" were giving America another chance to remove the injustices of the past through the Model City Program and the NDP. America is still sitting on a bomb!

The white community dare not break faith with the minorities again! The white community has lied too many times! It has sold the poor people short too many times! I know that inflation is a pressing problem,

Mr. Secretary. I realize that the action in Vietnam is a big problem, but they are both small problems in comparison to the problems we will have in our impacted area if the NDP programs are cancelled or significantly curtailed. The impatient young people in these neighborhoods are not going to accept another sell-out lying down. How will you control the disturbances in 150 cities at the same time, Mr. Romney—the bricks, the fires, the snipers? I shudder to think of what might happen!

We understand that congress has already appropriated NDP money. We are told the decision to withhold it was made by the Bureau of the Budget. Don't let the Nixon administration be held responsible for the conditions which may result if this decision stands, Mr. Secretary. Keep faith with the people! Keep America "cool"! Help reduce the alienation between our people! Continue NDP financing at its present level.

Sincerely,

MEL BOYD.

DES MOINES, IOWA.

NOVEMBER 6, 1969.

HON. GEORGE ROMNEY,
Secretary of Housing and Urban Development,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am enclosing herewith a copy of a letter, addressed to you, which was sent to me by Mr. Mel Boyd, a member of the Model Cities Planning Board in Des Moines, Iowa.

I am fully aware of the heavy burden of correspondence you have and, since the letter may not have reached your desk through the routine channels, I am sending it to you now. It seems to me that Mr. Boyd, who probably could be considered as one of the "forgotten Americans" of whom President Nixon spoke last year, has summarized in only three pages the feelings of many citizens who are working on the local level to solve our country's urban problems. I sincerely hope you will find time to read his letter.

Also enclosed for your information is the October 7 newspaper article mentioned in Mr. Boyd's letter, as well as a later article concerning the Des Moines Model Cities Program.

Sincerely yours,

NEAL SMITH,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, RENEWAL ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., November 17, 1969.

Mr. MEL BOYD,

President, Service Saw Co., Des Moines, Iowa

DEAR MR. BOYD: Secretary George Romney has asked me to reply to your very thoughtful letter of October 27, 1969, concerning the Neighborhood Development Program.

We in the Department of Housing and Urban Development recognize the value of NDP as a tool to revitalize our cities, and this Administration has no intention of abandoning the program. Demand for program funds, however, has been so great that we will be unable to participate to the full extent requested by communities across the country.

The enclosed position paper will give you insight into our problems with the program and will answer many of your questions. Please be assured that as soon as we develop the controls mentioned in the paper we will give the application for Des Moines every possible consideration.

Your obviously sympathetic interest in our programs is most gratifying.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH L. HEROD,
Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Renewal Assistance.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,

Washington, D.C., November 18, 1969.

HON. NEAL SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: Secretary George Romney has asked me to reply to your letter of November 6, 1969, on behalf of Mr. Mel Boyd concerning funding of the Des Moines, Iowa, Neighborhood Development Program application presently pending with the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The Department also received the same letter from Mr. Boyd. Enclosed, for your convenience, is our response to him.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE M. COX,
Assistant Secretary.

[From the Des Moines Register, Oct. 7, 1969]

HOPES FADE FOR DES MOINES AID OF \$3
MILLION

(By James Risser)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Des Moines has little hope of getting a requested \$3 million for physical improvements in its Model Cities area, federal officials said Monday.

The result may be little or no immediate progress on things which would be most visible to neighborhood residents—fixing up existing run-down homes, clearing a square block for construction of housing for the elderly, development of vest-pocket parks.

A Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) official, who is working on Des Moines' Model Cities application, said federal approval of the city's \$2-million, first-year implementation request is almost certain to come soon.

But that money, he pointed out, is to be used mostly for non-physical programs such as job training, educational programs, medical and dental care.

MASSIVE CUTBACK

The additional \$3 million, which the city wants for physical improvements in the area, was to come from a separate, but closely related, HUD program called the Neighborhood Development Program (NDP).

However, a massive cutback in funding for the infant NDP program was announced last Friday by HUD Secretary George Romney, who said:

"Only a limited number of those applications presently pending or under preparation will be funded this year."

In his statement Friday, Romney accused the Johnson administration of encouraging cities last year to file NDP applications far in excess of the available money.

He said HUD cannot come up with anywhere near the \$1.2 billion requested by 322 communities. He rejected the idea of approving more programs than HUD can fund in the hope that Congress would appropriate more money.

Only 35 cities have been approved for NDP grants to date, and they will get "less money than they had hoped for," said Romney.

If the other NDP applications were approved, there would be no money left for other types of urban renewal grants requested by some 900 cities, he said.

As a result, HUD will authorize no NDP program which does not promise to complete 80 per cent of its job in the first year and the entire program in two years, he said.

AWAITING APPROVAL

Des Moines' NDP application has not actually reached Washington yet. It is still awaiting approval in HUD regional offices in Chicago.

Dick Wright, acting director of the Model Cities program in Des Moines, said Monday, "I think the regional office has been slowing us down because they knew something was going to happen to funds at the federal level."

Wright acknowledged, however, that the re-

gional officials also have raised some legitimate questions about Des Moines' "workable program" and other matters. Wright said he believes the "workable program" will be certified soon, now that the city council has approved a housing code enforcement ordinance, and that this normally would be expected to speed up approval of the NDP application.

Of the fund cutback, Wright said: "I hate to see the Neighborhood Development Program shot down before it even gets off the drawing boards. This definitely is going to hurt us."

"If we're really sincere about rebuilding the inner cities across the country, then it's not time to do something like this."

Three out of every four houses in the model cities neighborhood are substandard. Clearance of some of those structures and rehabilitation of many more are key parts of the city's effort to upgrade the neighborhood, said Wright.

Without the NDP program, the HUD spokesman in Washington said, the residents cannot qualify for low-cost loans or federal grants for housing rehabilitation.

The plan was to use some NDP money to acquire and clear the block bounded by Twelfth street, University avenue, Thirteenth street and Carpenter street to make way for housing for the elderly, said Wright.

NDP money also was to be used to relocate the persons whose properties were cleared, to make low-cost rehabilitation loans to other residents and to set up vest-pocket park facilities both for the elderly and for youths, he said.

Wright said Des Moines could try to get some of the money through a "grab bag" of other federal programs.

This would result, however, in a more "fragmented" effort and more of the delays which already have area residents discouraged, he said.

[From the Des Moines Tribune, Oct. 18, 1969]

U.S. FUNDS AT HAND: SEEDS ARE PLANTED;
DES MOINES MODEL CITY TO BECOME REALITY

(By Julie Zelenka)

A 1,000-acre urban neighborhood immediately northwest of downtown Des Moines, with a population of 16,000, is known as the "Model Cities" area.

The incomes are low (31 per cent earn less than \$3,000 a year—twice as many as in the rest of Des Moines) and many residents are elderly. About 38 per cent are black.

The area has been described as a "decaying" neighborhood, but it's not yet a slum. That's the idea behind the federal Model Cities program—to stop decaying neighborhoods from becoming slums, and to make them more livable. But it isn't easy.

"We're just poor people, we're not very smart," many residents say as they struggle with the new jargon of Model Cities planners with backgrounds in economics, education and urban development.

And there remains a deep-seated suspicion that the whole thing is a glorious myth to pacify the under-privileged and that the "establishment" won't deliver the promised improvements—a suspicion that intensified when there were delays in federal money needed.

But last week, the federal government—after 15 months of planning and organizing—decided to spend \$2 million to help the families in the area.

If all goes according to plan, local, state and additional money will boost this aid to about \$3.2 million.

In five years, again if all goes according to plan, the total cost could reach \$40 million.

WHAT IT WILL BUY

What will all this money—most of it from taxpayers—buy?

The biggest chunk of money—and Model Cities officials call it the most important—

will be a \$300,000 program to help residents find better jobs, or jobs in which they have a chance to advance.

It isn't that the people there aren't working now.

"Any idea that there is idleness in this area is simply inaccurate," says Jim Booth, an economics specialist on the Model Cities staff.

He quotes studies to show that 96 per cent of the employable people in the area are working, but that 60 per cent of them have the lowest paying jobs—laborers, service and household helpers.

CAN'T DO IT ALL

But the government can't solve all the problems.

Richard Wright, acting director of the Model Cities project, described the federal grant this way:

"It is supposed to be seed money. To get the most out of this money we will be seeking assistance from private sources and from volunteers."

Where will these seeds be planted?

Education programs will get \$561,440 from Model Cities funds and commitments from other sources will bring the total to \$882,500. Individual projects will include expanded use of schools for recreational and cultural activities, vocational training to rehabilitate houses, assistance to a Des Moines Public School program to keep dropouts in school, and a work-study program.

DELINQUENCY

Delinquency prevention—including a youth police cadet program, a project to rehabilitate law violators without sending them to prison and a public defender program—will get \$153,200 from Model Cities, with other revenue boosting it to \$283,720.

A housing and relocation project costing \$130,000 in Model Cities funds will be used to help residents avoid financial pitfalls in buying, renting or selling a home.

Employment and economic development will get \$428,280. Other funds will raise this to \$490,215, not only to create better jobs, but to find jobs for the elderly and to establish small businesses in the neighborhood.

About \$200,000 is earmarked for health projects—other sources will boost it to \$376,922—including a family planning service; alcoholism treatment; dental, eye and hearing treatment for adults; speech therapy for pre-schoolers, a health insurance program and health education.

SOCIAL SERVICES

Income maintenance and social services will get \$144,140 from Model Cities. Other sources will increase it to \$438,518. Projects will include establishment of a service center for the elderly, children's day-care services, counseling for the elderly, a foster grandparents program, food stamp plans and services to single-parent families.

Recreation and youth activities will get \$9,500 in Model Cities funds for operation of a series of black forums and a day-camp program.

Physical environment and urban design will get \$104,000 from Model Cities and additional funds from the city of Des Moines for a total outlay of \$269,000. The funds will be used to improve street maintenance and solid waste disposal.

Administration and jobs for residents on the Model City staff organization will cost \$330,000. Residents of the neighborhood will be hired as field workers and evaluators of neighborhood problems.

JOB NEED

But Model City officials keep returning to the need for better jobs—or occupational upgrading in official language.

Says Wright: "We don't want people going into what we call dead-end jobs. We want

them to have an opportunity to advance. If we employ people in the schools as para-professionals and teachers aides, we want them to have some opportunity for advancement and additional training.

"This could include earning college credits so they could advance to better jobs. We also want on-the-job training. We want them to have increments in salary and fringe benefits, including vacations. We want to be certain they are part of these programs and not some separate entity."

OTHER FUNDS

Model Cities cash won't actually be in hand until the city signs a contract with the federal government, which may take several weeks.

Nonetheless, some projects have gotten under way with funds supplied from other sources participating in the Model Cities program. These projects are:

A children's day-care program that permits mothers to work and to enroll in job-training programs.

A family planning program that includes general health education aimed at improving the health of mothers and their families. This is being operated by Planned Parenthood.

A Greater Des Moines Education Center, designed to prevent youngsters from dropping out of school. It is being operated by the Des Moines Public Schools.

Extending the New Horizons junior high school work-study program into the high schools. The project is designed to prevent students from dropping out of schools and is operated by the Des Moines Public Schools.

Vocational training and housing rehabilitation at North High School.

The Model Cities contribution of \$40,000 is to be used to purchase homes for the students to rehabilitate for resale. Money from such sales will finance the continuous purchase of other homes to be fixed and sold.

Still another major program, known as the Neighborhood Development Program (N.D.P.) is aimed at the physical rehabilitation of the sprawling Model Cities neighborhood.

This, say officials, would have "visual impact."

The cost of the program has been set at \$3.2 million, but this undoubtedly will be cut back by President Nixon's austerity drive.

Officials here have been told that some money from N.D.P. may be available after Jan. 1. How much depends upon appropriations by Congress.

Funds for some of the projects that had been planned with N.D.P. grants may be available from other federal programs, officials said, somewhat hopefully.

LUTHERVILLE, MD., GI DIES IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, WO Charles J. Armstrong, a fine young man from Maryland, died recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend his courage and to honor his memory, by including the following article in the RECORD:

LUTHERVILLE GI DIES IN VIETNAM—HELICOPTER CRASH FATAL TO CHARLES J. ARMSTRONG

A 21-year-old helicopter pilot from Lutherville has been killed in a crash in Vietnam, his parents reported yesterday.

He was Army WO Charles J. Armstrong,

son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles T. Armstrong, of 15 West Seminary avenue, Lutherville.

Warrant officer Armstrong, in Vietnam two months, died last Monday when his helicopter crashed because of a malfunction. He was serving with the 118th Assault Helicopter Company, stationed at Bien Hoa Airbase, 20 miles north of Saigon.

He was a native of Camden, New Jersey. He graduated from Towson Senior High School in 1966.

Mr. Armstrong enlisted in the Army after graduating from Catonsville Community College in 1968. He studied electrical engineering there.

He received his pilot training in Georgia and at Fort Wolter, Texas.

In addition to his parents, he is survived by a sister, Maria Armstrong, at home.

HYPOTHETICAL HAPPINESS — OR HALLUCINATIONS FOR POOR PEOPLE

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, my colleague in the House, the Honorable Mrs. EDITH GREEN, who is a member of the Education and Labor Committee with whom I serve, rendered a statement on the floor of this House which startles the imagination of concerned Americans. In nine short paragraphs, Mrs. GREEN completely dispelled the notion that funds for combating poverty are inadequate. She concluded, in fact, that the Congress has little reason to concern itself with more money for the poverty stricken. Mrs. GREEN has shocked me by her total lack of knowledge of poverty or her insensitivity to the problem. I am most concerned that my distinguished colleague has served to reinforce the distorted and naive view of poverty which makes a national commitment to alleviate poverty so difficult.

My colleague presented us with a "hypothetical" case of a poverty-stricken family in Portland, Ore.—and skillfully pointed out, hypothetically, of course, that this family—if it "wanted to take advantage of" all the programs available to them "would be able to have an \$11,513 income for the year."

At last, the Members of this august body no longer need to postulate why it is impossible to agree on poverty programs. Some obviously view poverty totally as a hypothetical condition while others see it as a real one.

Those of us who have experienced poverty, who have lived with the tragic deprivations which are perpetrated upon 12.8 percent of our Nation's population—deal with the reality of it. Those of us who have seen children eating dog food or searching garbage cans for food, find it difficult to envision the hypothetical family. Those in need of medical service who cannot afford a doctor know the problem is a real one. Those who live in rat-infested houses that have no heat, no hot water, and who share a bed with three other children, who do not attend school because they are hungry or have

no shoes—those people could care less about the hypothetical.

What a very real problem it is to be denied a job because you lack the qualifications—then discover that you lack the qualifications because the school you intended was inferior. You also discover that the books used in your school were outdated, some 40 years old. And your attendance record was poor because you were shoeless or without warm clothing. The depth of your learning was impaired because your exposure was so limited. In a real sense, you have been denied employment because you are poor. You had no father because he was jobless, and his desertion made it possible for you to receive public assistance.

I do not know about poverty in Portland, Ore.—where the hypothetical family supposedly exists—but I wish my colleague from Oregon would produce even one family anywhere in this country who can or does collect \$11,513 annually from government-assisted programs.

Naturally, I limit my challenge to poor families. We can all produce thousands of rich families who receive much more annually from Government-assisted programs. The classic example is that of Senator JAMES EASTLAND of Mississippi, who received \$166,000 last year from this Government for not growing food on his farm. If my colleague, Mrs. GREEN, cannot construct in reality what she purports to be the truth in hypothet, then her example is as meaningless as her arguments against the committee-reported poverty bill.

My view of poverty is not hypothetical. It comes from experience. It is fair to say that my view of poverty is quite realistic. I have lived with it, and I now serve a constituency which battles daily with the problems of poverty on the ground level. There is not any family in St. Louis receiving \$11,513.00 annually, and I dare say there is not any poor family anywhere in the country who can testify to such glorious and profitable benefits for their poverty.

Let me point out, first, the extent of poverty in this country. According to official figures, there are 22 million poor people in the Nation and an additional 13 million near-poor. Of this number, 5.1 million people are classified as the very poor since they have no cash income at all.

If we are providing the kinds of funds asserted by the hypothetical view of Mrs. GREEN, this Nation, to provide \$11,000 to a conservative estimate of 6 million families—would have to be appropriating and spending \$66 billion annually on these programs now.

Some 9.3 million of these poor people are in the category of "hard-core" poor—which means they live in families whose incomes are less than \$2,400 per year for a family of four. The "remaining poor" are the 10.6 million people whose incomes are between \$2,400 and \$3,600 per year.

We are not reaching these people. Public assistance programs serve only 40 percent of the poor people. Mrs. GREEN's "hypothetical family" would have to be within that fortunate 40 percent. The

assistance payments provided in some States are less than 50 percent of what the State itself considers a necessary standard. In Oregon, AFDC payments for a family of four are \$226 per month. In the State of Missouri, the allotment for a family of four is only \$124 per month. And, in the State of Alabama, it is \$89 per month or in Mississippi, it is \$55 per month.

There are indeed, great discrepancies among the States, great discrepancies in welfare payments which are, no doubt, representative of the priorities those States place on poor people. And yet, my colleague would have us accept her poverty program which turns the administration of all poverty programs over to the individual States. And she insists that we have no reason for claiming the programs would, in that way, be effectively destroyed.

The average child assistance payment in the United States is \$40 per month. There are an estimated 4½ million children receiving aid through AFDC. There are at least another 6 million children in families who are eligible—but who are not receiving any assistance. Only 45 percent of those families receiving AFDC receive food stamps or food commodities—whereas the "hypothetical" example has this Portland family receiving generous assistance payments and food stamps.

There are two basic Government programs intended to improve the diet of the poor—the sale of food stamps and the distribution of commodities. The current food stamp program reaches only 16 percent of the people who need the food. Local counties choose to participate in the food stamp program, the commodity program—or in neither program. The food stamp and commodity program each serve only 3.2 million poor persons—or a total of 6.4 million of the currently estimated 22 million poor and 13 million near poor people.

Of the 3,098 counties in the United States, 1,125 choose to participate in the commodity distribution program. But fewer than 12 percent of those counties serve as many as 60 percent of the poor people in their areas who need the food.

There are 1,139 counties participating in the food stamp program—and the participation of poor people in this program is even worse. Only 20 of those counties manage to serve even 60 percent of the people who need stamps. On the average, food stamp counties reach fewer than 20 percent of the people eligible.

There are seven States in the country which refuse to participate in the food stamp program. And there are 413 counties in the United States which have no food program at all.

Recently, the State of California passed a law to require that all counties in California participate in the food stamp program. The good Governor of that State vetoed the bill. But the substitute poverty bill offered by Congresswoman GREEN, Congressmen QUIE and AYRES—asserts that each State should have the reins of control over poverty programs. I suggest that my colleague name the Governors who have demon-

strated sensitivity to and understanding of the problems of the poor.

A poor family does not have much going for it in America. Unlike the comfortable family of five in the "hypothetical" Portland, Ore., case—a family which is poor has only one chance in three of living in a county which has a food stamp program—and if it happens to live in such a county, it still has only one chance in six of participating in the program. It is clearly not just a matter of "wanting" to take advantage of programs—which keeps them from collecting any income of consequence.

The "hypothetical family" is said to be receiving \$75 per year in legal services under OEO. If that is so, then the "hypothetical family" is fortunate to have been among the 6,010 being handled by the legal services program. I have great hopes for the program—but there are many obstacles in the way to achieving legal representation for all the poor people who need it. Presently, there are 265 projects in the United States—but there is only one office in the State of Virginia, only one office in Maryland, in the city of Baltimore, and there is no program in the State of North Dakota. Many legal services programs are just getting underway, just becoming fully operational. Still, there are not enough programs or personnel to handle the legal defense needs of the poor.

The Portland, Ore., "hypothetical child" who is in high school is participating in the Upward Bound program valued by my colleague at \$1,440, to the hypothetical family. If so, this "hypothetical child" is, indeed, fortunate—since there are only 2,400 Upward Bound enrollees in the entire country. Last year OEO was forced to reject 150 proposals for programs which could have served an estimated additional 7,000 youth. Reason for these rejections—lack of funds.

The "hypothetical family" picks up \$3,000 when the mother decides to participate in the "job opportunity program." Whether or not such an opportunity may be available to her, the mother of four has a job at home. Why should she take a job which pays less than the minimum wage and then spend a large portion of her inadequate salary to hire a babysitter?

The "hypothetical child" in college is not only said to receive an educational opportunity grant—but to receive an NDEA grant of \$520 by taking advantage of the forgiveness clause. This assumes, of course, that this student elects to pursue a teaching career if the loan becomes a partial grant. And for his loan to be completely forgiven, he must decide to teach in a poverty area or to teach handicapped children.

Both NDEA and EO grants are programs feeling the fiscal squeeze as well as the effects of inflation on the costs of higher education. This year, there are 442,000 youth receiving NDEA assistance—but based on the President's budget, there can be only 398,000 participating in the coming academic year. This comprises only 6.4 percent of the total estimated higher education enrollment for the coming academic year.

The "hypothetical family" is calculated to receive \$125 in services from the comprehensive health program. But there are only 49 comprehensive health programs in the Nation serving an approximate 300,000. These centers operate in only 23 of the 50 States. Fortunate for this "hypothetic family" that they live in Portland, Oreg., where there is such a center.

It is documented fact that the total poor population of the Nation, 22 million poor and 13 million near-poor, all go without necessary health services. The family in question is among the few people being reached at present. There is hope that the program will be expanded to enable it to serve at least 1 million poor people—but these are cautious hopes which rest upon congressional action on poverty programs.

The "hypothetical preschool child" is enrolled in Headstart. There are 2 million poor children between the ages of 3 and 6 years who are eligible and in need of Headstart training. But only 600,000 youngsters are now receiving the benefits of this program. As luck would have it, "our hypothetical poor child" is one of those 600,000.

Moral of the story is "better that we should be only hypothetically poor than to suffer the realities of poverty." Hypothetically, we can have the mother of these four children marry the doctor at the comprehensive health center who will then go into private practice where he will enjoy the financial rewards of medicare and medicaid—and this family can live happily and comfortably ever after.

We are here in Congress not to deal with hypothetical situations—but with real problems. Poverty is real. We must look at the real people when we consider the poverty bill which will come before the House. The present magnitude of the problem inevitably stems from the lack of truth, the lack of reality in our "hypothetical" discussions of poverty. It must not continue.

Americans cannot and must not rest on the archaic notions of poverty—that a man who is in rags should—except for his own laziness—be on his way to riches, the American way of life. Americans must learn the truth. Until Americans spend as much time trying to understand as trying to condemn poverty and poor people—this country cannot become a great nation.

CHILDREN'S PRAYERS

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, this week's children's prayers are offered in order that the public schools of our Nation may have a source for morning devotionals.

The Supreme Court has outlawed prayer and Bible reading in our public schools, but it has not yet had the temerity to ban prayers from Congress.

Therefore, I believe these prayers can be read by our Nation's schoolchildren at the start of their day without interference from the Supreme Court.

The prayers follow:

I

We give Thee hearty thanks for the rest of the past night and for the gift of a new day, with its opportunities of pleasing Thee. Grant that we may pass its hours in the perfect freedom of Thy service that at eventide we may again give thanks to Thee.

II

Lord, as Thy mercies do surround us, so grant that our returns of duty may abound; and let this day manifest our gratitude by doing something well-pleasing to Thee.

III

Let us take hands and help, this day we are alive together, look up on high and thank the God of all.

IV

O Heavenly Father, Who has filled the world with beauty, open, we beseech Thee, our eyes to behold Thy gracious hand in all Thy whole creation, we may learn to serve Thee with gladness.

V

O Lord, grant that I may do Thy will as if it were my will, that Thou mayest do my will as if it were Thy will.

ADDRESS OF PRIME MINISTER EISAKU SATO

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Prime Minister Sato of Japan is one of the great and distinguished leaders of the modern world. It was my great honor and pleasure to meet him during his recent visit to Washington.

I believe Prime Minister Sato will join hands with our country in moving the free world forward into an era of strength, peace, brotherhood and understanding.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and the people of the United States the outstanding address of Prime Minister Sato before the National Press Club here in Washington on November 21.

The speech follows:

SPEECH BY PRIME MINISTER EISAKU SATO OF JAPAN

President Heffernan, distinguished members and guests: It is the third time that I am addressing you here at the National Press Club. Looking around me, I see quite a number of familiar faces. On this occasion, it is my great privilege and pleasure to speak to you about the new development in international politics and the new relationship between Japan and the United States—what can almost be called the New Pacific Age—which has been brought forth by the current talks between President Nixon and myself.

It is hardly necessary to mention that, for Japan, its relations with the United States are much more important than its relations with any other country. At the same time, I am firmly convinced, not only that the relations of mutual friendship and trust with Japan are immensely important for the United States, but also that the

maintenance and promotion of such relations of mutual friendship and trust between Japan and the United States are indispensable conditions for the peace and stability of the Asian-Pacific region. Such being the case, it gave me the greatest pleasure to be able to hold these talks with President Nixon—who is not only an old acquaintance, but is also, of all American Presidents, the best acquainted with Japan, having visited our country six times.

In my talks with President Nixon, we had a frank exchange of views not only on relations between our two countries but also on a wide range of international political problems in general. The results were most satisfactory, and it is perhaps superfluous to mention that the most important result was the solution of the Okinawa problem. As you are aware, the problem of Okinawa has been the major outstanding issue in postwar relations between Japan and the United States. President Nixon and I were, at these talks, at last able to reach basic agreement that Okinawa would be returned to Japan during 1972 and the two governments would proceed to work out reversion agreement. The details of the agreement are set forth in the Joint Communique.

For a territorial status resulting from war to be changed, in a manner satisfactory to both parties, by peaceful negotiation, is a rare matter in world history. It may be said that Japan and the United States, by solving the problem of Okinawa in such a fashion, have shown a new method of solving international problems in step with the progress of the times, and have blazed the trail towards a new order based on friendship and trust and the way of true peace in the handling of international affairs. I am convinced that through the solution of the Okinawa problem, Japan and the United States have been able to build the firm foundations of a lasting mutual cooperation necessary for the future of the world from 1970 onwards.

There are a few things that I should particularly like to stress on this occasion. These are, the background which enabled this historic negotiation, how the return of Okinawa will shape the Japan-United States relations to come, and how it will affect international politics from 1970 onward.

In 1953, in the immediate postwar period, the Amami Islands, and in 1968, the Ogasawara (Bonin) Islands, were respectively returned to Japan through talks between Japan and the United States. However, Okinawa, with its 1 million Japanese inhabitants, has been left under the administration of the United States as a strategic stronghold for the maintenance of peace in the Far East. The biggest problem in the negotiations between Japan and the United States for the return of the islands was nothing more nor less than the role that Okinawa was playing in the maintenance of peace. Japan and the United States agree in their basic recognition of the importance of United States military bases on Okinawa. The peace-keeping function of the bases on Okinawa must continue to be kept effective. However, the fact that our territory, Okinawa, and the 1 million Japanese who live there have been kept under the administration of the United States since the end of the war has left an unresolved feeling in the hearts of the Japanese people—in other words, it has remained in our thoughts as a symbol of defeat, and this mental block has been exerting a subtle influence on the relations between Japan and the United States.

President Nixon and I have agreed on the return of Okinawa on the recognition that to maintain and promote the friendship and trust of the peoples of Japan and the United States, and to take this opportunity to greatly strengthen the partnership gradually built up, over the twenty-odd years of the postwar period, and based on mutual inter-

ests and common ideals, would serve the national interests of both countries and would also contribute toward the peace and development of Asia. In other words, the return of Okinawa has only been possible because Japan and the United States have points of agreement in the various basic democratic ideals such as personal liberty, equality, the respect for human rights and the realization of social justice. For the trust and the forbearance shown to us by the members of the United States Administration and Congress, and the friendship and good will shown to us by the people of the United States during these negotiations, I should like to express my deepest gratitude, and I was impressed even further by the strength of the ties between our two nations. On the other hand, it is a matter of deep regret that our Northern Territories, of which we were deprived as a result of the same World War II, have still not been returned to the homeland. Heartened by the shining example of Okinawa, I am determined to continue my efforts to realize, by peaceful means, the just demands of the Japanese people.

It is natural that, with the return of Okinawa, Japan should gradually assume the responsibility of the local defense of the islands. Japan's self-defense capabilities are already filling an important role in securing the primary defense of Japan and it is our policy to continue to consolidate such capabilities. For my part, it is my expectation and conviction that the United States, in response to the hopes of the free nations, will continue to maintain its function of deterring war in Asia along the lines of President Nixon's pronouncement at Guam.

In connection with this point, President Nixon and I both reaffirmed our intention firmly to maintain the Japan-United States Security Treaty. Of course, the first objective of Japan in continuing this treaty is to ensure Japan's own security by filling the gaps on its own capabilities through cooperation with the United States. However, in the real international world it is impossible to adequately maintain the security of Japan without international peace and security of the Far East. This is where the second objective of the Japan-United States Security Treaty comes to the foreground—the cooperation of Japan and the United States in the form of the use of facilities and areas in Japan by United States forces under Article VI thereof for the security of the Far East in a broader context. And it would be in accord with our national interest for us to determine our response to prior consultation regarding the use of these facilities and areas in the light of the need to maintain the security of the Far East, including Japan.

In particular, if an armed attack against the Republic of Korea were to occur, the security of Japan would be seriously affected. Therefore, should an occasion arise for United States forces in such an eventuality to use facilities and areas within Japan as bases for military combat operations to meet the armed attack, the policy of the Government of Japan towards prior consultation would be to decide its position positively and promptly on the basis of the foregoing recognition.

The maintenance of peace in the Taiwan area is also a most important factor for our own security. I believe in this regard that the determination of the United States to uphold her treaty commitments to the Republic of China should be fully appreciated. However, should unfortunately a situation ever occur in which such treaty commitments would actually have to be invoked against an armed attack from the outside, it would be a threat to the peace and security of the Far East including Japan. Therefore, in view of our national interest, we would deal with

the situation on the basis of the foregoing recognition, in connection with the fulfillment by the United States of its defense obligations. However, I am glad to say, such a situation cannot be foreseen today.

I pray that peace will return to the Indo-Chinese peninsula as soon as possible, and that the peoples of the area will be able to work again for stability and prosperity; at the same time, I am earnestly exploring what role Japan could play to cooperate with such efforts. I believe that Japan's role should be, naturally, to cooperate in the rehabilitation and development of the economy of the Indo-Chinese peninsula, and if we are asked, to participate in, and to cooperate with, in a manner best suited to Japan, any international peace-keeping machinery which may be set up after the cessation of hostilities. I express my deep respect for the sincere efforts being made by President Nixon and all those Americans concerned toward the realization of a peaceful and just settlement of the problems of Vietnam and Laos, and also for the sacrifices that the United States has made to assure the people of South Vietnam the opportunity to determine their own political future without outside interference. At the same time, I have a deep understanding of the position of the United States and sincerely hope that such efforts will bear fruit.

At the beginning of my remarks today, I mentioned a "New Pacific Age". This is the age where, having put an end in name and in fact to the "postwar" era with the return of Okinawa, Japan, in cooperation with the United States, will make its contribution to the peace and prosperity of the Asian-Pacific region and hence to the entire world. Again, this may be seen as a transition from a "closed" relationship between Japan and the United States, confined to the solution of bilateral problems which concern the two countries alone, to an "open relationship, where both countries will now be able to work together to further promote broad international cooperation.

In order to facilitate such a transition, it is first necessary to formulate a projection of the 1970's. I believe that the 1970's will not mark a radical change from the 1960's, when the United States and the Soviet Union were shouldering the primary capacity and responsibility for the maintenance of world peace, but when other countries were also enlarging their spheres of independent action in accordance with their respective objectives.

In other words, this means that, first of all, we place great expectations on the two major powers, the United States and the Soviet Union. That is, it would be necessary for the United States and the Soviet Union to devote even greater efforts than they did in the 1960's towards such problems as further relaxation of tensions, peaceful settlement of local disputes such as are seen in the Middle East, and the realization of various arms control measures, all for the maintenance of world peace. In this sense, the Japanese people strongly hope that the negotiations between the two major powers for the limitation of strategic arms, which have recently begun, will become the starting point for future general disarmament.

It could also be said that the 1970's will be a decade when the various major countries other than the United States and the Soviet Union should assume greater responsibilities. We have a profound concern over the future of Communist China which is at present devoting great efforts to the development of nuclear arms, and the relationship that the United States and the Soviet Union will have, respectively, with Communist China. Having the United States, the Soviet Union and Communist China as our neighbors, Japan strongly hopes that in the 1970's Communist China will live in peace with the United States and the Soviet Union, in

the same way as the efforts for maintaining peace between the United States and the Soviet Union have developed. It is to be hoped also that Communist China will revise the rigid posture that it has been taking, and participate in international society as a country that will carry out its responsibilities in a constructive manner in the cause of international peace. For this purpose, I consider that both the United States and Japan should always keep their doors open towards Communist China.

The responsibilities that must be shouldered by Japan and the Western European countries in the 1970's will also be great. The role that these countries could be expected to play for easing international tensions or for the harmonious development of the world economy is expected to increase in the future. When we realize that the North-South problem is one of the greatest tasks which mankind will have to face and endeavor to resolve for a long time to come, we strongly feel the necessity for the industrial nations to transcend their short term interests and to make further concerted efforts to assist the developing countries in their nation-building. An age when Japan and the United States, the two great countries on both sides of the Pacific, cooperate with this perspective in mind; this is what I would call the New Pacific Age.

Next comes the problem of what form such cooperation between our two countries should take. As far as the bilateral relations between our two countries are concerned, it is quite obvious that with the settlement of the Okinawa problem, one of the most pressing issues facing us would be in the economic field. This involves various issues related to capital transactions and trade, and efforts to ease the relations between the United States and Japan are already being exerted by responsible persons in each country. It is my intention to exert my further efforts on this matter. In the 1970's, it is expected that both the cooperative and the competitive aspects in the economic field between our two countries will increase not only in our bilateral relations but also in other parts of the world. In this respect some friction may tend to arise between our two countries. However, compared with the magnitude of the benefits which will accrue through the deepening of mutual dependence as seen in the immense amount of trade between our two countries, the friction which may occasionally arise from competition is hardly important.

What is more important is to always understand the other country's position, and in the spirit of give and take, to make the necessary considerations within the framework of international rules so that localized frictions do not harm the broader, political ties between our two countries.

It is with this in mind that I have pursued the policy of liberalization of both trade and capital. As a matter of fact, in December, 1968, the Japanese Government in a Cabinet decision decided to conduct an overall review of the import quota items at an early date and to liberalize, within two or three years, a substantial range of those items. Last month the Japanese Government followed it up with the decision to have the number of the existing import quota items by the end of 1971, and to render utmost efforts to liberalize the remaining items under control. In the field of foreign capital liberalization, efforts have been made to widen the scope of the industries in which foreign capital can profitably invest.

I am determined to further promote this policy of trade and capital liberalization, and, at the same time, it is to be hoped that the United States will continue her stable economic growth and preserve her liberal economic policy.

In Asia, where Japan and the United States have a common concern, efforts being made

by the countries in the region for self-help, regional cooperation by countries with common interest, and economic and technical assistance from industrialized countries have combined to bring about a gradual increase in the speed of development, and in many areas progress may be seen in the establishment of a stable national system and in the initiatives taken in economic construction. In spite of all this, poverty in Asia has yet to be overcome, and we can hardly say that the foundation has been laid for the sustained development of the Asian countries. This situation in Asia is not expected to change significantly in the 1970's.

It is here that I find one of the greatest challenges for my country as the leading industrialized nation in Asia. The national goal that we have to pursue in the 1970's is to cooperate, in nonmilitary fields, with the Asian countries that differ in race, religion and culture, in their efforts to secure prosperity through mutual cooperation while preserving their freedom and independence. Since the United States plays the central role in preserving global peace and also holds great responsibility for the security of Asia, I believe that it is Japan rather than the United States that should take the leading role in such fields as economic and technical assistance towards the nation-building efforts of the Asian countries.

Although Japan has become the second economic power in the free world, the gap in economic potential between my country and the United States is still very large, and the fact remains that Japan's per capita income is only the world's twentieth. We also face the difficult task of overcoming the great insufficiency in social capital and public investments. At the same time, however, there is emerging among the Japanese people a desire to play a meaningful role in making a positive contribution to the world. There is no doubt that the settlement of the Okinawa problem will give confidence to the Japanese people and that it will become the turning point in directing the constructive will of the nation to the aim of bringing stability to Asia.

We have already set our goal for the 1970's to make it the decade for Asian development, but Japan alone cannot hope to secure the peace and prosperity of Asia. Along with the efforts of the Asian countries themselves, both the material and moral cooperation of the industrialized countries that have a great interest in this area are required. This is because in the construction of a new Asia, not only the material aspects such as the eradication of poverty, famine and disease but the attainment by the Asian people of freedom and social justice must also become one of the goals. Here again I find the shape of a New Pacific Age, where a new order will be created by Japan and the United States, two countries tied together by common ideals.

The cooperation between Japan and the United States is not confined to our two countries or just Asia. As this cooperation is one between the first and second ranking economic powers in the free world, it would extend over a wide range of global problems which I dealt with earlier in my projection of the 1970's, such as the easing of general tensions, the strengthening of the function of the United Nations, arms control and the realization of disarmament, the settlement of the North-South problem, the preservation of the free trade system and the securing of a stable international monetary system.

Now, in order to establish such a wide range of cooperation, what should we bear in mind? It is essential that the peoples of both countries increase their understanding of each other and foster mutual trust. Exactly one hundred years ago, forty Japanese immigrants came to the United States for the first time, but now, over one hundred thousand Japanese visit the United States an-

nually, and more than two hundred thousand Americans visit Japan each year. As the contacts between our peoples deepen through such direct contacts or by means of the mass media, the erroneous image that our peoples sometimes had of each other will be corrected, and they will begin to understand that both Japan and the United States have their own culture and tradition, and that both are countries facing a multitude of complex problems. And it is in this way that a proper evaluation on the unique roles that each of our two countries has to play will become possible.

The United States is a country of wide open spaces, a multiracial nation, a Federation of States, and, above all, a superpower. On the other hand, Japan is a country confined to a limited land area and inhabited by a homogeneous race, and it is also one of the many countries of Asia. Both are leading industrialized countries and share the common democratic ideals of liberty and the respect of human rights, but there are these fundamental differences of which I have spoken.

On the other hand, Japan and the United States are surprisingly similar in some aspects. Nowhere is there such a high degree of social mobility nor is the rule of fair competition, applied so universally than in our two countries. We can also find some similarity in the rapid adaptation of our various domestic systems to our increasingly mass information-oriented societies and the wide diffusion of higher education. We are also able to see a similarity in the national characteristic where both the Japanese and the Americans are never satisfied with the present, and their tendency to constantly endeavor to bring about a better society in the future.

The role of preserving freedom and stability that the United States plays at the center of a wide range of international organizations covering political, economic and security fields is unique, and can be replaced by no other country. Japan's way of life of dedication to peace also has its unique aspects. I am convinced that if we each recognize the national sentiment and the national characteristics of the other, and respect each other's position although our immediate interests may not always coincide, a system of truly substantial cooperation can most certainly be realized.

From this viewpoint, I believe that our two countries should widen the range of policy options in both their bilateral and multilateral relations. It is desirable to maintain a state of affairs where it is always possible to engage in a broad and flexible dialogue.

If Japan and the United States can bring off this kind of cooperation, it is then that the New Pacific Age will become rich in substance. I personally have high expectations and strong belief in the future of this New Pacific Age. The American people, who once developed the New World in the face of tremendous hardship and want, and in our own time, succeeded in the Apollo project through brilliant organization and personal courage, will certainly conquer the present problems they face in the political, economic and social fields, and this will exert a stabilizing effect on the entire world. Her partner, Japan, has achieved an economic growth during the twenty-odd post-war years which is outstanding in the world, and having become a power for stability in Asia, is a country that is about to tackle, with vigor, the problems of the future.

It can be said that the two great nations across the Pacific, of quite different ethnic and historical backgrounds, are on the verge of starting a great historical experiment in working together for a new order in the world, on a dimension that transcends a bilateral alliance. Although this experiment has just begun, I have full faith that this experiment will surely be successful due to the good will, mutual trust and efforts of our

two nations. I am especially pleased that it was President Nixon and I who set this experiment in motion by bringing about the return of Okinawa.

Thank you for your attention.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION CALENDAR FOR DECEMBER 1969

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the schedule for the month of December at the Smithsonian Institution. As always, the Smithsonian has a variety of events planned for this month, as well as special presentations for the holiday season. It is pleasant to note that there are a number of events especially for children during this Christmas holiday, particularly the programs of yule folksongs and the puppet show, "The Wizard of Oz."

During this holiday season, I hope everyone will take advantage of the excellent, high-level events scheduled at the Smithsonian Institution. There is something for each member of the family to enjoy.

The schedule follows:

CALENDAR OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, DECEMBER 1969

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1969

The Glowns Never Laugh: the work of Walt Kuhn; John Marin; this is Ben Shahn; Charles Burchfield. Smithsonian Film theatre presentation. This quartet of award-winning films suggests how the experiences of four modern American painters are expressed in their works—ranging from brilliant brush strokes depicting the world seen through nature's prisms to stark, dynamic cityscapes and introspective figure studies. 2 p.m., auditorium, National Museum of History and Technology; 8 p.m., auditorium, National Museum of Natural History. Introduction by Mrs. Adelyn Breeskin, curator of contemporary art, National Collection of Fine Arts.

Concert. Informal performance using instruments from the national collections. 4:30 p.m., Hall of Musical Instruments, National Museum of History and Technology.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1969

The Creative Screen. Jiri Trinka. Produced in Czechoslovakia. Behind-the-scenes views of the fantastic fairy tale world created by the famous puppet-animator. *Light.* How different kinds of light can change the way we see things and the many ways artists have used light to achieve their purposes. Films will be shown every half hour from noon until 3 p.m. Free admission at the National Collection of Fine Arts.

In the Company of Artists. Smithsonian Film Theatre repeat. Noon, auditorium, National Museum of History and Technology.

