

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. ROGER H. ZION

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I bring to the attention of my House colleagues the outstanding oratorical effort of a fine young lady from Indiana's Eighth District. Miss Carolyn Soniat is the winning contestant in this year's Voice of Democracy contest, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This year's theme was "Freedom's Challenge" and Miss Soniat has beautifully put her own feelings on this patriotic subject into winning form. Her bright, young mind has formulated a blueprint that America might well follow:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Carolyn Soniat)

"I dare you: I dare you to look this world in the eye, to meet this world as it is, not as how you'd like it to be. I dare you to see: to see not only what is wrong, but what is right; to see more than dirt and crime; to see new life and beauty and goodness, and I dare you then to choose forever the beauty, and the truth, and the freedom."

So does Freedom challenge me—Freedom in all her guises. Freedom demands more from us each minute that we live. She forces us continually to re-examine—ourselves, our actions, our motives. To meet her dare, I must each day, make myself more myself. I must eliminate all that is not real, not honest. I must cut out and cast off all my petty prejudices, all my vices, anything which weakens me. Only then will I be prepared, fit, not just for the rigors of the battle, but also for the responsibility of victory.

It is on these victories that we must set our sights; the victory over illiteracy, for ignorance is near kin to slavery; the victory over hatred, for malice breeds narrowness and discontent; the victory over prejudice, for injustice is the path to self-destruction. Our victory must be over all our own weaknesses and imperfections which lead away from liberty.

Each of us must begin with himself. Each student must study and learn about his world and specifically about how he personally can contribute to its betterment. It is not enough to be a good student. Each must be the best he can be. We must recreate the passion our founding fathers had to free themselves from all oppression, from within themselves as well as from without. We must find and eliminate whatever force it is that breeds apathy.

It is not enough that America boasts freedom and equality and is satisfied with that. These are never achieved once and for all. There is no room for complacency where freedom and equality are involved. They must be won over and over again, each time in a truer and purer form. Our victory will lie in our struggle for this pure freedom, not just in America, but in people, people everywhere.

Although the words "commitment" and "involvement" are on the verge of being overworked, they do hint at the type of action that must be taken to keep a world spirit of freedom. Organizations like "Head-Start," the "Up With People Sing-Out," and so many community projects have this spirit. But citizens must participate. People of all ages should become active in their

local government and politics. We must get away from our self-satisfaction, out of our lethargy. America has never been lazy. She must not become that now.

Our nation must strive with all its power to abandon secularism: and we must maintain and perfect our system of capitalism. America must not deny the principles epitomized in our motto "In God we trust." We must face the truth—that the nations of the world look to the United States of America for an example of right—and we must act on this truth and fulfill their expectations.

The Persian poet Omar Khayyam, an expert on the free life, wrote in verse 76 of his *Rubaiyat*:

"The Moving Finger writes; and having writ,
Moves on: not all your Piety nor Wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a Line,
Nor all your Tears wash out a Word of it."

We have one chance, and only that. America must show the universe for all time that man is noble enough to govern himself, and free enough to create a true civilization.

SAN DIEGO CELEBRATES

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, San Diego—California's first city and my hometown—is celebrating her 200th birthday this year, and the observances are attracting nationwide notice.

A fine article about San Diego, which was characterized in the headline as the "Turned-On City of 1969," was published in the Washington Post last Sunday. The article, by travel writer Horace Sutton, follows:

SAN DIEGO: TURNED-ON CITY OF 1969
(By Horace Sutton)

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.—This may be the most turned-on city of the U.S.A.

San Diegans have festooned their city with gold and white bulbs and are preparing to flick the switch every night through 1969. It isn't San Diego's scheme to rival the luminescent superiority of Los Angeles, but a dazzling way to broadcast the celebration of San Diego's 200th birthday. Gold and white are the home colors.

The miracle of the Mazdas celebrates the historical fact that in 1769 the Franciscan priest, Junipero Serra, established the first colony in California at San Diego. Serra's pioneering urban relocation plan with the word California as a new way of life is also being celebrated by Monterey. San Francisco reckons it did enough 20 years ago with the Gold Rush centennial, and Los Angeles is sprawling too fast to think about birthday parties.