Stratified Sites of Early Archaic Periods. Lecture by Dr. J. L. Coe, University of North Carolina. 2 p.m., Room 43, National Museum of Natural History.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1969

32 Washington Artists. Sales exhibition of graphics, paintings, and sculpture by artists currently represented in the 1970 appointment calendar, *Art in Washington.* Museum shop, National Collection of Fine Arts. Through January 31.

Candle Making Workshop, under the direction of Joyce Cooper. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates. By subscription only. For information call 381-6159.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1969

Misfortunes of the Immortals: A concert with Morton Subotnick and the Dorian Woodwind Quintet. Open Rehearsal from 11 a.m. to 3 p.m. Natural History auditorium. Donation \$1.00 (with concert ticket). Co-sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates and the Division of Performing Arts. For information call 381-6158.

Candle Making Workshop. Repeat. See December 5 entry for details.

Perceptions II/World Premiere—Misfortunes of the Immortals: A concert composed and performed by Morton Subotnick with the Woodwind Quintet. 8:30 p.m., auditorium, National Museum of Natural History. Tickets, \$4.00. For information call 381-6158.

Young People's Macrame Workshop, under the direction of Mary Walker Phillips. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates. By subscription only. For information call 381-6159.

The Creative Screen. Repeat of Jiri Trinka and Light. See December 4 entry for details.

The Camera and the Human Facade. Special exhibition of 200 photographs and photographic albums showing aspects of man and giving insights into the human character. National Museum of History and Technology. Through March 8, 1970.

The Scotland Project. Lecture by architect Rurick Ekstrom. 3 p.m., National Collection of Fine Arts.

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1969

Composer's Workshop, with Morton Subotnick: Description and discussion of simple control systems. 3 p.m., auditorium, National Museum of Natural History. Tickets, \$5.00. Limited to 50 persons. Co-sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates and the Division of Performing Arts. For information call 381-6158.

Young People's Macrame Workshop. Repeat. See December 6 entry for details.

Perceptions II: Misfortunes of the Immortals. Repeat performance. See December 6 entry for details.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1969

Uganda and Kenya—Lands and Peoples, illustrated lecture by international lecturing and film-making team, W. Gurnee Dyer, Vice President, American Museum of Natural History, and Mrs. Dyer. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates for members and their guests. 8:30 p.m., auditorium, National Museum of Natural History. Doors open at 8 p.m. Public admitted at 8:25 p.m. as seats are available.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1969

The Eye of Picasso. A Smithsonian Film Theatre Presentation. In this French-produced tribute to Picasso, the artist discusses his work, describing how he seeks to impress the mind as well as the eye. 2 p.m., auditorium, National Museum of History and Technology; 8 p.m., auditorium, National Museum of Natural History. Introduction by Mrs. Jan Keene Myhlert, National Collection of Fine Arts.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1969

Encounter With DDT—Persistent Biocides in the Environment. Third in a series of panel discussions, in which the audience is asked to participate, on critical issues of today. Dr. Richard Cowan, director, National Museum of Natural History, will chair this session. Panel members are: Dr. Roy Hansberry, Shell Development Company; Dr. Raymond Johnson, Bureau of Sport Fisheries; Dr. Thomas Jukes, University of California Space Sciences Laboratory; and Dr. Robert Riesborough, University of California Institute of Marine Research. 8:30 p.m., auditorium, National Museum of Natural History. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates and

directed by Dr. William Aron, Smithsonian Office of Oceanography.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1969

Milton Avery. One of America's modern masters is here accorded the first major retrospective of his works since his death in 1965. One hundred paintings and 27 graphics have been selected for this exhibition by Adelyn D. Breeskin, who calls Avery "the American artist whose color and general approach is closest to that of the great French artist Henri Matisse." At the National Collection of Fine Arts through January 30, 1970.

Perceptions II/World Premier: Game Opera No. 1, composed and directed by Loran Carrier, and featuring an outstanding company of total performers. 8:30 p.m., Hall 10, National Museum of Natural History. Co-sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates and the Division of Performing Arts. Tickets, \$3.00. For information Call 381-6158.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1969

Sing out for Christmas, children's yule folk songs. All children in the Washington area are invited to participate. Banjo and guitar accompaniment by special guests. 4 p.m. to 5 p.m., first floor Pendulum area, National Museum of History and Technology. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Division of Performing Arts.

Perceptions II/World Premiere: Game Opera No. 1. Repeat performance. See December 12 entry for details.

Composer's Workshop, With Loran Carrier: Game Theory and Music Composition. 3 p.m., Hall 10, National Museum of Natural History. Limited to 50 persons. Tickets, \$2.50. For information call 381-6158.

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1969

Rediscovered American Painters. Lecture by Theodore E. Stebbens, Jr., Yale University Art Gallery. 4 p.m., at the National Collection of Fine Arts.

Perceptions II/World Premiere: Game Opera No. 1. Repeat performance. See December 12 entry for details.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1969

A Program of Christmas Music, directed by James Weaver, 8:30 p.m., Hall of Musical Instruments, National Museum of History and Technology.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1969

Marc Chagall and Shalom of Safed: The Innocent Eye of a Man From Galilee. Two Smithsonian Film Theatre presentations. The emergence of a primitive artistic style is revealed through an analysis of the background and philosophies of two contemporary foreign painters. Introduction by Donald R. McClelland, National Collection of Fine Arts. 2 p.m., auditorium, National Museum of History and Technology; 8 p.m., auditorium, National Museum of Natural History.

Christmas Music. Informal performance using instruments from the national collections. 4:30 p.m., Hall of Musical Instruments, National Museum of History and Technology.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1969

The Creative Screen. Serenal. Award-winning film-maker Norman McLaren salutes the West Indies in a flow of abstract color images with exciting background music by Trinidad's Gran Curucaya Orchestra. *The Americans: Three East Coast Artists*. Visit with Jack Tworokov and Hans Hoffman as they work in their Provincetown studios. View the last film taken of Milton Avery in which he expresses his thoughts from his New York apartment studio. Continuous showings from noon until 3 p.m., at the National Collection of Fine Arts.

Marc Chagall and Shalom of Safed: The Innocent Eye of a Man From Galilee. Smithsonian Film Theatre repeats. Noon, auditorium, National Museum of History and Technology.

Functional Aspects of Photosynthetic Lamellae. Lecture by Dr. E. Moudrianakis, Department of Biology, The Johns Hopkins University. 2 p.m., Room 43, National Museum of Natural History.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1969

The Creative Screen: Serenal and The Americans: Three East Coast Artists. Repeat. See December 18 entry for details.

Sing Out for Christmas. See December 13 entry for details.

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1969

Sing Out for Christmas.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 22, 1969

Sing Out for Christmas. See December 13 entry for details.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 23, 1969

Sing Out for Christmas.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 25, 1969

All Smithsonian Buildings are Closed.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 26, 1969

Sing Out for Christmas. See December 13 entry for details.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 27, 1969

Last Saturday Jazz, featuring the Eddie Gale octet. National Museum of Natural History auditorium. 8:00 p.m. Tickets at \$2.00 may be purchased at the door. Presented by the Left Bank Jazz Society in cooperation with the Smithsonian Division of Performing Arts.

MUSEUM TOURS

National collection of fine arts

Daily tours at 11 a.m. and 1 p.m. Weekend tours 2 p.m., Saturday and Sunday. For advance reservations and full information, call 381-5188 or 381-6100; messages 381-5180.

National Zoo

Tours are available for groups on weekdays 10 a.m. to 12 noon. Arrangements may be made by calling—two weeks in advance—CO 5-1868 Extension 268.

Visitors may purchase animal artifacts and specially designed souvenirs and books at the KIOSK, which is operated by Friends of the Zoo volunteers as a public service and to raise funds for educational programs. Open daily 11 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Museum of History and Technology

Free public tours of the National Museum of History and Technology during weekends are sponsored by the Smithsonian and operated by the Junior League of Washington. They will be conducted on Saturdays and Sundays through May 1970.

The tours begin at the Pendulum on the first floor, and each tour lasts for approximately one hour. Saturday tours begin at 10:30 and at noon, and at 1:30 and 3:00 p.m. Sunday tours begin at 1:30 and 3:00 p.m.

Tours are available to anyone who wants to join the docent stationed at the Pendulum at the above-specified times. However, if you would like to plan a special group tour, call 381-5542 to make arrangements.

National Portrait Gallery

Tours are now available for adults and children at 10:00 a.m. and 11:00 a.m. For information on adult tours call 381-5380; for children's tours, 381-5680.

FOREIGN STUDY TOURS, 1970-71

The Smithsonian has organized several special tours concerned with archeology, architectural history, art museums, private collections, and natural preserves.

1970

Mexico and the Yucatan Peninsula. January 9-23. Dr. R. H. Howland and Dr. Franklin K. Paddock will accompany a group of 30 through the historic sites of the Yucatan Peninsula and Mexico. \$1,900 of which \$200 is tax deductible. (Itinerary available.)

Nepal, East Pakistan, Thailand, Cambodia, Hong Kong, Taiwan and Japan based in

Kyoto for the Osaka's Expo 1970, returning via Tokyo). March-April 3. \$2,350 of which \$400 is tax deductible. Dr. Howland and Mr. Roger Pineau will accompany. (Itinerary available.)

Classical Greece. July 6-27, for teachers, students and those making their first visit in this area; an exceptionally inexpensive tour. A yacht has been chartered for 5 days to sail among the islands. \$700. (Itinerary available.)

Greek Islands and Byzantine Greece. A deluxe tour, which will include a visit to the island of Crete. Dr. Howland will accompany. (Itinerary available shortly.)

Northern Italy (in the footsteps of Palladio). Venice, Verona and Vicenza. September 12 for three weeks . . . \$1,600 of which \$350 is tax deductible.

1971

Asiatic Turkey. This tour has been carried forward to April of 1971 to benefit more favorable climatic conditions.

Contemplated tours to Ireland in June; Africa; and Russia under snow just before Christmas!

Red China. Negotiations to take a group to Red China are under way. Possibly in the Fall of 1970.

For reservation and details contact: Mrs. Susan Kennedy, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560 or call 202-381-5520.

MUSEUM SHOPS AND BOOK SHOPS

(Open to public during all regular hours)

Museum shops

1. National Museum of History and Technology—Rotunda.
2. Natural History Building—Constitution Avenue Entrance.
3. Arts and Industries Building—Mall Entrance.
4. Freer Gallery of Art—Mall Entrance.
5. National Museum of History and Technology—Mall Entrance.

Books shops

1. National Museum of History and Technology—Constitution Avenue Entrance.
2. Natural History Building—Mall Entrance.
3. National Collection of Fine Arts—Main Floor, 8th and G.
4. National Portrait Gallery—F Street Entrance.

CHRISTMAS GIFT SUGGESTIONS FROM THE SMITHSONIAN

The Museum Shops is featuring a Christmas display in the Rotunda of the National Museum of History and Technology.

There are dolls from 14 countries, puppets from Germany, India, Sweden and the United States and Christmas ornaments from Mexico, Germany, Thailand, Taiwan, and the mountain communities of Appalachia.

Creche groups done by American Indians are available along with ones from Sweden, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Denmark.

The Christmas Shop, designed as the magical interior of a vast Hansel and Gretel house, includes a gingerbread house made for the Smithsonian by Braun's Catering Service. Braun's will also prepare unique decorative cookies, some almost a yard high, from a collection of early 19th century cookie molds.

Dolls, creches, games, toys and decorations are all combined in the exhibition to illustrate the origin of America's Christmas traditions.

THE SMITHSONIAN ASSOCIATES

You are invited to participate directly in the Institution's far-reaching education and research activities by becoming a member of the Smithsonian Associates. Through numerous programs for members, the Associates provide infinitely varied opportunities to explore the arts, sciences, and humanities. Call 381-5157 for information on fees and programs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

URBAN TRANSIT: PROBLEMS AND PROMISE

Special exhibition sponsored by the United States Department of Transportation. On the balcony of the West Hall of the Arts and Industries Building. The exhibit will feature sixty-two panoramic drawings and several working models of innovative urban transit facilities and methods. Through February.

CHRISTMAS CARDS

The Museum Shop in the National Collection of Fine Arts is currently offering Christmas cards featuring reproductions of paintings in the collection by James McNeill Whistler, Agnes Tait, Raphael Peale, Child Hassam, John Twachtman, and Charles Burchfield.

MUSEUM HOURS

Smithsonian Museums are open to the public 7 days a week. Hours: 10 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. daily.

CAFETERIA HOURS

Open 10:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. (Located in the History and Technology Building, 12th Street and Constitution Ave. N.W.)

HOURS AT NATIONAL ZOO

Gates open 6 a.m., close 5:30 p.m. Buildings open 9 a.m., close 4:30 p.m.

NATIONAL GALLERY CALENDAR OF EVENTS

For a Calendar of Events at the National Gallery of Art, which is separately administered, please write to the Office of Information, National Gallery of Art, 6th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20565, or call 737-4215.

VICTORY FOR COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all Members of the House of Representatives join me today in applauding the resolution of the railroad labor dispute without a national strike. Today's announcement of a new contract is a victory for the collective bargaining system and for the American people. The threatened strike has been averted through skillful negotiation and conciliation and without the threat of undue executive interference.

We should all be proud of the tremendous contributions which the Honorable George P. Shultz, Secretary of Labor, and the Honorable Willis J. Usery, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Labor for Labor Management Relations made to the resolution of this dispute.

This entire procedure has shown once again the strength of our collective bargaining system and its ability to function in the exchange of views and positions between labor and management. It has shown that the legislation under which the collective bargaining process works is helpful in providing a vehicle for the exchange of positions and for resolving differences without undue Government interference. The rights of the workingmen to improve their situation and the rights of management to control the future of their corporations have both been preserved and enhanced by the mutual agreement on the terms of a new contract.

December 5, 1969

THEODORE ROOSEVELT SHRINE IN BUFFALO IS BOUGHT BY THE UNITED STATES; RESTORATION WORK TO BEGIN

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, just a little more than 3 years ago, on November 2, 1966, then President Lyndon B. Johnson signed into law legislation which I sponsored to preserve the Ansley Wilcox Mansion in my home city of Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic shrine.

The Wilcox House is where Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office as President September 14, 1901, after the tragic death of President William McKinley.

This week, the National Parks Service purchased the mansion under the law which permitted the Government to spend \$250,000 toward purchase of the building, plus \$50,000 toward its restoration.

The effort to save and arrange for restoration of this famous edifice has been long and hard. I am indebted to many of my colleagues now and previously in the Congress for their help to me in this community project.

In order to provide the balance of the funding for the restoration, the Roosevelt Inaugural Site Foundation was formed in Buffalo and now has assembled nearly all the financing needed to complete the restoration.

We have had truly a community-wide effort. Indeed, as was pointed out during the announcement meeting this week, this is the first for the entire Nation involving such coordination between the National Parks Service and a community group.

Mr. Speaker, the following story from the Buffalo Courier-Express details many facets of the local fundraising effort and the key participants:

U.S. PURCHASES MANSION

Restoration of the Ansley Wilcox Mansion as a National Shrine to Theodore Roosevelt was officially cleared Monday with the announcement that the National Parks Foundation had formally purchased the building at Delaware near North, from the Liberty National Bank and Trust Co.

"This is a first for the entire nation," Walter S. Dunn Jr., director of the Buffalo Historical Society, said. "Never before has the National Parks Service worked with a community group in the restoration of a national historic shrine."

MAY SET NEW PATTERN

"This pilot project is being watched by the federal government and may set a new pattern in the United States."

It was pointed out that the federal government cannot afford to buy and restore all of the historic sites communities wish to preserve.

"In the past some citizens have requested shrines just to channel federal funds into their communities," said Dunn.

Dunn was authorized by William K. Kimmins Jr., chairman The Roosevelt Inaugural Site Foundation, to contact the regional office of the National Parks Service for permission to go ahead with the work on a local level.

SPINK COMMENTS

E. Perry Spink, president of the Liberty National Bank and Trust Co., and a member of the Foundation, said that local management would be "cheaper and more effective" than having the work done through national channels.

One of the first moves will be to hire an architect, Dunn stated, and recommended Olaf Shelgren, who already has done considerable planning on the building on a voluntary basis.

One of the requirements of the National Parks Service was that in addition to funds already allocated \$80,000 more should be raised locally.

"We now have all but \$28,000 of this quota," said Frank D. Leavers, chairman of fund raising. "Now that we have this project off the ground and the Wilcox Mansion is now in the possession of the Foundation and the National Parks Service, we should be able to collect this sum in 30 days."

CITES A FACTOR IN LAG

"One reason we have had trouble collecting money is that a lot of people have been under the impression that this project would never get off the ground."

Leavers also suggested that the Parks Service accept donations and service in lieu of cash.

The Banks of Buffalo have pledged \$11,000 annually and the Erie County Legislation \$15,000 for the operation and maintenance of the shrine.

More than \$2,000 has been received in Owen B. Augspurger memorial contributions. Augspurger, who was a former chairman of the Foundation, was killed in an accident last summer.

DULSKI IS PRAISED

During the foundation meeting high praise was offered for Rep. Thaddeus J. Dulski, who headed the long and bitter battle in Congress to have a bill approved for the purchase of the property by the Parks Service.

The congressional bill appropriated \$250,000 for acquisition of the property and \$50,000 toward restoration. The current estimate for restoration and rehabilitation is \$267,000.

OTHER AVENUE

The New York State Historic Trust has appropriated \$87,000 and the Junior League of Buffalo, with its donation of \$50,000 is the highest local contributor.

"This certainly is a joint endeavor—federal, state and local governments and the local community," said Kimmins.

Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office for president in the Wilcox Mansion in September, 1901. The mansion will be the only national shrine in the state west of the Hudson River.

DRUGS—FOR OR AGAINST YOU

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this week I received an encouraging letter from a young constituent of mine in Fort Lauderdale, Miss Susan Seger, concerning the dangers of drug use by young people.

Miss Seger's comments are concise and to the point, and reflect, I feel, a great deal of wisdom on the part of someone who is only in the 10th grade.

At this time, I would like to bring her remarks to the attention of my colleagues in the House, for they were made

CXV—2357—Part 28

by the kind of young American who represents the real future of this Nation:

DRUGS—FOR OR AGAINST YOU

Drugs, a simple five letter word that is used almost every day. Not just used in pronunciation but in the form of acid, pills, grass and many others you can name. I feel that anyone who buys, sells or peddles any kind of a harmful drug should be institutionalized where they can receive medical help or understanding where needed.

Anyone who cannot realize the dangerous risks involved in the usage of narcotics is in need of help. I see no great reward in having brain damage come sooner or later. It has been proven over and over what drugs can do. Just because one person says "It's the greatest, do it" someone does. What happens to one person does not mean it will happen to all. No two people are alike. Why try and find out the hard way. Just think, are drugs for you or against you?

SUSAN SEGER,
Stranahan School.

FIGHT THE GOLD FLOOR PROPOSAL

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the enlightened and courageous leaders of our international monetary policy have just delivered us out of the hands of gold zealots and gold speculators. The latter were trying to force an artificial increase in the price of gold and were foiled. Now they are back seeking an artificial but officially supported floor for gold. "A pox on their house," I say. We should send them packing once again.

What the bullion dealers, their clients, and the gold extractors want is a secure and sheltered market supported and risk limited by official governments, especially the United States. Let the gold suppliers of South Africa and the U.S.S.R. have the responsibility for the "free" market of gold. For once the law of supply and demand should function with full risk for the fat cats of the bullion market. They have enjoyed the greatest artificially cushioned, sweetened market condition in the experience of modern times. They had the gold pool to underwrite their borrowing for speculation and the \$35 floor to safeguard serious losses. Let them go it alone for awhile.

The assurance for protection of value for presently held gold reserves do not—I repeat, do not—require a floor on gold. All that is required is honor among established governments to maintain an agreed price reference for reserves to be used in settling accounts at the \$35-per-ounce figure. Leave the private gold market to its own devices. I assure one and all that, as painful as the move will be for the gold suppliers, the bullion brokers, and the speculators, the commercial gold users will not find the circumstances strange nor harmful.

The gold overhang resulting from the shakeout of gold hoarding by the worst of the speculators is a temporary phenomena. For the time being it is painful for the hoarder—a fact that illicit tears from me. It is worrisome to the

gold extractors, which is a humbling but not disastrous experience for those who a short while back had a throttle hold on key currencies. It provides a loss of undeserved haven for the bullion brokers of London, Paris, Frankfurt, and Zurich but they have been around for 50 years and can be expected to not only survive but continue to prosper.

Having gained a well-deserved freedom from the gold manipulators and dealers, please, I beg, let us not now blow it.

If governments keep their powder dry; if bankers do not venture to rush in where governments declare they will not tread then bullion dealers will wait and market management and prudent promotion will fall to South African gold producers and their colleagues which is where commodity market responsibilities should lie. We would then see a clear future for the freedom of the international reserve system from the importunings and costs of the industrial and speculative gold trade. A goal devoutly to be desired—a condition clearly within reach.

Treasury officials of these United States take note. IMF representatives of the United States mark well.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a recent article on the gold market from the London Economist included after my remarks. Also, I would like to have included two excerpts from the Washington Post. I know this subject matter is considered by most of my colleagues as beyond their ken but I would hope that all would take the time to review these materials. It is, in my view, exceedingly important that we realize our past policies have served a passel of international parasites. We have rid the international monetary body of their debilitatory attachment let us not be parties to a voluntary reattachment.

The material follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 23, 1969]

GOLD SPECULATORS GLUM

(By Hobart Rowen)

The spectacular slide in the price of gold is a happy development—happy, that is, except for South African gold producers trying to prop up the price and speculators who have been betting that the producers would win out.

As an indication of how things change in this fast-moving world, today's big question in gold is whether the price will have to be supported to prevent it from moving below the "official" \$35 an ounce level!

In addition to the South Africans and speculators, there are some banks hurting too—notably the usually canny Swiss private banks that bought large amounts of gold well over \$40, and lately have been unloading their hoards.

The drop in gold from a peak of nearly \$44 earlier this year is a triumph for intelligence over mythology, for planning over taboos. But it also involves an element of luck associated with the student revolution in France last year.

Essentially, the price of gold is lower because confidence in the international monetary system—in currencies—is greater. When paper money is suspect, people want to get rid of it, and stuff gold—although it earns no interest—under the mattress. Essentially, but the more sophisticated do the same thing, but because they expect to make a profit on a rise in the price.

That, in a broad way, was what was happening in 1967 and early 1968, when gold speculators raided central bank reserves—through the London gold "pool"—for about \$3 billion in gold at \$35 an ounce. The British pound had been devalued and the smart money in Europe was betting that the dollar would go the same way.

Finally, in a historic move, the seven major financial powers cut the flow off on March 17, 1968, and established a two-tier system: the \$35 price was maintained for official transactions, but the price was free to fluctuate in private markets (the other tier) in response to demand and supply.

That was the big step: in essence, it was the beginning of demonetizing gold, a process of letting the monetary function of gold fade away. What the seven powers were saying was that the \$40 billion in the existing gold reserves was "money" gold, but that newly mined gold would become a mere commodity, good for such things as filling teeth, jewelry and industrial purposes.

Not everybody believed it, notably France—which had dropped out of the London gold pool, and therefore did not join in the Washington agreement. With total reserves of \$7 billion, including nearly \$4 billion in gold, the French government was a leading advocate of doubling the price of gold. (Fifteen months later, France had almost run through that seemingly fat reserve cushion.)

And the South Africans, who wanted both an assurance of a \$35 floor, plus freedom to play the private market for the highest possible price, held out to their gold. This was an attempt to frustrate the intention of the Washington agreement: the authors of the two-tier system calculated that if the central bankers bought no more gold for "money" purposes, the South Africans would have to sell all of their newly mined metal in the private market, depressing the price.

For a time, the case for the speculators looked fairly good: gold prices rose steadily, and suspicion of currencies was heightened by the collapse of the French economy under an assault led by Danny Cohn-Bendit.

But a weaker franc took pressure off the dollar; moreover, the crisis in France stilled one of the loudest voices pressing for an increase in the price of gold. Despite a continuing U.S. balance of payments deficit, there was a steady drift toward reliance on the dollar as the standard of the international monetary system.

The coup de grace was given by the Euro-dollar market: when average interest rates in London rose from 8.41 per cent in mid-May to 11.44 per cent in mid-July, it killed the gold market. Gold no longer was a good speculation, and the speculators cut and ran. With Euro-dollar rates at those levels, expert Edward M. Bernstein points out, gold would have to go up about \$4 an ounce to produce a comparable profit. But in the same two months, while Euro-dollar rates were booming, gold hit a peak and never got back to it.

All of this made it apparent that the U.S. could persevere in a tough attitude toward South Africa. And if a world anxious to improve its holdings of reserves (the French lesson was a shock) could no longer depend on the barbarous relic of the past, it had to look to something else.

If gold alone couldn't fulfill its old role as a reserve cushion, what could? The answer was ready-made and available, the Special Drawing Rights (SDR) system, sometimes called "paper gold," that this country had been trying to push down the throats of the gnomes of Zurich for a couple of years.

The victory over the gold speculators was nulled down early this summer by Treasury Under Secretary Paul Volcker when he won agreement from his counterparts in Western Europe for creation of an astonishingly high

volume of SDRs, \$3.5 billion the first year, and \$3 billion each in the second and third years.

This decision, ratified in September by the International Monetary Fund executive directors, assured an adequate growth of reserves without (1) new gold or (2) marking up the price of gold. I can report from my own conversations with Swiss bankers during the Copenhagen meeting of the American Bankers Association in May that they were thinking that an annual volume of \$1 billion in SDRs would be desirable, and that in no case should the figure go over \$2 billion. When the \$3-plus average for the next three years was assured, the gold game was over.

Confidence in the international monetary system has been helped not only by the SDRs and the success of the two-tier gold market, but by the re-alignment of exchange rates, especially the up-valuation of the German D-mark which followed the devaluation earlier this year of the French franc.

And when it came to boosting IMF quotas by about \$7 billion, some of the same clever heads who figured out the two-tier system and the SDRs, found out a way to do it without requiring a new supply of gold.

There would seem to be a good chance, now, of a period of calm ahead on the international monetary front—at least by comparison with the crises of the past two years. The new parities appear to be a better reflection of their real values. Moreover, there are studies under way of how to introduce more flexibility into the exchange rate system that will avoid the kind of crisis for which the gold bugs light candles.

Ironically, at the very moment that the dollar is strong and gold is weak, some Europeans still express worry that the dollar might be affected in future years by a large capital outflow, once high interest rates in the U.S. settle back.

But for the moment, that is only a gnawing concern, and for the somewhat distant future. As of now, officials can relish the repeated bulletins from the London market that show declines, instead of advances. With the overhang resulting from the speculative hoarding of 1967-68 still to be worked off, the South Africans would do well to get an agreement that gives them a floor price.

In all probability, the dollar today is worth more than 1/35 of an ounce of gold. Or, to put it another way, gold is probably worth less than \$35 an ounce. But to prove that point, bankers would have to mark down their own \$40 billion hoard—and that they're not likely to do.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Nov. 28, 1969]

U.S. MULLS FLOOR PRICE FOR SLIDING GOLD MARKET

(By Hobart Rowen)

A behind-the-scenes debate is taking place at high levels in the U.S. government on whether or not to place a floor price under the sliding gold market.

Pressure for such a floor, presumably at the "official" \$35 price, is coming not only from South Africa, the major producer, but from European governments who allege that if the price drops below \$35 an ounce, it would be unsettling to their citizens who own gold, and to some extent, to their own treasuries.

The unofficial market price for gold has dropped from nearly \$44 an ounce this past spring to within pennies of the \$35 official price. It closed in London Wednesday at \$35.60.

Key U.S. Treasury officials have had sporadic talks with the South African government for almost a year on whether a floor price should be instituted, and if so, at what level. There has been no agreement.

ADMINISTRATION HOPEFUL

But contrary to the view of some influential congressmen and other experts, the position of the Nixon administration is that it is possible to reach an agreement with South Africa that would be beneficial to the U.S.

"I am not taking the position that no agreement (with South Africa) would be desirable," a high official told The Washington Post. Presumably, the U.S. would have a quid pro quo for a floor price: South African agreement to push the bulk of its newly-mined gold into the unofficial, non-monetary market.

But this willingness to consider a deal with the South Africans draws the ire of Rep. Henry Reuss (D-Wis.), who heads the Joint Economic subcommittee on such matters.

Reuss says an agreement would be "stupid." The U.S., he says, should accept the opportunity provided by the lowered gold price "to be cool and correct." In that case, he argues, the South Africans "will have to sell their gold on the free market, and the price could drop to \$28 or even lower."

KENNEDY TRIP

Despite Reuss' objections, the U.S. will outline its conditions for a gold price deal to its major continental allies, when Treasury Secretary David M. Kennedy goes to Europe for a NATO conference next month.

Reuss also condemned the Treasury's failure to criticize West Germany for including \$25 million in South African rand in its recent \$540 million drawing of currencies from the International Monetary Fund.

Eventually, Germany will exchange the rand with South Africa for gold, which Reuss regards as a technical violation of the March 1968, agreement not to add to gold reserves.

Most U.S. officials are annoyed, but not upset by the movement of South African currency out of the IMF, subsequently to be traded for gold.

But direct sales of gold to either the IMF or major central banks would be a different issue, and while the preference of the U.S. government is to maintain the tough attitude toward South Africa it has held since March, 1968, there are those who feel they must make concessions to the edgy European point of view.

Moreover, as a practical matter, it is conceivable that leading European central banks, anxious to see a floor for gold, may provide it, themselves, regardless of U.S. reservations or conditions.

And over and above these considerations, some U.S. government officials argue that it is not very important, anyway, whether a floor price is provided. "The significant thing," said one man, "is that we are living in an SDR (Special Drawing Rights) world. The growth in reserves is going to be in SDRs. We don't have to be concerned, because whether or not there is a gold price floor, the importance of gold is going to diminish over time."

Critics say it would be a mistake to give in now to the "ill-conceived" concern among Europeans that the value of their reserves might drop. Reuss suggested that any central bank worried about the value of gold could sell official holdings to the IMF for SDRs.

The IMF maintains a discreet silence, since its governing board is the creature of individual governments not yet in agreement on the issue. But within the IMF staff, there is known to be a feeling that it has some obligation to buy gold from any country offering it at the official \$35 price.

Those who oppose this think it an unnecessary concession. "We shouldn't give a damn what happens in the (unofficial) gold market," says an official who helped create it last year.

Reuss revealed that a report by his committee, to be issued in a few weeks, will condemn any step toward providing a support price as weakening the two-tier system.

SDR SYSTEM SUCCESSFUL

Behind the slide in gold prices, precipitous in the past several weeks, has been the successful institution of the Special Drawing Rights system, which makes it evident that the principal growth in monetary reserves in the next many years will be from that source, not gold.

Speculators' interest in gold has also been diminished by stronger currency markets, and the high-level of interest rates, especially in the Euro-dollar market, which makes gold hoarding unattractive.

The net effect of all of this, however, has been to force the South Africans to build up a stock of about \$1 billion in gold, for which the monetary reserves of the major nations are no longer an outlet.

Since March, 1968, when these nations agreed that it was no longer "necessary" to buy newly-mined gold for their reserves, South Africa has been lobbying for an agreement which once again would allow its gold to move to central banks and into the IMF.

There are strong emotions on both sides of the issue. Some Europeans, backing the South African desire for a floor price, insist that the March, 1968, agreement establishing the two-tier system did not guarantee that central banks would never buy additional gold for monetary reserves.

But Reuss argues that if the South Africans can "stockpile" some of their excess gold in official reserves, it will force the unofficial reserves, it will force the unofficial price up, thus putting pressure on the dollar.

"Why should we give this racist country a floor for its gold," asks Reuss, "when the needy countries of the world cry for and do not get stabilization of cocoa, coffee, and other commodity prices?"

[From the Economist, Nov. 15, 1969]

GOLD BETWEEN TWO POLES

Up to March 15, 1968 the marketing of gold was child's play. The price was underpinned at the bottom end by the fact that central banks were willing to take unlimited quantities at \$35 an ounce, and encountered an equally impenetrable barrier at the top end—just a few cents up—an account of the willingness of the same central banks, and especially the Federal Reserve Board, to supply unlimited quantities as well. That appeared to be the basis of the international monetary system, and was apparently immutable. Towards the end there were doubts about the bankers' ability to maintain the supply, even with the mechanism of the gold pool, devised in 1961 to facilitate the flow. But that was scarcely a problem for the entrepreneurs who had built up and conducted the markets over a period of centuries. Indeed, it made life extremely easy for them: turnover soared on a one-way speculation that the price might be forced up.

It was even better than that. The bullion merchants were free to take a position themselves and there is no reason to suppose they failed to do so. In the event the speculators—a polygot of governments, dealers and faceless men—came within an ace of bringing off one of the most spectacular financial coups of all time. They failed, but still they did not lose. The price of gold has not doubled but in the subsequent experience of the market it has at least at all times been higher than \$35. The fat cats did not audibly purr, but for several months they did complain cheerfully of "indigestion," and indeed had every reason to be contented.

For a while. As long as gold was bought and sold at roughly \$35, participation in the market amounted to the comfortable occu-

pation of buying gold in order to sell it—sometimes re-refined, often reshaped—for a relatively modest margin. As long as it had been bought for \$35 and could be sold for more (the situation after mid-March last year), the market, though potentially less cosy, was rather more profitable. Up to and for much of 1968 the market lacked a serious challenge to its skills. But for the interruptions of war, the shape of the market had been reasonably stable for some 50 years. London was much the main centre, its dominance assured by the supply arrangements of the biggest producer, South Africa, and of the gold pool, both of which entrusted their disposals to the Bank of England, which in turn was represented in the London market by one of the five participants (Rothschild).

Under this dispensation the other markets were neatly complementary. The freight advantage enabled Hongkong to attract the bulk of Australian gold for sale in the Far East, giving it an unassailable but limited base. The Zurich banks, having organised themselves into a market in 1947, were unbeatably placed to meet the requirements of smugglers supplying Italy's important jewellery industry; and, relying on London as a source, did not immediately threaten its turnover but in fact helped to expand it. Markets in North America, Paris, Beirut and elsewhere, both officially-blessed and clandestine, were able in some measure to cater to local needs, but in one way or another tended to operate as extensions of the London market. There the competition consisted of drumming up business in a gentlemanly way, sometimes on price but more often on service and product differentiation.

The morning and afternoon "fixings" (the latter introduced to offer a guidepost for trading in North America) have never implied an absence of price competition, nor has the system meant that dealers reveal their turnover to each other. The opportunity for product differentiation occurs not only in shapes and sizes, but surprisingly enough in the cultivation of brand loyalty. This has been proved by Johnson Matthey (known over large tracts of the Middle East as "John Matthews"), whose mark is demanded by some of the wealthiest traditional hoarders.

The bullion dealers did not have to worry about supply at all, and there is not a great deal of evidence that they worried much about the composition of demand. Indeed, they hardly needed to: there is ample evidence that increasing amounts of gold found their way into private hands year by year for at least a decade. The International Monetary Fund put the offtake at 520 metric tons in 1957, 1,031 tons in 1962 and 2,654 tons in 1967.

The profound change which occurred last year was, of course, the freeing of the price—flowing from the decision of the big central banks that they would not again participate in the market, either as buyers or sellers. This left the market without firm guidelines, except perhaps for the assumption (which, strictly speaking, is still no better than an assumption) that \$35 an ounce is the floor price below which gold cannot fall. Not even the decision itself was taken at face value, hence the substantial premium on March 18th. In that moment the bullion dealers lost whatever chance they might have had to keep the market firmly under control. Had the price settled at about \$35, and had it been established that it was underpinned at this level, the dealers would at least have had an opportunity to put their stamp on subsequent developments. As it was, the situation immediately became too big for them to handle. For there has ever since been a large speculative element in the price, involving risks which no private bank or banks could think of running.

GAMBLING ON THE OVERHANG

Recent unofficial estimates, prepared for Consolidated Gold Fields, underline the point. They suggest that of 7,485 metric tons of gold falling into private hands in the four years to end-1968, perhaps 4,691 tons were acquired by industrial end-users of various kinds (of which, 1,296 tons in 1968, see chart). This left 2,794 tons with hoarders, speculators and middlemen at the beginning of the current year, worth some \$3½ billion at \$40 an ounce. It has obviously been impossible to take a view (i.e. to buy gold at ruling prices, which in point of fact have fluctuated between \$39½ and \$43¼ without gambling on the firmness with which the bulk of this overhang is held. And that is only one of the speculative features to be set against the prospect of an industrial offtake of perhaps 1,300 tons this year (the estimate offered by the Gold Fields economists in September—itsself some 80 per cent higher than projections of the IMF's calculations, which were all the market previously had to work on). The others are that newly-mined gold from western sources (mainly South Africa) is arriving, potentially on the market, at the rate of 1,280 tons a year; and that Russia's output and intentions are unknown but significant.

The immediate aftermath of mid-March was that London shut up shop for several days while the market in Zurich was promptly reorganised with central bank approval by the formation of a three-bank pool, in which form it has continued to function ever since. For several months it published its turnover (see chart). The initial reaction was a sharp burst of speculative buying, which the Swiss banks sought to discourage by quoting a marked differential between buying and selling prices. This was soon followed by a disgorging of speculative hoards, a lot of which had evidently found their way to Switzerland for safe keeping. Sources close to the gold mining industry have surmised that the Zurich market achieved an edge over London in terms of turnover in the ratio of perhaps 60 to 40. Except for small test sales, South Africa kept its gold off the market for much of the rest of 1968, thereby preserving the premium and also, in effect, taking on its shoulders full responsibility for the management of the market.

The South Africans were confident in mid-1968 that a rise in the official price of gold could not be long delayed. They were not alone in that as the free market premium continued to show. And as came to be demonstrated early in 1969, when it transpired that the Swiss pool had bought a substantial quantity of South African gold. This surprising development implied that the Swiss were bidding to take over the job of judging the market—for which they were variously described as arrogant and courageous. It was a long shot even if, as is probable, they had agreed only on short-term strategy: having done no more about consumer research than their London counterparts, they must surely have been gambling on such factors as a resumption of speculative buying and the settlement of South Africa's dispute with the United States (under which, to date, with minor exceptions, South Africa has been unable to use its gold in transactions with the IMF and central banks at the old price of \$35). In this they were sorely disappointed.

The upshot is that bankers in general have abandoned the attempt to assert their mastery over the gold market. As with commodity markets the world over, the major producers (in this case the South Africans) have little choice but to carry the costs of management—as to rationing supply, as to establishing who the customers are, and (which has yet to be seen) as to promoting their product. It is neither a bankers' market, nor a free market.

Circumstances could change. Adopting the projections of Consolidated Gold Fields, a few years of rising demand and dwindling supply could restore the markets and the bullion dealers to their former glory. That might equally well be achieved, though more drastically, if declining prices caused a shake-out of dispirited hoarders and returned gold to its floor. Life has been full of surprises for the bullion dealers. It is little wonder that in celebrating, this year, the fiftieth anniversary of the daily London "fixing," they have been anything but despondent.

THE GREEK TRAGEDY

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on November 18 I placed in the RECORD two articles detailing the attempts of the ruling colonels to stifle the Greek press. Another aspect of the colonels' campaign was reported on November 26, 1969, in the New York Times. The article follows:

GREEK PROVINCIAL POLICE BAN SOME ATHENS PAPERS

ATHENS, November 25—Most of the daily newspapers of Athens were prevented today from circulating in north and central Greece.

The ban was apparently imposed by local security police Greece's military-backed government, which recently issued a new law attesting to "freedom of the press," had no official comment.

For the last six weeks, newspaper publishers and distributors have reported police obstruction in the provincial sales of Athens newspapers not actively friendly toward the Government.

It began with ban on the sale of specific issues of national newspapers. On an apparently haphazard basis, newspaper distributors in some provincial towns were ordered to ration the sales of Athens newspapers that did not support the regime. This was later changed to a system of quotas sometimes representing 20 percent of the newspapers' normal sales.

Today's measures were enforced differently and more drastically. Technically no newspapers were seized and no quotas were set. The police visited news vendors in the Thessaly area of central Greece and ordered that the bundles of all but three Athens dailies were to be returned unopened to the publishers. The sale of newspapers friendly to the regime, Eleftheros Kosmos, Nea Politia and Vradini, was permitted.

The battle between the Government and the press started soon after Premier George Papadopoulos abolished preventive censorship on newspapers on Oct. 3.

The press reacted cautiously but with wit. There were cartoons ridiculing the Portuguese elections or of Spain that were easily translated by readers into comment on Greece.

Headlines were often calculated to irritate the Government, and two Athens dailies published series on the attempt of exiled King Constantine to topple the military-imposed regime.

Athens publishers were called in by Government officials and told to mend their ways. But officially the Government denied any attempt to harass the press.

Deputy Premier Stylianos Patakos said early this month: "What has happened is that readers are so disgusted with what

newspapers print that they naturally refuse to buy them."

Under the new press law, which goes into effect Jan. 1, any interference with newspaper distribution not authorized by judicial authorities is punishable by a minimum three-month prison term.

Nothing has been more characteristic of the junta than their attempt to end the free press in Greece unless it is the colonels' periodic announcements of reform timetables. The latest was reported by the Times on November 24. The following day an excellent editorial put the latest "reform" in its proper perspective:

GREECE REPORTS TIMETABLE FOR REFORM

ATHENS, November 23.—Greece's military-backed Government said today that it had set a firm timetable for the restoration of representative government, which was abolished in a coup d'état 31 months ago.

This assurance was given by Foreign Minister Panayotis Pipinelis in an article published today in the Athens newspaper Acropolis. In the article, which did not disclose any dates, Mr. Pipinelis said:

"I can assure the Greek people that the actual Government under its present leadership is in a position to carry out unflinchingly the program for a phased application of the whole Constitution within a predetermined time limit. Then the Greeks will be called upon to express their opinion on its accomplishments, in order to consolidate them or even smash them if so they wish."

The Foreign Minister's statement marked a step forward from earlier vague declarations that full constitutional rule would be restored "only when the revolution's goals have been accomplished." One of these goals is the civic re-education of the Greeks, which could last a generation.

ALLIES PRESSING GREECE

Most civil and political liberties of the Greeks have been in abeyance since the army coup in April, 1967.

Greece's Western allies have been pressing the leaders to commit themselves to a timetable for evolution toward democracy. The United States even "selectively suspended" military aid to Greece as leverage for political changes.

The Greek leaders have so far resisted this pressure on the ground that they alone "shall determine when the time is ripe for democratic evolution, bearing in mind the interests of the Greek people."

Mr. Pipinelis's statement that a timetable does exist comes at a time when most of Greece's allies and friends are reviewing their attitudes toward the Greek Government in view of the slow progress toward a return to democratic government.

A crucial decision is expected in Paris Dec. 12 when the 18 foreign minister of the Council of Europe meet to consider the motion to oust Greece for suspending democratic freedoms and parliamentary rule.

Earlier efforts to avert an ouster, by inducing Athens to pledge itself to an irrevocable timetable for democratization, failed last September when the three-phase program submitted by the Greek Government, covering the period to the end of 1970, fell short of promising either the lifting of martial law or the holdings of free elections.

CHANGE IN ATTITUDE IMPLIED

Mr. Pipinelis's statement implied a change of attitude. If a guaranteed timetable leading to elections were announced, Greece's expulsion from the Council of Europe might be averted.

The Scandinavian countries, Belgium and the Netherlands which have led the movement to expel Greece, were joined this week by Britain. Britain made it clear that unless definite proof of good faith were produced

by Athens at once Britain would support the ouster movement.

GREEK'S PREDICTABLE JUNTA

One thing can be said about the Greek junta: Its international political maneuvers are entirely predictable. It invariably begins to make noises about restoring freedoms or returning Greece to representative rule when it is facing the threat of international censure or condemnation.

Thus, almost on the eve of the meeting of Atlantic Alliance ministers in Washington last April, Colonel Papadopoulos proclaimed "restoration" of three articles of the 1968 Constitution relating to civil liberties. With this meaningless gesture he was trying to head off a threat of NATO action against Greece.

And thus, with a move to expel Greece from the Council of Europe coming up at the meeting of foreign ministers next month, Foreign Minister Pipinelis discloses that the junta has a definite timetable for elections and a return to representative government. Mr. Pipinelis gives no dates—just assurances that the regime will apply the Constitution in phases "within a predetermined time limit," and that the Greeks will then be given the opportunity "to express their opinion on its accomplishments." They can vote to consolidate those accomplishments "or even smash them if they so wish."

Mr. Pipinelis at seventy is a pathetic figure: the only political leader of any prominence to serve the colonels since King Constantine's abortive countercoup of 1967; the only political name the junta has been able to flaunt abroad in the vain attempt to garner respectability.

Mr. Pipinelis is the foreign minister in name only, as he certainly discovered long ago; and not even he can really believe that Papadopoulos, Patakos and Company have a timetable for legitimate elections or any intention of submitting themselves to a free judgment of the Greek people.

Finally, the European Commission for Human Rights has concluded its study of the Greek regime. They reportedly have found that torture and ill-treatment are "an administrative practice" that is "officially tolerated." Those who defend the colonels' government should carefully consider this report and the effort which will be made later this month to expel Greece from the Council of Europe.

At this point I include in the RECORD news reports of these developments:

INQUIRY ON GREECE REPORTS TORTURES: EUROPE COUNCIL STUDY ALSO FINDS MANY FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS ARE BEING DENIED

(By Alvin Shuster)

LONDON, November 28.—The European Commission for Human Rights has concluded that Greece's military-backed Government allowed torture of political prisoners and denied many fundamental human rights.

Its 1,200-page report, the result of more than two years of investigation, found that torture and ill-treatment were "an administrative practice" that was "officially tolerated." It charged that Greek authorities had taken no effective steps to stop the practices.

The commission, an agency of the 18-nation Council of Europe, also found that, contrary to contentions of the Greek regime, there was no danger of a Communist takeover at the time the army colonels seized power on April 21, 1967, and imposed martial law, still in effect.

"There is evidence indicating that it [a Communist takeover] was neither planned at that time nor seriously anticipated by either the military or police authorities," the commission said.

Its still-confidential report, in four volumes, is likely to bolster the case of govern-

ments that will push for the expulsion of Greece when the ministers of the Council of Europe meet in Paris on Dec. 12. The council has postponed action awaiting the commission's findings, which have now been submitted to the member nations.

Apart from the blow to Athens' prestige, expulsion from the Council would also mean removal of Greece from the Parliament of Europe, which sits in Strasbourg and prepares social and economic programs for its members.

BRITAIN TO BACK EXPULSION

Britain has decided to vote against the regime at the meeting and is trying to influence others to do so. The United States, although not a member of the council, has indicated concern about Greece's expulsion, fearing, in part, that it might lead to pressure to expel her from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as well.

Some United States officials also worry that such council action might lead the colonels, out of pique, to withdraw from participation in NATO.

Greek leaders have sought to give the impression of movement toward democracy. They are expected to defend themselves at next month's meeting by citing steps they have taken, including recent talk of a still-vague timetable for the restoration of representative government.

But the regime will be presenting its arguments against the background of the most detailed and official condemnation of its actions yet. The report represents the efforts of lawyers who took hundreds of hours of testimony and even traveled to Greece for on-the-scene investigation. Some have called their work the weightiest international legal inquiry since the Nuremberg trial of war criminals after World War II.

Technically, the council cannot take any steps on the basis of the report until three months after its submission. But such countries as Britain, Norway, Sweden and Denmark believe there are sufficient grounds for action now anyway.

CHARTER VIOLATION CHARGED

The conclusions—that the use of torture had been established "beyond doubt," that human freedoms are violated and that no Communist threat existed at the time of the coup—go to the heart of the case. The report concludes that the Greek regime has thus violated the conditions of membership, in particular Article 3.

That article in the charter of the council, founded 20 years ago, states that members "must accept the principles of the rule of law and of the enjoyment by all persons within its jurisdiction of human rights and fundamental freedoms."

Such rights may be suspended under the charter in "time of peril or other public emergency threatening the life of the nation," but the commission found that these conditions did not exist at the time of the coup.

The report said that while there was a period of "political instability and tension" in Greece, this did not constitute a "public emergency." While there were demonstrations in the streets, it said, the situation did "not differ markedly from that in many other countries in Europe."

It also rejected the Greek Government's argument that continued suspension of rights was necessary because of bomb incidents and the growth of "illegal organizations."

"The commission does not find, on the evidence before it," it said, "that either factor is beyond the control of the public authorities using normal measures, or that they are on a scale threatening the life of the Greek nation."

CONFRONTED GREEK AUTHORITIES

The report said that competent Greek authorities, "confronted with numerous and

substantial complaints and allegations of torture and ill-treatment," failed to take any effective steps to investigate them or to insure remedies for "any such complaints or allegations found to be true."

Moreover, the report said that Greeks were being denied such fundamental rights as freedom of expression, association, a fair trial, and free elections at regular intervals, such rights, it noted, are required under the council's charter.

The report, prepared by a subcommission of the Human Rights Commission, was adopted by the parent group earlier this month. It was submitted to the member countries nine days ago.

The council, primarily an advisory organization, was organized to further political, social and economic unity of Europe. Its other members are Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, France, West Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Switzerland and Turkey.

GREECE: TROUBLE AHEAD FOR THE COLONELS

LONDON.—The regime of the colonels in Greece will shortly face one its more difficult diplomatic tests since the 1967 coup that brought it to power. The Council of Europe, meeting in Paris a week from this Friday, will consider suspending Greece from membership because of her undemocratic military government. The expectation here is that the council will vote for the suspension.

The move against Greece has more than the usual potential of mere name-calling motions in international organization. This action might have a real political effect in Greece. And it is also noteworthy because it has aroused a rare difference of diplomatic opinion between Britain and the United States.

Britain is going to vote against the colonels, and the Foreign Office is playing a leading part in trying to persuade others among the 18 council members to do so. The United States, which is not a member of the Council of Europe, has indicated to its European allies its uneasiness over the British move.

The American concern is with Greece's position in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The growing number of Soviet ships in the Mediterranean, the coup in Libya and the unending Arab-Israeli tension have all intensified the view in Washington that Greece is vital as a military ally.

U.S. MILITARY AID

American military assistance, which was cut off after the colonels' revolution in 1967, was resumed in part after the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia last year. Some aircraft, minesweepers and other items especially useful for NATO support are now going to Greece. And the United States again has an ambassador in Athens.

What worries American officials is that the colonels, in pique at a slap from the Council of Europe, might suspend Greek participation in NATO's operations on the southern flank of Europe. Diplomats here report that various Greek sources have been voicing threats of that kind in an effort to prevent an adverse council vote.

British officials are skeptical at the notion of Greece's withdrawing from NATO in pique. They argue that the Athens regime needs NATO more than the alliance needs it—especially because the colonels depend for their power on support from the army, which greatly values the NATO role.

European sentiment against the colonels will doubtless be further stirred by a report of the European Human Rights Commission. A massive study of repression under the military regime, in four volumes, it began leaking out here over this weekend. The study concludes that the regime has made a practice of using torture and has denied most of the fundamental rights of man—of expression, association, fair trial and free elections.

The charter of the Council of Europe, an advisory body created in 1949, says that members "must accept the principles of the rule of law and of the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms." It is because the council has that political basis that Michael Stewart, the British Foreign Secretary, has insisted on dealing with Greece.

At the last meeting of the Committee of Ministers, in May, Greece was in effect put on probation. A resolution warned that she would be suspended unless the Government took steps to restore democracy and the rule of law.

British officials see no sign that the colonels have rule since then. No date has been set for any elections. The press is still gagged. The colonels dismissed the President of their Council of State last summer when he found that they had gone beyond their powers in acting against some judges; for good measure the colonels exiled the lawyers who had handled the case.

American diplomats say the United States has persistently urged the colonels to get the country back to representative democracy. But the United States is plainly reluctant to apply direct pressure.

One American worry is that successful action against Greece in the Council of Europe would lead to demands for her expulsion from NATO. The British argue that NATO's purpose is altogether different. They also say that failure to do anything in the Council of Europe might bring pressure in three NATO countries—Norway, Denmark and the Netherlands—for a move against Greece in NATO.

The members of the Council of Europe are Austria, Belgium, Britain, Cyprus, Denmark, France, West Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and Turkey. At least 10 of the 18 must vote for expulsion for the motion to prevail.

The council's purpose is to further the political, economic and social unity of Europe. It has sponsored a large number of treaties on legal, social and practical communications questions. One of the treaties is the European Human Rights Convention, which is accepted by many European states and has a court to enforce its provisions.

Exclusion from the council would bother the Greek regime primarily as a symbol—a blow to the prestige that the colonels have carefully tried to foster. Loss of council membership would also deprive Greece of her seats in the Parliament of Europe, which sits in Strasbourg and acts as an advisory legislative body for Europe.

DR. WILLIAM MASON, OF TRUESDALE HOSPITAL

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 5, 1969

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, few human relationships are nobler and more endearing than that of the physician and the families he serves. In this day of the medical specialist, however, the traditional family physician has become a vanishing breed.

It is fitting, therefore, to pay high tribute to a man like Dr. William Mason, of Truesdale Hospital, in Fall River, Mass. He typifies the traditional family physician. I think for many of us this article, which I am inserting in the RECORD, will bring back "memories that bless and burn" of our own family doctors.

In his years as a family physician, Dr. Mason has earned the love and respect of innumerable families in Fall River and throughout my district. I know him personally as a delightful individual and as a great humanitarian. His "joy" in his relationship with his patients is the quality of a family physician most frequently cited by the author of this moving article. It is also the attributes which has made Dr. Mason so successful in his field.

I feel certain that many will enjoy the article from the Spectator, of Somerset, Mass., which reads as follows:

[From the Somerset (Mass.) Spectator,
Nov. 13, 1969]

A POIGNANTLY, BEAUTIFUL MEMORY
(By Ruth Howland)

Many of you, my older readers, I know, will enjoy these memories and I am sure you have your own lovely remembrance of the same man—Dr. William Mason, of Truesdale Hospital.

A recent, brief visit there, when he popped in one morning to see me, brought back many of the "memories that bless and burn". Dr. Mason was for years our family physician and although not an old country doctor, still had many of the qualities of those dear people.

The especially lovely and sometimes sad memories were of his care of my dear mother even to her last breath, at 88. She as I have written before, was a pretty, little woman and always extremely clothes conscious. When she was due for a visit to Dr. Mason, she would primp and polish as if she were a young girl going out with her beau. He always repaid that and it was a delight to see them together. He would help her up onto the examining table, and then stand back in admiration as if she was of his own creation. "Now, I ask you. Did you ever see a prettier little woman for her age, in fact for any age?" Mother would blush and almost smother; while our hearts were warmed by his sincere joy in her and we would grin, on the side, that "she still kept the tilt to her kilt".

Until the last few weeks of her life, although she had to give up many of the joys—her church work, Sunday School teaching, even attendance at church and as a diabetic the sweets which she loved, she never complained. Her Bible was her constant companion and she was a truly devout Christian woman, in word and deed.

Finally, about two months before her death, she was in Truesdale and had a completely paralyzing shock, which left her in a coma. Jessie and I were both teaching in Taunton and it was late before we could get down to the hospital. Dr. Mason said "Try it. Come in and see what her reaction is." She did not know us and was in a coma most of the time. After our visit, Dr. Mason called to say "Keep away. She cried all night after you were here. So just leave her in peace."

You have no idea how difficult that was, because for several years she had been "our baby" physically and we had a guilty feeling. But we had also the relief of knowing that our good Dr. Mason was in, morning and night to see her. Unless you have lived through such a situation, you cannot know how wonderful it was to be assured that he was watching her in his loving way!

I have several newer friends among the Truesdale doctors—but I think that the roots of my love of my mother and his joy in her, still leave him top place!

When he dropped in to see me the other morning, I began to relive those days and the bitterness of losing her was somewhat alleviated by the memory of their reaction

to each other when she went for an office call. We love him, as I know many of you do. Somehow, although I never called him "Bill"—I was reminded of the old song—was it of Ethel Merman's?—I can't recall all the words, but part of them so perfectly describe him "He's just an ordinary kind of guy, but he's just my Bill". To those of you who have reason to feel the same way, doesn't it describe him as perfectly as any words can?

STATEMENT ON MORATORIUM

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under consent to extend my remarks I would like to call your attention to a statement made by Charles Majer, member of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, on Wednesday, October 15, 1969, the date of the first moratorium demonstration in Washington, D.C. The first two resolutions presented by Mr. Majer were adopted unanimously by the board of supervisors and the third suggestion was adopted with one dissenting vote.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CHARLES MAJER AT BOARD MEETING, OCTOBER 15, 1969

I hesitate to involve this Board in a matter which is essentially national, but today has been designated as a moratorium day on the war in Viet Nam. I am not sure what this so-called Moratorium is designed to do. It can be either good or bad, and I would guess that there are many, many groups involved in it that hold widely varying motives.

If it is to renew a dedication in this country to peace, with honor, good—if it is to give support and encouragement to our President and the Government to continue seeking and striving for peace and the end of the Viet Nam conflict, fine—if it is to express support for the job being done by our fighting men in Viet Nam, and to express our appreciation and gratitude for the personal sacrifices which they and their families are making, excellent—but if the effect is to give aid and comfort to the enemy in Hanoi, it is reprehensible. When I read that the North Vietnamese government in Hanoi has strongly endorsed this moratorium today, and when I further see that one of the principal sponsors of the activities has been the outspokenly pro-Viet Nam Students for a Democratic Society, and other equally militant organizations, I am, to say the very least, suspect of the results.

Certainly objective discussions of the whys and wherefores of the Viet Nam war together with collective thinking seeking means to end the war can be useful. However, demonstrations for the purpose of demonstrating are useless. Surely no intelligent people are naive enough to believe that our government is unaware of the public sentiment on this matter, or that delicate international policy and negotiations can be conducted on the basis of street rallies.

However, if we can impress on Hanoi that the means to the end of the conflict lies with good-faith negotiation and not unilateral demands, I believe a really constructive purpose to the events of today will be accomplished. But if Hanoi interprets the events of today as weakness or sympathy to the enemy, then I can see only further delays in peace.

I would, therefore, like to suggest that this

Board express our support and heartfelt thanks and appreciation to the American military in Viet Nam and to their families. Secondly, I would like this Board to express our support to the President of the United States for his efforts to end the war in Viet Nam, and urge him to continue to vigorously seek the peace which we all want. Finally, I think this Board should request all those groups within this County holding activities and functions today to direct their criticisms to the apparent complete lack of willingness on the part of the enemy to negotiate in good faith and not to the vigorous efforts being made to end the war by our Government.

And I so move, Mr. Chairman.

SCOTLAND COMMUNITY OF ROCKVILLE, MD., WINNER OF LANE BRYANT VOLUNTEER 1969 AWARD

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, since 1948 Lane Bryant awards have been made annually to carefully selected groups and individuals representing the unsung hero of the unique American phenomenon—voluntarism. The Lane Bryant Awards were conceived to recognize those who were trying to help make things better without thought of reward or recognition.

It is encouraging that both public and private sectors today participate so actively to provide a climate in which this voluntary action can achieve much notable success. The spirit and interest is so well described in the Lane Bryant Award statement of 1969, as follows:

THE LANE BRYANT VOLUNTEER AWARDS

The historic flight of Apollo 11 has given a whole new meaning to the word impossible. That which for so many centuries stood as a symbol of the unattainable now is a shining beacon of man's potential for achievement. And, while illuminating the magnificent heights to which man can aspire, the very success of the moon landing cast a harsh glare on the so-called impossible tasks we still face here on earth.

The Age of the Moon must give way to the Age of Man as the world faces its mounting social ills. Through the centuries, man has efficiently and successfully sought out physical boundaries to conquer. Now he must apply the same determination in seeking out the answers to some of the most compelling questions he has ever faced: how to rebuild decaying cities, feed the hungry, curb overpopulation, restore the purity of the atmosphere and the waters, heal the sick, revise crumbling educational systems, and initiate learning where there has been none. The list is long; the task is great.

For many quiet Americans around the world and in the United States, these impossible conditions do not present a new challenge, but rather a rededication to solving problems they have been successfully battling for years. It is these Americans that the Lane Bryant Volunteer Awards have sought out and honored from their inception in 1948.

In reading about the work of the winners and finalists, an important common denominator emerges—self help through mutual involvement. True, each provided aid and support to those in need. But, wherever possible, they have gone a step further . . . they taught others how to begin working toward their own support and a life of self-reliance and dignity.

The purpose of the Lane Bryant Volunteer Awards is to bring this work to the public attention—not to “whitewash” social ills, but to highlight them and the positive action combating them. Raphael Malsin, founder of the Volunteer Awards, said of them: “They serve as a kind of x-ray into the inner workings of our society. They illuminate the trouble spots, they highlight the symptoms, they show us the best and the worst. They are a kind of laboratory where we can see healing ideas being tested. They are a tribute to the power of individuals, the best kind of individuals.”

The 1969 Volunteer Awards are a tribute to those who would not—could not—be thwarted by the impossible.

The 1969 Lane Bryant Awards being made here in Washington today, I am pleased to say, are honoring as the top group award winner, Scotland Community Development, Inc., of Montgomery County, Md. The Scotland community in its recent history exemplifies the power of “individuals, the very best kind of individuals who would not—could not—be thwarted by the impossible.”

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the following description of the 1969 group award as presented in today's Lane Bryant Volunteer Awards:

Ramshackle houses on rutted dirt roads, surrounded by junked cars, mountains of rubbish and other debris of poverty. Shanties without indoor plumbing, running water, electricity, modern heat or trash removal. Crumbling homes. Helpless squalor. This was the community of Scotland in Montgomery County, Maryland.

An enclave of 50 Negro families whose median income of \$80 a week had to be stretched to cover the expenses of families of six, seven, eight or more. These were the residents of Scotland.

A fast-growing, progressive county, where affluent white suburbanites enjoy lovely park lands, expensive new homes and one of the highest median incomes in the nation. This is the rest of Montgomery County.

Since the turn of the century, the residents of Scotland, mainly descendants of slaves, heeded the advice of their ancestors and held onto their land even when they had nothing else. But, in 1965, the roots of their rural community were severely strained by land speculators who sought acreage to house Washington's upper middle class. The future was indeed bleak for Scotland's citizens, who had no resources for relocation. The Save Our Scotland (SOS) Committee was set up by county, civic and church leaders, as well as some sympathetic Bethesda neighbors, to investigate avenues of action for the area. SOS moved the county to repair the town well and extend water and sewer services to the local church, and organized an ambitious clean-up campaign. As the community began to take on more and more responsibility for itself, the Scotland Community Development Corporation (SCDC) was formed.

The basic concept behind SCDC was that the local residents pool their combined land holdings, sell some of them, and build new housing on the remaining acreage. Then began the tortuous process of titlesearching. Volunteers uncovered extremely complicated systems of ownership, to the extent where one resident was found to own 1/108 of his quarter acre plot. As the process of land buying progressed, model communities were designed, with the main requirements drawn by Scotland's citizens to conform with their own life-styles. An example is the inclusion of front porches on the townhouses, a rarity today. The final result is a plan which includes six basic types of townhouses, ranging in size from two to five bedrooms.

With the aid of a Housing and Urban Development (HUD) grant of \$78,400, the 100 units are now being completed. As they become ready, families will take possession, and their old shacks will be demolished, thus avoiding the trauma of forced relocation. Seventy-five of the units will be low rental, the others will be for sale through the life insurance industry's billion dollar housing fund.

Residents who owned land in Scotland have traded it for equity in housing. Others, such as Melvin Crawford, president of the SCDC, can gain equity in their homes through their own labor. Mr. Crawford, a maintenance man with a wife and seven children, spent 42 years in a “dilapidated four room house not fit to live in.” He and his family have chosen their new three bedroom home in the development—with available room for expansion.

Along with the task of building new homes, the SCDC has accomplished many other goals. Anticipating some of the problems of the first year of residence, they held a benefit which raised over \$8,000 to hire a full-time social worker. They have instituted such services as tutorials, community newsletters, emergency legal help and a highly successful furniture drive. The Scotland Teen Health and Beauty Workshop, instituted this past year, offers girls a variety of activities dealing with fashion, dieting, cosmetics, creative exercise and modeling. A “mod fashion tour of Georgetown” and a tea with informal modeling are highlights of their activities to date.

The Scotland Community Development, Inc. saw a problem, studied it, and went into action. Using their own resources, hundreds of people from diverse backgrounds worked together to create in Scotland a climate of opportunity in which individuals can become economically and socially viable citizens—all within the familiar and comfortable surroundings of Montgomery County. This is the Scotland of today . . . and tomorrow.

ARTHUR F. BURNS SPEAKS ON HOW TO END INFLATION

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago I talked with a leading publisher in New York City. He described himself as a liberal on social matters and a conservative on fiscal responsibility.

When I asked his advice on congressional policy, he said:

This Country will be in great shape if they have the courage in Congress to follow Arthur Burns' policies.

Burns just made a speech in New York City that lays it on the line.

I recall the word “courage,” because Congress is called on to vote for the good of the country—and not on a political voter appeal basis. Burns stresses the need for expenditure reform and realistic fiscal commitments on social problems. Burns also made the suggestion of an over-all ceiling on total appropriation spending for the year.

Here is a full text of the speech by Arthur F. Burns:

THE CONTROL OF GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

This year the Congress has devoted a great deal of attention to tax legislation. Besides aiding the fight against inflation by extend-

ing the income tax surcharge temporarily, the Congress has been heavily engaged in writing a tax reform bill that is of major significance to the American public. If the bill survives in something like its present form, some troublesome inequities under existing law will finally be corrected. However, the relative tax burden borne by individuals and corporations will also be changed, with corporate income tax liabilities gradually going up about 5 billion dollars by 1975 and individual income taxes coming down 12 billion dollars.

This projected shift in the tax structure will favor consumption at the expense of capital formation. Such a development will be useful in the short run by helping to cool off the business investment boom that is still under way, but it may damage prospects for the long-term growth of our economy. We surely cannot afford to take capital formation or economic progress for granted. If our economy is to grow and prosper in the future, as it both can and should, business enterprise may well need the stimulation of an improving tax climate.

In recent times, our nation has moved rapidly towards the welfare state, such as various European countries previously developed. Unlike these countries, however, we also devote an enormous part of our resources to meeting the needs of an intricate and far-flung defense system. Thus far, the prodigious productivity of American industry has made it possible to finance liberally both our defense needs and the social services of government. But in order to continue to support the growing scale of our public consumption without doing injury to private consumption, the productivity of our factories, mines, farms, construction enterprises, and service trades may have to improve more rapidly than in the past. This will not be accomplished without substantial and increasing investment in new and better tools of production. The projected shift in the structure of taxation therefore seems undesirable to me, and I trust that the President's Task Force on Business Taxation will soon point the way to a better balance in our tax system.

I do not know at precisely what point the burden of taxation will materially serve to check our nation's economic progress, but I also do not think it wise to test this issue too closely. The trend of governmental spending and taxes in the past forty years has been sharply and inexorably upward. In 1929, government expenditures at the Federal, state, and local levels amounted to about 10 percent of the dollar value of the nation's production. This fraction rose to about 20 percent in 1940, to about 30 percent in 1960, and to about 35 percent this year. The broad trend of taxation has been very similar. With over a third of our nation's output already moving into the hands of the tax collector, it seems hardly prudent to contemplate any further increase in the level of taxation. And yet, unless we bring government expenditures under better control than we yet have, the modest over-all reduction of tax rates that the tax reform bill projects will prove abortive and further increases in the level of taxation may become unavoidable.

As our nation's economy has grown and as our political democracy has widened, the responsibilities assumed by government have kept increasing. In fiscal year 1962, the rising curve of Federal expenditures first crossed the 100 billion dollar mark. It now appears likely that the 200 billion dollar mark will be crossed the next fiscal year; so that we will be adding as much to the Federal spending rate in a mere nine years as it took nearly two centuries to achieve previously.

The explosive increase of Federal spending during this decade is commonly attributed to the defense establishment, or more simply to the war in Vietnam. The fact is, however,

that civilian programs are the preponderant cause of the growth of the Federal budget. When we compare the budget of 1964 with the estimates for this fiscal year, we find that total Federal spending shows a rise of 74 billion dollars, when defense outlays are larger by only 23 billions. If we go back to 1953, when the Korean war ended, and take into account state and local expenditures as well as Federal, we find that defense outlays have been responsible for only about one-sixth of the vast increase in the cost of government that has occurred since then.

Thus, the basic fiscal fact is that spending for social programs now dominates our public budgets. Although the Federal government's direct involvement in problems of social welfare is a recent development, it is already huge and is growing at a fast rate. This fiscal year, programs for education, manpower, health, income security, housing, community development, and crime prevention will cost over 80 billion dollars—a sum that exceeds all the spending done by the Federal government in the peak year of the Korean war. Federal aid to the poor will alone cost 27 billion dollars this year, in contrast to 12 billion in 1964. Grants in aid to states and localities will cost about 25 billion dollars, in contrast to 15 billion in 1967, 10 billion in 1964, and 5 billion in 1958.

This upsurge of Federal spending is a response to the economic and social difficulties that afflict many of our communities—witness the slums, ghettos, racial strife, poor public schools, teenage unemployment, drug addiction, poor health, student disorders, inadequate transportation, traffic congestion, air and water pollution, and unsafe streets and parks. The Federal government has tried to solve these complex problems by spending large sums of money on projects that have often been hastily devised. Hundreds of grant-in-aid programs dealing with health, education, welfare, and other local needs were established in quick succession. Several regional commissions were established to seek better balance in economic development and social improvement. An Economic Development Administration was established to aid local communities, both urban and rural, that suffer from excessive unemployment or inadequate incomes. More recently, a Model Cities Program was established, aspiring to achieve what our best city planners can contrive. By proceeding in all these directions, we have created a costly governmental maze that involves much duplication and waste, that often hampers the constructive efforts of local officials, and—perhaps worst of all—that practically defies full understanding or evaluation.

Nowadays, many local government officials, instead of grappling with the most urgent needs of their communities, devote their finest energy to maximizing and husbanding the Federal grants that happen to be available. With over 600 categorical programs of Federal aid to choose from, there is plenty to keep them busy. Many of the programs involve tedious procedural steps extending over a number of months before a community can learn whether Federal funds are to be granted for its proposed project. Each program is equipped with its own set of administrative requirements involving endless forms and reports. If a local official attempts to draw upon several funding sources to help finance a neighborhood project, he may be confronted with a mass of complex application forms weighing several pounds, with Federal processing steps that may take well over a year to elicit a "yes" or "no" response, and with stringent requirements for hundreds of detailed reports. Further, this official will usually have to work with Federal representatives scattered in a number of different cities in order to arrange the project.

I am informed by the Bureau of the Budget that one Federal program requires over a

hundred different kinds of forms and reports; that a grant involving \$1,000 may require over 30 major Federal agency steps, including review by a 15-man advisory committee and headquarters approval; that a department of one state has counted 120 different reports that it is required to submit to a particular Federal agency, many of them on a monthly or quarterly basis; and that there are numerous instances in which Federal, state, and local governments make independent studies of the same community without one agency knowing what the other is doing or having an opportunity to share in the results of the other studies. The mere listing of all Federal requirements imposed on states and communities would be so voluminous that it has never been done.

As a result of this administrative morass, various Federal programs are half smothered in paper. Employees at all levels of government are required to devote time to detailed paper work which would be better devoted to rethinking program objectives or assessing the extent to which present objectives are being met. More important, help may not reach the people who need it until months—sometimes years—after it should, with much of the money meanwhile siphoned off by the bureaucracy. To give only a few outstanding examples, neither the achievements of the compensatory education program, nor of the urban renewal and slum clearance programs, nor of the public assistance programs have come very close to the expectations of our lawmakers.

In view of the explosive growth of Federal spending and the ineffectiveness or inefficiency of much of it, I am inclined to think that the need for expenditure reform may be even greater than the need for tax reform. One of the advantages of a new Administration is that it can move with energy to change the direction of governmental policy. President Nixon responded to this opportunity by taking major steps to win control over Federal spending. Needless to say, the rapid rise of the consumer price level has been the most troublesome economic problem facing the nation this year. In view of the inflationary pressures in our markets for goods and services, it was clearly important that the Federal government curb its spending beyond the earnest move to frugality that the previous Administration made in its closing days. In all, reductions of 7½ billion dollars from the January budget were therefore ordered by the President for this fiscal year. These reductions were widely distributed among government agencies, with 4.1 billion allocated to the Defense Department and 3.4 billion to the rest of the government. Moreover, when Congress later passed or considered legislation that foreshadowed an expenditure total well above the revised budget of \$192.9 billion that the President had submitted, he firmly announced that he would try his utmost to see to it that Federal finances continue to be subject to the ceiling that he had imposed. Later in the year, in order to deal with the special problem of runaway construction costs, the President ordered a cut-back of 75 percent in Federal construction contracts.

Administrative steps were also taken by the President to achieve greater efficiency in government spending. In March a carefully planned effort to cut red tape got under way. As a first step, the several agencies most closely concerned with human resources were directed to adopt common regional boundaries and to locate their regional offices in the same cities. Further, a review was started of the several hundred Federal assistance programs, with the objective of simplifying procedure, cutting down on the paper work, and shifting responsibilities to the field so that decisions could be made both more expeditiously and by officials who are in closer touch with the local problems.

The Administration has also sought legislation to correct the deficiencies of the grant-in-aid programs. In order to give local officials greater flexibility to meet their priority needs, the President has requested authority to consolidate existing grant-in-aid categories, subject to a Congressional veto within 60 days. Moreover, as legislation has moved through the Congress, the Administration has been alert to the opportunity of converting narrow categorical grants into block grants for broad functional areas. In line with this policy, proposals for grant consolidation were advanced in connection with legislation on hospital construction, on elementary and secondary school education, and on manpower training services, as well as through the appropriation route.

But by far the most important as well as the most dramatic step that the President has taken to reform expenditure policy is his proposal to the Congress to inaugurate a system of revenue sharing. This proposal marks a milestone in Federal-State relations. It seeks to decentralize governmental power. It seeks to restore the balance that existed in earlier decades between the state capitals and the national capital. Or to be more precise, while it seeks to extend additional Federal assistance to state and local governments, it insists that this be done in a manner that will enable local officials to attend to urgent problems within their own jurisdictions as they deem best, without being subjected to rigid Federal controls or requirements.

The leading features of the Administration's revenue sharing proposal are as follows: First, in view of budgetary constraints, the revenue sharing fund will be limited in fiscal 1971 to a half billion dollars, but will subsequently grow fairly rapidly and reach 5 billion dollars by the mid-seventies. Second, the distribution of the fund among the states will be based on a simple formula that assigns primary weight to population, but also gives some weight to tax effort. Third, the distribution within each state between the state government and the localities will be likewise based on a formula, so that each unit of government within a state will be assured a share that is proportionate to its own tax revenues. Fourth, no restriction will be placed on the use of the funds made available by the Federal government; in other words, each state, county, city, or town will rely on its own judgment and use the money for education, health services, parks, law enforcement, or some other way, as it deems best.

The precise details of this revenue sharing plan grew out of detailed discussions among members of the Administration, Congressmen, Governors, Mayors, and county officials. In the course of these discussions the argument was sometimes encountered that revenue sharing may lead to fiscal irresponsibility, since local officials may be careless in using funds that they did not have to raise from their own constituents. This argument cannot be dismissed. It might in fact be decisive if the practical choice were between levying local taxes or Federal taxes. By all indications, however, Federal financial assistance to the states and localities will continue to grow, and the only real question is whether Federal grants will lead to more or to less centralized control. In taking a definite stand for decentralization, the Administration has enunciated a policy whose wisdom is now widely recognized by liberals as well as conservatives within our two major political parties.

As a result of the careful preparation of the Administration's revenue sharing plan, it has already won the general approval of the Governors Conference and also of the leading national organizations of mayors and county officials. The Administration's own thinking on the subject is not rigid, and it will entertain any reasonable proposal for

change that would facilitate Congressional approval. In particular, the Administration would welcome an enlargement of the projected revenue sharing fund, provided categorical grants were correspondingly curtailed. If that happened, revenue sharing would grow more rapidly than presently contemplated, and the decentralization of government—which has become so vital to order and efficiency in the public economy—would be speeded.

This sketch of recent progress toward Federal expenditure reform should be reassuring to responsible citizens, but it certainly leaves no room for complacency. Much of the needed legislation has yet to be passed. Many of the administrative improvements are still in an early stage and remain to be tested. The ceiling of \$192.9 billion on this year's expenditure is not entirely secure. True, the curve of Federal spending is now rising at a much slower pace than in recent years, but the improvement would be less impressive if the various government-sponsored financial agencies were all included in the budget. And, as far as I can judge, the growth of population, the need to improve our social and physical environment, and the widening concept of governmental responsibility will almost inevitably lead to large additions to Federal as well as state and local expenditures in the future. There will therefore be a continuing need to control governmental spending, first, in order to avoid strain on our physical resources of labor and capital, second, in order to assure the continuance of a vigorous private sector, and, third, in order to maintain pressure for discriminating judgment on priorities as well as for economy of execution in the public sector. These are difficult requirements and they will not be met without further significant expenditure reform.

One major step toward reform was taken last year and again this year by Congressional enactment of a ceiling on expenditures. A legislative budget is a radical departure in budget-making, and its significance should not be minimized by the rubbery texture of the ceiling. In the first place, the vigorous discussion surrounding the legislative ceiling has of itself served to dampen enthusiasm for larger spending. In the second place, the rubbery ceiling of today can become a rigid ceiling tomorrow. If the Congress moves in this direction, its fragmented approach to appropriations, which will doubtless continue, need no longer run up Federal spending as it has commonly done in the past.

To be sure, the individual appropriation acts may imply a much larger expenditure total than had previously been legislated. In that event, the Congress would in effect say to the President: "You are the manager of our national finances. We fixed a ceiling on expenditures earlier in the year, after considering your budgetary recommendations and making our own best judgment of what the national interest requires. But there are several hundred of us; each of us is subject to heavy pressure for appropriations that seem vital to our constituents, and we find it impossible in the time at our disposal to trim individual appropriations so that they be consistent with the expenditure ceiling. In view of our inability to agree on priorities, we assign this responsibility to you; but we naturally reserve the right to challenge your actions by new legislation." Such a mandate by the Congress would, of course, not make the President's job any easier; it could well lead at times to uneconomical cutbacks; and it might even mean that we will have only one-term Presidents in the future. However, by enabling the members of Congress to satisfy both their conscience and their constituents, such a mandate would probably assure that total expenditure is kept under decent control.

A second reform of vital significance would be adoption of the concept of zero-base budgeting. Customarily, the officials in charge of an established program have to justify only the increase which they seek above last year's appropriation. In other words, what they are already spending is usually accepted as necessary, without examination. Substantial savings could undoubtedly be realized if both the Budget Bureau examiners and the Congressional appropriation committees required every agency to make a case for its entire appropriation request each year, just as if its program or programs were entirely new. Such a budgeting procedure may be difficult to achieve, partly because it will add heavily to the burdens of budget-making, and partly also because it will be resisted by those who fear that their pet programs would be jeopardized by a system that subjects every Federal activity to annual scrutiny of its costs and results. However, this reform is so clearly necessary that I believe we will eventually come to it. I regard President Nixon's request of the Budget Bureau this year for a list of programs judged to be obsolete or substantially overfunded as a first step toward zero-base budgeting.

Several other reforms that I can only mention also deserve serious attention. First, earmarking of funds is often a dubious practice and should be carefully reappraised by the Congress. Second, agency heads should be subject to a Presidential requirement that if they request additional funds—whether for new or old programs—after the budget has been transmitted to the Congress, they must as a rule give up an equal amount of money from their ongoing activities. Third, new programs should be typically undertaken on a pilot basis and not launched on a national scale until their promise has been reasonably tested. Fourth, the law requiring that the cost of new programs be projected five years ahead when they are first presented to the Congress should be strictly enforced. In addition, comprehensive five-year budgetary projections should be constantly maintained by the Budget Bureau for the President's guidance. Fifth, I think that it would be useful to rotate the personnel of the Budget Bureau among its major divisions, so that the key examiners can periodically shed their preconceptions or frustrations and approach with a fresh eye the financial concerns of the agencies that are newly assigned to their scrutiny.

In addition to institutional reforms such as these, effective control of public expenditures will require larger reliance on volunteer efforts for dealing with our great social ills. It will also require thorough, realistic, and penetrating study of the promises, costs, and achievements of individual governmental programs. Although Federal agencies, particularly the Bureau of the Budget, need to augment their evaluative work, some doubt will always surround research that is carried out by agencies which originally advocated or subsequently supervised the programs under study. There is a great need, therefore, for expenditure studies by organizations that are independent of government and have no direct stake in any of the programs. In view of its preeminence in fiscal research and public education, the Tax Foundation is especially well equipped to organize teams of economists, accountants, political scientists, and management experts for the concrete study and evaluation of some of the major branches of Federal expenditure.

I hope that the Trustees of the Tax Foundation will be able to find a way of making this additional contribution to good government. If you undertake to do so, I assure you that the evaluation teams you send to Washington will receive a very warm welcome.

TRUCKERS WAX ELOQUENTLY OVER DEATH OF TRUCK BILL

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, a recent publication of the Private Truck Council of America, Inc., has come to my attention, and causes me to have a mixed reaction to its contents.

The text of the trucker publication to which I refer follows:

REQUIEM: TRUCK SIZE AND WEIGHT BILL
DEALT A DEATH BLOW

Taps are being played in Washington today over the barely warm body of the legislation known as H.R. 11870. It, you will recall, would have authorized the States to legislate trucks from 96" to 102" in width, provide a formula for establishing more sensible weight restrictions and allow a manageable increase in lengths. To repeat, it would have authorized the States to do such things. It would have authorized *no changes* in and of itself.

Our mournful announcement emanates from the fact that the Subcommittee on Roads met this week and reported out H.R. 11870 to the Committee on Public Works *without recommendations*. Such a lack of recommendation doesn't always have this chilling effect, but in this instance, the "without recommendation" amounted to a virtual kiss of death.

At the same time it was revealed that the DOT had told the leading congressional enemy of H.R. 11870, Fred Schwengel (R-Iowa), that all of the amendments to the bill suggested by the DOT had to be accepted or the DOT would be opposed to it. Such a position was tantamount to the hammering of several solid nails in the well-constructed coffin.

There's a moral behind all this, if the American people will just take heed. The AAA, Congressman Schwengel, the railroads, all too many of the subjective reporting type journalists whose prejudice, bias and arrogance is worn on his sleeve, and whose supercilious intellectualism appears to be vaporously draped from his body like the tinkling bells and colorful cloths of a typical 17th century court fool, and various other temporary or permanent miscreants, have once again trotted out the wondrous phrase "highway safety," dusted it off, polished it up a bit and thrown it at Congress and the public. Both seemed to have unquestionably swallowed it, lock, stock and barrel.

First, it is enlightening and reassuring to learn that the truckers themselves, now openly accept the fact that the "big truck bill" is dead. Second, the belittling attitude taken in the publication toward highway safety greatly disturbs me. Indeed it is reason for disgust. The publication, in an attempt to belittle and ridicule opponents of the legislation, refers to them as "miscreants." Webster's dictionary defines a miscreant, among other things, as being "destitute of conscience; unscrupulous; villainous." Thus, I take the comment of the truckers as a direct personal affront, and highly resent it. I am certain that the several hundred editors and reporters who editorialized and wrote stories in opposition to the bill likewise consider it an affront to be referred to as "supercilious intellectuals" and "court fools."

In addition, I am certain that the use

of this terminology is very much resented by the many capable, reputable and competent witnesses who testified in opposition to the bill. They included such respected people as: Mr. George Kachlein and Charles Brady of the AAA; Mrs. Walter Varney Magee, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs; Mr. Richard Boccabella and Warren G. Davison of the National Association of County Engineers; Mr. Joseph Coupal, Iowa's director of highways; Prof. John O'Mara of the University of Iowa's College of Engineering; Douglas Fugate, first vice president of AASHO; and Congressmen JOHN KYL and RICHARD McCARTHY.