San Diego's Kiwanis Club had little trouble putting over its Warm Lights of Welcome idea once they announced it would cost only \$5.37 each to hang a string of gold and white lights four hours a night throughout the year. The downtown skyline, where a new tower rises almost weekly, glows like a carnival midway. Naval ships parked in San Diego are wreathed with bulbs, casting a golden glow across the water.

Visitors at San Diego in 1969 will stumble into a bicentennial event nearly every day and

night. There will be fiestas, trade fairs, concerts, art exhibits, boat races, parades, golf tournaments, historical pageants, fireworks, water shows, and on through the spectrum of revelry. More than 30 nations will show their colors none brighter than Spain with its royal flamenco dancers, fashion show, art exhibit, costume display and royal Spanish ball, all in April. Each of the 50 states will have a week to do their thing.

By happy coincidence, the bicentennial will mark the arrival of a bridge and a baseball team. Some local folk won't be happy to see the 80-year-old ferry service replaced by a sweeping span joining San Diego and Coronado Island, scheduled for completion this summer. Coronadoans fear the increased traffic will sully their proud ground; others want to save the ferries as San Francisco saved the cable cars. The Padres baseball team, new entry in the National League, will open the season April 15 at San Diego Stadium, 50,000-seat part-home of the Charger football team.

That makes San Diego a big-league town in every sport including whale-watching. If there was any doubt the San Diego Rockets would make the grade in basketball, it vanished this season with the advent of Elvin (Big E) Hayes, the 6-foot-9½ Houston All-American who has become a bigger attraction than the giraffes at San Diego Zoo.

Ironically, the place where San Diego began may fade from the scene in 1969. Mission San Diego de Alcalá, where Father Serra built a crude altar in 1769 and where bells rang in the 200th birthday last New Year's Eve, has fallen victim to freeway encroachment. As new roads were laid to serve the nearby stadium, the white stucco mission on the hill was all but swallowed by the concrete landscape. In fact, some maps neglect showing the mission altogether.

Close to a thousand visitors a week came to the mission a year and a half ago, but by late 1968 attendance had fallen off to a few a day. Father Booth, the mission pastor, has put out a brochure describing three routes to the mission—the easy way, the confusing way, the hard way. For the seasoned freeway driver, the easy way isn't hard to find: Interstate 8 to Mission Gorge Road, north to Twain Avenue, left on San Diego Mission Road.

From the bell tower to the cool concrete walls to the brick courtyard alive with bird song, the mission meets perfectly a visitor's expectations. One of the few hints of modernity is the public address apparatus hanging from the chapel ceiling—that and the hum from the highway down the hill.

Come April, the hum will be upstaged by the roar for the home team at neighboring San Diego Stadium. Maybe in the end big-league ball will be a blessing to the all-but-forgotten mission. A certain number of errant motorists and bored box-seat holders are bound to find their way to the mission, perhaps just in time to save it from oblivion. In return, the mission can relay to the nascent San Diego Padres a little bit of providence.

THE LOWLY COLLARD COMES INTO ITS OWN

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, collard greens are neither universally known nor ap-

preciated. This is unfortunate. Perhaps you have to be raised with collards to know how good they can taste. I am one of those fortunate individuals who understands that collards are a delicacy. My good friend, Judge E. W. Carswell, formerly Mayor of Chipley and a most capable writer on folklore in northwest Florida, has told in effective language the story of the sometimes lowly collard greens. I recommend it, and I will even help the uninitiated to obtain some west Florida collards if they desire to learn more about good eating.

Judge Carswell's articles which appeared in the Pensacola Journal of February 16, follows:

LOWLY COLLARD COMES INTO ITS OWN
(By E. W. Carswell)

CHIPLEY.—Thanks to the "soul food" craze sweeping the nation, the once lowly collard is coming into its own.

The collard, the uncrowned queen of greens here in the Gulf Coast southland for generations, has found favor among the sophisticated city folks up north.

Other Deep South delicacies now among the "soul food" favorites include black-eyed peas and hog jowls, barbecued ribs, sugar cane syrup, candied yams, fried okra, ham-hocks, hog head cheese, crackling bread, pot-liquor, corn pone, hoe cake and chitterlings.