The overwhelming majority of the opposition to the big truck bill was generated by those citizens of this country who do have a sincere and justifiable reservation about the impact of the proposed legislation on highway safety. Granted, there are varying degrees of understanding of the safety problem. Some have studied the problem in depth and are firmly convinced there are safety problems which should not lightly be brushed aside as supercilious. It is true that some oppose the legislation on grounds which are more emotional in nature, but none the less sincere. It is typical of the high-handed arrogance of the truck lobby to lightly disregard the desires and feelings of a clear majority of the citizens of this country, just as they have continually done in their past efforts to steamroller this legislation through the Congress.

If safety is in fact no real problem with the proposed increases in size and weight, then I challenge the Trucking Industry to join in support of the legislation to establish a Presidential Study Commission which I have introduced. The Commission proposed by my bill, H.R. 15051, would constitute a study group representative of all groups affected by the proposed increases in size and weight. If, as the truckers indicate, there is no safety problem, my proposed Commission should be able to report that fact to the Congress in short order. In which event, the big truck bill would undoubtedly sail through the Congress. However, the truckers will probably disregard this suggestion as mere "supercilious intellectualism."

MAYOR-ELECT OF ATLANTA SPEAKS OUT ON THE MURPHY AMENDMENT

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, recently the mayor-elect of Atlanta, Ga., Sam Massell, testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty. He voiced his opposition to the Murphy amendment which would give Governors a veto power over the legal services program.

Mr. Massell stated in his testimony:

The legal services program is distinguished from many other "poverty programs" in that

it is designed not merely as a bandaid on the carbuncle of poverty but as a sharp surgical knife of judicial and legislative reform, aimed at the laws and regulations that are the very heart of the discrimination that so effectively keeps poor people "in their place."

The legal services program demonstrates to the poor what a lawyer can be. A lawyer—to a poor man—is a person who keeps rich people out of jail. It is precisely because lawyers and legal services have never been possible for the poor—that poor people believe laws are written for the rich. The impact of this law has been significant in showing poor people that they, too, have legal rights. With lawyers to represent them, they have seen equal justice under the law become more than a convenient cliché. By providing disadvantaged Americans with an experience within the established system, the legal services program enhances the chance that these people may someday become a part of the system. It makes a difference—not only in the lives of the poor—but in the outlooks of the poor.

Support of the legal aid program in Atlanta comes from such local groups as the NAACP, the clergy, the Urban League, and the chamber of commerce.

I agree wholeheartedly with Mayor-elect Massell. Implementation of the Murphy amendment will put a halt to the legal services activity by virtue of a Governor's veto. The poor in America will lose their right to justice and not be served at all.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Mayor-elect Massell's testimony in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT OF SAM MASSELL, MAYOR-ELECT OF ATLANTA

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I am Sam Massell, mayor-elect of the City of Atlanta. I am appearing here today on behalf of the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities, to register our opposition to the Murphy Amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. At present, I am serving as vice-mayor of Atlanta, and as secretary to the Human Resources Development Committee of the Conference of Mayors.

If enacted, the Murphy Amendment would give state governors an absolute veto over all or part of any legal services program. The Amendment would thus splinter the final authority over legal services into 50 separate parts, removing legal services from the protected niche it has enjoyed as a part of OEO's national program, under the national guidance of OEO's Director. The Murphy Amendment might very possibly annihilate legal services.

Mr. Chairman, the legal services program as it has existed for the past four years has been in many ways the finest jewel in the crown of the poverty program. It has brought together a coalition of groups and funding sources that have never been joined together before. Under its roof lawyers and other heretofore solid buttresses of the establishment have been willing to combine their education, energy and talent with the financial resources of the Federal government—and in many cities, including Atlanta, with the financial resources of the local community—to work with poor people for the collective benefit of our cities and towns. Through legal services even the chamber of commerce has come to the assistance of poor people, and in Atlanta has paid for these dramatic and effective posters—posters that have appeared throughout the city in busses, churches and schools.

Surprisingly enough, the legal services program is distinguished from many other "poverty programs" in that it is designed not merely as a bandaid on the carbuncle of poverty but as a sharp surgical knife of judicial and legislative reform, aimed at the laws and regulations that are the very heart of the discrimination that so effectively keeps poor people, "in their place." It is a program that really does something.

Our Legal Aid Society has earned acceptance by its clients—which is no small task for an agency with establishment ties. In many respects it serves as an ombudsman—an office governmentally empowered as a citizens' advocate—an office that will lose much of its power and prestige if its independence is deflated by superimposing political considerations. The authority over the program at the federal level—the purse string—is understood, and is not likely to cause any dilution of the Legal Services Program.

I think I can speak with some authority when I identify agencies that have the confidence of the citizenry, and I am here to tell you that the poor people have found a friend in the Legal Services Program. And I am just as certain that any effort to shift the management of affairs to the Governor's Office will surely be read as code language for the end of a meaningful relationship between the poor and their lawyers.

We in Atlanta have had ample opportunity to observe the operations of a fine Legal Services Program. The Atlanta Legal Aid Society, an OEO program with five offices and approximately 30 full time lawyers, has produced a number of significant changes in my City—changes which in my opinion were long overdue and were accomplished by the force of reason instead of the force of violence.

A good example of the work of legal services is Atlanta Legal Aid's representation of a public housing tenant group known as TUFF (Tenants United for Fairness), a group that came into being because of tenant dissatisfaction with the management of public housing in Atlanta. (You may better understand the seriousness of that dissatisfaction if I mention that one of the few social disturbances we have ever experienced occurred in 1967 when Mr. Stokely Carmichael spoke at one of our public housing projects.)

The tenants were upset and in my opinion rightfully upset because all of the decisions affecting their tenancy were being made without regard to their wishes.

Tenants, for example, were evicted without being afforded any opportunity for a hearing. They were subjected to arbitrary rules including a rule in one project against feeding pigeons and a rule in another against keeping lawn furniture outside. They were humiliated in some projects by having their electricity turned off if their rent was overdue.

And they were constantly subjected to a variety of arbitrary charges and assessments over which they had no control.

In one project—indeed at the very project where Stokely Carmichael spoke—every new tenant was obligated to purchase a "grass cutting set" for \$3.95 consisting of a pair of hand clippers and a small wooden-handle scythe. Even the elderly residents of the project were assessed and charged and were obliged to keep their grass trimmed—or to pay an additional charge for failing to obey the project rules.

The tenants were also angry because the authority included the earnings of minor children in the computation of the family's income, thus forcing a family to evict a working child or confiscate his earnings.

These grievances, along with many others, were sufficiently distressing to motivate approximately 800 tenants to come to a protest meeting on a cold winter night last March. Obviously the situation was highly unsatisfactory—and potentially dangerous.

Fortunately for Atlanta, the tenants turned to the lawyers of the Atlanta Legal Aid Society instead of the streets.

By the month of August, after six months of negotiation and discussions—and law suits—the attitudes and policies of the Atlanta Housing Authority had changed so drastically that the tenants were able to claim a complete victory in their battle with the authority. The authority agreed to the following policy changes: (1) The creation of a tenants' grievance panel with complete jurisdiction to determine questions arising between tenants and management including project rules and charges, (2) to forego all income from minor children, (3) the creation of a housing authority advisory board designed to advise the authority of the needs and wishes of the tenants. This Board, with membership drawn from the tenants' association, community groups—and legal aid—now meets once a month and has proven an articulate and effective means of communication between the tenants and the authority.

The Atlanta Housing Authority is now in many ways a model of responsiveness to tenant needs. The change that has occurred over the past year is one that we in Atlanta find thrilling, for an established and conservative institution has now been made responsive to the needs of its low income clients, and the potentially dangerous situation has been defused—largely by an OEO Legal Services Program. This change has been accomplished throughout the traditional American procedures of negotiation, advocacy and legal action.

But let me tell you about another road that was being traveled during the same period in response to the grievances of the public housing tenants. At their request, our Board of Aldermen recommended to our local delegation in the Georgia General Assembly the addition of a tenant representative on the Atlanta Housing Authority Board and the reduction of the term of office of authority board members from 10 to 4 years. These amendments to Atlanta's Charter were subsequently recommended by the local delegation and adopted into law by the Georgia House and Senate—only to be vetoed by the Governor. Need I say more. Need I say more.

Legal aid's representation of TUFF is merely one example of the important work that legal services programs do on the local level; work that involves discovering the problems of poor people, bringing them to the attention of the authorities, and vigorously advocating changes in the system. In Atlanta, as in other cities, legal services programs represent many groups like TUFF and have produced major changes in the operations of public and private organizations who deal with the poor.

We in the Conference of Mayors and the League of Cities are concerned about the future of legal services because of the significant and beneficial impact legal services has had on our cities, and the reduction of future value which could result from the pending legislation. Legal services programs are our programs—for they are local programs created and designed by local people to deal with local problems. In Atlanta the Legal Aid Society receives federal funds, but is governed by a local Board of Directors and is sponsored by the Atlanta Bar Association NOT a State Bar or the ABA.

A sizeable percentage of Legal Aid's income is derived from our local united appeal campaign, NOT from any State campaign, and its work is supported by volunteers from the Atlanta Junior League and by the Atlanta Bar Association. It is also supported by such local organizations as the Atlanta NAACP, the Atlanta Concerned Clergy, and the Atlanta branch of the Urban League.

In my opinion it is inappropriate for any Governor to be able to veto—in whole or in part—a program that is such an entirely local

entity. And it is even more inappropriate for legal services lawyers in Atlanta to be required to worry about whether any specific suit they choose to bring might offend the interest of the Governor of the State.

It would be foolish of me to state that the work of the Atlanta Legal Aid Society would definitely be brought to an end in the event the amendment becomes law. But the Murphy Amendment would clearly endanger the Atlanta Legal Aid Society and would require every attorney in that organization to pause before advising a client, and to think twice and then to think again before filing a law suit against the State agency, a powerful political figure, or a person or organization known to be friendly to the Governor.

I hasten to explain, however, that to the best of my knowledge no legal services program in Georgia has ever had a disagreement with our Governor. If a legal services program is doing its job, however, that is, if it is actively defending the interest of the poor and vigorously fighting against the landlords, merchants and government agencies with whom poor people have to deal, it seems inevitable that the program will at some time conflict with the Governor's views. I know of one case in Georgia that might cause such a conflict; The Atlanta Legal Aid Society has brought a suit to force the state to increase the welfare grant given to AFDC mothers, and if legal aid should prevail in its suit the state welfare budget will be greatly increased. It goes without saying that my governor or your governor going through such a situation might be tempted to consider retaliation against the legal services program that had caused the administration such expense.

One of the beauties of the legal services program is that it has been able to represent its clients without deferring to such political considerations. When Atlanta legal aid began its representation of TUFF it was not obliged to pull its punches because the Board of Commissioners or the Housing Authority included distinguished, powerful and conservative members of "the establishment." When it brought its suit against the State Welfare Department, it did not first pause and wonder whether such a suit might endanger its support in the capitol building. It brought these lawsuits because its client's interest demanded the suit, and because it adhered to the position that the fate of poor people can and should be changed in the courtrooms of our country.

Legal services programs throughout the country are in a situation similar to that of the Atlanta Legal Aid Society. Their ability to fight fearlessly on behalf of their clients—indeed, their very ability to attract the kind of committed and excited young lawyers who are working for legal aid in Atlanta—depends on their continued freedom from political pressures. The Murphy amendment jeopardizes that freedom.

Legal services has demonstrated a profound and comprehensive understanding of the problems of poor people and an ability to do something about them. It correctly understands that the way to deal with the problems of poor people is to bring the people into our system and make them a part of it—not to isolate and segregate them from the system that supports and assists the rest of us.

By seeking to expand our present social and legal system to incorporate the demands of the poor, legal services has taken a long step towards the total American dream of equal justice for all. On behalf of America's mayors, on behalf of the cities, and on behalf of our too-long forgotten poor people, I urge you to reject and repudiate the Murphy amendment.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to appear before you today.

"PLEBISCITARY DEMOCRACY"—WHAT?

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bruce R. Hoefler, a constituent of mine, has called to my attention an editorial which appeared in the November 17 issue of the New Orleans Times-Picayune.

The editorial, entitled "Plebiscitary Democracy—What?" concerns itself with the recent antiwar demonstrations which were held here in Washington.

The situation as discussed by the Times Picayune shows knowledge, objectivity, and insight. I only wish that more newspapers would have had similar editorials following the so-called peace march.

There are those who will be suspect, I am sure, because the Times-Picayune is published in the South. But this paper has been in New Orleans for more than 100 years, and I am sure it will be there more than 100 years from now.

Mr. Hoefler suggested that it be made a part of the RECORD so all Members of Congress could read it and think about its content. I heartily agree with Mr. Hoefler and am inserting the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

"PLEBISCITARY DEMOCRACY"—WHAT?

Some folks have a knack for hiding the truth with jargon and catch phrases—of imputing to things a character they don't have. Some columnists have been talking about "plebiscitary democracy" and they infer that demonstrations by vocal minorities, such as last week's New Mobilization, constitute something of a plebiscite.

If the coined phrase means anything, it would have to be that the will of the people—all who let themselves be counted—has been expressed in a referendum of sorts, and that a democratic government has received its mandate from the majority.

But there is a strange element of intellectual intolerance in certain liberal circles, which arrogate to themselves the clear knowledge of truth and right and wisdom. They look down their noses at those not blessed with this inner light—moreso if the "untitled" happen to be in the majority. Such people preach democracy only when and if the majority can be won over to their point of view. Then only is democracy sacred.

We do not impugn the motives or sincerity of all anti-Vietnam adherents. But we believe there are some whose bile is eating away at their innards to such a degree that in their secret hearts they pine for the United States to be humiliated and for the non-Red population of Vietnam to be drenched in a Communist blood bath after American disengagement.

What might the reaction of some after such a catastrophe be? It served the South Vietnamese right for being "corrupt," or being "puppets of U.S. imperialism" . . . or any number of other rationalizations which would prompt one to be outraged at the reported liquidation of a Communist double agent while feeling no anguish for the civilians of Hue whom the Reds callously slaughtered and buried (some while still alive) in mass graves.

But does the massing of a quarter of a million protesters—which is 1-800th of Americans—really represent plebiscitary democracy? Or must it be viewed in relationship to a less vocal majority who concur with

President Nixon's position for ending the war and who do not organize a "spectacular"? And would a quarter million crowding the Washington Monument in support of current U.S. policy be any more a plebiscite?

A genuine barometer of plebiscitary democracy on the Vietnam issue, we believe, was the overwhelming bipartisan support for a report which the House Foreign Affairs Committee issued on a resolution cosponsored by 307 of the 432 House members backing the President's effort's for peace.

For the offices of congressmen, who by and large reflect the convictions of their constituents, are the best places to go to put your finger on the pulse of America. That pulse is beating strong and fast for an honorable peace in Vietnam—against a sellout to the Reds.

Columnist Thomas B. Ross's report from the Paris "peace talks," on this page, gives testimony on the importance of unity among the "silent majority" of Americans, so that Hanof's illusions, fostered here by a small vociferous minority of chronic dissenters, may turn to disillusionment and to reason.

GRUBSTAKE, INC.—PITTSBURGH YOUTH REHABILITATION PROGRAM

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is an established fact that drug abuse, particularly among the young, is one of our major national problems.

In our larger cities, it is calculated that addicts must raise in the neighborhood of \$500,000 per day to support their habit, resulting in their turning to such crimes as robbery, shoplifting, burglary, forgery, and prostitution.

Beside the financial cost, the real cost of abuse of drugs and narcotics to the users in alarming, as they live in half-alive, half-free states, without hope or meaning to their lives.

In Pittsburgh a unique program has been established by an Episcopal priest named Father Dom Orsini, to aid and rehabilitate these young offenders, and give them a "grubstake" on life. While they need more money at the moment to continue their fine work, some real progress has been made to date, largely due to the commitment, philosophy, and efforts of Father Orsini himself.

An article from the Pittsburgh Press and a letter to the editor of the New York Times, by Father Orsini himself of November 16 are included at this point in the RECORD for the thoughtful attention of my colleagues and for all who are concerned with finding meaningful solutions to the drug dilemma. The articles follow:

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Nov. 16, 1969]

GRUBSTAKE NEEDS ONE TO AID YOUTH (By Roger Stuart)

When Father Dom Orsini, an Episcopal priest, first began to help prospecting young criminals search for a richer life he did so with "a dream and a degree of hope."

Now, five years later, he still nurses his dream of giving faltering youth a lift into the mainstream of life with a lot of hope and "a lot less ignorance" of just how tough that job really is.

"We've made mistakes," he concedes. Especially at the outset in dealing with youths hooked on drugs and largely because he lacked knowledge about the problem.

"But you learn fast," says Father Orsini. "We no longer take heroin addicts. We failed with every one of the 11 sent to us."

There have been other failures, too, which have become discouragingly obvious when young men he thought he had helped got "busted" all over again by police.

CONTRIBUTING NOW

Still, Grubstake, Inc. on the South Side, which gave substance to Father Orsini's dream, has had more success than failure, with about 80 of its more than 100 "graduates" going on to become contributing rather than leeching members of society.

They're holding jobs now, he says. They pay taxes. Some are married.

Such success is in direct contrast to the national success ratio in rehabilitation of young delinquents, Father Orsini contends.

And in achieving it, Grubstake has stamped its own imprint on the Pittsburgh district's youth corrections program as indelibly as Father Orsini has stamped his own black eye-patch trademark on Grubstake.

Among local judges—two are members of the Grubstake board—who have sent wayward youths to Grubstake, it has inspired confidence.

PATCH INSPIRES CONFIDENCE

And to at least one youth—a black who wound up there—Father Orsini's eye patch (which he's worn since he put a lighted match to a gasoline tank at age 10 to see what would happen) has inspired confidence. "I like you," the youth told Father Orsini. "I can trust you."

"Why?" asked the priest. "Because," said the youth, "you wear that eye patch. And with it—like me—you carry a certain mark."

But for all its success, Grubstake—unless it soon gets its own new six-month, \$65,000 lease on life—will run out of funds and die.

To Father Orsini, such a death knell would come "when all our plans are just about ready for picking" and be like falling "two inches short of our goal."

"BACK TO JAIL"

To Nate, 21, a Wilkensburg Negro enrolled there for burglaries committed to help sustain his marijuana-smoking and pill-popping, Grubstake's demise can mean only one thing.

"Back to jail," he says. And though Nate says "it's tougher here (at Grubstake) than in jail," he wants to stay, because "they can't help me in jail."

His view is born of a certain amount of experience, including three months in the County Workhouse and four months another time in the County Jail.

Right now Nate is just one of the 15 youths at Grubstake, where enrollment has been cut from 25 because of the financial squeeze.

DAILY CONFERENCES

But at Grubstake, he says, he's coming "face to face with myself" through the help of almost daily conferences with Innocenzio Gregnano, a consulting psychologist, and Dr. Ken Whipps, a Duquesne University sociologist.

And one of the things he admits about himself now is that "I started messing around with drugs because I was afraid of getting drafted and going to Vietnam."

Somebody told him once that drug-taking is a good draft dodge because the service won't mess with anybody who's fooled with them.

"I was going to leave them alone later," says Nate. "But I couldn't."

Indeed, just a week ago he was discovered "messing around with goofballs" that had been supplied to him by another Grubstake resident.

"Where's that resident now?" asked Father Orsini.

"In jail," said Nate.

And Nate?

Grubstake gave him another chance. He was placed in its Tender Loving Care (TLC) program—a misnomer which, Father Orsini contends, could be described more adequately as "the old monastic mortification of the body to sanctify the soul."

From 7 a.m. until 10 p.m. every day for six to eight weeks, Nate will scrub floors, walls, cupboards and the like. And if he doesn't have anything else to scrub, he'll scrub the same things again.

But in Grubstake's big barn of a building at 2400 E. Carson St., which used to house the Lutheran Service Society on the South Side, there are many rooms.

Every 15 minutes a supervisor checks up on him. He's subjected to periodic shake-downs and at least every two days—sometimes more often—he's given a urinalysis examination to determine if, somehow, he's gotten more drugs.

LIKE BEING ON A LEASH

TLC, in short, says Jim, 18, a white Penn Hills youth who became its first subject, is "like being on a leash."

Arrested a year ago and three days after he started pushing pills in school, he says he was sent to Grubstake without the authorities knowledge that he had smoked marijuana, and "tripped" on Speed and LSD.

"We just weren't alert to it," says Father Orsini. "The records didn't indicate it. There was suspicion, but how far can you go on that?"

As it turned out, Jim and a couple of other Grubstake residents, who normally are given great amounts of freedom, got some LSD on a visit to Shadyside.

But becoming frightened after a bad trip, "they busted themselves," says Father Orsini.

Grubstake's TLC component was devised as a result.

MAKING RESTITUTION

And in Jim's case, at least, it seems to have worked.

He's been off all drugs and narcotics for three months now, he says. He's confronted his guilt of burglaries and voluntarily confessed to his victims and has started to make restitution.

This week he will leave Grubstake, hopefully to complete his last high school year in prep school and then enroll in college, where he will take an architecture course.

In the meantime, however, Father Orsini's financial dilemma with Grubstake remains. Government agencies are likely candidates to provide financial buttresses.

Charitable fund-raising groups, too, reasonably can be expected to provide some help in the future.

Applications to local, State and Federal agencies are being or already have been prepared.

UP TO COMMUNITY

But right now the foundations which provided Grubstake's original "seed money," can help just so long, says Father Orsini, noting: "Once a project proves itself, the foundations figure it's up to the community to support it the rest of the way."

So Grubstake Inc. is campaigning among Pittsburgh district people—average citizens—for a grubstake. Donations may be mailed to Grubstake Inc., Post Office Box 9107, Pittsburgh 15224.

Speed is critical, says Father Orsini. Meanwhile, various public administrators, including State Attorney Gen. William Sennett, are pulling out the stops to see what kind of emergency help can be provided.

But regardless of the outcome of these

efforts or the longer term hopes for government support, Father Orsini says:

"The measure of our greatest success will be if the community accepts us. If the average citizen doesn't accept us, we're lost; we're dead—no matter how much other money we get in the bank."

[From the New York Times Magazine, Nov. 16, 1969]

CRADLE-TO-THE-GRAVE BUSINESS

To the Editor:

Gertrude Samuels' article "A New Lobby—Ex-Cons" (Oct. 19), is a masterful portrayal of long ignored and shameless attitudes and practices of the "law abiders" in this nation. I know nothing of the Fortune Society—which may be my shame—but the statements about the problem are accurate.

I am not an ex-con but I am the son of one. My father spent time in the Comstock State Prison. His charge was murder. I was 2 months old when he began "pulling his time"; I met him for the first time when he was released (I was 8 years old). Jail and the fate of an ex-con made him less than human. I am an Episcopal priest, the founder and director of Grubstake, Inc., a community treatment center for the young adult offender. Ours is a work with the ex-con and the pre-con.

In our society, crime is cradle-to-the-grave business. From the earliest stages sufficient deprivation guarantees a tragic emptying of individual lives. It is like a self-fulfilling prophecy. When the crash occurs, and jail becomes a part of one's personal history, those who are not crushed in spirit and hope by our penal system need but wait upon release for the final touches: official suspicion and hounding are added to the personal insecurities, inferiorities and fears. These, plus the social, political and economic ostracism, work to erode further the remaining spirit until either recidivism or death. If recidivism occurs, then society says "See, no good," and the screws of the system are tightened. If death—the record is expunged by the grave.

Few, if any, ex-cons survive this whipping without deep and permanent scars. The chances of overcoming these forces are small and life is a bitter, uphill battle for mere survival.

Considering the impetus to new solutions offered by the Federal Government by way of the Omnibus Crime Bill, and the pioneering work being done by the Federal Bureau of Prisons, there is hope. In Pennsylvania an alert and sensitive Attorney General, William Sennett, has brought into being a constructive crime commission to "re-think" the entire approach to the criminal justice system. The Pennsylvania Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation has for several years offered its resources to help meet the vocational and educational needs of the social deviant. The Department of Corrections and the Board of Parole are now energized by a young breed which lacks the jailor concept. In Pittsburgh, foundations and corporations have provided generous seed money to organizations such as ours to investigate, program, staff and innovate. The Criminal and Family Courts of Allegheny County actively support our efforts. Our push was provided by the Hon. Ruggero Aldisert, formerly of the Court of Common Pleas and first chairman of the Grubstake board. He is now a member of the U.S. Court of Appeals. His successor at Grubstake, the Hon. Joseph Weis Jr. of the Court of Common Pleas, carries on by leading an expansion of our effort.

I feel that if the states would set aside 10 per cent of their corrections and parole budgets for innovation and if this were matched by Federal funds, we would see a dramatic change in our crime cost and an upsurge of hope and productivity among those now deemed "dead."

FATHER DOM T. ORSINI,

PITTSBURGH, PA.

TO MUCH OF THE WORLD SONGMY SIGNIFIES AN AMERICAN TRAGEDY

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, December 3, 1969, the New York Times printed a story by Henry Tanner detailing European reaction to the Songmy tragedy. The second paragraph summarizes the feelings of many:

Apart from the predictable exploitation by the Communists, the atrocities allegedly committed by American soldiers have moved the world to feelings of sorrow, shock, anger and a deep fear that the continuation of the war will have a corrosive, brutalizing effect on American youth and American society as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I share this fear. The complete article follows:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 3, 1969]
TO MUCH OF THE WORLD SONGMY SIGNIFIES AN AMERICAN TRAGEDY

(By Henry Tanner)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., December 2.—In much of the world's press and for many ordinary citizens the village of Songmy has become the symbol of an American tragedy, even more than a Vietnamese tragedy.

Apart from the predictable exploitation by the Communists, the atrocities allegedly committed by American soldiers have moved the world to feelings of sorrow, shock, anger and a deep fear that the continuation of the war will have a corrosive, brutalizing effect on American youth and American society as a whole.

These feelings emerge as the main theme from reports by correspondents of The New York Times from some 30 countries.

Although comparisons with wartime Nazi crimes and with crimes committed by Communist forces in Vietnam were being drawn by some, the survey showed that the great majority in most countries do not see Americans in a similar light.

JUDGMENTS VARY

Most persons, the survey showed, apply one set of moral judgments to dictatorships, both Communist and Nazi, and another to the United States. Although an implied tribute, this only deepened the anger and the sorrow of those who have considered themselves the friends of Americans.

"What is happening to America, arbiter of the world, with its high moral standards," an Italian university professor asked. "Are you fighting the war by the standards of your enemies?"

The reports also showed that in Europe and Asia the Songmy affair has rekindled sharp public concern over Vietnam, reversing a trend toward growing indifference that an earlier survey had found a few days after President Nixon's speech on Vietnam of Nov. 3.

THREAT TO AMERICANS SEEN

Many people linked the alleged massacre in the settlement of Mylai No. 4, which is a part of Songmy, to what they saw as the inherent evil of the Vietnam war. They renewed their criticism of Mr. Nixon's Vietnam policies and renewed their appeals for the United States Government to end the war.

American withdrawal now is "both a necessary act of state and a human imperative," wrote The Spectator, the conservative-inclined London weekly, in a typical comment. "Continued war now means a deadly threat not only to Vietnam but to the American

people," an editorial in Dagens Nyheter, the respected Swedish daily said.

From Oslo a correspondent reported that the common theme of virtually all available comment was "the war has to stop" and one of the most urgent reasons for stopping it "is to save American youth from slow moral poisoning."

In several countries Songmy awakened memories of other wars and other atrocities—atrocities committed as well as atrocities suffered.

OTHER VILLAGES RECALLED

"The Americans have learned that the Americans in Vietnam have become the equal of the French in Indochina, Madagascar, Algeria and of the Germans at Oradour," wrote the Paris weekly L'Express, whose publisher, Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber, first gained prominence abroad by writing a book about a young lieutenant—himself—being caught up in the "vicious circle of violence" in Algeria.

Oradour-sur-Glane was a village in central France that was razed and its entire male population killed by the Germans in reprisal against an attack by partisans in 1944.

In Germany too, newspaper editorialists recalled not only Oradour, but also Lidice, the Czechoslovak village, and Flett di Camarda, a village in Italy, both of which suffered atrocities.

In Spain an official remarked: "Perhaps if American writers were dealing with the civil war now they would not be so quick to draw moral conclusions from the terrible things that happened then," referring to the Spanish Civil War of 1936 to 1939.

"I am shocked," a grocer in Athens said. "If atrocities like this are tolerated by the United States Army and we are simply told that the Reds are doing worse, one wonders what it is the Americans are fighting for in Vietnam."

REDEEMING ASPECTS

"Almost every army has its killers, but these Americans have done away with the American dream of being different," said an official in Belgrade.

And in The Hague, an editorial in the Socialist daily Het Vrije Volk wrote: "The American's have been killing the people they wanted to protect. This means the bankruptcy of United States Vietnam policy."

Many persons abroad noted that the American press had given detailed coverage to the eyewitness accounts. This public debate and the Administration's promise to investigate and mete out justice are the only redeeming aspects of the tragedy, in the view of foreign public opinion, the survey showed.

Aldo Rizzo, an editorialist in the Bologna Daily Il Resto del Carlino condemned the alleged massacre and added:

"All this must be said explicitly and without mental reservation, but it is necessary to add that the war crime of Songmy is being examined, evaluated and discussed in America today with a frankness and sincerity that has no precedent in the sad history of such things."

La Stampa, the respected Turin daily, wrote in a front-page editorial: "But the civilization of a people is judged above all by the courage and the severity with which it isolates certain individuals and denounces their crimes. The American press has done and is doing its duty."

Government officials in most countries have refrained from making statements. Among the exceptions were those in Britain, Sweden, Norway and West Germany.

Prime Minister Wilson, six days before the White House issued its statement, said that it would be a grave atrocity if the charges made thus far turned out to be only a quarter true.

Efforts are under way to bring the issue into the House of Commons for formal debate or at least before a meeting of the

Parliamentary Labor party prior to Mr. Wilson's departure for Washington in January.

The British press, politicians and people were quicker than their American counterparts to sense the full horror of the affair, a correspondent wrote from London, adding:

"Why should this be so? Perhaps it is easier for outsiders to see horror. The British admire us so much, and still have so many illusions about the United States, that our wounds make them bleed. And they are less inured to violence than Americans now."

TERMED HORRIFYING EXAMPLE

Foreign Minister Torsten Nilsson, of Sweden said in a speech in Malmö last week: "World opinion cannot be silent about the American war crimes in Vietnam. We must say clearly what we think."

In Norway, Songmy was described during a debate in the Storting, or Parliament, as a horrifying example of the atrocities of war. It was the main reason why Gunnar Garbo and Olaf Kortner, respectively chairman and vice chairman of the Liberal party, which is part of the Government coalition, came out for recognition of Hanol.

Guttorm Hansen the spokesman for the Labor opposition, which is spearheading the move for recognition, said: "This war is a heavy weight on America's relations with its friends around the world, and from the dead-end street this great nation has driven itself into, there is only one way out: the way back."

In Bonn, Chancellor Willy Brandt was asked about Songmy at his first news conference since taking over the Government, and refused to draw a parallel with Nazi war crimes. He replied:

"If I were still a private citizen or a newspaperman I know what I would say. I can see how heavily the burden weighs on the American people and I feel it inappropriate for me to comment as if to put two things in the same pot that do not belong together."

BILL TO RAISE PERSONAL EXEMPTION RATE

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of H.R. 7331, a bill to raise the personal exemption rate per dependent from \$600 to \$1,000, I was pleased by the Senate vote on Wednesday to increase the rate to \$800. The Senate action, while inadequate, nonetheless constitutes a major step toward alleviating the heavy tax burden borne by low- and middle-income Americans.

Over the past three decades the cost of living has more than tripled in the United States. Yet, during this same period, the personal exemption rate, originally designed to relate to the cost of living and the cost of rearing a child, has been increased only once and then by only \$100.

Justice and equity demand an increase in the pitifully low and antiquated exemption rate. The Senate has acted correctly and courageously by boosting the rate in the face of vigorous opposition from the administration, and the Congress should act quickly to ratify the increase. I am confident the President will respect the wishes of millions of over-

taxed citizens by signing the exemption rate increase into law.

CAMPUS UNREST: A STUDY OF WHO AND WHAT IS INVOLVED

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is much concern and interest about what is going on in our colleges and universities today.

Why is there unrest? What can we do about it? Is it a single problem or a combination of problems? Is it a matter of lack or of collapse in communications?

The questions are endless. The answers are not so easy.

Mr. Speaker, the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News in my home city sent an able young member of its Washington bureau staff, Ronald Maselka, on a study tour of 10 key colleges and universities in the Northeast and Midwest.

On this tour he produced a series of stories of his findings which I believe merit wider circulation because this basic matter is of such broad interest.

As a part of my remarks today, I am including the first four stories in Mr. Maselka's excellent series:

CONFLICT ON CAUSE, CURE HINDER SOLUTION OF UNREST ON CAMPUSES—I

(By Ronald J. Maselka)

WASHINGTON, September 22.—As signs of autumn reappear, so do the renewed pangs of a gnawing national tummyache—campus unrest.

Like its related agony—the Vietnam war—trying to forget about it doesn't make it go away. And while the wrong medicines might only inflame the pain, the right ones are hard to find.

However, there is a growing conviction that student disorder is but a symptom of a larger national ailment. "Campus unrest is not just a passing thing," said U.S. Education Commissioner James E. Allen Jr., but part of the nation's undergoing "turbulent social change."

This echoes the interim report in June by the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence that "the problem on campus unrest is more than a campus problem. Its roots lie deep in the larger society."

Addressing a conference of student leaders and university officials over the week-end, Dr. Allen compared this unrest to a mild heart attack, which signals a need—while leaving time—for corrective action.

EXPERTS DISAGREE ON FUTURE

But how much time is left? What steps should be taken? Experts disagree on the problem's future, as they do on the underlying causes and the diagnoses for cure. There is agreement on the magnitude of the problem, the need for concern that it may envelope the high schools.

But these are tough questions, this student talk of war, hunger, poverty, militarism, racism. What is a university? What is the purpose of education? Of government?

To Prof. William S. Stanmeyer of Georgetown University Law School these questions add up to: "What is the good society? What is the good life?" These are issues that have posed intellectual headaches for philosophers since Plato. Now they pose some real head-

aches for America's politicians, who also have no clearcut, immediate answer.

THE SEARCH CONTINUES

Throughout America, however, in Washington, in state capitals, in college dormitories and living rooms, the search continues. And there lies the hope, the difference between an evolution and revolution.

As President Nixon noted in a meeting with campus leaders Saturday afternoon, there is a need for students to listen as well as talk, a need for more tolerance between the community at-large and the vast majority of rational students.

How tolerant, how patient will the students be this year, no one can say for sure.

Dr. Allen, for example, has been criticized for his public optimism that "there are signs that the worst may be over." Some say this is wishful thinking, or an attempt at reverse psychology.

OPINIONS DIFFER

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has predicted that it "will not subside in coming months." And Dr. Richard Peterson, a research psychologist who conducted national surveys in 1965 and 1968 on organized student protests, said: "I don't think it's going to decline. All the issues are still alive. While reform efforts are going on at many schools, these are not fast enough to counteract."

While campus reforms have brought "more channels for students to communicate their views" and "conditions exist for an exchange of trust and responsibility," New York University President James M. Hester acknowledges: "We will have continuing confrontation with various groups."

Reports indicate that institutions generally are better prepared for protests. A tightening-up trend is indicated in beefed-up campus police forces, improved campus disciplinary machinery, codes of conduct and willingness to use expulsion and court injunctions to keep order.

LONG, SHORT RANGE VIEWS

But as one federal educator noted: "You can't document a prophecy."

Is Dr. Allen, then, looking at the campuses through rose-colored glasses? It would seem not. Apparently, he is looking through intellectual bifocals for long- and short-range views.

He is soft-pedaling the symptom, hard-selling the long-range cure.

Acknowledging that unrest is a pressing immediate problem, he urged the week-end conference of students and educators to put emphasis "not on patching up the cracks but in building a whole new structure." This means "looking beyond the moment," he said, to the long range goal of improving the university and the nation.

The short-range view sees the need for controlling and preventing campus violence this year. Long-range, it sees the task of answering the larger questions.

AWAIT LEGISLATIVE ACTION

This dual perception also clearly shows that some issues are intramural—like curriculum, student participation, minority admission policies—and can be solved by universities and their students on a campus-by-campus basis.

It also shows that some issues—Vietnam, the draft, race relations, aid to education—await action in Washington, in state legislatures and in the larger public opinion.

Keeping these differing views in focus will depend on distinguishing between what the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence called "peaceful protest and violent disruption, between the non-conformity of youth and the terror tactics of the extremists."

Studies on campus unrest generally note that only a tiny minority—around 3 per

cent—of the students are the revolutionary radicals, the anarchists, the nihilists. Between these committed to violent confrontation and the 70 per cent or more moderates are the discontented, who can be aligned with the radicals on an issue-by-issue basis.

MUST BE CONTAINED

It is apparent that the violence of the few has done violence to the reasonable complaints of many more.

Campus administrators face the task of distinguishing between the unreasonable demands of the disrupters and the legitimate complaints of the dissenters. It is a task that requires a kind of walking-on-eggs statesmanship to prevent the escalation of incidents sparked by a tiny minority.

In short, the disrupters must be contained. The dissenters must be communicated with. But student impatience sometimes makes communication difficult.

And according to one Bureau of Higher Education official, "one factor is worse this year." Noting that an estimated 250,000 students are affected by congressional failure to pass an emergency guaranteed student loan program—providing an incentive allowance to lenders to make loans to college students—he said: "By the time Congress enacts this, it will be too late for most of the kids. . . ."

ECONOMIC ISSUES CITED

"Sure students are refusing to fight the old men's war. But they're also making some very valid complaints about the rising costs of education and about the decline in the quality of teaching . . . students as individuals and universities as institutions are both caught in this economic crunch.

"As federal funds are being cut drastically, costs are rising for both. The economic issues on the campus are just as serious as these others that get more publicity."

In a widely circulated report based on a spring tour of campuses, 22 House Republicans stressed the need for increasing aid to education.

Led by Rep. William E. Brock (R. Tenn.), the group has been pleading with Nixon administration officials to implement some of their recommendations, ranging from draft reform to lowering the voting age to 18 and ordinating all federal youth programs in one agency.

SEEK INTERN PROGRAM

There are reports the administration is considering establishing a blue-ribbon Commission on Higher Education to study the complex issues from ROTC to government research on campus.

The GOP group is also working toward obtaining funds for the congressional intern program to get more young people involved in politics constructively. Federal funds for the program were cut off two years ago.

From its own party and elsewhere, the Nixon administration has been criticized for "moving in the right direction but not fast enough" on campus problems.

But Henrik N. Dullea, special assistant to State University of Buffalo President Martin Meyerson, criticizes the administration's contradictory policies.

CITIES PEACE DIVIDENDS

A delegate to last week-end's student-educator conference here, Mr. Dullea stressed that this was his personal opinion. While encouraging volunteer student action social programs, he said, the administration sponsored a meeting in Washington on the subject but didn't invite any students.

Evidence of de-escalation of the war and troop withdrawals, he said, are counterbalanced by reports that the peace dividend of post-war funds available for domestic programs won't be very large.

While the administration's school desegregation policies are also an irritant to students, Mr. Dullea said they also question education fund cutbacks in the light of the

size of the military budget or the space exploration program.

Seeking to dramatize its concern, the administration has announced its proposal to drop the November-December draft quotas and seek congressional approval of a lottery system.

NEED DRAFT REFORM

While this was viewed as a hopeful gesture, even moderate students at the week-end sessions sponsored by the Association of Student Governments were not particularly enthusiastic.

"We need real draft reform, not a stop-gap measure," one said. "Besides, the war is a bigger issue."

Mirroring the nation, Congress too is divided on how to respond to campus disorders. Some would attack the social issues fueling the unrest. Others would react harshly with repressive legislation.

One federal education official said: "So far, we in the administration and the agencies involved have been successful in blocking repressive measures. We hope we will continue to be successful."

LAWS ON BOOKS

But a congressional aide was more pessimistic. "If there's another blowup, anything can happen," he said in discussing possible Capitol Hill reaction.

There are already federal laws that call for aid-cutoffs to students convicted in civil courts of crimes linked to campus disorders or who have been found administratively guilty by university procedures.

In the opinion of some, these laws are really unnecessary, or at least superfluous. "These laws are more a statement of public concern," one agency expert said. "Congress showed that it acted. But it's easier for a university to expel somebody."

Blocked so far—but available if there is public outcry for more campus violence—are legislative proposals to cut off all federal aid to institutions, not just individuals, and to make campus violations punishable by federal fines and jail terms.

"SILENT MAJORITY" IN THE COLLEGES IGNORES NEW PATHS OF RADICALS—II

(By Ronald Maselka)

COLLEGE PARK, Md., October 1.—Four asphalt paths intersect the grassy mall in the heart of the University of Maryland's main campus.

When classes end on the hour, most students follow those paths. But scores of others are carving out a fifth path, already a yellowish brown trail, and a handful just cut across the lawn.

These cross-campus walking patterns parallel the political breakdown of today's collegiate student bodies. Those following the paved paths, for example, symbolize the so-called "silent majority" of students, concerned about current, pressing issues but immediately more concerned about their studies.

Dr. William E. Sedlacek, assistant director of the University of Maryland's Counseling Center, said his student behavior studies indicate this majority "is just trying to get through."

The reform minded minority is represented symbolically by the group forging the new path, while student radicals might be compared to the independent lawn crossers.

CLAIM NEED FOR NEW WAY

According to Dr. Sedlacek, the vocal group of new pathmakers is legitimately concerned about the society and about changing it. "They are saying there is a need for a new way of doing things by registering their protests through traditional or modern channels."

The radicals are that small group of hardcore revolutionaries who carry violence as a tool in their portfolio of protest. For Dr.

Sedlacek, the radicals include members of the SDS (Students for a Democratic Society), who believe the "whole thing is no good" and want to tear down the society without offering a pragmatic alternative. Not only would they walk on the university's grass, they would stomp on it, burn it, uproot it. They are the extremists.

In between the reformers and radicals are what Dr. Sedlacek calls "the blenders into the liberal environment." These don't always stick to the same path. Today, they may be liberals, tomorrow—who knows what.

The "blenders" would include the faddists, those who grow beards and don't wear shoes, for example, Dr. Sedlacek explains, but "when they leave school, they shave off the beard and go straight, so to speak, right away."

33,000 AT MARYLAND

But long hair and short skirts, bare feet and beards are not the exclusive uniform of any of these groups, which accommodate any number of subgroups with political variations from ultra conservative to ultra radical.

The University of Maryland and nearby Georgetown and George Washington Universities are physically different but they share this diverse student spectrum.

Maryland has about 33,000 students on a campus dotted with majestic trees and red-bricked, white-pillared colonial-style buildings. It is the fourth largest single state university campus in the nation.

Georgetown's 7600 students have a lot less green area, which is offset by quaint shops and cobblestone streets. It is the oldest Catholic university in the country.

OPINIONS ON SILENT MAJORITY

George Washington's 14,000 students share a concrete campus that covers a large area in downtown Washington with no visible boundary lines. Its buildings, classrooms and town houses are spread over an urban campus that is nearly across the street from the State Department on one side, four blocks from the White House on another and 14 blocks from a ghetto.

On these three very different campuses, as elsewhere, there are differences of opinion on how loud this "silent majority" of students is. Some call the silence apathy, indifference. Others attribute it to a heavy work load rather than a lack of concern for non-academic issues.

Stressing that "most college students are concerned about the fundamental problems of our society," George Washington's president, Dr. Lloyd H. Elliott, said that most are also "moderates who are knowledgeable about these problems and concerned with their solution, and to a considerable measure are changing their own goals and career plans because of them."

WORKS IN SILENT WAYS

For instance, he points to increased interest medical students are showing in assignments to neighborhood health centers, law students in legal aid work, business schools in re-examining social responsibilities.

Another defender of the "silent majority" and the belief that it works in many silent ways is Francis P. Hyland, a Maryland junior, who wrote in a letter to the campus newspaper: "This campus does have a conscience. It gives blood for transfusions, it bounces basketballs for heart disease, it holds trash bashes, it sells daffodils for cancer research, it pays welcome visits to shut-ins, it collects food and clothing for the poor, and it takes children, who otherwise could not go, to the zoo and the circus."

Responding to another student who had found some merit in SDS protests, the letter added: "You seek a neatly compartmented, homogenized student body, which, pray God, will never exist."

While "any dissent is carried on by a minority," Dr. John Portz, head of Maryland's

honors program, stressed that today's student activism is "being carried on with at least the tacit consent of the majority."

THE ACTIVIST STUDENTS

And while the majority "may not have the oomph" to overcome the natural inertia of the non-reformer, Dr. Portz added: "They're certainly not indifferent. I've been teaching for a quarter-century and this is the most involved, committed generation of students I've seen."

But then, how do you explain a turnout of 75 in a student body of thousands for a meeting to plan a peaceful anti-war protest?

Activist students—even the SDS types—usually the student government leaders, the newspaper editors, see this moderate majority "going to class and going home, period."

That's partially explained because so many students are commuters, off-campus residents with outside interests. Many have jobs to support their cars and their education. This type of student population cuts into organizing ability.

FRATERNITIES FADING

But Ira Allen, associate editor of Maryland's daily student newspaper—the Diamondback—said: "I don't underestimate the apathetic people. They are concerned about things but there's this thing about showing it. A large majority are respectably against the war, for example." One indication that the wave of concerned students is growing is the reported decline of fraternities and sororities.

Noting that the number of students who sought admission to fraternities was down, one George Washington junior said: "Fraternities are fading. Students don't see fraternity life as meaningful enough." Or as a Maryland senior put it: "Did you get drunk Friday night and who did you date Saturday night are no longer the important questions."

Largely, however, the "silent majority" seems to mirror the larger society. Generally for example, students are notoriously lax voters.

CONSIDERED PRISON

And like many adults, they don't get concerned about an issue until it affects them personally. It's like the student who explained that he was concerned about the draft "in general" but "when the draft comes to me, then I'll have to make a decision."

The thin line between unconcerned moderate and very concerned radical was drawn when he recalled that he was out of school for a semester and worried about getting drafted.

"I considered going to prison rather than being drafted," he explained, adding that he was still determined not to accept induction if called to fight in Vietnam.

"If it were a question of defending this territory," he said, "sure I'd go. But in Vietnam . . . the objectives aren't clear there."

Occasionally, like when a group of veterans at Maryland helped thwart an SDS building takeover, the silent majority asserts itself. But indications are that short of total crisis situation, it apparently cannot be regularly expected to counter campus violence.

OTHER WAYS OF CHANGE

One of the acknowledged tasks of student governments this year will be an effort to motivate this bulk of the campus population.

Robert L. Liebersohn, a junior at Maryland, in an interview noted that he's concerned about the big issues but "I'm concerned about my grades, my personal problems . . . There are other ways of change besides protest." He plans to be a teacher.

What would get him to protest?

If there were a threat of a campus takeover, he said, I'd protest that and demand my rights to an education be protected."

And an engineering student watching an SDS Teach-In said: "I wish they'd put that energy to use trying to make the bookstore more efficient . . . But if the government cuts off money because of jokers like that, I might get a little violent myself."

RE-EXAMINED ISSUES

But sometimes there are undramatic transformations, Robert X. Morrell, a Georgetown sophomore from Los Angeles, explained that he was "a gross example" of non-involvement last year.

Noting that he used "to take a lot of long naps," he recalled working on a scholarship drive for inner city students. "And wait a minute I said to myself. All these kids at other schools wouldn't be doing this for no reason at all. So I re-examined the issues all by myself."

Which way will this current freshman class go?

FEELING THEIR WAY

They are still an unknown quantity basically. One Georgetown spokesman voiced a consensus why he said: "Each incoming class seems to have been more volatile than the other. On that basis, we'd expect some more activists but we don't really know."

Upper classmen generally seem to have the opinion that the freshmen are "amazingly tuned on to what is going on." Random talks with some freshmen indicate a "just feeling my way" attitude.

Take John C. O'Keefe, a Georgetown freshman from Dayton, O., who said: "Around here, everyone expected or suspected the freshman class to be vociferous or boisterous or active . . . But I don't know if everyone's all that fired up about ripping things up. I'd like to find out what I'm tearing up first."

SDS GLAMOR ATTRACTS STUDENTS BUT FAILS TO HOLD MOST—III

(By Ronald J. Maselka)

WASHINGTON, OCTOBER 2—"Never in the history of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few."

In the context of campus unrest, Winston Churchill's tribute to the Royal Air Force could be read as a censure of the violent student minority. For the violence of this comparatively small group has cast a pall over American higher education and besmirched the public image of thousands of students.

Spurts of campus violence already have added credence to the educators who had predicted renewed trouble and those who refused to predict. "We never speculate on the future," one University of Maryland administrator said. "You only need one to start trouble."

One reason for the impact of the radical Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) is that for any specific planned protest their relatively small hard-core of members on one campus is swelled by members from other campuses and non-student outsiders. This is the view of both administrators and students, looking back at the disruption of a talk by San Francisco Mayor Joseph Alioto last spring at Georgetown University and two building seizures at George Washington University.

CERTAIN EXOTIC APPEAL

The SDS charter at Maryland was revoked until next February by the student court for repeated violations of campus regulations. But it still functions.

But the mere facts that they proclaim themselves to be revolutionaries and that revolutionaries are different afford a certain exotic appeal for the SDS.

This, plus their truly committed individual determination, gives them a capacity for disruption far exceeding their numbers.

Sometimes, this makes them appear sophomoric.

For instance, about 20 SDS members way-

ing red books temporarily disrupted a recent orientation meeting at George Washington University, chanting "Mao Tse-tung, Mao Tse-tung."

At the very least, they were advertising that they were still around.

STUDENT COURT TRIAL

"SDS has tremendous color," explained Dr. John Portz, a Maryland University English professor who formerly headed the Faculty Senate Committee on Student Life. "And they are prepared to engage in fantastic actions. It's not enough for them to carry a sign. They want to be the focus of attention by glaringly unusual human behavior."

This was documented last week at a student court trial at George Washington of two students charged with disrupting a faculty meeting last spring.

During the proceedings, SDS members or sympathizers alternately hummed, belched and yelled to be recognized. At one point—when a faculty adviser consulted with the student court members—three students crawled around the classroom on their hands and knees moaning: "Grovel, grovel, grovel."

One student explained that this was a reference to the SDS allegation of a slave-owner relationship between student and faculty.

ATTRACTED LISTENERS

Another example of the electric appeal of the SDS also came out last week on the patio of the University of Maryland library.

In a pre-announced teach-in, a handful of SDS members succeeded in attracting several hundred student listeners, who became arguers and hecklers.

Richard Fox, a Maryland SDS leader, says that the organization is a social magnet. "It makes people take sides," he said, noting that the teach-in drew the curious, the patriotic, the apolitical troublemakers and agitators, the bullies and the people looking for excitement.

RELUCTANT TO PREDICT

One student ripped down a Viet Cong flag carried by the SDS and a fist throwing brawl erupted for a few minutes.

It's this type of incident that explains the reluctance of administrators to predict the temper of their campus. The potential tensions are there. And the SDS is waiting for someone to accept its dare.

But campus police are becoming more sophisticated about accepting that dare. At the height of the minor disturbance at Maryland last week, for example, there were no uniformed police evident.

And ironically enough, the presence of police uniforms adds strength to the SDS generally, for example, might be cast in the role of SDS supporter because of their intervention when SDS members are being carried away by police.

BECOME CELEBRATED

Noting that if SDS members are hauled off to jail they simply become "more celebrated" on campus, Dr. Portz explained that "students today have a sense of peerage of their own age group, that they never had before. Students respect their right to be different." With outside police intervention, he added, student support could grow because of this "we're all in it together" feeling.

Conversations indicate that students generally acknowledge the right of fellow students, who are SDS members, to state their beliefs publicly.

RIGHT TO SUSPEND

"It's all right for them to have their say here, as long as they are students," one Maryland junior said. "But it's not right for the outsiders."

"Throwing them out is not the answer," one faculty member argued.

The court injunction and the student judiciary system are two tools university ad-

ministrators have evidenced they will use to counteract violence.

The George Washington Student Court, for instance, has the right to expel, suspend or reprimand a student charged with a campus violation. This type of reaction to violence does not draw the ire of other students toward the administration building.

Asked why the majority of students attending last week's first Student Court trial at George Washington seemed to be either SDS members or their allies, Columbian College Dean Calvin D. Linton replied: "This group is not representative of the student body . . . I have the distinct impression that the majority is disenchanted with this kind of thing."

A LOT ARE BORED

Maintaining that the lack of attendance should not be confused "with apathy or indifference on the part of the majority," he said he felt it was more "a desire of students to see their judicial machinery operate properly and speedily, without fanfare."

"I get the impression also that a lot of students are bored with this kind of thing. They would rather be in the library studying, for instance, rather than sitting in here."

Between currently divided SDS factions, there is disagreement on whether to accentuate their appeal to youth or blue-collar workers. So, typical SDS appearance is a compromise. The long-hair might appeal to the youthful hippie, for example, but the blue denim shirts and dungarees apparently are meant to relate to the workers.

HOW TO DISTINGUISH

One SDS faction at Maryland plans to aim its key thrust this year at the unionization of the university's service employees, the housekeepers, maintenance personnel and cafeteria workers. Georgetown's housekeepers have twice voted down such unionization.

One way reporters can distinguish between the two main SDS factions is that one will talk to them, the other won't.

For instance, one SDS member, who visited the University of Maryland for last week's teach-in was confronted by the campus police afterward because her license plates had expired.

Confronted by a Buffalo Evening News reporter, she said: "We don't talk to the Establishment press. You've fouled us up too many times."

And when Jim Stark, an SDS leader at George Washington University, was asked by an intermediary to discuss the coming issues and SDS plans with a News reporter, he said: "I don't want to rap (talk) with him about that."

CHANGE IN GENTLE WAY

On the wider philosophical question of "What this all means," Jim Stark said: "You know, the people who are involved in it don't know what it all means or where we are going."

Noting that the meaning of campus unrest won't be gauged for several years, and probably by historians, he added: "When the Depression came in 1929, people didn't know what it meant right then. Some people thought it was the end of the world."

A similar uncertainty of directions was voiced by Maryland's SDS leader, Richard Fox. "I have difficulty trying to figure out what I am going to do," he said. "But I don't want to be happy at the expense of someone else's pain."

Noting he became involved in SDS because of his sister's involvement in civil rights work, he said: "I dislike violence. I opposed the Vietnam war initially because of the violence . . . But violence is something that is used to achieve political ends. Most like to see change in a gentle way. So would I."

Some students noted they could "admire the goals but can't relate to these guys in SDS" because the group attacks "the

system rather than trying to improve the university."

REALLY BADLY SPLIT

Recalling that SDS had wider student support at George Washington last year, Greg R. Valliere, managing editor of the Hatchet, the student newspaper, said: "This year, it's completely different it seems to me. There's a lot less support for them generally . . . They're doing stupid things, like disrupting some meeting the students came to hear. They do a lot of idiot things. They're getting too unreal and losing their appeal . . . with their endless rhetoric of imperialism and racism."

Reporting that SDS members are required to detail where they went and who they spoke with that day at evening discussion groups, another student said SDS "is becoming paranoid . . . they're hurting themselves. And they're really split up badly."

Whether SDS can cause as much trouble divided remains to be seen.

But Ave J. Saunders, a Maryland student government leader who dropped out of SDS after being a charter member at the university, said: "So you take over a building, what do you accomplish? You have to convince people you are right. You can't force anyone to agree with you."

STUDENTS PURSUING GOALS BEYOND END OF VIET WAR—IV

(By Ronald J. Maselka)

WASHINGTON, October 3.—A flight path into Washington's National Airport brings commercial jets thunderously close to the sky above Georgetown University.

While the jets are not a campus issue, their speed and sound echo the intensity of the changes occurring at Georgetown and other universities. Plans for larger, louder jets mirror the depth of the campus changes and issues ahead.

While the Vietnam War and the draft are overshadowing, indications are that the end of the war and reform of the draft will not end campus discontent.

Discussions with liberal student leaders—interested in campus and off-campus issues—reveal a depth of concern about the structure of the university, academic reform, and the values of the greater society.

"If the war ended," said Donald J. McNeil, editor of Georgetown's student newspaper, The Hoy, "I think the (student) emphasis would switch. Like the war's over, fine. So let's put the money to work here."

Why is this collegiate generation raising these questions? Why are they different from their predecessors? There were always liberals on campus, but why so many now?

"The war was a big catalyst for all this," explained Michael Gold, president of the University of Maryland's Student Government Association. "But the civil rights movement was an even bigger catalyst. That showed that this country is not what it's cracked up to be. The rhetoric does not approach the reality. The war just fueled this awareness, providing concrete evidence of this hypocrisy."

PROVIDE NO ANSWERS

Noting that "there's more knowledge today" and that the assassinations of President Kennedy, Martin Luther King and Sen. Robert F. Kennedy added more fuel for student concern, Ave J. Saunders, a cabinet member in the Maryland student government, added: "I think students today just have a greater awareness of people and the world around."

As an example, he said: "If you live in a \$60,000 house and go to school with a black student who lives in a ghetto in something less than a shack, you start to ask yourself: Why do I have it so good and he has it so bad?"

Responding to the criticism that "smart-aleck" kids are raising a lot of questions

but providing no answers, he added: "Students don't have the answers. We're not saying we do. We are saying let's face the questions, like when the government says things are fine and yet millions of people in this country live at or below the poverty level."

BE MORE PATIENT

Acknowledging his idealism, Robert X. Morrell, a Georgetown sophomore, who was working to get signatures for an anti-war petition, said: "Maybe if we all got together and admitted that we don't have the answers, we can do something."

Urging that "we give this feeling of community a chance," he suggests "being more patient with alternatives, not taking it for granted that the established ways to get things done are necessarily the only ways or the best ways."

Administrators in public and private universities throughout the country are moving in a number of directions to respond to the genuine depth of this student concern.

Changes range from better food and lower food prices to coeducational dormitories, student voices on faculty committees, improved student disciplinary procedures and judiciary systems.

TOO CONSERVATIVE

Pointing out that the day of the dictatorial dean is gone, one administrator said: "The emphasis today is on due process, on fair treatment."

There are still students who think administrations are too slow, too conservative.

While the University of Maryland's President, Dr. Wilson H. Elkins, has stressed the institution's reputation for scholarship during his 15-year tenure, one student said: "But the trend today is toward student life . . . Show us how to live, not how to make a living."

And another student credited Dr. Elkins with "building this into a fine institution," but added: "There's a new breed of students today, a new level of interest. He wants to continue change at the same pace. We want to move faster." Noting that Negroes represent only about 2 per cent of the university's population, he said: "If we can solve racism on the campus, it will in great measure affect the community around us."

LIQUOR IN DORMS

The University of Maryland is in the process of complying with an order from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to institute programs aimed at increasing integration on campus.

The rate of change varies from campus to campus. Georgetown, for instance, allowed liquor in dormitories since 1966, but Maryland's Board of Regents just dropped its total ban on alcoholic beverages a week ago.

There are more similarities though. Georgetown, Maryland and George Washington Universities all have groups of students working for campus involvement in the Oct. 15 moratorium on normal scholastic activity as an antiwar protest. And all three are reacting to demands for "relevance" with programs or plans for urban studies.

At all three, black students are a tiny minority—less than 200 among Georgetown's 7600 students, less than 800 among George Washington's 14,000, less than 500 among Maryland's 24,500 full-time students.

SEEKS BETTER BALANCE

Explaining student reaction to this distribution, one George Washington student said: "We are aware that we are a white school in a predominantly black city and we believe the university should do something about it."

One George Washington spokesman said that administrations are trying. "There is a feeling," he said, "that educational institutions must do what they can to equalize educational opportunity for black students."

Part of this is the growing development of black studies programs and university efforts to recruit inner city students and devise special programs to upgrade their qualifications so they remain in college and compete effectively.

INFLUENCE WILL GROW

At many campuses, the Black Student Union is the key magnet for organized, non-violent Negro protest. At George Washington, for instance, the BSU last spring proposed that the university devise a way to recruit 100 black students, tuition free, for the next school year. The university found funds for about 40.

Carolyn Jones, a BSU member at Maryland, said that the influence of the Negro population will increase with their size and their ability to agree on objectives. As reflected nationally, black students are gravitating toward themselves and their special concerns, while accepting white student support.

A key issue at both Georgetown and Maryland this year is student interest in getting representation on the university governing body—variously called trustees, board of regents or board of directors.

LACK DIRECT CONTACT

Many experts point out that these boards, usually comprised of prominent citizens and alumni, merely rubber-stamp administration policies. Some of the student efforts, however, seems aimed at revitalizing these boards' functions.

Why do students want a voice on the university board? One argument is that the trustees lack direct contact with the students and are generally ignorant of campus problems.

But more importantly, as one Georgetown student said: "If this is going to be a true community, like everyone keeps saying it is, it needs everybody's voice in it."

This question of student participation, of course, is the subject of endless debate. How much is beneficial? How much is necessary? Weakening the student case are reports that once the students get the right to vote on a certain committee, for instance, it is difficult to get full-time interested student participation.

CONFUSED ROLE

On faculty-student committees on parking, security problems or educational opportunity, students can play a large role.

But Dr. John Portz, an English professor at Maryland, noted that in some cases—like committees on faculty hiring, firing, pay and tenure—there is no obvious student role. Citing a committee on scheduling and admissions—a complex subject—he said students are relegated to a sort of confused role of observer because the work is done by faculty who have gone through this scheduling process for years.

He suggests that students might better set their sights on committees where they can make a genuine contribution. Naming Maryland's committee on the future of the university, he said: "This is essentially a think tank, where students might perform more satisfactorily."

AMERICAN YOUTH IN FIGHT TO PROTECT ENVIRONMENT

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call my colleagues' attention to an

article entitled "American Youths Find New 'Supercause,'" which appeared in the South Bend Tribune on Sunday, November 30, 1969.

Lynn Sherr, who wrote the article, points out that a new activism surrounds efforts to protect our environment. The activism is not rooted in anarchy, since ecology is a system, and anarchy is against all systems. It is, rather, a growing movement on the part of our Nation's young people to take positive steps to prevent the destruction of our ecological balance.

I am particularly interested in this article, since along with Congressmen SCHEUER and REID of New York, and HANSEN, I have introduced H.R. 14753, the Environmental Quality Education Act. Our legislation would establish programs of environmental education from elementary school through graduate school.

It appears to us that legislation of this type is necessary if we are to begin to meet our obligations to protect the environment in which we live.

At this point I insert in the RECORD the text of the article from the South Bend Tribune:

AMERICAN YOUTHS FIND NEW "SUPERCAUSE"—DRAW BATTLELINES AGAINST POLLUTION OF LAND, SEA, AIR

(By Lynn Sherr)

American youths have found a new supercause and—maybe—those over 30 may be invited to join.

They are trying to save the world—nothing novel with the young—but this time the threat is real and widely recognized.

The young are mobilizing with some of the same intensity that had gone into antiwar movements against the pollution of air, land and sea.

It's a new movement, just taking shape, but given the receptivity of today's youth to causes it seems almost destined.

Their concern over pollution is understandable said William E. Felling program officer of the Ford Foundation's Resources and Environment Department. "They can see it, they can feel it, they can smell it, and they think they can change it."

"It" has already inspired a new vocabulary. As Stewart Udall, former secretary of the interior, told a standing-room-only student audience, "The word 'eco' is like 'mini.' Add it on to anything and you get a new word."

Thus the talk of "ecocastrophes" and irreversible air pollution imbalance, for instance, "ecogroups."

TALK OF "ECOLOGY"

But mostly the young talk of "ecology"—the comparatively young science which studies living organisms in relation to their environment:

Man against such deadly byproducts of his technology as poisonous DDT in the body, sulfur dioxide in the air, foul detergents in forest streams and the overcrowding of three-and-one-half billion fellow earthlings.

So far, the young ecologists are not a full-fledged movement. They are unorganized, largely unknown. Although the West Coast has generated the most vocal advocates, they have no real headquarters, no national president. They are not all scientists. They do not all understand the finer points about ecology.

But their passionate concern has caused Francois Mergen, Dean of Yale's environmentally-oriented School of Forestry, to comment: "Sometimes I think the students who earn degrees in ecology here should be ordained. They're so serious."

And they are beginning to act.

YOUNG PEOPLE TESTIFY

Mostly through local groups, young people have variously testified at congressional hearings on the pollution of Lake Erie, chained themselves to bulldozer-threatened redwood trees, met with state senators to discuss antipollution tax incentives.

Already, student ecology organizations exist at some of the nation's most impressive colleges. Among them: Berkeley, California Institute of Technology, MIT, Reed, Stanford, University of Minnesota, University of Wisconsin, Yale.

The Associated Students for Cal Tech (ASCIT) has begun its third year of an air pollution research project that was granted \$18,500 from the Ford Foundation and \$68,500 from the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Wisconsin's Science Student Union last spring picketed DDT hearings in the state capitol and is currently protesting the U.S. Navy's Project Sanguine—an electronic communications center which conservationists say may threaten forest life in northern Wisconsin.

At Yale, one student group is trying to mobilize the community to clean up New Haven's unswimmable harbor waters; another takes ghetto children on Saturday field trips to show them "that there are natural areas in the world."

Off campus, eco-groups have hit both coasts, the underground press, peace people and prep schools.

Ecology Action, an independent organization in Berkeley, Calif., sees its mission as informational, and insists that would-be activists treat ecology action as "something you do, rather than something you join." Along with extensive brochures and reading lists, they have devised a pilot ecology course which is now being taught in a local high school.

The War Resisters League devoted an entire issue of its monthly "Win" magazine (pipeline to some 8,000 members of the underground) to "ecological consciousness—yanking ecology out of the context of pure science and using it to describe the ways that man relates to his natural environment."

WRITE TO LEGISLATORS

One-hundred eighty girls from the Thomas School in Rowayton, Conn., wrote letters to state legislators, aroused the community, urged the introduction—which ultimately passed—of a state bill to survey and preserve Connecticut's coastal wetlands which were being used as a dumping ground by contractors.

On the other side of the generation gap, university, school board and other established officials have started making changes of their own to accommodate the burgeoning interest.

Professors from dozens of universities have reported new courses in ecology (for non-science students) and, in some cases, doubling and tripling of enrollment in existing courses. In addition, some science departments have begun combining biology, architecture and sociology, for instance, to offer inter disciplinary majors—or even new departments—in ecology.

FORD GRANTS FUNDS

The Ford Foundation last year granted nearly \$4 million, mostly to colleges and universities for research in environmental subjects.

The University of Wisconsin's new branch at Green Bay is organized entirely around man and environmental problems in a radical academic experiment.

The American Assn. for the Advancement of Science has, for the first time, invited 40 students to participate in its annual Christmas meeting. Subject for an entire after-

noon session: Undergraduate Education in Environmental Science.

Sen. Gaylord Nelson, D-Wis., longtime advocate of conservation, has proposed a national environmental teach-in on college campuses this spring.

The antiwar movement started with teach-ins, too.

In many ways, ecology activity is largely an outgrowth of The Movement—antiwar, anti-ghetto, anti-Establishment.

THREATENS TO END LIFE

In their own terms, both groups see the status quo which they define as war or pollution as threatening to end life on this planet. Both see "the system" (which they consider government or giant corporations) as the adversary. Both reject old values, old politics, piecemeal solutions. Both talk of revolution.

And both blame the profit system.

Indeed, to the young ecologists, capitalism is Ecology Enemy No. 1. They criticize the growth motive—America's annual attempt to push the Gross National Product higher and higher.

"We've got to get away from the notion that growth is a good thing," emphasized Dr. Paul Ehrlich, director of graduate study for the Department of Biological Sciences at Stanford. Ehrlich has had a vasectomy—an operation to make himself sterile—and is one of the youth's most-quoted environmental heroes.

FORMS ECOLOGY ACTION

"Capitalism is predicated on money and growth," explained Cliff Humphrey, 32, who was building California freeways before he turned on to the problem, received a bachelor's degree in ecology and helped found Ecology Action.

"And when your only interest is to maximize your profit, you maximize the pollution. We need a system that takes maximum care of the earth," he said.

And yet, that system, the young activists feel, is not necessarily the political opposite of capitalism.

"I don't think either right or left or center has the ecologically sane answer," said Keith Lampe, 38, a cofounder of the Yippie movement, whose first environmental activity was to join the conservationist Sierra Club.

EDITS UNDERGROUND LETTER

Lampe now edits a biweekly underground newsletter from Berkeley called "Earth Read-Out," in which he has published "ecotes" urging "a rapid evolution from competition to co-operation; in the U.S. specifically this means shucking capitalism and evolving a community for which there is yet no label, a community within which the notions of ownership and money no longer have meaning or appeal."

During a trip to New York this fall, Lampe elaborated. "Capitalism may be more antagonistic than Marxism, but both share the man-against-nature thing, the growth motive," he said.

NONE HELD BLAMELESS

More important, most of the young activists believe that although some individual polluters can be singled out for spilling oil or destroying wildlife, no one—not even the ecologist—remains blameless in the massive assault on the earth. They like to quote Pogo, the cartoon 'possum, who said: "We have met the enemy and he is us."

Us: Everyone who rides in automobiles that spew deadly exhaust fumes into smog; everyone who buys shampoo in undemolishable plastic containers; everyone who adds unwanted children to the crowded world.

"There's a role for everyone in ecology," according to Lampe. In a recent column of advice to his underground followers, Lampe suggested that they should not close the door to rifle club members, Boy Scouts, or John Birchers.

"Since everybody is still groping for effective roles and tactics, people with widely different styles and widely different politics within the old context can talk to each other with no more tension than a Presbyterian talks to a Methodist."

DEPENDS OF MUTUAL TRUST

Thus, many members of the new ecogroups are beginning to understand that unlike seizing the dean's office, ecology action will depend on mutual trust among all ages and groups.

A group of peaceniks in New York recently were debating whether to approach older groups to protest jet noise.

"Talk to the Queens housewives, get them involved," said an earnest young girl.

"I don't want to talk to them, replied a barefoot youth with a three-day beard, "I just want to get them picketing."

"We're trying to leave behind the polemical solutions," said Cliff Humphrey. "Ecology provides the means and articulation of doing something positive."

Steve Berwick, 28, a stocky wildlife ecologist at Yale, reflected, "I doubt if you'll find many anarchist ecologists. Ecology is a system, and anarchy goes against that."

PERTAINS TO ALL GROUPS

It pertains as much to the rock music festival fans who dump garbage in the fields as it does to the industrialists who destroy marine life in lakes.

Joe Rhodes, 22, former student body president at Cal Tech who established their air pollution project, summarized: "Pollution is like the war, like the ghetto. They all became a problem invisibly, slowly. We must start paying attention to the gentle changes. We've got to start connecting what happens now with later consequences . . . start listening to the warnings."

He cut short his rapid-fire delivery and reflected on the commitment of the ecology-minded of his generation.

"I hope that this cause is close enough to everyone that they won't be confused because they don't like young people," he said.

Jim Beck, Rhodes' successor at Cal Tech, put it another way: "We don't want to revolutionize society—we want to live in it."

VETERAN HOME LOAN PROGRAM DRYING UP FOR LACK OF FUNDS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as part of the GI bill of rights, Congress created a program to assist returning war veterans in financing the purchase of a home. This program was a great success following World War II and the Korean conflict, but it has fallen victim of the tight money market. At the present time the home loan provision can be considered nothing more than an empty promise.

The Veterans Affairs Committee has been considering legislation to use \$5 billion from the NSLI trust fund, and such a proposal is also under consideration in the Senate. In this connection, Mr. Harold A. Pollman, a builder from Dallas, Tex., with great experience in home building and financing for veterans, appeared before the Senate Finance Committee and delivered a very pertinent statement on this proposal. I feel that

Mr. Pollman's statement will be of interest to Members of this body. It appears below:

TESTIMONY TO THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON VETERANS LEGISLATION, U.S. SENATE, HEARING ON S. 3008

(By Harold A. Pollman, Representing Texas State and Dallas Home Builders Association)

Honorable Senator Talmadge, Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Harold Pollman, I am a builder in Dallas, Texas. I appear before this committee at the invitation of your chairman, Senator Talmadge, and our Senior Senator from Texas, the Honorable Ralph Yarborough, the sponsor of this legislation today coming under your pervue and study.

My official capacity in testifying to this committee is that of a Texas State board director and Dallas director of the Home Builders Association.

Please permit me a valuable moment of this morning's time to bear to you greetings from both the Texas State Board of Directors and the Dallas Board of the Home Builders Association and also to state to you that both Boards have asked me to express to you their commendation for your knowledgeable awareness of the economic plight of the returning veteran seeking a home in which to establish himself and his family upon his completion of military service.

I am aware, both by the presence at this hearing before you today of numerous experts in the field of finance and economics, as well as by submitted transcripts for the committee's study, that a very substantial amount of studied economic and technical data will be provided for your consideration in this matter.

A most capable understanding of this matter from the viewpoint of home builders throughout the Nation will be provided by Mr. Larry Blackmon a past national president of the National Home Builders Association who is accompanied by various staff economists of that association. These gentlemen are most learned in statistics and studies germane to the questions involved in this legislation. I also note with interest the testimony of most knowledgeable economists as well as the general counsel for the Treasury, the president of the National Mortgage Bankers Association, officials of the Veterans Administration, officers of the National Association of Real Estate Boards and many other highly qualified and competent witnesses. With the availability to you of this necessary and properly highly informative type of testimony I can only believe that I have been requested to appear here today to testify to you on a more "grass roots sense of feeling" concerning this proposed legislation.

My company in Dallas is a medium volume tract builder in the price range of a low of \$19,900 to our top home at \$42,500. We build between 135 and 200 homes per year. Our annual dollar volume is between 4½ million and 6 million dollars. These homes are financed approximately 95% of our total annual volume by FHA and VA guaranteed loans and of that percentage 70% of our homes are sold to veterans.

You are of course aware that the legislation we have under study here today concerns itself with approximately 6 billion dollars of national service life insurance reserves. These reserves have been generated by the veteran's payment of his life insurance premiums. As you know these funds are currently loaned to the Treasury on an "inside the family" type loan at a yield to the National Service Life Insurance Fund of approximately 3.77%.

The veterans home loan program has an eligibility of 10½ million veterans. Soon, hopefully, many more young men will be returning from service in Viet Nam. These men will be returning to their community seeking

to make a home for themselves and their families.

While Congress has acted appropriately (and I cannot use the word magnanimously as these are the men who have served their Nation) in providing the necessary legislative vehicle to provide housing for the veteran, the veteran has returned home to find that the congressionally established vehicle for home ownership is totally immobilized due to a complete lack of economic fuel.

The entire climate of money availability has changed since many of us returned from service after World War II. At that time we found awaiting us very substantial funds in savings and loans and life insurance companies. These funds were accumulated through substantial war time earnings and with very little real goods of value to purchase and thus dissipate these savings. Thus the returning veteran found substantial savings in savings and loans anxious to be invested in government insured GI home mortgages. The insurance companies were anxious to place large insurance reserves in government guaranteed real estate home mortgage loans. Thus under prior economic conditions the returning veteran with no economic wherewithal to make a down payment on a home and economically disadvantaged by his time in military service, found that Congress had provided legislation for a readily acceptable and marketable government insured home loan.

This economic climate resulted in \$72 billion of loans to 7 million veterans. By the way, I am informed that the loss rates on these veteran mortgage loans has been less than conventional lending programs.

Today's returning veteran finds a totally different home loan climate awaiting him.

I. THE INSURANCE COMPANIES

Almost all major insurance companies in the country have abandoned the financing of the single family G.I. homes. Today's money managers for our insurance companies have chased "yield" (for inflationary protection) into the highly questionable practice but for, at least this time, highly remunerative yield of apartment, shopping center, and commercial loans premised upon various formulas of:

A. Participation actually in the venture with the project developer, or of gross or net rental yields.

There is, of course, no logical way that the individual home owner can compete in the mortgage money market for this type of insurance company money against that formula of yield attraction.

II. THE PUBLIC MORTGAGE MONEY MARKET

A. The historically unparalleled corporate expansion in the last decade has engendered the corporate debtor who can pay 10 and 12 percent interest, which when adjusted for 52 percent tax rates and 7 percent investment credit nets an effective cost to the corporate borrower of 4 to 6 percent for his 10 to 12 percent rate commitment. Again this makes the 7½ percent veteran loan unattractive to the investor.

B. Unparalleled Municipal, State, and school District Expansion carrying tax favored exemptions and being issued at 4%, 5% and 6%, giving investors an effective yield of double these rates, again significantly undercut the funds once called upon for home ownership.

III. PENSION TRUST FUNDS

The character of saving the last 20 years, certainly until the last decade, was primarily individual in nature. Each individual held his own passbook saving account. He provided the bulk of his personal savings for his old age, his retirement, or an emergency sickness, reserved in his savings and loan account. These savings were invested by savings and loans almost totally (by virtue of

the very premise of their charter) in home loan mortgages. However, today by far the very substantial majority of our savings from individual earnings take the route of: Payroll deductions, with an automatic holdout from salary and a moving of these holdout savings into tax favored employee pension trust funds. They only seek for their entrusted funds "maximum yields"—of course, that is their job.

Those of us who have addressed ourselves to the current money resources for home financing find some peculiarly anomalous creatures in the pension trust fund investments. For example, numerous carpenter, plumbing, electrical, etc., union pension trust funds with their employees livelihood geared to and dependent upon the residential construction industry, hold not one dollar in their investment portfolio in federally guaranteed home loan mortgages. They, of course, also are chasing "yield". The better "yield" of glamour electronic stocks, corporate bonds, tax favored municipals, etc.

I beg your indulgence but for another graphic example. We have found that in a large majority of all states, some as tremendously important as California, not one dime of the teacher pension trust funds—or for that matter, any other state employee trust funds—not one dime of the investment portfolios were held in federally insured home ownership. It must, of course, be shocking to you as it was to us to find in a vast majority of all of our teacher, professorial, professional, and trade association tax favored pension trust funds these are the teachers and mentors, the very people who stand before our young people and teach and exhort for our American way of life and who avow the fundamental foundations and sociological importance of a good family home, and thus a solid family life, find not one cent in their multi-million dollar trust funds—which by the way, in some states grow at the rate of several million dollars each year—not one cent for home ownership loans in their portfolio. The glamour stocks the piece of the action and participation of shopping centers and apartment loans, the tax preferred municipals and in fact we have actually found pension trust funds in glamorous yield investments of these tax favored funds in Las Vegas motor hotel facilities makes the returning veterans' home loan mortgage a totally unattractive package.

Thus the vehicle of your Congressional legislation permitting home ownership can only be funded by the veteran stacking up exorbitant points of brokerage. High enough to make his interest rate, set by Congress, attractive. Thus the veteran competes in the money market place with points as high as 5, 6, or 7 on new housing and 9, 10, and 11 points on existing housing.

On a \$20 thousand home the veteran may pay anywhere from \$1500-\$2000 to get his 7½ percent loan.

Herein lies a double economic tragedy when:

I. Firstly the veteran returns from service and finds himself in the market place competing with an undesirable loan at 7½ percent and paying 8 to 10 points—\$1600-\$2000 on his \$20,000 home, while his veteran's insurance fund has \$6 to \$8 billion of his reserve insurance funds loaned out to the general citizenry through Treasury at approximately 3.77 percent. Unable to borrow from his own life insurance reserves, the 8 to 10 points of brokerage he pays, when added to the 7½ percent stated rate, yields depending upon the true historical life of this mortgage—(approximately 8½ to 10 years) yields 12% to 14%. Certainly this is a grave disadvantage to him when his insurance reserves are being loaned out at 3.77 percent.

II. Secondly to compound the veterans injury I understand that Treasury has taken a position that the brokerage points of

\$1600-\$2,000 which the veteran pays to get the loan interest rate up to a competitive yield is not considered interest for tax purposes. Of course that is all it really is. This disallowance of considering this an interest further injures the veteran whereby if we recited his true cost for financing at 12 to 14 percent this would properly reflect his interest cost in his computation for taxes.

We are not unmindful of the necessity for restrictive fiscal and monetary policies to curb the ultimate calamity of unbridled inflation. Certainly the housing industry, standing virtually alone, as it now does, in the application of economic restraint is most aware of this unpalatable but necessary medicine for our economic health.

I am not unmindful of Treasury's contention that to call 1 billion dollars of their note per year out of their 3.77 percent "sheltered family loan" puts them out on the street to seek the replacement of that money. This it is asserted can contribute to our economic inflationary pressures. It is true that the economic climate is cold and harsh in the open money market. None of us could blame the Treasury from not wanting to leave their comfortable, warm, and sheltered loan position "inside the family" and go out in the cold market climate to replace that money. But that is the very climate in which the veteran is asked to seek his loan today. In answer to the Treasury's view that they would contribute to inflationary pressures by seeking this \$1 billion a year in the open market, we must not overlook the fact that when the veteran funds his loan through the \$1 billion dollars returned to his national service life insurance fund, he thus, to the identically correlative amount of \$1 billion removes his demand of that billion dollars of mortgage funds from the money market. Thus it really becomes a question of who gets out into today's harsh money climate to the extent of \$1 billion a year, the Treasury or the veteran. The dollar effect on the economy should be the same save and except the interest rate differential which Treasury would have to pay to the open market rather than the sheltered loan they hold. We believe that all of us as general citizens, and by the way the veteran included, must share this burden. We must not call upon this veteran, who has already borne services to its country, to again ask this veteran to subsidize the general citizenry with a preferred interest rate loan from his life insurance funds—while he is unable to borrow these funds and pays exorbitant rates at a non-competitive disadvantage in the open market place.

In conclusion, please permit me to state that shortly after World War II when more than 10 million men returned to their homes they found awaiting them your congressional commitment and their Nation's commitment to house the returning veterans.

The housing industry was capable of fulfilling this commitment. Shortly after World War II our housing industry was providing 2 million homes per year.

Today after a quarter century of vastly improved technological ability, of marvelously expeditious mechanical improvement and a quarter of a century of improved industry know-how for volume production, in which we have doubled and perhaps tripled our production ability, our industry finds itself this year barely providing between a million and a million two hundred thousand homes.

Thus from a population of 130 million when we showed the capacity to build 2 million homes we have moved to a 200 million population and will deliver less than a million and a quarter homes. This comes at a time when Congress has directed our industry to a need for 26 million homes over the next decade. Thus we are building into our already multi-faceted burgeoning crises the additional problem of a construction

deficit of approximately a million and a half homes per year.

I can assure you that it is only the fiscal and monetary restraint on our industry, which completely shuts us down and then attempts to start us up when it is economically expeditious to do so, which has created the critical housing shortage throughout the Nation today and spells out impending new multi-faceted sociological problems for tomorrow.

Gentlemen, we must make a commitment to innerspace as well. Innerspace is living space. You gentlemen have seen what such a commitment can do for us in almost infinite and limitless accomplishments in outer space. While perhaps not as glamorous a *short range impact*, an equal commitment to inner space must be made and fulfilled.

The pending legislation before you is just one small stepping stone along this important journey to the accomplishment of better housing for all Americans. It does not purport to solve but a small part of the problem of housing Americans.

I can find no valid reason for denying to veterans the access to their life insurance savings for home loan mortgages. It appears perfectly appropriate and timely that the life insurance savings generated by veterans be made available by veterans in need of home mortgage funds.

Again, Mr. Chairman, permit me to extend to you and your committee colleagues and the Senate, as well as the House through Honorable Olin Teague of Texas who is sponsoring the parallel legislation, the commendations of the veterans in our community and yours; as well as our housing industry for your consideration of this valued and necessary legislation.

MAYFLOWER COMPACT DAY CELEBRATION

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of Friday, November 21, 1969, the Society of Mayflower Descendants in the District of Columbia, celebrated the 349th anniversary of the signing of the world-famed Mayflower Compact. This is an annual event of the society, and this one, with an excellent program, had one of the largest number of members and guests in attendance that the society has ever known. Addresses by distinguished speakers, bestowal of awards, installation of newly elected officers of the society—by Lorenzo S. Winslow, assistant general of the general society—and a fine musical of songs by the Army Chorus—were prominent features. The addresses of high order were warmly applauded.