The yams in these parts are called sweet potatoes, the hog head cheese is sometimes called souse, pot-liquor is spelled pot-likker, crackling bread is pronounced without the "g" and chitterlings, of course, are "chitlins."

Because of a scarcity of 'possum, that "soul bowl" composed of baked 'possum and sweet potato is yet to be introduced at the gourmet restaurants in the big towns. But give them time—and enough 'possums—and this delicacy may become a franchised item to compare in fame with Kentucky fried chicken.

The mullet fish, which the Florida Board of Conservation has been trying to glorify under the name Lisa, is the number one seafood "soul food" near the Florida Gulf Coast. Maybe the board of conservation is missing a bet by not promoting it as such.

But this is primarily about collards. This has been an excellent season for this supreme queen of edible greens. They're tastier after having been nipped by frost. That happened early last fall, with repeat performances at timely intervals in the meantime. That has kept them at their tantalizing, taste-tempting best throughout the winter.

Science has made it possible, of course, for the frosting to be done artificially by means of the deep freeze. But that is a poor substitute, at best, for the frosting applied by nature.

To be on the safe side, it is well to poke tomorrow's mess of collards into the freezer for a few hours for the frost effect. The greens will come out more tender if covered with water before freezing.

A flavorful delicacy, the collard is enriched by nature with an astonishing variety of vitamins and minerals. Scientists have confirmed that they are blessed far more than most other vegetables with nutritive content.

They are an excellent source of iron, for example, and of vitamins A and C. A couple of ounces of collards, in fact, contain a list of food values to compare with those outlined on the average vitamin and mineral food supplement label.

Those who know collards best agree that the richness of flavor, whether before or after frost, is actually captured in the cooking pot. Recipes and methods are many.

One of the oldest, simplest and most universally used recipes calls simply for tossing a piece of smoked ham, pork or bacon into the collards before boiling them in a little water in an iron pot.

That recipe, handed down for generations, is a favorite of Mrs. Mary C. Davis of Washington County's St. Joseph Community. She likes to chop the leaves before cooking, but many of her neighbors cook the leaves whole and cut them up afterward.

She also likes, particularly if the collard leaves are mature, to bring the mixture to a boil and then drain off and replace the water. She says this improves the flavor.

She usually adds a little cooking oil. Some housewives add a pod or two of pepper, but not Mrs. Davis. Her family likes the collards best without the pepper. But for those who do, she suggests green pepper if it is available. If not, red pepper will do.

Many persons add a zestful dash of pepper sauce. Others insist that collards are flavorful enough without the sauce. Since it is a matter of individual choice, a bottle of sauce is usually made available. Collards are usually served with corn pone or crackling bread.

For those who want their collards Southern fried, the leaves can be chopped up into a little bacon grease and water and fried.

A few collard-lovers enjoy day-old greens warmed over in a frying pan, according to Mrs. Davis. A few (mostly old-timers) also like to cover their collards with sugar cane syrup and then serve with crackling bread, baked sweet potatoes or corn pone. She doubts that this recipe has yet found its way to places like the Waldorf or the White House kitchen.

Collard-cooking success depends largely on how the greens are grown. Collard seed should be sown in a small seedbed in January and no later than February. Transplant to the collard patch in late March or early April.

If you can start your plants earlier than January of the year in which they're to be grown, your plants are likely to run-up or go to seed during the summer. When that happens, the plant becomes tough, fibrous and bitter tasting.

By waiting until January or February to plant, your collards will have the benefit of a full summer's growth—without going to seed—before being flavored by the autumn frosts. Many commercial growers, unfortunately for the flavor of the plant, fail to follow this practice in an effort to shorten the growing season.

Collard pot-likker, the liquid in which the greens are cooked, is unsurpassed for rich vegetable flavor. In the pot-likker is captured that indescribable elixir of the collard pot, a blend of the essence of hickory-smoked ham or bacon and the royal nectar of the supreme queen of greens.

Just crumble a little corn pone or crackling bread into a bowl of collard pot-likker for a brothy, distinctly flavorful culinary combination. With such a "soul bowl," the other gourmet foods—including even chitlins and fried okra—will just have to wait.