The society was organized in 1897, and has since flourished as a patriotic society which seeks to keep alive the lives and deeds of the Pilgrim group that landed at Plymouth Rock on December 21, 1620 (N.S.).

The addresses were made by John Jay Daly, a distinguished journalist and author, and Maurice H. Thatcher, former Congressman from Kentucky, and former Civil Governor of the Canal Zone and member—now only survivor—of the Isthmian Canal Commission, which had charge of the construction of the Panama Canal; and former governor of

the society, and now honorary life counselor general of the General Society of Mayflower Descendants.

The introduction of Mr. Daly was made by John Russell Whitney, deputy governor general of the general society; and the governor of the society, Col. Frederick I. Ordway, presented Mr. Thatcher.

Under leave granted, I am including herewith, as part of my remarks, the indicated addresses:

ADDRESS OF JOHN JAY DALY

Governor Ordway, Members and Guests. In the course of my newspaper career it became my good fortune to interview many noted historians. Occasionally I was invited to attend round-table historic discussions at the Cosmos Club. One day they took up the story of the Mayflower, its outstanding voyage across the Atlantic, one hundred and two passengers buffeted about in all sorts of weather, and the landing at Plymouth December 21, 1620—the 350th anniversary of this event now coming up, next year, 1970.

Louis Sears, professor of history at Purdue University, started the discussion on this subject. Dr. Sears, a real conservative, said he thought the story of the Mayflower should be told, re-told again and again and again wherever school children gather. In this he had the concurrence of Dr. Charles Tansill, another famed historian. This talk, and what I learned from these eminent scholars, enabled me to write the story of the Mayflower—Flight to Freedom—which is just off the press.

That day, in one burst of supreme assurance, Dr. Tansill, author of "Back Door to War", and other monumental works, declared: "It is no exaggeration to say that the Voyage of the Mayflower and the Landing at Plymouth rank with Hannibal's Crossing of the Alps, back in the third century."

Dr. Sears said, "I agree. It could be compared also with the overthrow of the Persian Empire by Alexander the Great, with the destruction of Carthage by Rome, with the conquest of Gaul by Clovis I, King of the Franks and founder of the French Empire."

Hearing all this gave me, an amateur historian, the courage to ask, How would the Voyage of the Mayflower compare with the taking of Constantinople by the Turks?—and the answer was, by Dr. Sears, "You might even compare it with the discovery of America by Columbus."

General Bonner Fellers, U.S.A., Ret., a friend of these historians, likened the dangers of the Mayflower adventure with that of Marco Polo, the Venetian traveller and author who set out to find China—and did. No one ever knew or ever will know how he accomplished this feat. It remains one of the great mysteries of all times. Marco went up against barbarians. The Pilgrims faced savages. So there is a comparison there, too. Marco Polo and the Pilgrims; of the same caliber.

You asked me to tell about my writing of the poem, "The Toast to The Flag." Believe it or not, this verse was written and published for the first Flag Day, June 14th, 1917.

At that time I was the youngest editor of a full-fledged Associated Press newspaper in America—The New Britain Herald, in Connecticut. From the moment the European War broke, and up to the time we entered the fray, there has been turmoil in this vicinity. Factories were blown up, by German sympathizers, to prevent war material from reaching the British. In order to get some patriotism going I decided to place an American flag at the masthead of the Herald. Under it each day we ran a well known saying from one of our patriots, like: My country, right or wrong—Decatur, Damn the torpedoes, go ahead—Farragut, Entangling Alliances with none—George Washington. Came the day that Congress set aside June 14th as Flag Day and I looked around for a Toast

to the Flag; but inquiry at the local library and the New York Library gave no clue. So I called my old friend, Dr. Putnam, Librarian of Congress. He could find no such toast, either.

In the room where I slept was a great chandelier. Under it was a silk American Flag. As I started to slumberland, the light was turned off and I saw Old Glory fade out, the colors glorious beneath the dimming light. At about 2 a.m. I awoke with the Toast in mind, dashed it off on a piece of stationery, typed it at the office that morning—and it appeared in the afternoon edition—on the first Flag Day. From then on it went places. Editor at The Hartford Post wrote an editorial about it, the Boston Post spread it across the front page, the old New York Tribune re-printed it—and within a year it had been printed in practically all the national newspapers—and in some magazines throughout America. It was spread about by the Vigilantes, a patriotic society of writers and artists. Eventually it got into Edwin Markham's anthology—and today it is in 18 such books, along with about one or two million school books. Also, it has been set to music about 65 times, once by the great march king, John Philip Sousa—but, and here is a story never published—Sousa's music was rejected by his publisher, saying it was not up to his standard. "T" was not his fault. None of the other compositions made the grade, either; because of the shortness of the lines in this lyric. Originally I had only three verses, and these were never copyrighted on account of my joining the Army in the First World War. In order to get a copyright and prevent others from selling these verses I added a fourth verse. Here, then—at your request—is the present product: and, as you have asked, I now recite it:

"A TOAST TO THE FLAG"

"Here's to the Red of it—
There's not a thread of it,
No, nor a shred of it
In all the spread of it
From foot to head
But heroes bled for it,
Faced steel and lead for it,
Precious blood shed for it,
Bathing it Red!

"Here's to the White of it—
Thrilled by the sight of it,
Who knows the right of it
But feels the might of it
Through day and night?
Womanhood's care for it
Made manhood dare for it;
Purity's pray'r for it
Keeps it so White!

"Here's to the Blue of it—
Beauteous view of it,
Heavenly hue of it,
Star-spangled dew of it
Constant and true;
Diadems gleam for it,
States stand supreme for it,
Liberty's beam for it
Brightens the Blue!

"Here's to the Whole of it—
Stars, stripes and pole of it,
Body and soul of it,
O, and the roll of it,
Sun shining through;
Hearts in accord for it
Swear by the sword for it,
Thanking the Lord for it,
Red, White and Blue!"

ADDRESS OF MAURICE H. THATCHER

Governor Ordway, Members of the D.C. Society, and distinguished guests: when my good friend, John Russell Whitney, former Governor of the Society and now Deputy Governor General of the General Society, in arranging this program, asked me to deliver this address, he left it to me to designate the subject and the title. I told him that I

would choose the title of "The Pilgrim Contribution", for what I had to say.

At the outset I take advantage of the moment to advise this assemblage—and particularly those, like myself, of Elder Brewster descent, of the fact that on the 7th of last September, I presided at the formal dedication of the Cenotaph to Elder Brewster, and his wife Mary Wentworth Brewster, which was erected by the Elder William Brewster Society of which I am the President-Treasurer. On that Sunday afternoon there was so much fog and rain in Plymouth that there was eliminated the customary program of the General Society's on Burial Hill Cemetery I proceeded there, nevertheless, with the dedication which was attended by a goodly number of Brewster descendants and others. While it is known that Elder Brewster and his wife found burial in Plymouth, yet there is no marking of their graves, but possibly their unknown burial sites were either in or near Burial Hill Cemetery, on which the combined Fort and Meeting House of the Pilgrims was established at the beginning of the founding of "The Plimoth Plantation." The memorial stone is of the best Barr Granite, appropriately inscribed, and of early colonial design.

I may add that the Elder William Brewster Society will continue its campaign for funds for the erection in Plymouth region of a more adequate and separate memorial to Elder Brewster and wife.

Now, I wish to pay tribute to the unique and outstanding remarks of my long-time friend, John Jay Daly. He has brought to us a splendid and inspiring designation of the Pilgrims, and his observations have included new and fresh material of great historical value through the evaluations furnished by eminent historians of a recent generation. It was fortunate indeed that Mr. Daly was present at the time these historians gave their united judgments as to the Pilgrims and their success—in the face of obstacles absolutely overwhelming.

Many thanks, Brother Daly, for what you have thus contributed to this occasion; and we are also deeply indebted to you for telling us the most interesting story of the genesis of your famous and universally popular poem, "A Toast to the Flag." If your career had as its principal feature the writing and dissemination of this poem, this of itself would have been sufficient to carry your name to future generations of Americans; but in journalistic labors and in poetic and prose efforts you have distinguished yourself.

In addition to the high tributes to the Pilgrims made by great historians, mentioned by Mr. Daly, I would also refer to similar tributes paid by some of our most eminent authors and statesmen, and among them (see Stoddard's "Truth About the Pilgrims"): Daniel Webster, 1820, Edward Everett 1824, Robert C. Winthrop 1839, Rufus Choate 1843, Charles Sumner 1853, William M. Evarts, 1854, William T. Davis 1870, George William Curtis 1885, Edwin D. Mead 1893, Governor Roger Wolcott 1897, George F. Hoar, 1897, Charles W. Elliott 1910, Henry Cabot Lodge, Sr. 1920, and Calvin Coolidge 1920.

Who were the Pilgrims? and what did they do?

The Pilgrims were high-class, middle-class Englishmen—men and women. They were dissenters of the Established (English) Church, which in that era, under a narrow and tyrannical hierarchy, had set up a policy of proscription and persecution of all those who, in England, dared to doubt or dissent from Church authority. Thus, the Church made it unlawful for any of its members—except the elect—to hear the Bible read. Thus, those listening to such readings received punishment as high as twenty-seven months of imprisonment. Such intolerable practices brought about many dissenters,

the chief of whom, perhaps, were in the Scrooby neighborhood in northeast England. The leader of the Scrooby group was William Brewster of Pilgrim fame. Upon the death of his father he succeeded the latter in charge of the Post in Scrooby, with other added duties of public character, and lived in the Manor House which had succeeded the more pretentious Manor at Scrooby. Pilgrim Brewster was a man of education and culture. At Cambridge University he had been a student for three years, when he was selected as a member of the diplomatic staff of Sir William Davison, the representative of Queen Elizabeth at Antwerp. Because of his education and Christian character and conduct Sir William found in young Brewster a most valuable assistant and advisor.

At this time Holland was at the zenith of its historical record. It was the most tolerant of the European nations as regards the rights of worship by all denominations, and the Established Church of Holland interposed no objections. Although Spain was nearing the end of its political contact with the Netherlands, that nation had become the most enlightened of all the nations of the world, and was first in education, commerce, shipping industry and naval power. Fronting England—a short sea-distance away to the westward—the latter country, following the example of Holland, was changed from an agricultural country to one of factories. Also, the policy of religious tolerance in Holland became increasingly understood and followed by dissenters in England. Brewster as a young man was exposed to all he saw and heard in the land of the Dutch and was greatly influenced then and there; indeed throughout his subsequent life. Later when he returned to Scrooby after his diplomatic career he carried lasting memories of the Dutch and the excellence of their institutions. He organized a church of dissenters in Scrooby and the Manor House in which he lived became the site of worship. Pastor Robinson became the ordained minister of this congregation, and later the church leader of the Pilgrims in Holland. William Bradford of nearby Austerfield, became a member of the dissenting church at Scrooby, and proved himself a completely dedicated Pilgrim. The Established Church of England prosecuted and brought about the imprisonment of Brewster and other dissenters. The effect of this persecution caused the Pilgrims to flee their native land for a sojourn of exile in Holland which lasted from 1607 to 1620.

During this era of exile, after an unsatisfactory year in Amsterdam, the Pilgrims established themselves in Leyden, a city of education and culture with manifold industries which yielded employment and livelihood to the Pilgrims, and provided for the Pilgrim youth education in its public schools. Brewster taught English in the university at Leyden; and also published religious books and tracts. The city is near the mouth of the River Rhine, by which it is encircled. Thus the Pilgrim group was welcomed with open arms in Leyden; but as Englishmen they nourished the hope that ultimately they would establish in the New World on the eastern seaboard of North America a permanent home dedicated to civil and religious liberty under English authority. Their faith and determination were not only outstanding—they were truly epochal. The larger portion of the Pilgrim group in Leyden accordingly left Delfshaven in August 1620 for South Hampton and southern England on the sailing vessel, the Speedwell. Pastor Robinson and some others of the Pilgrims remained in Holland expecting to follow later; but he died in Holland.

The story of the voyage of the Mayflower with these valiant passengers crowded aboard, needs no retelling at this time. It is sufficient after a stormy passage which ended in the waters of Cape Cod Bay at presentday

Provincetown. The Pilgrims had a charter from the English crown to establish a colony in "the northern parts of Virginia," but storms seem to have driven them farther north away from the mouth of the Hudson River where they had expected to have as neighbors Dutch colonists. Attempt was made to take the Mayflower to the mouth of the Hudson, but shoals and other difficulties involved caused the return of the ship to Cape Cod waters and a later landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock. Here on December 21st, 1620, for better or worse, as Heaven might ordain, the Pilgrim group landed and established immediately there a permanent colony, "Plimoth Plantation." Before landing certain persons—non-Pilgrims—who had been employed by the Pilgrims in England, as mechanics, laborers and the like, for the proposed colony, on learning—some of these—that the colony would be founded north of the northern parts of Virginia, boasted that when they came ashore they would do as they pleased, and would not submit to Pilgrim rule. The result of this rebellious conduct caused the Pilgrims to formulate the famous "Mayflower Compact" (probably composed by Brewster & Bradford) in the cabin of the Mayflower before its permanent landing. This famous document is believed to be the first public enunciation for the establishment of a free political and representative government anywhere in the world. As I pointed out a few moments ago when I read the Compact, as a feature of this program, I explained that the instrument (signed by 41 of the Pilgrim group) contained all of the essentials necessary for the intended colonial government of civil and religious liberty. By extension and elaboration these simple but comprehensive provisions were later embedded in the Declaration of Independence and the Federal Constitution. Under the Compact the Plymouth Colony was successfully governed from the time of its adoption (O.S. Nov. 11th, N.S. Nov. 21st, 1620) until the Colony was merged with the Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1691.

The text of the Compact, in modern English, follows:

"MAYFLOWER COMPACT"

"In the name of God, Amen. We whose names are underwritten, the loyal subjects of our dread Sovereign Lord, King James, by the Grace of God of Great Britain, France, and Ireland King, Defender of the Faith, etc.,

"Having undertaken, for the glory of God and advancement of the Christian Faith of our King and Country, a Voyage to plant the First Colony in the Northern Parts of Virginia, do by these presents, solemnly and mutually in the presence of God, and one of another, Covenant and Combine ourselves together into a Civil Body Politic, for our better ordering and preservation, and furtherance of the ends aforesaid; and by virtue thereof, to enact, constitute, and frame such just and equal laws and ordinances, acts, constitutions, and offices, from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general good of the colony; unto which we promise all due subjection and obedience. In witness whereof, we have hereunto subscribed our names, at Cape Cod, the 11th day of November, in the year of the reign of our sovereign Lord, King James of England, France and Ireland the eighteenth, and of Scotland the fifty-fourth, Anno Domini 1620."

It was wisely fashioned. It provided for a Colony under the English King (James) who was unfriendly to the Pilgrim concepts, but who permitted the group to organize and govern Plymouth Colony as they pleased. As to the other English Colonies of the New World they always had crown governments. Not so with the Plymouth Colony; it always elected its own Governors and other officials, and made its own laws, with exception of what was deemed best of applicable English

laws. Their policy of civil and religious liberty was never destroyed or abridged. The Pilgrims never adopted primogeniture nor tolerated a belief in witchcraft. They were indeed an enlightened aggregation and brought with them to their colony the best of England and Holland. The colony was founded on the Christian home—as were the other colonies of the northeastern seaboard. They brought to the New World Christian character and conduct, and free conscience of the first degree. They paid promptly their debt, incurred for their voyage and colony needs, to the English Adventurers who had furnished the money. They possessed a great and unwavering faith for the success of their great undertaking; and that they were guided throughout by a divine destiny of what was true and good, they believed, despite all trials and tribulations. Their colony was the oldest continuing colony throughout the northeastern seaboard, since that of Jamestown was removed from its original site. The inauguration of Thanksgiving Day was perhaps brought from Holland where it was well established. Virginia makes some claim of priority in the New World; but be that as it may, the Plymouth group had a better practice of public relations; they dramatized the occasion, garnished it with elaborate menus, prolonged it three days and had 60 Indians as guests. In the course of time, the observance of Thanksgiving has come to be, under Federal proclamation, a fixed event.

As was well stated years ago by a distinguished South American to an eminent North American who, in substance said, "The Conquistadores came to the Latin American lands for gold, but those who colonized English North American regions came to find God; and to worship Him as they desired."

The greatest gift bestowed by Heaven on man is the moral principle. From that principle everything must flow. The Conquistadores were a brave and resourceful lot, but for the most part they were cruel in their conquests. They did not bring with them their families, though in their wake there followed from Spain Christian faith. Later there came Christian families, and in time the native populations were converted, in general, to Christian faith, under complete Spanish dominance.

The Mayflower is indeed the most notable waterborne vessel of history since Noah's Ark, except the tiny ships used by Columbus on his voyage of American discovery.

The Pilgrims constituted a group distinctive from the Puritans who were the original settlers of Massachusetts Bay Colony. The latter, though dissenting from the English Church, never left it. Of course, in time, that Church became fully tolerant, and later throughout the nation had wide acceptance in the English colonies of America. The church at Plymouth Plantation is considered the first of Congregational Churches.

The Pilgrims are credited with the establishment in their Colony the laws on wills, estates and inheritances; and in time the other English colonies largely followed these "firsts" of the Pilgrims. In many ways the Plymouth Colony was a fine exemplar, and its policies and practices did ever so much in establishing the moral basis of our nation. In all this the companion colonies established like policies. The Plymouth Colony government was the first of all these colonies in the official declaration (about 1627) that "Taxation without representation is tyranny."

Except for the fact that King James trusted the Pilgrim group, it never could have established an enduring colony. The King, though narrow in his religious interpretations, was a scholar of no mean ability; and under his reign the King James Version of the Bible was promulgated, and it consti-

tutes, as many of us believe, the most noble and beautiful employment ever made of the English tongue; and that it and the works of Shakespeare hold within their bounds the most glorious language known to man.

The Pilgrims were possessed of abundant common sense and broad experience, and were able thereby to deal with practical situations in a practical way. They were especially successful in dealing with the grave and difficult problems that confronted them. All in all, the Pilgrim Movement was of vast sequential benefit.

As illustrative of the tolerant attitude and practices of the Pilgrims in religion may be noted that when Roger Williams was banished from the Massachusetts Bay Colony because of his alleged radical views and sermons, he sought and found in the Colony at Plymouth a satisfactory haven of refuge. During the three years he remained there he was permitted to preach to the Pilgrims; and was treated with the utmost kindness and hospitality; for all of which he expressed his gratitude. On a certain occasion he was reproached by Elder Brewster for the hostility of Williams to members of the English Church who might be altogether worthy in their everyday lives, saying, as has been related, that he would not take communion with them. The Elder was indeed more tolerant, at that time, than was Williams who came to be famed for his spirit of tolerance.

Brewster, by the way, served as Ruling Elder from 1609 (Holland) until his death at Plymouth in April 1644—a period of something like thirty-five years.

I must not fail to say something more about William Bradford, a protege of William Brewster, and always the latter's faithful friend. Elder Brewster was the wise counsellor of Bradford from first to last. Bradford was a fine executive and a most capable historian. His History of Plymouth Plantation was and yet is—a most famous of American Histories. For about one-hundred years it was lost in oblivion—having disappeared from New England during Revolutionary Days, but, ultimately found in the library of the English Church in England. Thereupon it was generously given by the proper church authorities to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts where it is safely kept.

Another interesting reference can be made to Bradford. In time it became current in England the belief that Bradford's birthplace was Ansterfield, and not Austerfield, as had theretofore been believed. Of course, his birthplace was Austerfield. Scholars and students in England, through the years, looked in vain to find the place in England called Ansterfield. Finally, someone of greater wisdom pointed out that the letter "n" had been substituted through error for "u" in Austerfield; and that the latter was the true name involved. Thereupon, Bradford received greater acclaim in the world at large. Thus a little typographical error played an important part in the life of Bradford. Austerfield is near Scrooby.

I give you this story as I have read it.

It is interesting to note that through trial and error the Pilgrims learned that under a communal industrial system the Colony would fail, while under a free enterprise and incentive system the Colony would prosper; and accordingly they were thenceforth governed.

The faith and grim determination to make their Colony a lasting success is shown by the historic fact that after the cruel winter of 1620-21—during which more than half of the Colony died, Captain Christopher Jones of the Mayflower which had remained in Cape Cod Bay, in April 1621 just before sailing for England, offered to take back to that country all or any of the Colonys survivors, but not a single one returned.

The nations and peoples of the Earth are in the greatest crisis ever known. For years the human race, in preponderance, has preferred entertainment to instruction, with the inevitable result. The crisis is not only political, but it is also moral and economical and physical. It is accelerating with great cumulative effect. The Pilgrim Example, if followed, would greatly aid in changing the fatal trends. Without righteousness the people perish. This is a law eternal, and cannot be flouted if the race is to survive.

These enumerations indicate some of the outstanding achievements of the Pilgrims; and in sum they constitute the Pilgrim contribution which has blessed the world. I would conclude by quoting Bradford as set forth in his renowned history of Plymouth Plantation, and as the text has been inscribed on the monument over his grave in Burial Hill Cemetery, to wit:

"Do not basely relinquish that which the fathers have with such great difficulty attained."

DEATH OF WARREN JAY VINTON,
MAYOR OF SOMERSET, MD.

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 5, 1969

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, on November 19, 1969, Maryland suffered the loss of one of her finest citizens, Warren J. Vinton, of Somerset, had a record of public service spanning four decades. His work in housing and environment stands as a lasting memorial to this colorful and outstanding civic leader. I express my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Vinton and the entire family.

I ask unanimous consent that a Washington Post article, dated November 20, describing Mr. Vinton's distinguished career, be printed in the RECORD.

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

W. J. VINTON, MARYLAND MAYOR, DIES
(By Kirk Scharfenberg)

Warren J. Vinton, a thoughtful and articulate spokesman for a better environment in his neighborhood community of Somerset, in Montgomery County and across the country, died at his home early yesterday after a long illness. He was 79.

Mr. Vinton's death followed by only a few hours his attendance at the first "Vinton Lecture," established in his honor at Montgomery Junior College this year by the Montgomery County Citizens Planning Association.

Whether helping to design the country's "greenbelt" towns or attempting to protect his shaded residential community of Somerset from commercial encroachment, Mr. Vinton always sought what the Housing Act of 1949, which he helped write, called "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family."

A native of Detroit, he graduated in 1911 from the University of Michigan after studying astronomy and mathematics.

At 21, he became secretary and director of the Vinton Company, at that time the largest general building contractors in Detroit.

During World War I he left the contracting business and became scientific attache at the U.S. Embassy in Paris.

In 1928 he returned to New York and Social Security, which did the groundwork

for the eventual adoption of Social Security legislation.

In 1934, Mr. Vinton was appointed field research supervisor for the newly formed Federal Housing Administration, and it was in this job that he developed the basic research tools now used by the Census Bureau in evaluating housing in the country.

When the Resettlement Administration was established in 1935, he was put in charge of economic and sociological studies for greenbelt towns and helped select the locations for Greenbelt, Md., Greenhill, Ohio, and Greendale, Ohio.

From 1935 to 1937 Vinton worked on drafting the legislation that became the 1937 Wagner Act, the country's first major housing act.

In addition to his regular agency duties, Mr. Vinton served as chairman of the Bureau of the Census advisory committee on housing when it made the nation's first housing survey in 1940.

As chief economist, he was responsible for the economic and social studies that led to the public housing legislation adopted as part of the Housing Act of 1949.

With the passage of that legislation, Mr. Vinton became assistant commissioner of the new Public Housing Administration. He continued in that position until his retirement in 1957.

The next year he was elected mayor of the small, incorporated community of Somerset, located on the west side of Wisconsin Avenue, just north of the District line. He continued as mayor until illness forced his retirement last April. He was then appointed to the Town Council.

As mayor, he led his community's fights against several attempts to build commercial buildings in the area. His attacks on those he opposed were often couched in colorful language that left no doubt about the point he was making.

He was joined in this effort by his wife, Mary P. Vinton. Mrs. Vinton, known as Molly, is generally considered the county's most informed citizen on issues of planning and zoning. She was a regular fixture at planning board meetings until recently, when the declining health of her husband kept her away.

Vinton lived to see the resolution of the last major zoning battle that Somerset fought. On Nov. 10, the Town Council reached an accord with developers who at one time wanted to build 30-story apartment towers just outside Somerset.

Survivors include his wife, of the home, 4718 Cumberland Ave., Somerset; a son, Jay Emerson, of Bethesda; a daughter, Mary V. Erlich, of Washington; and a sister, Elizabeth Rankin, of Royal Oak, Mich.

A memorial service for Mr. Vinton will be held at 3 p.m. Saturday at the Washington Ethical Society, 7750 16th St. N.W.

ADDED PACIFIC AIR SERVICE NEEDED

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 5, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the recommendation of a CAB examiner, Robert L. Park, in the Pacific Northwest-California case recognizes the need of added competition between Seattle and Portland on the one hand and Los Angeles and San Francisco areas on the other. This added service would call for nonstop

flights and would assign to Northwest Orient Airlines a route from Seattle to the bay area including one satellite and including two such satellites in the Los Angeles area.

This report makes real sense to me because after all Seattle is the gateway to the Orient which Northwest Orient Airlines now serves with its short-cut circle route to Tokyo via the North Pacific.

Seattle has enjoyed excellent competitive Pacific coastal service but the marked growth and needs of Seattle air network improvement fully justifies and supports Examiner Park's recommendation.

THE IMPORTANCE OF SMALL BUSINESSMEN: AN ADDRESS BY GENERAL GOLDSWORTHY

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 5, 1969

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, recently I sponsored a Business Opportunity/Federal Procurement Conference in Albuquerque, N. Mex., on November 13, 1969, and in Las Cruces, N. Mex., on November 14, 1969, to bring to the attention of the small businessmen of my State of New Mexico the opportunities which are available to them in Federal procurement.

I, and the several hundred small businessmen and Government officials assembled in Albuquerque on November 13, had the great pleasure of listening to Lt. Gen. Harry E. Goldsworthy, Deputy Chief of Staff, Systems and Logistics, HG USAF, speak on the importance of the small business community in the Nation. I believe that the General's remarks deserve the attention of the Senate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE IMPORTANCE OF SMALL BUSINESSMEN

(By Lt. Gen. Harry E. Goldsworthy)

I always look forward to a visit in the West with pleasure. Since I was born in the State of Washington and raised on a farm, I have more than the usual affinity for the great western land. I am sure many of you who grew up on a small farm will agree with me that we gained an early appreciation of the work and problems associated with running that kind of small business.

The purpose of this meeting, as you know, is to stimulate local participation and competition in government contracting. It is an attempt to make better use of the production and service facilities of this area of our country.

I wish to thank you, Senator Montoya, for your invitation to come here today. In this connection, I never cease to be amazed at the tremendous responsibilities that being a member of Congress involves. Before my first assignment to Washington, I did not have a full appreciation of the staggering workload of our elected officials; nor, frankly, did I know what a general in the Pentagon was up against. I don't know which is worse.

Seriously, however, there is a "need to know" if the Congress is to act and legislate wisely and there is no better place to gain a grass roots feel for our National Small Business Program than a meeting like this.

As for myself, I have learned much about small business and the part it plays in our national economy since assignment to the field of logistics. For example, I've learned:

There are about five million businesses in the United States and approximately 4.8 million of them, or 96%, are small firms.

I've learned: These small business firms account for 40% of the business activity of the United States.

I've learned: It's the livelihood for 60% of our population.

I've learned: It accounts for over 70% of the dollars in the construction, retail, wholesale and service industries.

So, one can see, small business is a very important segment of our economy. What a contrast this is to a century ago when there were about 300,000 businesses in this country—nearly all of them small by today's standards. They served a population totaling 29 million people.

Not long ago, I read a statement which summed up the importance of small business in these words:

"Every American community draws its base of leadership, its stability, its continuity, and its drive for progress from responsible and progressive small businessmen. Leadership at the local level will decide the quality of our cities, our classrooms, our countryside; in fact, the quality of life in our country for a century to come."

Our tradition of free enterprise is simply the economic application of the ethical concept of freedom. The right to compete is the oldest thread of our country. It came with the earliest settlers and far ahead of nationhood.

Small business has continuously flourished as a pillar of competition—the American way of life. It has done so because, as a people, we have always believed—and still believe—that competition must prevail in the market place. Indeed, few Americans today would question the importance of small business in our way of life or the wisdom of helping to maintain and strengthen its influence in the economy.

Although it can be seen that throughout the history of our country, the small businessman has played a major role, there are times when he is hard pressed. He neither has the resources of the large corporation nor does he have the market research and management controls that larger businesses generally have. On the other hand, his decision-making process is less cumbersome. A good, small firm can provide flexible and responsive engineering, low administrative costs and first rate products.

We have heard it said that every small business wishes to become big business. This, of course, is not always true and neither will nor should it happen across the board. A better statement might be that, with rare exceptions, every big business was once small.

SBA EXPERIENCE WITH SMALL BUSINESS

The question often arises as to how our government should treat small business in carrying out the policy of the Congress as expressed in the Small Business Act. The act reads, in part: "It is the declared policy of the Congress that the government should aid, counsel, assist and protect, insofar as is possible, the interest of small business concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprise, to insure that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts or subcontracts . . . be placed with small business enterprises." (15 USC 631, Sec 2a).

I am never sure of what is meant by the term "fair proportion."

The federal government follows policies that foster growth during the early—and sometimes critical—years in the life of a new business.

Small companies should know that there will be reasonable safeguards to protect them from unfair competition, and that they can prosper if they are creative and efficient.

In the event that a reduction of requirements makes necessary the termination—in whole or in part—of a contract, there must be a prompt and fair settlement with the contractor. This is equally true whether the contractor is doing business directly with the government or as a subcontractor at any level.

This might be a good point at which to comment on observations I—in fact, probably all of us—have heard about doing business with small business.

We have all heard the remark, "It costs more to do business with small business concerns." It just isn't so. Of course, there might be isolated instances one could cite, but they would be the exception.

While talking on this subject, let's get rid of another of the old wives' tales. This one is that small business gets favored treatment. Again, it isn't so. If the words were changed to read "fair treatment," then I'd say that is what we seek to do.

In general, it seems that small business problems fall into three areas of major need and concern:

Obtaining a fair share of government procurement.

Gaining access to adequate capital and credit.

Obtaining competent management, technical and production counsel.

Let me hasten to say that large business shares some of these same problems.

Incidentally, if notice has been taken that I have not discussed large business, the omission has been intentional. It is not that large business doesn't play an important role as a supplier of government's requirements, for it, too, makes tremendous contributions to our defense posture. That fact is, most people here today are small businessmen.

Let's consider for a moment an area of national concern—it has been called the problem of employment. There is no question but that socio-economic problems exist in this nation. The government has launched programs to mobilize the resources of private industry and the federal government to help find jobs and to provide training for thousands of America's hard core unemployed. The Department of Defense is making positive contributions to the social needs of the country which, in turn, contribute to our national strength.

One area where we are helping is by awarding contracts to the Small Business Administration under the provisions of Section 8(a) of the Small Business Act. The SBA, in turn, places these requirements on a preferential basis with concerns that agree to hire and train the disadvantaged.

In making these awards, our purpose is to establish self-sustaining, competitive small businesses. A potential recipient of such an award, commonly called "8a contracts," will be required in the future to have a business plan, approved by the Small Business Administration, which will permit the Department of Defense to determine the extent of its commitments and the degree to which DOD contracts will assist in bringing the company to a competitive status and, thus, eliminate further use of "8a" contractual support at a discernible time.

I do not wish to appear redundant, but let me try to capsule some thoughts and ob-

servations. The Congress has made it abundantly clear that our resources must be used in every way possible to increase the contribution of small business to the general welfare. In economic terms, this is a command to help strengthen the competitive structure by helping small business offer America the highest quality and the greatest variety of goods and services at the lowest fair and reasonable price. In social terms, this is a mandate to preserve and strengthen the small business community as an outlet for the imagination, initiative and individualism we in DOD understand and fully support.

The concern to keep economic power distributed among many independent proprietors is one that goes back to the nation's beginning. It was a favorite theme with Franklin and Jefferson who feared that industrialization might lead to a propertyless labor class.

Today, there is a continuing need to evaluate the place of small business in our economy, as well as the actions necessary to create and maintain an economic climate in which small business may be viable and significant.

In closing, let me say that there is one link in the chain of small business and government relationship which can be strengthened. Let's call it a need for better communication which, in turn, results in knowledge. This meeting today will put us considerably further down the road toward that happy marriage of industry capability and government utilization by piercing and destroying, so far as possible, that which has been referred to so many times as "a communication barrier."

I appreciate the invitation and interest of Senator Montoya and others which made possible our joining with you in this meeting.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT HISTORIC SITE'S SHUTTERS COME HOME

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the pleasure of informing the House of the formal acquisition by the Federal Government of the Ansley Wilcox mansion in Buffalo, N.Y., which was where Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office as President in 1901.

This was authorized under legislation which I sponsored in the 89th Congress.

Now comes new word which indicates the wide and sympathetic interest in this historic project.

The grandson of a previous owner of the mansion had taken the shutters with him when he moved from the city, believing that 1 day he might find an appropriate use for them. They do not fit into the pattern of today's buildings and he never had the heart—thankfully—to trim them down.

The other day, he bundled them in his automobile and returned them to Buffalo prepared to turn them over to the local foundation which has taken on the job of restoring and refurbishing the mansion.

The story of this incident is told in intimate detail in an article by Karen Brady in the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News as follows:

KAREN'S KORNER—THE MAN WHO LIVED IN WILCOX MANSION

(By Karen Brady)

Ollie brought the shutters back. Six pairs of them, wrapped in blankets.

Age way over 100, made of cedar, he thought. Brought all the way from Pittsburgh; a daughter, Tricia, sleeping on top.

All done by hand, one pair of them five feet tall. Once they were white. Now they're ivory. And hardly peeling at all. Even the round ones, that once covered a historic door.

Ollie's had them nearly 10 years, sort of a keepsake he'd hoped to use. But a keepsake that would never fit modern windows or doors. Unless he cut them and then they'd never be the shutters Ollie knew—when he lived in the Wilcox Mansion.

"Which is where the shutters are from," says Ollie, "and when I heard the house was going to be restored, I said: 'OK, shutters, you're going back.'"

Now Ollie is, as he tells it with proud jocularly himself, Oliver Lawrence Poppenberg, the handsome young father of four.

GRANDMOTHER RAN RESTAURANT

The first time I met him he'd just become engaged to my efficient, most beautiful classmate, Mary Kay Pepe (now Poppenberg). And Ollie was jolly: A blond, witty young man who made people feel comfortable at parties.

A rare art he may have learned from his remarkable maternal grandmother, Kathryn Lawrence—the wonderful, also witty, white-haired proprietor of the Kathryn Lawrence Tea Room, then Restaurant—house for over 20 years in the Wilcox Mansion.

A rare art he may also have inherited from his paternal grandfather Gustav Poppenberg—for whom Poppenbergs Inc. (organs, pianos, television) was named, the man I'm told was responsible for most of the church organs in Buffalo, and who served as the first violinist with the Philharmonic here.

At any rate, Ollie was always enchanting. When he could have been a snob about the fact that he and his family lived in a mansion—the nationally-famous Wilcox Mansion.

HERE COME THE SHUTTERS

And that's probably why most of us never heard much about it from Ollie until this week-end—when he breezed in from Pittsburgh by car, with the calm, beautiful Mary Kay, plus Ollie Jr., Kate, Tricia-on-the-shutters, Karen and the Poppenberg pup, Schatz.

They were all here to see Ollie's parents—Mr. and Mrs. Arnold C. Poppenberg—and Mary Kay's—Mr. and Mrs. Alphonse P. Pepe. The former of Poppenbergs Inc., the latter of Hodge Liquor.

And when they'd done away with Poppenberg-Pepe turkey, they came by to talk shutters with us: An extraordinary evening that included childhood visions of Ollie, age 12, creeping upstairs alone from the restaurant at night. An impressionable boy who knew the house' foundations had been used as barracks in the War of 1812, and that the cellar had housed part of the Underground Railway at the time of the Civil War and that Theodore Roosevelt had taken the oath of office in the house, after McKinley was assassinated here. And that the ghosts of all of them were crawling upstairs after him.

OLLIE LIVED THERE

"I heard the doors screaming on their hinges, and the silver ringing, and the crystal singing. But subtly. It happened every time," said Ollie, who lived with his family in the celebrated 641 Delaware Ave. manse from 1949 till the early '60s, when Mr. Lawrence died and the house was sold.

"I was the only person in the world," he

informed us to our delight, "who could make a turkey sandwich—with all the trimmings—right down to finding the sharpest knife and slicing the bread pencil-thin—in the late night, pitch-black when my grandmother was in charge of the kitchen."

Ollie, who still wakes up and dreams of those turkey-sandwich specialties, had more to tell of the Wilcox: About the huge, harlequin great dane that used to lie by the fire in the East Room, where there is a giant marble fireplace. Ollie was scared of the dane.

MOW IN SUMMER; SHOVEL IN WINTER

Ollie recalled the long summer hours cutting the mansion lawn—and the brisk winter mornings he shoveled "that horrible slate walk." He said he knew where the underground railroad must've gone through—over 100 years ago.

"It's all boarded up now," he said, "but I've been through the iron vaults, where they kept furs and jewels, and I've ridden on the elevator that was put in for a Wilcox who was crippled, and, during high school, I studied on the roof. It was scary, too, but I did it, crawling up through a trap door . . ."

The "tragic thing about the mansion to Ollie though is the inconsistency of its owners: 'A couple of generations, and a family moved out,' he explained his feeling. "When my grandparents moved in, in 1939, I don't think anyone'd been there for at least 20 years. But I loved it. That's why I wanted a keepsake. That's why I took the shutters."

NO HEART TO CUT SHUTTERS

So Ollie and Mary Kay took them to their Richmond Ave. apartment, their Williams-ville home, their Franklin, Pa., house, their Pittsburgh residence . . . "I could never bring myself to cut them," said Ollie, "People kept sending me clippings about the house—about to be torn down, about to be saved. Saved and more than saved. Now it will be restored . . ."

A Buffalo native, and a graduate of School 16 and Bennett High School, Ollie always wanted to be an architect but holds a degree in engineering from Case Institute and a master's in business administration from UB.

His first job was as bus boy at Kathryn Lawrence's—something he did in the sixth grade that mainly gave him a taste for his grandfather's finest cigars. His second job was as life guard, at several area beaches, a pleasant Tarzan-like occupation that introduced him to Mary Kay and kept him out of shoes till he was in college.

Formally, he's been an industrial engineer for Republic Steel here; an operations research engineer for Symington-Wayne locally, and data processing manager for the Joy Manufacturing Co. here, which later sent him to Franklin, Pa., from where Ollie went on to Pittsburgh and his present situation, as vice president for Computer Processing Inc., a software, Pitt-based firm.

HISTORIC SITES AWESOME

Wordwise, that's more than a mouthful—but Ollie-wise, it's only a little less than the little boy who once waited for Joanne, the tea room then restaurant baker, who always made two extra pies-in-miniature: one for Ollie, one for his brother, Arnold.

We asked Ollie if he cooked himself (oh yes, great Sunday breakfasts and oysters Poppenberg although I'd rather call them oysters Ollie) and we asked him where he'd take the shutters, now he'd wrapped and brought them back.

"I don't know," said the little-boy-grown-up who once lived in the manse that's brought Buffalo an extra name in history. "I don't know who's in charge of that sort of thing. Because of course, historic sites are awesome, even if they were once 'home', and

that's just about the point where we found out the other thing Ollie's kept from the Wilcox: The great big front-door key. And he may return that next year. If he found out whom to give it to."

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF MUSEUMS MOVED TOWARD ACCREDITATION

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 5, 1969

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the American Association of Museums has been making significant efforts toward principles of museum accreditation. This is an important matter of museums both for public confidence and also in easing judgments which have to be made by governmental agencies and private agencies in connection with contributions, grants, and contracts.

To illustrate the steps that have been made, I ask unanimous consent that the special report on accreditation, dated August 4, 1969, from the American Association of Museums be printed in the RECORD. The special report includes a letter from Kyran M. McGrath, director of the association, and an Interim Report from the Committee on Accreditation dated May 26, 1969.

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

SPECIAL REPORT: ACCREDITATION

August 4, 1969.

At the General Business Meeting of the American Association of Museum May 26, 1969 in San Francisco, the membership approved the following resolution on the important subject of museum accreditation:

"Resolved, that the Council of the American Association of Museums reconfirms the desirability of a system of accreditation of museums, accepts the report of the Accreditation Committee appointed by President Parkhurst at the 63rd Annual Meeting and recommends that the membership: (1) adopt the principles of that report, (2) authorize the committee to continue in session in order to define the methods to be followed, and (3) authorize the Council to implement the resulting action of the Committee."

Charles E. Buckley, chairman of the Accreditation Committee, reported on the efforts of his Committee during the previous fiscal year and explained the contents of the report delivered to the A.A.M. Council preceding the business meeting. The Council had discussed the report in detail and had unanimously approved adoption of the resolution above.

The report is recognized as incomplete, and the Council and membership wanted assurance that it would be submitted to the membership for study and comment. Originally, distribution to the membership was to be made through Museum News. However, this magazine is not published during July or August, and its first appearance in the September 1969 issue would not afford time for timely consideration and discussion and feed-back of opinions and suggestions prior to the annual meetings this Fall of the Regional Conferences or the continuing meetings of the Accreditation Committee. So this Special Accreditation Report is being mailed to all A.A.M. members to inform them of the

action taken at the 64th Annual Meeting and to afford them an opportunity to offer their suggestions and comments for developing the most meaningful and workable system of museum accreditation.

Some comment has been received about the procedure by which this report was brought before the members at the San Francisco meeting. Authority for accreditation rests with the membership of the A.A.M. which was assembled May 26, 1969, and which would not have been assembled again until June 1, 1970 in New York. If implementation of accreditation was to begin before 1971, authority had to be obtained from the membership at this past meeting to allow the Committee to continue meeting and to authorize the Council to approve the steps of implementation at its mid-winter meeting January 28, 1970. If the Council takes exception to the steps recommended by the Accreditation Committee, it will take the steps necessary to meet the objections. For this reason, the Accreditation Committee, and the Council which now contains full voting representation from the six regional conferences, look forward to your comments and suggestions on the contents of the report printed below.

In order to appreciate the significance of timely action for the A.A.M. to implement a meaningful program of accreditation, understand the pressures upon the Internal Revenue Service, other federal agencies, Congress, and private foundations to have a means of identifying museums which indeed meet objective standards of cultural and educational service to the public. With the momentum generated by the message in America's Museums: The Belmont Report and recent demands for equal tax and funding treatment for museums as presently afforded universities, colleges, libraries, churches, etc., museums are being looked to for a system by which institutions are measured against objective, acceptable standards. If museums did not undertake this task, other organizations would, especially on the governmental level. For the sake of timely progress, the vote "on the principles of that report" was sought, taken, and unanimously approved. To assure the fullest possible informing of the membership, this report is now being distributed along with a call for your expression of opinion, comments, and suggestions. For reasons set forth above and in the report itself, accreditation is one of the most important matters that will ever come before the American Association of Museums. Your help and support is vital.

KYRAN M. McGRATH,
Director.

INTERIM REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION FOR THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF MUSEUMS

In May 1968 Charles Parkhurst, President of the American Association of Museums, appointed a committee to study the question of accreditation by the AAM of individual museums throughout the United States. Members of the committee are William T. Alderson, Director, American Association for State and Local History; Charles E. Buckley, Director, City Art Museum of Saint Louis, chairman; W. D. Frankforter, Director, Grand Rapids Public Museum; Richard Grove, Associate Director, Arts in Education Program, JDR 3rd Fund; Hugo G. Rodeck, Director, University of Colorado Museum; William C. Steere, Executive Director, The New York Botanical Garden, ex officio; Holman J. Swinney, Director, Adirondack Museum; and Verne L. Yadon, Curator, Museum of Natural History, Pacific Grove, California.

Financing for the work accomplished by the committee to date was provided by a grant in the amount of \$10,000 from the Smithsonian Institution (Grant No. SFC-9-

2016). Applied against this grant to date are the travel and per diem expenses of the committee and certain minor administrative expenses starting August 1, 1968.

The committee was instructed to meet at regular intervals throughout 1968-69 and to prepare a report for consideration and possible action by the President and Council of the AAM meeting in San Francisco on May 26, 1969. The committee met at City Art Museum of Saint Louis for two-day meetings in July, November and February. A fourth meeting was held at the Asilomar Conference Grounds, Pacific Grove, California, on May 24 and 25, 1969.

A. DEFINITION OF A MUSEUM

As a first step the committee recognized the need to establish a definition of a museum. While it was aware that on several occasions in the recent past other attempts to arrive at a definition have been made within the American museum world, it was agreed that for the purposes of the report it was worth attempting another, one that would be more concise and hopefully acceptable to the majority of our colleagues. This definition is as follows:

For the purposes of the accreditation programs of the AAM a museum is defined as an organized and permanent non-profit institution, essentially educational or aesthetic in purpose, with professional staff, which owns or utilizes tangible objects, cares for them, and exhibits them to the public on some regular schedule.

The committee believes this definition of a museum to be accurate and suitable for general use throughout the United States; for further clarification the key words in it are defined as follows:

1. Organized institution: A duly constituted body with expressed responsibilities.
2. Permanent: The institution is expected to continue in perpetuity.
3. Professional staff: At least one salaried employee who commands an appropriate body of special knowledge and the ability to reach museological decisions consonant with the experience of his peers and who also has access to and acquaintance with the literature of the field.
4. Owns or utilizes: Has legal title to or authorization for the possession of its collections.
5. Tangible objects: Things animate and inanimate.
6. Care: The keeping of adequate records pertaining to the provenance, identification and location of a museum's holdings, and the application of current professionally accepted methods to the minimizing of damage and deterioration.
7. Schedule: Regular and ascertainable hours which constitute substantially more than a token opening, so that access is reasonably convenient to the public.

B. REASONS FOR ACCREDITATION

The committee next considered why it is desirable, necessary and beneficial for institutions which can be reasonably described by the above definition of a museum to be accredited by the AAM. In recent years it has become ever more apparent to many of our museum colleagues throughout the country that some definite method must be devised for evaluating the quality and performance of institutions operating in the broad museum field.

Heretofore, museums in the United States have been governed according to widely varying standards. While recognizing that uniformity of operation is neither possible nor desirable, there is nevertheless a compelling need for the formulation by the AAM of specifically defined guide lines and attainable professional standards to which a museum should conform. Acceptance by the AAM of accreditation and the development of the

machinery necessary to implement it are of first importance.

Evaluation is the prerequisite for accreditation and is a process that should encourage improvement in the quality of all museums. It should be helpful in creating a climate of aspiration so that a museum not yet prepared for accreditation or one that fails in its first effort in this direction can work toward professional standards of quality and performance, as defined by the AAM, which must be met to assure accreditation.

1. Accreditation will help to develop public confidence by certifying in a visible manner that in the opinion of the AAM professional standards have been met.

2. Accreditation will significantly strengthen professional respect and cooperation between museums.

3. Accreditation will further promote institutional self-confidence and engender professional pride of accomplishment on the part of the staff and the policy-making body.

4. Accreditation will be important in guiding private and governmental agencies which need expert opinion as a basis for qualitative judgment in connection with contributions, grants and contracts.

C. PROCEDURE FOR ACCREDITATION

The committee believes it will be necessary for the AAM to create an ultimate authority, such as an Accreditation Commission, to consider all matters having to do with accreditation.

The committee is unanimous in its opinion that evaluation is the first step to be taken. Museums aspiring to accreditation must first willingly apply for accreditation and cooperate with the AAM throughout the valuation proceedings.

A museum will not be accredited without having been visited by an evaluation team. The committee recognizes, however, that such visits will be difficult to arrange as accreditation becomes a reality even if the procedure is well organized. Visits to museums throughout the United States will inevitably be time consuming and it may well require a period of several years before the task can be accomplished. Some method of granting provisional accreditation to a substantial number of museums should therefore be considered. A long step forward in this direction may be accomplished by a carefully constructed questionnaire to be filled out by the applying museum. The completed questionnaire would be submitted to the Accreditation Commission for study and, if approved, passed on to a regional visiting committee. If the questionnaire is properly prepared and thoughtfully answered, it can provide an accurate profile of the institution, defining and describing its philosophy, collections, conservation, staff, exhibitions, activities, finances, housekeeping, record, maintenance, et cetera. On the basis of the questionnaire the committee believes that many museums will qualify for provisional accreditation.

Even though provisional accreditation is granted, it must be emphasized that the need remains for a museum visit from a regional visiting committee which will be assigned to this task. It is on this visit and the drawing up of a final report that accreditation will be granted or withheld by the Accreditation Commission.

The committee recommends that, concurrently with the preparation and distribution of questionnaires, procedure for committee visits be perfected and put into operation. It is suggested that visiting committee members be drawn from the regional conference. It seems obvious that it will be necessary to create a sizable body of committee members so that the burden of service does not fall too heavily upon a small group of individuals. Each committee, consisting of at least two, but of not more than seven, members,

depending on the size and complexity of the museum to be visited, will spend sufficient time studying and observing the museum under consideration. The visiting committee chairman will be briefed in advance by the Accreditation Commission chairman, and all committee members will be furnished copies of the questionnaire answered by the museum. On conclusion of the visit each committee chairman must develop a written report, modeled on a form to be developed by the AAM, concluding with a recommendation to the Accreditation Commission that the museum be either accredited or that accreditation be withheld. A copy of the report will also be sent to the President of the Board of Trustees of the museum. A museum failing in accreditation should have an opportunity to correct deficiencies in quality and performance and to request reconsideration at some later date without further expense.

It is recommended that the accreditation commission prepare a guide for use by visiting committees in evaluating individual museums. The following points, however, should be considered by visiting committees even though some of the answers will already be available through the questionnaire.

1. Administration:
 - (a) Physical plant and allocation of space.
 - (b) Duties and qualifications of museum staff.
 - (c) Organization and functioning.
 - (d) Fiscal responsibility.
 - (e) Maintenance.
 - (f) Public relations.
 - (g) Security.
 - (h) Trustee organization, policy and delegation of authority.
 - (i) Salaries.
 - (j) Fringe benefits.
 - (k) Other considerations.
2. Curatorial:
 - (a) Quality and suitability of collections.
 - (b) Care of collections.
 - (c) Acquisition policy and practices.
 - (d) Record keeping.
 - (e) Research.
 - (f) Identification services for the public.
 - (g) Qualifications for loans.
 - (h) Other considerations.
3. Exhibition program:
 - (a) Relevance of exhibitions.
 - (b) Quality of exhibitions.
 - (c) Design and interpretation of exhibitions.
 - (d) Other considerations.
4. Educational and interpretive program:
 - (a) Docent program.
 - (b) Activities.
 - (c) Organized classes.
 - (d) Circulating exhibitions.
 - (e) Lectures, films, television and radio.
 - (f) Publications.
 - (g) Organized school programs.
 - (h) Graduate student training.
 - (i) Cooperative programs with colleges and universities.
 - (j) Other considerations.
5. Future plans:

In the opinion of the committee, not all creditable museums are expected to give attention to each of these objective points, or to all of them to an equal degree. Recommendation regarding eligibility for accreditation will be made by the visiting committee on a subjective basis after consideration of answers to the questionnaire following a museum visit. Museums which do not fit these pre-conceived criteria will still be eligible for accreditation if in the opinion of the visiting committee and the Accreditation Commission their quality and performance are of such caliber as to warrant accreditation.

Financing AAM accreditation will require more study than the committee has been able to devote to it thus far. It has been suggested, however, that museums be re-

quired to pay an administrative fee, but in order to prepare the necessary machinery and to implement accreditation, foundation and government support may have to be sought.

The committee recommends to the President and Council the adoption in principle of the above report and further recommends the drawing up at the time of the Council meeting of a resolution to be placed before the membership in San Francisco to the effect that the concept of accreditation by the AAM of museums throughout the country be formally reconferred. Although recognizing that much work remains to be done, the committee further recommends that the AAM, through its Council, proceed to implement this program. The committee is of the opinion that the machinery of accreditation needs further study and perfecting of detail. It is here proposed that the committee prepare an article regarding accreditation for publication in *Museum News*. The committee also recommends that a major address on accreditation by a figure of national importance be featured at the 1970 meeting.

NEEDED: MORE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 5, 1969

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which will appear in the January 1970 issue of *Plane & Pilot*, a widely circulated magazine in the field of aviation.

The article, entitled "Who's Afraid of ATC?" deals with the mounting problems of air traffic control throughout the United States, and suggests again the need for a constant updating of air safety requirements. There are now more than 700,000 licensed pilots in the United States, and most of them fly private planes for pleasure, business, or both.

The article leads one to the inevitable conclusion that an expanded and more rational program is needed for air safety and a growing reliance on the qualified controller to safeguard us against future traffic accidents.

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

WHO'S AFRAID OF ATC?

Hugh Riddle, president of Air Traffic Control Association: "The general aviation scene is perhaps the most interesting at the present time because of the increase in the number of general aviation operations at so many airports. The ATCA sees the controller's role as trying to accommodate all types of aviation—military, airline and general aviation. I think we are reaching the point where we need some special facilities even at our larger metropolitan airports, shorter runways or what have you to help take care of the general aviation operations. In my own experience I think that airline operations tend to generate general aviation operations at the same airport . . . private or corporate aircraft bringing passengers in to catch other flights. To completely try and isolate the two entirely probably is not a practical approach."

Thousands of pilots among the nearly 700,000 in the United States have a common fear—ATC. To the majority of private pilots air traffic control is a mystery—the men in the towers are government agents dedicated to take away the licenses of pilots who make

mistakes. The men in the towers, the centers, the Rapcons are remote voices who must be tuned in on specific radio frequencies. A high percentage of pilots consider the controller a traffic cop of the airways.

Pilots by the thousands shy away from tower-controlled airports as if the facility were some kind of giant electrode projecting an anti-aircraft barrier to be penetrated only by a chosen few. Often the non-tower fields in some areas are busier than the prime tower-guarded airport until the Federal Aviation Administration decides the non-tower field is busy enough to have a \$600,000 tower that most of the pilots don't want. Airports honored with new towers often suffer business declines if pilots have a nearby non-tower field that they can use.

FAA officials try hard to convince pilots at airports planned for new towers that safety is sharply improved by having skilled ATC specialists in the tower cabs directing traffic with the help of radio, radar and computers. But most of the midair collisions of 1968 happened within control zones during VFR weather. What many pilots refuse to realize is how much worse the traffic problem would be without controllers.

But at the same time the FAA tells the pilots that they can fly from uncontrolled airports if visibility is estimated at one mile. But at the controlled airport, the pilot can't just hop in his bird and fly unless the visibility is at least three miles.

Four or five miles from a controlled airport pilots may be flying without restrictions in one-mile weather while at the controlled airport the pilot must receive a special VFR clearance that he has to repeat to the controller and then wait in line while IFR traffic arrives and departs. True, the special VFR clearance does allow flying on the same basis as at an uncontrolled airport, but at the same time many pilots consider they are being penalized by being forced to receive a clearance and forced to endure delays while at the nearby uncontrolled airport local traffic possibly is heavier and the pilots probably are cheating a little on the minimums.

This is the concept that turns thousands of pilots off on ATC. They see their flight freedoms disappearing into the hands of faceless men in a glass cab overlooking the airport like a giant stop and go signal. Pilots at controlled airports often sit around flight lounges, pacing the floor, calling time after time for weather reports, looking at the sky, muttering about the controllers and ATC while waiting for the sky to turn VFR, because they don't want to ask for a special VFR clearance. It happens somewhere almost every day at one of the 315-plus controlled airports in the United States.

Pilots see more restrictions in the future as air traffic control spreads across more of the airspace. Private pilots realize that soon they will need better equipped airplanes and higher skill levels to fly into about 120 of the nation's airports. Hundreds of the pilots who might have used these 120-plus airports now will select alternates that are nearby and non-tower controlled.

Pilots by the thousands don't realize that technicians in the towers aren't there to catch them making errors or to appraise their flying skills. The ATC men in the towers, the centers, the Rapcons are willing to help any pilot who asks for help. Tower personnel at some airports do extensive public relations jobs to convince pilots that using FAA services is as easy as talking to a friendly next door neighbor. The basic assignment of a controller is to help pilots keep out of trouble, not to get them into trouble and demand explanations for mistakes.

Most of the pilots in the United States are private pilots. They don't want to be commercial pilots or instrument rated. They want to fly without too many restrictions. They want to fly for business or pleasure and go where they want to go without look-

ing up a lot of contact frequencies for ground control, approach control, tower control, right runways or left runways. Every tower chief, every ATC specialist or radar controller in an air route center realizes that they must work with private pilots, commercial pilots and ATR rated pilots with wide varieties of skill levels.

During a recent meeting of the Air Traffic Control Association at the Stardust Hotel, Las Vegas, Nevada, a cross-section of controllers talked about how general aviation pilots can make use of ATC . . . make it work for them, make their flights easier and safer by being prepared to ask for help if problems develop and recognizing the man in the tower as a friend, not an enemy.

WHY PILOTS AVOID CONTROL TOWERS

Control Towers are on the negative list for thousands of general aviation pilots and the controllers know it. They don't like being snubbed and some of them try to change the image. The men of ATC don't want to drive light planes out of the skies, they want to make the skies safer for light planes by having better control of all traffic through automation and types of radars that will track light planes without transponders as well as bigger planes with transponders. Automation that the controllers want will give them more time to provide better service to the increasing numbers of light, general aviation aircraft being flown by pilots who want to keep the fun in flying. If you think that ATC men are inhuman or FAA cops, or pro-airlines, here's what some of them had to say in *Plane & Pilot* exclusive interviews:

Charles Meng, Ft. Columbus Control Tower, Columbus, Ohio—"One thing I feel good about is our relations with all groups at Columbus. We have military, air carrier and much general aviation operating in and out of Columbus. There is as much mix there as anywhere I know of in types of traffic and different levels of pilot skills.

"We have quite a few transient pilots who own airplanes. They'll have to come to Columbus for a meeting of some kind and they'll land at a satellite airport or take some other form of transportation to Columbus to keep from landing at a controlled airport. Quite a few of these individuals have come up to the tower and start talking about owning airplanes and we'll say why didn't you land here and they say, We avoid these control tower airports like the plague. This always makes me feel like some place along the line we've let them down because the only thing we are there for is to serve the flying public.

Some of these people who have been flying at non-controlled airports, even though they may have been flying 20 years, some of them do cause problems when they come in that the students who have learned to fly in the controlled environment don't have. You can't expect everything to go 100 percent just like you want it to go from our standpoint in handling the traffic or from their standpoint in complying with what we are trying to get them to do."

WHY RADIO CONTACT IS IMPORTANT

New terminal area requirements are moving rapidly into the general aviation picture. Controllers working with the new systems believe that most private pilots need more training or self-discipline to cope with precision demands that will be made on their skills. This is especially true of using the com side of the radio, an area where most pilots are left by instructors to learn for themselves.

Edward Morrow, Atlanta, Georgia Tower data systems coordinator—"As far as general aviation, we pioneered the TRSA (an automated radar system). For the general aviation pilots not familiar with procedures, in the beginning we had trouble with them and we still do. We would establish them on a heading and they would deviate from

this heading sometimes en route. They weren't used to being tied down. Training in this respect is important to teach them to generally comply with ATC instructions and how to work in the system. By this I mean for an air carrier who is coming in and out every day it is the same thing over and over again he gets to the point where he can make one word suffice for 10 or 15 words and this is not true in general aviation we don't expect it. We know the condition but still as for suggestions as to how they could improve this is one of the problem areas to reduce the communications—better radio procedure—and other than that we don't have any major problems in Atlanta. Most of us are private pilots ourselves.

"Seventeen percent of our traffic is the general aviation VFR pilot and while if they don't have a transponder we may lose tracking on them when they pass abeam the antenna on the tangential still we track them everyone of them. Because this track in that area is a reminder to us that he is there even though we don't see him. And so for that reason I don't advocate that all general aviation airplanes have beacons. I didn't intend this in the meeting or otherwise. The point that I was trying to make was that we should go back and re-evaluate this thing (requiring transponders) and provide radar tracking. This is necessary even if everybody had beacons."

James R. Daniels, Spartanburg Tower, a low activity VFR facility at Spartanburg, South Carolina—"We have a number of private aircraft, corporation aircraft based at our field and one of the main things we want the pilot to do for us is communicate so we can provide the service a tower is supposed to do—provide him with concrete to land on—provide him a safe entry into and departure from the traffic pattern.

"We tell the private pilot we want to know who you are, where you are and what you want to do. First whether you are on the ground asking for takeoff instructions or in the air. You call Spartanburg Tower, this is Bonanza 23 Victor, eight miles east, landing Spartanburg. At that time we have the complete picture. He knows where he is and we know where he wants to land. We know what type service he needs and we can provide it—exchange traffic that he might be meeting or anything approaching him that might overtake him. These are the kind of things we try to get to the private pilot. Don't be afraid to talk to the tower. A lot of pilots are a little skeptical, especially the new private pilot. But we are just people and we are there to serve him. This is one of the problems we have to overcome first is to get him to be able to talk to us.

"A lot of times we have pilots call into the tower and say this is Aeronca 792 three miles east of the field. We look three miles east of the field in five miles visibility and we don't see the aircraft. Usually we make a 180 and look to the west of the field. We have traffic controllers who have become accustomed to this. We don't belittle the pilot, we don't run down the pilot on his errors or even if he violates some of our rules, we don't do this. We just say Cessna 279, taxi to the ramp and call the tower when you have time. Then we'll talk to him on the telephone or invite him up for a cup of coffee and we explain the error of his way and how he could avoid it and why we need to straighten him out because we are up there for his service and the more we can communicate with him as to his need and our need the better off we'll be."

WHY PILOTS NEED TO UPGRADE SKILLS

Most private pilots don't want to fly into the giant metropolises like Los Angeles International and O'Hare at Chicago. However, sometimes flying a light plane into one of the big airports may be a convenience or a necessity. A key FAA official spells it out

frankly when he says that skill levels need to go up for pilots who want to mix with jet traffic.

John Munds, Western Region, FAA—"Every private pilot who wants to fly in an area like Los Angeles where there's quite a bit of traffic is going to have to upgrade his qualifications if they aren't already up there and then keep them up. This seems a particular problem. The pilot who either wants to fly into a congested area or wants to fly in there as a regular operation, he must be up on what the rules are and also his piloting technique and his ground technique. And this requires more than most of us private pilots are willing to do. We want to go out once a month or once every two months and have a good time without really keeping up on what a pilot should be up with. To this end we recommend such things as have already been recommended by the FAA since then of periodic checks on your flight proficiency whether these are written exams or compulsory attendance at courses to upgrade the pilot's understanding and techniques. My personal feeling is that the FAA could do more in this regard too. If they make this sort of thing available to the pilot, he'll avail himself of it. The private pilot needs to know where to fly in order to avoid high performance aircraft."

Vern Baran, O'Hare Tower, Chicago—"The private pilot who operates in and out of Chicago O'Hare is a highly professional type pilot if he is flying a Cessna 172, an Apache or what have you. Maybe the other ones are scared to come in there but we have no problems in general with the private pilots who use O'Hare facilities. These people are real good, just as good as the air carrier types. The other ones that fly in and around the general metropolitan area of Chicago, there are some problem areas. This I think is evident in any area you go to. I blame this on possibly their schooling when they obtain their private ticket, their lack of knowledge about the system. At one time I ran a private pilot course at a private field and I got very good participation for four weeks. The private pilot is hungry for information how to fly in and around large metropolitan areas.

"Some of the problem perhaps is with the agency itself. It does not have a firm enough program for the private pilot to show him certain things he should know prior to flying into a metropolitan area and I think it is a two-sided coin. The private pilot should try to obtain as much information locally and if he can't get it there, he can try some other media. But I think an overall general aviation program is necessary for the private pilot so he can be made aware of the operations in particular areas, something that can help him out and the pilots I have run across are very receptive. They want to know this information. It is just a matter of who is going to provide this information. So once we can get a program of this type out, whether it be on a voluntary basis at FAA facilities or local, or what, but we have to get some cooperation so a pilot won't transition through an approach course to O'Hare or some heavy density area. I think if he would realize where he was and made aware of this, he wouldn't be there. He doesn't want to get himself knocked out of the sky anymore than an air carrier does. I think it is a matter of education. It could be in microphone technique or it could be in general navigation or just by making themselves aware of the local operation that's in effect.

"We are getting more and more airplanes in the system . . . they are building more and more so lack of education is going to lead to nothing but a chaotic situation in the metropolises complexes it's just going to reach an area where it is possibly dangerous. But I think we can alleviate this if everyone is aware of what to expect, where not to be and what to do when they get themselves in a certain situation."

Vito Borrello, Rochester, New York—"It's getting mixed traffic that is the problem—jets and light aircraft. They (private pilots) have to learn more about ATC. They should not have to be told. And that's it, it's getting to learn to fly with the big boys, and being able to take care of themselves in the pattern and learn more about terminals. I think instructors are making instruction too easy. A guy three months ago didn't know how to fly and now he's an instructor. We have three flying schools in Rochester and they pretty regularly visit us. They get to know the controller. They believe that a controller is bad, that he's not there really to help 'em. That's the impression they get until they come and visit us. And then you have people learning to fly where there are no towers. Radio is their big problem, they're afraid of the radio and the proper use of it. And they are afraid to say repeat."

WHY PILOTS NEED EDUCATION, PLANNING

Pre-flight planning is an area of weakness among the men and women who make up the average of general aviation pilots. This situation may lead to some problems in metropolitan areas where reporting points become essential and knowing where you are keeps you out of trouble.

Pete Nelson, common IFR Room, New York—"We have expanded radar which provides VFR traffic service to pilots landing and departing at the airports of New York and traffic overflying New York. This is a real work-horse of a position either due to poor communication technique of the general aviation pilot or due to his lack of planning on just where he is located. He knows he is somewhere, but he's not just sure where and his position reports are usually inaccurate. You can tell real quickly when you are dealing with a competent aviator. He knows where he is and he knows that he is not cutting someone out when he transmits. Items like that I think are not hard to correct with a little training and a little thought and not just jumping in the plane . . . let's take off for here or there without thought about what radar service you can work and not listening on the frequency before you call. I think these are basic things that if corrected would make the controller's job a lot easier.

"Basically the general aviation pilot needs a little more education. I think there are times when some people ask some questions that you just can't believe a pilot would ask on the air as to either services that are available that he doesn't know about, which he could have found out before he took off and it just shows an area of poor flight planning, let's put it that way."

Joe Shirley, Tower Chief, Spartanburg, South Carolina—"I believe the main thing about pilots in general aviation should be a better educational program. Too many of them don't know how to enter the traffic pattern at small airports. A lot of it would be the instruction they're getting. Lots of times they have regulations on the big airports where they make big changes. For instance, this inverted wedding cake they are talking about. We have a lot of pilots that object to that for the simple reason it is a restriction. The thing about that restriction is this, the pilots say we are taxpayers, we should be able to use the big airports. Well, like the expressways, there are farmers who drive horse and wagons. They are taxpayers, too, but they can't use the expressways either.

"So I believe general aviation should go more toward airports that are definitely for general aviation where they will be a lot safer. Where they won't have to worry about airline traffic and big airports can stick to airline traffic. They need more training on radio procedure. Pilots go into these controlled airports and they have no conception about what to do. But general aviation pilots are under the impression that we

in the tower are a police force. Well, we are not a police force, we are just interested in getting aircraft on and off safely. I believe general aviation pilots would be a lot better off using general aviation airports because we are more geared to general aviation than the bigger airports are. Take Atlanta, a lot of pilots want to fly into Atlanta, well, they have Fulton and Peachtree that are built for general aviation and the expressways are just as close to the downtown area."

That's the way some air traffic controllers from across the nation look at general aviation from their tower cabs and IFR rooms, obviously realizing that they pose a fear image for thousands of pilots. But the undertone of sentiment favors the private pilot, urging only that he make better use of FAA facilities and keep himself educationally aware of the hows and whys of air traffic control.

HON. W. R. "BOB" POAGE SALUTES
A GREAT TEXAS LADY AT WOOTAN
WELLS HISTORICAL DEDICATION

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 5, 1969

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on November 30, 1969, I was privileged to give the dedicatory address at the dedication of the Wootan Wells Historical Marker near Bremond, Robertson County, Tex. Wootan Wells was a famous health resort in Texas in the latter years of the 19th century and the early years of the 20th century.

It was a fine day, and a large crowd was in attendance at this program to dedicate the marker to identify the site of the former spa.

In my opinion, the highlight of this day was an address given by the Honorable BOB POAGE, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture and a Representative in the U.S. Congress from the 11th District of Texas. Mr. POAGE paid an elaborate tribute to Miss Ima Hogg, the daughter of Texas' great populist Democratic Governor, Jim Hogg. Miss Hogg has been generous with her time, efforts, and personal resources to preserve historical buildings of Texas, and its past, so that they may be passed down to succeeding generations of Texans. I want to share BOB POAGE's speech with you others.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the program of the dedication ceremony at Wootan Wells, the text of the address by the Honorable BOB POAGE, and the well-written historical article "Wootan Wells" by L. W. Baker, published in the Waco Tribune-Herald of November 23, 1969, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

WOOTAN WELLS—OFFICIAL HISTORICAL
MARKER DEDICATION

(Texas State Historical Survey Committee; Texas State Historical Foundation; sponsors: Robertson County Historical Survey Committee; Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Turner; Mr. and Mrs. C. M. Campbell)

Famous early health spa and resort. First well was dug 1878 by landowner Francis Wootan. Water tasted good, but turned dishes

yellow and clothes red. Even so, it seemed to possess amazing curative properties.

Wootan soon built a hotel and in 1879 a resort town made its debut. He formed promotion company with T. W. Wade and more hotels, a bottling works, dance pavilion, and school sprang up. Leading socialites came for miles to "take the waters."

Disaster struck in 1915 when fire swept the town. In 1921 the last buildings also burned.

DEDICATION PROGRAM—NOVEMBER 30, 1969,
2 P.M.

Wootan Wells—Intersection State Highway 6 and Farm Road 1373 3½ miles west of Bremond

Presiding: Mrs. Jud Collier, Chairman Robertson County Historical Survey Committee.

Invocation: Rev. Gary Munion, Grace Methodist Church, Bremond, Tex.

Introduction of out-of-town guests: Dudley Jaggar, Bremond Chamber of Commerce, vice chairman, Robertson County Historical Survey Committee.

Introduction of speaker: Hon. William T. Moore, State senator.

Dedicatory address: Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH, U.S. Senator.

Tribute to Miss Ima Hogg, early spa visitor; Hon. BOB POAGE, U.S. Congressman.

Unveiling of marker: J. L. Turner.

Reading of marker inscription: Hon. Dan Kubiak, State representative.

Acceptance of marker: G. D. Reagan, Robertson County judge.

Benediction: Rev. Louis Wozniak, St. Mary's Catholic Church, Bremond, Tex.

MISS IMA HOGG AND WOOTAN WELLS

(Comments of Congressman W. R. POAGE)

Mr. Chairman, there are probably not a dozen people in this audience who personally knew James Stephens Hogg, the 17th Governor of Texas.

He took the oath of office as Governor about 80 years ago, and probably did more to change the emphasis of government than any single man. Every school boy, who has his hair cut, knows that Jim Hogg believed that government exists to help the people. He lived in an era when the power of corporations was growing faster than the power of the people. He did much to reverse that trend. He lived in an era during which the railroads held a life or death power over communities and individuals. Today it is hard for us to understand this power of the railroads. They are now seeking enough business to stay in business and they have long since lost the control of our economy which they once held.

It avails us little to speculate on what might have been, but had Governor Hogg come on the scene 20 years earlier we might have avoided many of the abuses and scandals in connection with the gift of 30 million acres of public land to railroads many of which were never built. The railroads might have made a more serious effort to develop the country rather than to develop the directors, and in the long run they might well have prospered far longer, but I realize that "of all sad words of tongue or pen, the saddest are these: 'It might have been.'"

Enough of Governor Hogg and the railroads—suffice it to say that the Governor was the friend of Texas—the people of Texas so long as he lived, and at his death he passed this love of the people on to his children, and we, today, seek to express our respect and admiration for the only surviving member of the Governor's immediate family. We had hoped to have Miss Ima Hogg with us today. Unfortunately, her health would not permit. We do, however, have her assurance of interest and best wishes. Miss Ima, we hope that with the coming of the flowers of Spring you may again visit the site of old Wootan Wells where you and members of your family once enjoyed the hospitality of Central Texas. You will always be welcome.

It was never my privilege to know any of the members of the Hogg family except for a short association with Honorable Mike Hogg while we were both members of the 40th Legislature, but I am aware of their long and constructive association with our State. If Jim Hogg had done nothing more than developed a statewide interest in the pecan tree, our people would be in his debt. If his wife had done nothing more than to give this State three outstanding new Texans, she would deserve our plaudits. If Will Hogg had done nothing more than to develop the great corporation which carries the name of Texas to the far corners of the earth, he would have established his place in history. Had Mike Hogg done nothing more than to present the needs and wishes of Harris County in our Texas Legislature, he would have rendered a great service. Had Miss Ima Hogg never aided in another public service than the construction, furnishing and gift of the home at Bayou Bend, she would be known as one of our States' greatest philanthropists. Of course, each member of this remarkable family did a great deal more.

But this afternoon, we are not gathered to honor this great Texas family. Their works speak for them louder than any words of ours. We are here to take note of this family's connection with Wootan Wells.

I like to think that the family of Governor and Mrs. Jim Hogg was a typical Texas family of the eighties and nineties. They came here as typical Texans to enjoy the best Texas had to offer, and while it was a far cry from the great institutions of the Bayou City of today—the culture of which has been so liberally endowed by Miss Ima Hogg, it was pleasant and wholesome recreation. I can envision the little boys and their sister riding two mule drawn cars to and from the railroad junction at Hammond. And I can imagine that from their childish experience it was a great adventure. I can envision a few years later when the young men and the young lady were leading figures at the soirees and dances on the grounds and at the hotels.

I doubt that these young people were concerned with the water—they were more interested in the beaux and the belles, but even then as today, the natural beauty of the spot and the curative powers of the water provided the setting and opportunity for social contacts. In any event, I hope that Miss Ima has only pleasant memories of Wootan Wells.

This seems to me to have been an ideal spot for the leading family of the State to visit, because it was so representative of the State. It was not a spot reserved for those of great wealth, nor was it a gathering place of raffia. It was visited by the kind of people who were making an empire out of a wilderness and those are the people who Miss Ima Hogg personifies today.

Her whole life has been devoted to the building of her State and the betterment of her fellow citizens, just as was her father's life devoted to the needs of the people of his day and generation. Fortunately, Miss Ima has had far more of the material wealth of the World with which to work, and she has used that wealth generously and judiciously. Texas is a better place because she has passed our way.

We are all proud that this community had a small part in shaping the character of one who has done so much for the State we all love so well.

[From the Waco (Tex.) Tribune-Herald,
Nov. 23, 1969]

WOOTAN WELLS

(In a bustling time in Cen-Tex history a health resort glittered, then Wootan Wells became a ghost town, recalled in legend and memories, pleasant, intriguing, mysterious. On November 30 an official state historical marker will be dedicated at the site of the old town and resort of Wootan Wells at the intersection of Highway 6 and Farm Road 1373 about three and a half miles west of

Bremont. High ranking officials from over the state have been invited. J. W. Baker, superintendent of schools at Bremont, has been collecting stories and data about old Wootan Wells for many years. He has been assisted in this by many people who had memories of the once-famed resort. Baker put the facts, the myths and the legends together to make this story.)

(By J. W. Baker)

Wootan Wells, near Bremont, became a nationally famous health resort in the 1880s, glittered brightly for a few decades, then became a ghost town. One old timer said the spa began "in roaring fun" but that when it died its death was so complete "it seemed the place had never existed."

Its only traces today are a rubble of brick foundations barely visible in the grass, some old cisterns, and an opening through the woods where its famous mule-drawn rail cars once traveled.

A BUSTLING TIME

The town of Wootan Wells came into existence in a bustling time in Texas history. The Civil War had ended, men had become bored with Reconstruction, and there was a new awakening in the South.

The first real interest in northwest Robertson County came when the Houston and Texas Central Railway extended lines northward from Bryan in 1868, passed through Hearne and Calvert, and came to a stop at Bremont in June, 1869.

When Bremont became a town in 1870, people flocked "to the end of the railroad" by the hundreds. By 1871 Bremont's population exceeded 2,500. But when the railroad pushed on northward the boom town died down, some of the terminal merchants moved away and a great number of former laborers and railroad officials became farmers on the land surrounding Bremont.

TEXAS FRONTIER GONE

The telephone was a year from invention; Thomas Edison had started manufacturing electric lights, ox-wagons were disappearing, and the Texas frontier was gone. Travel by railway was convenient, and people who had been confined by economic conditions for years were moving about, seeking opportunities for an improved life.

Among the fads of the day was taking health treatments with mineral waters at fashionable spas.

It was a time for enterprising men looking for ways to push chance discovery into big business.

And into such an arena stepped Francis Marion Wootan, a native Alabamian.

STARTLING WATER

He came to Texas in the 1870's, stopped for a time at Bremont, and in March, 1873, bought 51.5 acres of land from William Hamman and J. C. Roberts, planning to become a farmer. Wootan moved his family to the Davlin League land in 1874 and built his home and barn on a hill overlooking a grove of beautiful oak trees.

After four years of cotton farming, Wootan decided to dig a well to supply his family and livestock with water. He dug the well 75 feet deep, completing it in 1878.

The first water he drew from the new well startled him, so he filled a barrel and took it home. When Mrs. Wootan washed the dishes after supper the plates turned a bright yellow. The following day she washed clothes and the garments turned red.

These mysterious actions of the water fascinated Francis Wootan.

CURATIVE MINERALS

Next day he invited friends to his home, and all of them sampled the water. Wootan remarked later that "the water tasted good and seemed to be filled with curative minerals."

He drew another sample from his well and sent it off to Dr. W. M. Mew, a U.S. Navy

chemist. Dr. Mew sent part of the sample on to Professor C. F. Chamber of New York.

When results of the analysis came back to Wootan, he took them to the editor of the Bremont newspaper. The newspaper ran an account of the analysis, ending with this sentence: "The water contains several minerals making it suitable for drinking and for baths in a health resort."

VALUABLE 51.5 ACRES

Instantly, the 51.5-acre Wootan farm became valuable. Rumors spread that many sick people had gone to the well and after consuming the water "became whole again." The demand for small plots of land grew, and Wootan accommodated buyers, dividing most of the land over and over until there were several hundred owners of parcels of the original farm.

An article in the Bremont Sentinel, in 1878, explained about mineral baths as follows:

"Mineral water and bathing has become fashionable throughout the nation. It seems there are great possibilities here, west of town where the Francis Wootans live. Mr. Wootan's well positively has curative properties as those in ancient times had. It will be well to remember the ancient Romans maintained famous mineral water baths and in later years Germans found water a great treatment for body ailments. Mineral water is the greatest cure for rheumatic disorders, heart disease, skin and muscular ailments, fatigue and exhaustion, and for nervous conditions. The water is helpful both internally and externally."

FREE WATER ENDED

For more than a year people interested in health restoration were free to visit the Wootan well, but in 1880 Wootan put an end to free water.

He formed a partnership with a promoter, T. W. Wade, who organized a company to bottle the water and convert the property into a health resort.

In 1881, Wade proposed developing the area into a resort of hotels, cottages, stores and entertainmnet spots. Wade was made manager of the company and within months three additional wells were dug and four spacious hotels were built.

QUICK SUCCESS

Wade also built a mule-drawn train car and railway to take water to the main rail line south of Bremont for shipment over the country, and to bring visitors from the main line to the resort.

The resort became a quick success, and in 1883 the company was reorganized with four stockholders: T. W. Wade, R. H. Wade, William McKinney, and Francis Marion Wootan. Wade then supervised the building of two long rows of cottages, a large dance pavilion, and additional bath houses.

The spa became the most fashionable in the state.

By 1890, Wootan Wells was known over the nation. It had more than 200 permanent residents and the summer population exceeded 2,000. The Texas Business Directory had this listing: "Wootan Wells derives its name from the celebrated wells located there which have gained an enviable reputation throughout the country."

Every day of the summer months guests from many states took rooms in the hotels and engaged in the pleasant life of drinking the water, bathing, eating in the hotels, dancing to the music of a band imported from Mexico, and riding the mule-drawn train from the railroad junction south of Bremont to the Wootan Wells depot.

BUSINESS BOOMS

Business in Wootan Wells soared. Western Union built a station there; Wells Fargo took charge of receiving supplies and shipping both mineral water and soda water over the nation.

Not all visitors arrived by train. Many came in wagons and by carriage. In June and July each year hundreds of wagons and carriages were parked among the tents and cottages scattered over the vast park area.

The U.S. Post Office at the resort was a busy place, and Wootan was postmaster.

Before 1900, there were more than 30 business establishments in the town including offices of at least six physicians. G. H. Higginbotham had the billiard and games concession; A. S. Lane operated the largest general merchandise store; William Goodwin was a wagon-maker; Edward McGlaun ran a grist mill and cotton gin; Willis Martin was assistant to the postmaster and part-time operator of the mule train.

HISTORIAN FOR TOWN

A. C. Walker went to the resort in 1883 as a carpenter's helper in building hotels and cottages. He remained until 1894 as the operator of a store, then moved to Bremont in 1895. Walker's daughter, Miss Lottie May Walker, is now in the insurance business in Bremont and has been the town's historian for many years. Miss Walker has many letters and articles about old Wootan Wells and life there.

Mrs. C. C. Hill, sister of J. L. Turner who now owns the land where the resort was located, told about her father who spent a week at the old Wootan Hotel in 1884. He described the town: "Wootan Wells was but a beginning and an ending, the beginning was of roaring fun, and when its day was over it seemed the place had never existed."

Willis Martin described early days when he worked at A. C. Lane's store at the resort, and sometimes worked at Skorpinski's cotton gin.

A WONDERFUL PLACE

"Wootan Wells was a wonderful place," he said. "It was spread out among pretty trees and there were attractive cottages surrounding the shops, hotels, wells, and bathhouses."

"I attended dances at the pavilion and parties at the hotels. I remember Governor Hogg and his daughter, Ima, and the people who gathered to greet them. They were wonderful, friendly people.

"The men enjoyed riding fine horses. Women and children had picnics, parties, games and singsongs. People came to the Wells with plenty of money, and they spent it fast. Big dances were common, and the Chatauqua was attended by hundreds. Mr. Wade once told me the place was worth over a million dollars and I believed him," said Martin.

"I guess the thing I enjoyed most about the place was driving the mule-drawn train from the depot to the main railway line and back, with laughing children, old folks, and curious fellows who had heard of the Wells and decided to give it a try."

DEPRESSION OVERCOME

In 1893 an economic depression hit the nation, and business began to decline at Wootan Wells. But the directors, to offset losses, began an advertising program to promote the place as an entertainment resort.

When the depression lifted in 1897, more people than ever before began to come. For three years it seemed the place would become a great city. In the wave of prosperity, directors improved buildings and facilities.

There is one story that Buffalo Bill Cody registered at the Wootan Hotel in the summer of 1898, and another that the great marksman met George Washington Holland in a shooting match on the grounds. Cody had retired from show business in 1894, but according to Willis Martin, the old Indian fighter enjoyed shooting contests until the time of his death.

FLOOD HITS TOWN

Turner Hubby, a famous Waco marksman, often went to Wootan Wells for skeet shoot-

ing. He once pronounced George Holland the champion of champions.

There were many other activities: horse racing, fishing, and drinking bouts at the Wootan Wells saloon, which was called "Well No. 5."

Lloyd Campbell lived at Wootan Wells with his mother, in the Summer House. He left for the Spanish American War, and when he returned in 1899 a flood had converted the western part of Robertson County into "a shallow sea."

"It rained 16 inches, and the buildings at Wootan Wells were severely damaged. The water remained for two months, and when it receded it left gorgelike holes and all the roads to and from the place were gone," Campbell recalled.

Ralph Wade said the flood cost the Wootan Wells company half a million dollars to restore the resort.

Mrs. Fay Bailey, Allbritton of 713 Proctor, Waco, granddaughter of Francis Marion Wootan, recalled that her father, J. P. Bailey, drove the Wootan Wells mule car after he married her mother in 1883. The family lived in Wootan Wells 10 years.

COMPANY IS SOLD

"The company got into deep debt because of depressions, the flood, and droughts, and my grandfather sold his interest in the enterprise and moved to Bremond," Mrs. Allbritton wrote. "In 1930, mineral water was discovered in Marlin, just 15 miles to the north, and thereafter the new place drew people from the old Wells that were not as they had been in former years. On Aug. 1, 1906, Wootan Wells was sold to Ralph Wade by the stockholders, and by 1909, Wade was unable to pay for the property and D. M. Pendergast, who held first mortgage against it, demanded that it be sold at auction in Franklin. At the auction from the court-house steps Pendergast bought the resort for \$10,000 because he was the highest bidder."

After Wade, the great promoter, was removed from his position as manager, Wootan Wells declined even more.

In 1967, Woodie L. Wade, son of Ralph Wade, who managed the general park and soda water parts of the Wootan Wells company, wrote that he left Wootan Wells in 1912, when he was six years old.

"I remember going to school which was located south of the park, and having to go over a stile to get to it. One of my most poignant memories was riding the old horse-drawn flat car with my father and picking up twigs and small tree branches along the right-of-way to use for kindling to start fires in the old depot stove," wrote Woodie Wade.

FIRST SIGN OF END

The first sign of the end of the dazzling resort came in 1902 when one of the large hotels was destroyed by fire. Then the original bathhouse over Well No. 1 burned. Workmen cleared away the burned debris, and "a good number of people" came in the summer of 1903.

Roberts Rifles, Co. E of the Texas 2nd Infantry, was stationed at Wootan Wells in 1903. It had been organized by Roy Hearn in 1900. Officers were Webb Hearn and John T. Atkinson. Fifty Bremond men took part in the drills on the famous camp grounds. Roy Hearn later became adjutant general of the Texas National Guard.

Mrs. E. A. Muret wrote of further troubles of Wootan Wells: "The company struggled to regain its high position after 1910, but good times did not return." The operators borrowed money, but this did no good.

LARGE HOTELS BURN

Marion Cummings, writing of troubles of the resort, said: "Large hotels burned, then another fire, then another. Parties and dances were for local couples, and the great shows that came in other years did not return. An effort to sell lots for homes failed

to stimulate interest, and the resort continued to decline until there was nothing left but ruins of places that had once been beautiful and fresh."

Dr. C. E. Mays, the leading physician at the resort in the 1890's, worked hard to build the reputation of the Wells. Through his efforts other fine physicians came, including Drs. Pennick, Spring, Powell, and the last to become a part of the adventure, Dr. F. W. Stoltje.

AS IT WAS IN 1914

Mrs. Clark Brown, Dr. Stoltje's daughter, wrote in 1956, describing the resort as it was in 1914:

"The buildings and grounds at that time consisted of one large rambling two-story hotel, a three-story building in which we lived and which had been a famous hotel, two other two-story structures, former hotels which were not in operation, and about six cottages. There was a grocery store, a bottling plant that was doing business locally and shipping soda water elsewhere, and the old pavilion was still there for social gatherings and occasional dances. . . . While we lived there the largest hotel burned, and along with it the cottages and our place. That must have been in 1916. We moved to Waco after that, and so far as I know no further attempt was made to re-establish the resort."

Mrs. Ben Campbell talked on the first telephone in the Bremond area. The line "was stretched from Bremond to the J. T. Bailey store at the Wells." The family of Emmett and Annie Clark lived near the resort and their sons, Jim, Henry, Alfred, Roland and DeWitt, became successful business men in Bremond and Waco. They all have memories of the town that appeared almost magically, glistened awhile on the prairie, then vanished.

LEGENDS AND MYTHS

Except for a few square nails, railroad spikes, brick building foundations, underground masonry cisterns and abandoned wells, there is little physical evidence the resort ever existed.

But like all ghost towns, Wootan Wells has its legends and myths.

There is a story about a former slave who worked at the Wells from the time of its beginning until the place became an empty relic of charred skeletons of once-splendid buildings. It was told that on summer evenings he visited the hill where the resort had been "to see the ghosts who remained and to hear the music and laughter where the old pavilion stood."

Fred Gaston, who drove oxwagons over Wootan Wells hill in the 1870's and lived to the age of 105, maintained until the time of his death in 1947, that "the ghosts of the Wells walked on moonlit nights, and if one listened closely he could hear the dinner bells at the hotels and the screeching of the wheels of the old mule-drawn train as it traveled westward toward the depot filled with laughing children."

STORIES OF TREASURE

There are stories of gold buried in bottles, and of bottles and jugs more precious than gold, buried in the hill. J. L. Turner, present owner of the land, has information that at one time a full load of bottles was dumped into the creek near the park where they were probably covered by waters of the flood of 1899. The old bottles and jugs, if found, would be a bonanza for modern bottle collectors.

There are other stories that add to the myth and legend of Wootan Wells. The late J. J. Staskey, who was a leading businessman of Bremond for more than 70 years, knew them all.

One that adds mystery was that of "the drowning of Henry Przybylski in a stock pond at the Wells." The account, as told by Mr. Staskey, was of a tragedy with a peculiar

ending, resulting in the creation of a character who would match Harold Bell Wright's "Shepherd of the Hills."

A PECULIAR "DROWNING"

The account of the "drowning" was generally as follows:

On a summer afternoon in 1899 a group of boys was swimming in a stock pond near old Wootan Wells. One of the boys fell from a grapevine into the water and disappeared. The boy, according to John Kubiak, was Henry Przybylski, then 14 years old was visiting from Nesbit. He remained under the water for "at least 15 minutes." When Henry's friends realized he was in trouble they dived into the pond and dragged the unconscious boy to the bank where they left and ran to Wootan Wells for help.

When the boys returned to the pond with several adults, Henry had disappeared, leaving no trace at all. He was pronounced "dead by drowning," and a search for the body began.

Seven days after the "drowning" a horseman found Henry in the woods near Wootan Wells and took him to a doctor who gave him food and clothing. When the boy was dismissed from the sanitarium he again disappeared into the woods and was not found for another week.

AN AIMLESS WANDERER

Surely the story is fiction. But there is still a Henry Przybylski who walks through the woodlands around Bremond, homeless, wearing three hats and three coats, who "communes only with nature," and has not said an intelligible word to anyone for half a century.

No one knows the story of the ageless man who, for as long as people in Bremond can remember, has wandered aimlessly over the countryside.

It is said he knows the location of every wild fruit and nut tree in the area and that he has never been sick a day in his long life.

Sometimes he is seen unexpectedly by people of the region, standing harmlessly in the woods, gazing into space.

Whether the story of Henry's drowning is fact or fiction is immaterial, for there is a mystery in the man, and his story is a part of the story of old Wootan Wells.

EXISTENCE ON PAPER

Wootan Wells continued to exist on paper long after the resort was gone and the ownership of land on the hill had passed from person to person, combining blocks and acres until the parcels that were in the original Robert Moffitt and Hugh Davlin tracts were drawn together again.

The skeletons of the old buildings that remained after the death of the resort, stood as reminders of the once gay resort.

Then on a fall evening in 1926 a horseman riding eastward from the Brazos River saw smoke rising from the prairie west of Bremond. Thinking there was a grass fire, the rider galloped to the site of the fire and there he saw the last remains of old Wootan Wells disintegrate in flames.

FLAMES TAKE ALL

The smoke curled skyward and flames shot high over the skeleton structures. The horseman could hear the breaking of bottles and jugs and light explosions of gas drums along the streets. The flames spread from the dry grass on the prairies to the Park Hotel, and there were thrown to the famous old Well No. 4. The bottling works was the next victim, then came the well cover, and the fire swept southward to the stately old Jackson Hotel and the cottages nearby.

Before morning, the Wootan Hotel and the Summer House were gone, along with the pavilion, the boardwalks, and every bathhouse and sanitarium on the grounds.

Henceforth, the resort that had boosted a million dollar enterprise, a summer popula-

tion of more than 2,000, the finest music and the "most beautiful girls in world," would be nothing but a memory.

But what a memory.

THE CAMPUS "THING"

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 5, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, to find out what is doing today on the Nation's university and college campuses, the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News sent a staff reporter from its Washington bureau, Ronald J. Maselka, on visits to 10 schools this fall.

He returned with varied impressions which he related in a series of articles. Following is the second group of articles in the excellent series:

COMFORTABLE COLLEGE KIDS FACE SOCIETY'S INEQUITIES—V

(By Ronald J. Maselka)

WASHINGTON, October 4.—Today's collegiate generation is reputed to be the healthiest, wealthiest, smartest the world has ever known.

If they're so well-fed—literally and figuratively—why this hungry dissatisfaction with society? Why all this unhappiness on the campus?

FO: Dr. Lloyd H. Elliott, president of George Washington University, the underlying cause is "the difficulty the student has in finding meaning in the greater society and in his own personal life."

Noting that today's students see a "Hollywood-type facade" on American society, he added: "He can see the serious problems which this facade attempts to hide. When he looks behind it, he sees poor education for a lot of our people. He sees people of all ages in need of minimal health services and unable to get them. He sees people with skills and desires unable to get an equal chance for themselves . . ."

"STUDENTS DOUBT SINCERITY

"The students," Dr. Elliott continued, "doubt the sincerity and dedication of both government and leaders of private industry in their efforts to correct these differences."

Acknowledging that the Vietnam war, the draft and "living in the shadow of the nuclear bomb and the possibility of sudden death" have a lot to do with student unrest, the Rev. Robert J. Henle, SJ, Georgetown University's president, also cites television and the rapidity of modern communication.

While it is yet unclear what the effect of spending hours in front of a television set does to young people, he said, "one thing it has done along with movies, publications, the media . . . is that young people have been exposed in a fairly direct way to whole areas of human experience" that earlier generations did not encounter until later in life.

CLASSROOM HASN'T ADJUSTED

This "direct contact with the evils of the world . . . seeing the seamy side of life" at such an early point in their physical and mental development, Father Henle added, has resulted in a certain amount of disillusionment and a desire for quick results.

Noting that "classrooms haven't adjusted to these things yet," he said that today's students are used "to having all messages presented in rapid fire." This presents a special problem in the classroom, he explained, where the lecturer is unaccompanied by noise, background music or flashing lights.

Rapid communication and the mass media have also made students aware of the diversity of morals and values in the world, Father Henle said, "before students are solidified in one view."

RECALLS AN EXPERIENCE

Reading about things and using your imagination to draw conclusions, he continued, have far less impact than seeing them directly. For example, reading about violence does not have the same effect as seeing pictures of a nuclear explosion or seeing daily televised reports of the death and destruction in Vietnam.

Buttressing his case, Father Henle recalled a personal experience in his college days, when he was considered "a flaming liberal." "These things aren't totally new," he said. "I remember I was all fired up about getting the Marines out of Nicaragua. But I think there was only one other guy on campus who knew where Nicaragua was. Communications of what was going on in Nicaragua was limited to an occasional newspaper article."

While adults who lived during the Depression know what economic fear is, Father Henle said, the values of today's youth include a belief that "a job is not that important, nor is bread for that matter."

PERSONAL COMMUNICATION

The search for a better way, he continued, is fueled when "they see their parents on a treadmill . . . keeping ahead of the system."

Besides devising "more imaginative kinds of educational activity," Father Henle sees the university reacting to this new breed of student by "somehow putting him in personal communication" with faculty members who have wrestled with value problems like why am I here or why am I a Baptist, for example.

He favors an interdisciplinary approach to coursework, citing as an example a Georgetown special projects seminar that involved a deep examination of "freedom in the 19th Century."

PROBLEM COMPOUNDED

Father Henle said that a similar examination of "what is the defense budget of the U.S." for instance, would take students on a search through history, politics, economics, international affairs and other departments.

Dr. Elliott believes the problem is compounded because today's pre-college students "have relatively little freedom of choice."

For young men, for instance, "the draft says if you don't go to college, we'll draft you."

Pointing out that the liberal arts college is the recipient of many students who have no career plans or who are advised to come "while you make up your mind," Dr. Elliott said: "This delivers someone to us who not only, doesn't know if he wants to be there or not but who already clearly has said to himself: I'm just putting in time."

NEED RANGE OF CHOICE

Dr. Elliott said that "one of our more serious weaknesses is that we have created a halo around these places. We've told parents, in effect, to get your son and daughter into a liberal arts college—doesn't matter if he or she is interested—and some marvelous, mysterious revitalization will take place. This isn't true."

Stressing that colleges today "have to say more clearly than ever before what we are trying to do, what we can't do and what we are not yet undertaking," Dr. Elliott said this "all-knowing" halo effect partially explains why students are turning to the universities for the solutions to pressing social problems.

Dr. Elliott thinks universities must provide students with "a greater range of

choice" in education. He suggests an expansive curriculum—"to provide training for a specific job—that will provide post-high school vocational training for an airplane mechanic, for example, with similar instruction all across the board to the fine arts, for those who want to be artists, dancers, actors and musicians.

SKILLS NECESSARY

This type of widespread change, he said, will require a change of society's thinking, where the high school counselor and the parent "lean toward liberal arts" as the most valuable path toward education and a career.

Noting that "we keep losing sight of the basic function of higher education, which is to equip people, to educate them, to train them with a bit of the skill and knowledge to enable them to devote their lives and energies to the so-called work of the world," Dr. Elliott said it should be impressed on students that they need the tools that college education can provide to be a ghetto lawyer or fight the problem of pollution.

"Without some skill," he added, "he won't be able to do much but scream about it."

While there are a lot of debaters, complainers and blamers today, he continued, there are not enough problem solvers.

"Too often you hear the questions—'Why don't you do something about it? Why doesn't he do something about it?'—but not 'What can I do about it?'"

VIOLENCE NAILS COLLEGES AGAINST WALL OF CHOICE—VI

(By Ronald J. Maselka)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., October 7.—The American university today is much like the hero in "The Lady or the Tiger."

It faces two doors to the future: One leading to repression, one to reason.

Unlike the story's hero, however, the university's decisions is more complicated than simply picking one of those doors to open. There is more than one pair of hands on the door knob and the administration, the faculty, the students all have their fingers on the key, along with alumni, parents and the outside community.

Excessive reaction by any of them—from the extreme left to the extreme right—could be the impulse that turns the key in the wrong door.

With good reason then, there is much talk here at Harvard University and elsewhere of the need for tolerance, understanding and better communication.

It would seem to start specifically with the acknowledgement that nobody is completely right, nobody completely wrong.

As Morris B. Abram, Jr., a Harvard junior, explained: "Most problems at Harvard can be solved by dialogue."

DIALOGUE IS THE NUCLEUS

Dialogue is the heart of the university system, the meaning behind academic freedom, the right to dissent, the right to be different. It is the medium through which the university traditionally has accommodated diversity.

But in recent years, dialogue has been usurped on many occasions by student violence—not peaceful dissent like sit-ins, picketing or noisy demonstrations—but violence.

And the uneasiness that hovers over Harvard and elsewhere is that there may be more.

The troubling thing one detects in conversations with students is not that everyone supports violence but that everyone does not disavow it. While the general belief is that violence has no place at a university and only a tiny majority considers it a working tool, the unsettling thing is that some students qualify their opposition to it. For these, whether student violence is good or bad de-

pends on the specific circumstances, the specific issue.

Two incidents and the students reaction at Harvard illustrate this point.

A NEGATIVE REACTION

The most recent was less than two weeks ago, when a small group of anti-war demonstrators invaded the university's center for international affairs and roughed up several staff members. Supporting the belief there is no general support of violence for violence sake, the university community's reaction was one of shock at the "unprovoked viciousness" of the hit and run attack.

As Richard C. Manny, a varsity football player from Des Plaines, Ill., said: "That got a completely negative reaction here. They didn't take responsibility for their actions at all."

Spokesmen for the less radical wing of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) also criticized that raid, alleged to have been inspired by a more radical SDS faction.

SEVERAL DEANS EVICTED

But even this moderate SDS reaction to the raid—that it was an assault on the workers, not the bosses—begins to hint at the division of student support for some types of violence. As one SDS moderate explained: "We never attack secretaries . . . but deans are different than secretaries. The deans are very important in perpetuating the system."

The division of opinion is evidenced by the reaction to the other incident here last spring, when student radicals seized an administration building and evicted several deans from their offices.

Here again, the majority opposed a building take-over—even if it is an empty building—as a gesture that goes beyond peaceful protest.

"ONLY SAW VIOLENCE"

But then, besides the radicals who were all for it, there were those who:

—Were opposed to the building take-over only because the deans were involved.

—Didn't think it was too bad because while there may have been some manhandling of the deans there were no permanent physical injuries. "The public only saw the violence," one student said, but they (the SDS) had some just things to say."

But here the definition of violence depends on which end of the receiving line you are on. As one of the deans who was evicted noted: "Why should a person come and push on me anyway?"

Initially opposed it, but in retrospect think it may have been worthwhile. Noting that university action on dropping ROTC, discussion of low income housing and university expansion into the community followed the take-over, one student said: "I don't know if those things would have taken place if the building hadn't been seized. At least, they wouldn't have happened as quickly."

It's hard to argue with success.

PATIENCE COUNSELED

As David Blumenthal, editorial board chairman of the independent Harvard newspaper, the *Crimson*, said: "It's hard to argue you should wait, when violence gets action so much faster."

But the majority still counsels patience on the grounds that short-term gains will not balance harmful long-term effects like repressive laws.

Acknowledging that "violence can act as a catalyst for social change," Ralph Hornblower, Harvard's first string halfback, noted changes taking place and said: "I would be hard-pressed by any more violence on this campus. Justification for it would be darn near impossible."

Plans to respond firmly yet judiciously to violence or to provide better disciplinary procedures are at best only stopgap measures.

The long range answer, of course, is to head off the violence.

A KEY RESPONSIBILITY

A Harvard Board of Overseers' report defined this task as the need "to assure the great mass of the university that reasoned views with respect to change will receive prompt attention."

Since it is the students who choose the battlefield and the tactics, obviously they too hold a key responsibility.

According to Harvard College Asst. Dean A. C. Epps, however, the long-range solution is to somehow "bring the community to agree that the use of violence is wrong and unacceptable and the community must stand by this."

Noting that this can be accomplished partially by expelling the violent, more importantly, he said, is the need for "such a general view that violence is wrong that no one will attempt to use it."

"UNJUST" VIETNAM WAR IS FUEL FOR RADICALS—VII

(By Ronald J. Maselka)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., October 8.—"This whole question of campus unrest is complex," one college administrator said. "It's difficult to know which pieces are more important than the others."

It is generally agreed, however, that violence is an important piece.

What causes this minority of students to resort to violence? One can't expect a single answer.

If it is granted that much of the violent student rebellion is based on convictions, political reasoning and political motivation, are there still some underlying psychological answers?

Ask a radical student why he thinks violence may have to be used and he is apt to say that it's a "result of frustration" with the system or "there wasn't anything else to do" because he felt the channels of communication were closed, clogged or non-existent.

But even if all that is true, does that make violence right, you might ask?

He might very well then cite the Vietnam war, which he says is unjust, and "don't start telling me about the end not justifying the means."

As David Blumenthal, a Harvard senior who is against campus violence, explained: "The war is the one great advantage the radicals have. It's hard to explain to anyone rationally why we are there."

IMPELLED TO DO SOMETHING

Noting that he also is "not a militant," Ronald H. Janis, a Harvard senior from Amherst, stressed that "students are not causing trouble for the sake of causing trouble." Deciding that the war is unjust, he continued, students are impelled to "do something about it or else you may have to help fight it . . ."

"Once you see that problem, you see these others and you say: Maybe I should do something about that one, too."

But that again raises the question why some students want to "do something" more quickly, more violently than others?

Reams have been written about America's violent beginning, its currently rising crime rate, its Western heroes and tough guys, violence on television and in the movies and the effect on people.

SLAPPING INCIDENT

Stressing that there "is no simple answer, just complex individual answers," a Cambridge psychiatrist, who asked not to be identified, said that "example has a lot to do with it."

As a basic case, he recalled his son watched two older boys slapping each other in the face at a playground and immediately walked over and slapped his sister's face.

"The decline in parental authority has much to do with this too," the psychiatrist added. Pointing to the "misplaced emphasis on permissiveness . . . the idea that we must never set limits on the child or GOD forbid he'll have a trauma," he added: "It's idle to raise a child to believe that any punishment is intolerable."

Warning that campus violence can't be explained away, however, as a gigantic collegiate temper tantrum, he said other contributing factors could be things like family splits, the boredom of affluence, the lack of stable personal relationships.

VACUUM IN RELATIONSHIPS

One administrator explained that the militant activists he knew generally "have a serious problem of self-identity . . . They're not sure why they're in college, for instance. They're not ready for college emotionally."

Some individuals, the psychiatrist agreed, might be attracted to radical groups because of this vacuum in their social relationships.

But a key factor in the spread of violence, he said, is "the element of contagion . . . One outbreak of violence tends to lead to another."

This electric appeal of violence illustrates the tightrope college administrators must walk.

DEFINES CRACKDOWN

If they appear overly tolerant, this might fuel an escalation. If they crack down too fast and too hard, they might widen sympathy for the radical offenders.

Recalling last spring's seizure of a Harvard building by the Students for a Democratic Society, Kenneth L. Carson, a sophomore from Seattle, Wash., said that before police arrived to liberate the building students outside were either for the administration or against the SDS.

"There was no alternative between these positions until the police arrived," he added, noting that then the violence of the police became a larger issue than the violence of the building seizers.

Disclaiming any expertise in the specific field of campus unrest, the psychiatrist suggested that the university's role is "not to crack down needlessly but to crack down on substantive issues."

Or as he added, it should "hang loose . . . because they're working out something in their heads."

PARENTS' MONEY CAN PAD PROTESTERS' SOCIAL VIEWS—VIII

(By Ronald J. Maselka)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., October 9.—The love of money has been called the root of all evil.

But indifference to money may be a large root underlying today's campus unrest. For if there is one clear facet to this complexity, it's that this is not generally a rebellion of economically struggling students.

A Harvard College junior, the son of a university president, asked to explain the reason for wealthy students' interest in current social protest replied: "Our parents made the buck. Now we're trying to figure out what to do with it."

SOME DON'T UNDERSTAND

That remark substantiates what many studies have shown: Today's young people have a different perception of the world than their parents.

The so-called "generation gap" stems from this different way of looking at things, a gap that remains because each side has a different background and difficulty appreciating the other's point of view.

For instance, many adults who did not have the opportunity to go to college find it difficult to understand why students who do don't concentrate on their studies, instead of on politics and reform.

It's like the Boston cab driver who hopes to send his daughter to college "to give her

a better start in life." This, of course, implies that a college education will lead to material success or a more secure future economically.

A NEW QUESTION

And for many of today's college students, this is still their goal. As Stanley Hoffmann, Harvard's professor of government, explained: "For many students, getting to the top—getting an education—is an important thing yet."

But those who already are "on top" economically, Prof. Hoffmann added, are saying: "Now that we have everything, what are we going to do with it? You don't ask yourself this question—what am I going to do with it—until first you have it."

The affluent student seems to be looking for a new frontier of his own, something beyond material success.

As one Harvard student explained: "Kids have a lot given to them today. But persons want to develop values and work for things themselves."

DON'T RECALL DEPRESSION

The underlying questions students raise—what is the good life, what is the role of government, the university—are what one Cambridge psychiatrist called "basically concerns of the educated leisure class."

"For these young people," he said, "the economic system has always worked. Something like the Depression is out of their ken."

Another different perception between many adults and today's students is the view of college itself. Non-college-educated individuals see college as a golden opportunity, or as the cab driver said: "A lot of these college kids don't realize how good they've got it."

But, even many students for whom college was not a birthright and foregone conclusion expected to go to college ever since they first understood the word. Instead of being where they had always hoped they'd be then, it seems that most of today's students are where they expected to be.

DRAFT A KEY FACTOR

This questioning trend seems to be fueled by this social attitude that you have to go to college, and the military draft, which forces able-bodied students to go to college, even if they are not sure of a career or "where they are going."

The draft is particularly a key factor, a Harvard English professor explained, because it adds to the frustration of a student "who can't leave college if he is bugged and dissatisfied by it."

The Vietnam war, in the opinion of Dr. Adam B. Ulam, a Harvard professor of government, has placed a burden of guilt and anxiety on young people.

In an article in the Harvard alumni magazine, he explained: "Guilt because of the natural feeling that their superior economic status or luck protected them from the dangers of Vietnam; anxiety because of the obvious consequences of the termination or interruption of their student status."

A NATIONAL HYPOCRISY

"A certain degree of anxiety is always present in the young," he continued, "but for some in the colleges, both their sheltered status and the consequences of losing it have increased this anxiety to an intolerable degree."

Another element is that students proclaim a belief in practicing the American ideals that have been preached to them. Racism and poverty are prime examples of the national hypocrisy they mention.

Or as David Blumenthal, a Harvard senior, put it, many students have parents who grew up in the 1930s and "held up liberal principles as something to live up to . . . students are now taking this seriously, and they have the time and security to question."

Adding to this total aura that encourages

questioning is what Richard S. Berne, a Harvard football player from Syracuse, N.Y., described as "things are generally more liberalized . . . less rigid socially."

ELEMENT OF CONTAGION

The Cambridge psychiatrist, who has done work with Harvard students, noted that the student questioning "is in a certain sense a spiritual quest, and they can afford a spiritual quest."

Noting that he feels "many of their concerns are religious," he added: "They'd die rather than admit it . . . if you would say that to them, they'd laugh in your face."

But like violence, he said, there is "a certain element of contagion" to this trend of student questioning.

"Many are caught up in the latest student movement," he continued. "For them, not all this represents a whole life commitment . . . Many will fade into the 'establishment' later."

But there is evidence that some of this vocal student concern for community problems and community betterment is being translated into action. On-campus reports of the decline in fraternities and social clubs is matched by off-campus reports that young lawyers show a declining interest in corporation law and medical students are interested in community health clinics, for example.

INTERESTED IN ECOLOGY

The student calls for "relevance" are translated into course selections at Harvard, for instance. Statistics indicate that the number of students concentrating on English and history have declined in recent years, while those in government and social relations rose markedly.

"Noting that science for science sake is not as popular as it used to be," Harvard Physics Prof. Sheldon L. Glashow said more students are interested in political science and ecology because "they want to go into something that is directly useful to society."

While there's no rigid rule, most studies indicate that the politically active protesters are more concentrated in the social sciences and humanities, rather than the natural sciences and professional schools.

This is not to say that one will never find pre-med, pharmacy or business school majors or even a chemistry or physics student in the ranks of the protesters. But generally not.

ASSURED ADVANCEMENT

The suggested reasons for this are varied. One is that students who pick a hard-science major or a specific professional school already have a career goal in mind, while liberal arts students mainly include "the seekers."

Another is that many students from lower-class backgrounds go into the hard sciences because this route provides an assured job and guaranteed economic advancement. Or as Harvard's David Blumenthal explained: "Science students generally know where they are going better."

Citing the wider interest of liberal arts students, a Harvard graduate student in chemistry from Rochester, N.Y., said that besides disagreeing with the tactics of protesters he and many of his colleagues are "generally too busy in our studies."

One engineering student at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who was visiting at Harvard, said: "Science students generally face practical questions, not philosophical ones." This view was taken by Prof. Hoffmann, who noted that liberal arts students generally tend to ask questions on "what is popularly called the values of life."

SENSE OF PROGRESS

While the scientist is concerned with research, to find means toward ends, he added, the liberal arts student is interested "rather in ultimate ends."

Noting that "in a certain sense this is a revolt against technology scientists who are plugged in, social scientists are sort of out of it," a Harvard English professor pointed out that in professional training, there is a certain noticeable learning development. "There's a sense of weekly, monthly progress you don't see in the liberal arts field, for example," he said.

And what the protesting students are saying, with all this talk of relevance, he said, is: "We want to know what is absolute truth, so we can go right out and apply it."

STUDENT PROTESTS SEEN AS APPEALS FOR ADULT HELP—IX

(By Ronald J. Maseika)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., October 10.—Perhaps the most haunting question about campus unrest—the question that eludes a simple answer is—: What does it all mean?

Closely linked are questions on the merit of the student protests. Are they right. Are they wrong?

It's impossible, of course, to take specimens of campus unrest and examine them under a microscope.

Like other intangible issues, campus unrest can at best be put through each man's intellectual microscope. Thus, the opinions are divided.

The analysis of Dr. George Wald, a Nobel Prize-winning biologist at Harvard University, is that "the whole business, all the campus unrest in all the forms it takes is a disguised shout for help."

Pointing out that young people are brought into a world where they don't see much of what they want and a world which faces them with threats, "some of them involving their continued existence," he said: "They are very upset and quite right."

HAVE MERIT, BUT NOT ERROR-FREE

While he finds merit in the student protest, Dr. Wald does not find them free of error.

Noting that students "will go on making all the mistakes in the book," he added: "But that is their privilege, because they are young. They are just beginning to learn, to acquire experience . . . This is not the world they made."

A vocal opponent of the Vietnam war and militarism, Dr. Wald, 62, successfully urged the Harvard faculty of Arts & Sciences to petition Congress to repeal the draft.

A recipient of the Nobel Prize for his research on vision, Dr. Wald said it is unreasonable for adults to meet the collegiate assault by "complaining that the students themselves are always complaining."

Stressing that students "are not offering solutions to these problems," he added: "Those are not the students' problems. Those are our problems. And it is for us to work them out."

Dr. Wald recalled that "at Harvard as recently as 10 years ago" he could stand in front of his class and say, in effect:

FIND PARENTS BAFFLED

You are a highly select group. Do your work well and you will end up with a good job, two cars in the garage, a large bank account. You'll be able to afford a good private school for the kids, to write big checks to the right charities. You'll have a high status in the community.

"If I did that now," Dr. Wald said, "they'd laugh me out of the room. And the reason is that this is not what they want. These are the things their parents got and they have not made their parents happy."

A benign, white-haired bespectacled man, Dr. Wald added in a soft-spoken voice: "The hardest thing for these young people to bear is not that they don't know what to do but that we, their parents, don't know what to do . . . They find their parents baffled about the most important things in life."

NO LONGER WORKING

The students' confusion, he said, is compounded by "the rapidly widening gap between what children are taught about America, its traditions, what it means, and the reality of what America has come to mean to all the world and the rapid deterioration of its traditions.

"The pat phrases these kids learned in school are becoming increasingly empty and not only if one is black."

But why the attack on the university structure.

Stressing that a university "fundamentally is a student body and a faculty . . . everything else is fundamentally, as the Bible says, commentary," Dr. Wald added.

"The United States is the only nation in the world where colleges and universities are run by boards of trustees, who don't even include a member of the faculty, who are 'men of affairs.' Now this is a uniquely American institution and I think it has run its course and isn't working any longer."

Emphasizing the "increasing need for open communications," he said: "Faculty and students communicate all the time. But the universities are being run by other people, who generally are badly out of communication with both students and faculty.

NEW BREED OF POLITICIANS

"I think that may be the major thing wrong with American universities today."

Exemplary of the trend for academics to get involved in non-campus issues," Dr. Wald turned to American politics.

He said he has detected a new breed of "capable" politicians developing, "bright young politicians . . . fine, intelligent men, first-rate people . . . They are actors with brains, writing their own parts."

Specifically, he cited Rep. Richard D. McCarthy (D., Buffalo), who has led a drive against chemical-biological warfare, and Sen. Charles E. Goodell (R., N.Y.), who has challenged the Nixon administration's Vietnam policies.

WE MUST FIX IT

For instance, he said: "Sen. Goodell seems to be standing for the right things. This is especially significant at this time in a Republican, who has to break with his own leadership and, to a degree with his own party."

Indicating that "my hopes are in those bright young politicians," Dr. Wald acknowledged that students generally do not share this view.

"Kids have trouble getting beyond their local situation," he explained. Since they don't have the vote, he continued, "they try to get their local situation going in the direction they want to go."

Returning to his original theme, he concluded: "These are not problems for students. These are problems for adults. We have the vote. If things are going badly, as they are, all students can do is tell us that. They can fix it . . . we have to fix it."

SDS WORRIED BY SPLIT ON REVOLUTIONARY GOALS—X

(By Ronald J. Maselka)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., October 11.—"These are people looking for revolution for reasons which I can't understand."

That was one Harvard senior's appraisal of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS).

Those reasons are getting harder to understand these days because there are two main factions claiming the name SDS.

The split that was revealed publicly at last summer's SDS convention in Chicago is particularly noticeable in the Boston area, the headquarters of one faction, the Workers

Student Alliance (WSA). The other group claiming the SDS label is the Revolutionary Youth Movement (RYM) No. 1.

SPLIT SHOWS CLEARLY

Both factions, each with its own internal differences of opinion and sub-groupings, express discontent with American society and believe in a need for revolution. The tactics, philosophy and the question of who should be in the vanguard of that revolution and who should be attacked are among the points that led to the split.

The radical SDS solution to problems, like taking over a building, has focused attention on it as a key element in campus unrest. But to hope that the current split will bring internal implosions that will curtail its campus effectiveness is, at this point, simply a hope.

But for some Boston area SDS members, it is also a fear.

Last month's hit and run raid by about 20 anti-war protestors on Harvard's Center for International Affairs brought a reaction from the WSA wing indicating that the split here is a serious thing.

DANGER OF DISCREDIT

Laurent C. Delli-Bovi, a Radcliffe junior from Richfield, Conn., and a WSA member, said the raid "poses a great danger of discrediting us with students and workers." She says WSA HOPES "to counter this by concretely supporting workers' struggles on and off campus."

One man, identified as a Boston area leader of the RYM faction was arrested in connection with the raid.

Later, spokesmen for the WSA faction blamed the raid on the "RYM extremists" and said that WSA was SDS and that RYM had no right to the SDS label.

James Kilbreth, editor of WSA's newspaper, New Left Notes, said the WSA seeks to develop an alliance of students and workers "to fight for better conditions in the schools" through unionization, for example.

"RYM has a great deal of contempt for the working people," he added.

CRUCIAL ISSUES AHEAD

While SDS is "supposed to be an open, democratic, non-exclusionary organization," he continued, RYM people believe "you should agree with us or else."

Mr. Kilbreth said the crucial issues ahead for SDS at Harvard include attacking university expansion into the surrounding community and university links with the Defense Department.

Another distinction between the WSA and the RYM elements, he said, is that WSA would direct any violence against "the bosses" on and off campus. But Mark Rudd, the national leader of the RYM group, has reportedly expressed the belief that the revolutionary movement can be served best "in whatever manner is necessary," even by closing down the universities and schools.

"POLITICALIZES" STUDENTS

The extremist tactics of RYM have found little sympathy at Harvard, various sources indicate.

But the wider student appeal of SDS generally has not been in response to its rhetoric of "exploitation of the workers" or "bossism and capitalism."

SDS strength lies in its ability to politicalize "a larger segment of students, either on the force of a specific issue or because of a university's response, like calling in outside police.

The strength lies also in the fact that SDS picks the issues it will seek a confrontation on. At Harvard last year, for instance, it picked ROTC, which was unpopular with a wide range of students.

FUTURE OF SDS?

Probably one of the weaknesses cited most often in the American university structure is that it tends to react to an issue that SDS raises.

The months ahead will bring a test for both the SDS and the university community.

To survive as a potent force, SDS will need to find potent issues and achieve some measurable success.

But if administrators, faculty and students can achieve the communication needed to head off those issues, by doing something about them or by convincing the majority that something is being done, then it would appear that the future of SDS would be doubtful, regardless of its solidarity or splintering.

HUNGER AND POOR PERFORMANCE LINKED

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 4, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, many of us have long maintained that the existence of hunger in the richest and most prosperous nation the world has ever known casts a shadow over all that America claims to stand for. Recently, however, evidence has come into my hands that hunger in the midst of plenty is not only immoral, it also contributes directly to other problems which exist in our inner-city "ghetto" areas. Problems like low educational standards, school drop-outs, and low levels of scholastic discipline.

The Woodlawn Mental Health Center, operated by the city of Chicago Board of Health, recently completed a survey of 2,300 mothers with children attending public schools. The interviews gathered information on all aspects of family life, much of which will be useful in further sociological and sociomedical evaluations of the effects of ghetto life. The study showed a definite relationship between inadequate meals at home—especially the morning meal—and the child's ability in school. Dr. Sheppard G. Kellam, codirector of the Woodlawn Center, and a distinguished associate professor of psychiatry at the University of Chicago, summarized the results of the survey:

The results of these systematic studies show that hunger is important in influencing how well the child socializes in the first grade classroom. By hunger we mean not having food. We are not referring to malnutrition necessarily, but to missing meals.

Children miss meals for a variety of reasons, but if they do, they are likely to have difficulty in school. A program aimed at providing meals would therefore be extremely important in bettering the adaptation of children to school.

I am currently working on a bill which would substantially increase present Federal programs to provide meals to children in schools. I am waiting anxiously to see the exact nature of President Nixon's recently announced efforts in this respect. Dr. Kellam's letters, which I insert at this point in the RECORD, make clear that decisive action to meet the

problem of hungry school children is imperative.

The letters referred to follow:

WOODLAWN MENTAL HEALTH CENTER,
Chicago, Ill., November 4, 1969.

Congressman ABNER MIKVA,
Federal Office Building,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MIKVA: We are writing this letter to report to you the results of hunger, which is a basic condition among others blocking children in poor communities such as Woodlawn from succeeding in school.

As you know, for the last six years we at the Woodlawn Mental Health Center have been carrying out extensive studies and prevention and early treatment programs for all the 2000 first graders entering Woodlawn schools each year, and have periodically assessed them three times in first grade and have followed 6000 of them as far as the end of third grade. We have considerable information on the families of first graders obtained by two community-wide extensive interviews with about 2300 mothers.

The results of these systematic studies show that hunger is important in influencing how well the child socializes in the first grade class-room. By hunger we mean not having food. We are not referring to malnutrition necessarily, but rather to missing meals.

Children miss meals for a variety of reasons, but if they do they are likely to have difficulty in school. A program aimed at providing meals would therefore be extremely important in bettering the adaptation of children to school.

However, such a program must consider a variety of other factors which are also related to doing poorly in school. In our studies, such basic issues as the mother's sense of potency to influence her children's future; her own mental health; whether she

lives with other adults who can share the child-rearing role with her; whether she has \$5,000 income (a figure which very sharply distinguishes between families of children who are adapting to school and those who are not); her child-rearing practices, particularly in regard to limit-setting and permission-giving—all characterize basic factors related to successful child-rearing and successful careers in school.

Our considered opinion is that a program aimed at the hunger of children would be a fundamental contribution in poor communities such as Woodlawn. This program, if it is to be successful, must include a role for the mothers at the policy-making level so that the program is basically planned and operated by the local neighborhood community which it serves. This would reinforce the mother's sense of her own importance and self-esteem. The program should be seen as an opportunity for employing mothers and fathers and thus would be a way of improving income. Incidentally, along this line, Mr. Julian Levi has recently described a private catering service as a possibility for implementing such a program. Such a private catering service would work under contract with the local community which in turn would receive its financing through an appropriate mechanism such as the one we are hoping you can successfully develop.

One closing thought which I am sure you share is that a program to alleviate hunger is one of several basic programs which can be a base for improving conditions of family life. We have considerable data on family life and its relation to success in school and to mental health which suggests that programs, such as after school programs, may have similar economical and social benefits. All of these programs in our view must be community-owned at the neighborhood level and must combine a variety of aspects which not only alleviate the central bad condition

such as hunger, but also take into account other related problems.

Sincerely,

SHEPPARD G. KELLAM, M.D.,
Codirector, Woodlawn Mental Health
Center; Associate Professor of Psychi-
atry, the University of Chicago

WOODLAWN MENTAL HEALTH CENTER,
Chicago, Ill., November 20, 1969.

Congressman ABNER MIKVA,
Federal Office Building,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MIKVA: The information regarding family life which we reported in our recent letter was obtained in two home interviews. Each interview lasted about an hour and a half and took place in the living rooms of the mothers or mother surrogates of half of the first-grade children in the spring of 1965, and all of the first-grade children in the spring of 1967. A total of about 2300 mothers were interviewed.

The relationships that exist between the family life of the child and the child's adaptation to school according to ratings made by the teacher have been examined in detail and the results of these systematic studies were the basis for the conclusions which we presented.

About four percent of the mothers in 1965 reported that their children had nothing to eat for breakfast or only had liquids; in 1967 this figure was about five percent. These children were not succeeding in a basic task, namely, being able to socialize with the other children in first grade. From other studies we know that if children do not succeed in their social adaptational tasks in first grade, they run a grave risk of not succeeding from then on.

Sincerely,

SHEPPARD G. KELLAM, M.D.,
Codirector, Woodlawn Mental Health
Center; Associate Professor of Psychi-
atry, the University of Chicago

SENATE—Saturday, December 6, 1969

(Legislative day of Friday, December 5, 1969)

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, deliver us now from the drive of daily duties, from the tumult of the world about us, and the attention of many competing concerns that our hearts may know Thy refining and renewing power. Keep us from coldness of heart and indolence of spirit, that we may worship while we work in the beauty of holiness and in the holiness of beauty. Equip us now for new tasks, brace us for fresh undertakings, and give us strength for the adventure of this day with Thy love and grace and truth filling our souls and finding expression in our actions.

In the name of Him who lived for others. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 5, 1969, be approved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that sometime during the afternoon there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND) is recognized.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, briefly?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield.

SENATE POLICY ON CONSIDERATION OF MEASURES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, may I seek the attention of the majority leader, to ask a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I note that last night, after the final vote on an amendment to the tax legislation was taken, a bill was called up and unanimous consent was obtained for its consideration. It increased the number of supergrades in the Government, as I understand it, by 150.

My question to the majority leader is this: What will be our policy in the future? I was on the floor for 8 or 9 hours almost constantly yesterday. I could have stayed another half hour, or another 2 hours, for that matter, but I had no idea that the tax reform bill—on which there would be no more votes last evening—would be set aside and a measure taken up separate from the tax reform bill.