ADVANCE FEED-GRAIN AND WHEAT PAYMENTS

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to be associated with the remarks of my colleagues from Washington (Mrs. MAY), from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE), from Texas (Mr. PRICE), from North Dakota (Mr. KLEPPE), and from my own State of Minnesota (Mr. LANGEN and Mr. NELSEN).

I strongly endorse the announcement by President Nixon and Secretary Hardin

that participants in the feed-grain and wheat programs will again receive advance payments of up to 50 percent for voluntary acreage diversion.

I know that many farmers and their suppliers, not only in my constituency but throughout the Nation, depend on these advance payments to meet some of their heavy springtime expenses.

I am pleased that the Johnson budget has been corrected in this instance.

CRIME RATES AND POLICE PROTECTION

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the sharp increase in the incidence of crime in the 13th Congressional District in Brooklyn, N.Y., underscores the inadequacy of police protection not only in my congressional district but in the entire city of New York. New burdens thrust upon the police department by tensions of the urban crisis, by demonstrations, and by strikes that the blue line of police designed to protect our people from normal criminal activity is stretched to the breaking point.

Crime statistics for the 13th Congressional District during the month of October 1968, show the following:

First. During this month a total of 2,160 major crimes in the categories used by the FBI Crime Index were reported in this district. This represents an increase of 13.3 percent over reported crimes during the month of September. Robberies increased from 49 in September to 80 in October for an increase of 63 percent; burglaries increased from 568 in September to 681 in October for an increase of 20 percent; and motor vehicle thefts increased from 481 in September to 538 in October for an increase of 12 percent.

Second. In simplest statistical form, in September 1968, the people of this district were subjected to 63 major crimes every 24 hours. In October 1968 the crime rate leaped to 70 major crimes every 24 hours.

Third. During the first 10 months of 1968 a total of 19,278 major crimes were reported in the district. The monthly incidence of crime in the district was as follows:

January	1,775
February	1,630
March	1,797
April	1,901
May	1,960
June	2,115
July	2,050
August	1,985
September	1,905
October	2,160
Total	19,278

Fourth. During this 10-month period the people of this district were victimized by 6,327 burglaries; by 6,504 larcenies of \$50 and over; and by 4,956 motor vehicle thefts. On a daily basis, this

amounts to 20 burglaries, 21 larcenies, and 16 automobile thefts.

Fifth. The Crime Index Trend for October and for the first 10 months of 1968 shows the following:

	October 1968	1st 10 months, 1968
Crimes against the person:		
Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter.....	0	16
Forcible rape.....	6	44
Robbery.....	80	633
Assault.....	69	798
Total crimes against the person.....	155	1,491
Crimes against property:		
Burglary.....	681	6,327
Larceny, \$50 and over.....	786	6,504
Motor vehicle thefts.....	538	4,956
Total crimes against property.....	2,005	17,787

Sixth. The special police problems in the city of New York were fully set forth in an article written by Peter Kihss, a distinguished reporter for the New York Times, in the December 22, 1968, issue of that paper. After an interview with Chief Inspector Sanford D. Garelick, of the

New York City Police Department, Mr. Kihss reported that school problems alone in the fall of 1968 often required the assignment of 3,000 policemen.

The thinness of the blue line against crime—

Mr. Kihss wrote—
is measured by the men actually available for duty. Chief Garelick said only about 4,000 were available on each of three daily shifts—and of these only 2,800 are deployed by the 78 precincts.

Seventh. It is clear that our urban centers have an urgent need for increased and better trained manpower. It is equally clear that the urban centers with their limited taxing powers will be unable to meet this need. The Nixon administration must take every possible step to provide substantial Federal funds for local law enforcement programs as an essential step to eliminate the fears that stalk our people on our streets, in their homes, and in our parks.

Eighth. The following tables show the criminal statistics for the 13th Congressional District for October and the first 10 months of 1968:

OCTOBER 1968 STATISTICS

Precinct	Murder nonnegligent manslaughter	Forcible rape	Robbery	Assault	Burglary	Larceny, \$50 and over	Motor vehicle thefts	Total
60.....	0	1	21	29	134	88	49	322
61.....	0	1	17	12	175	305	192	702
66.....	0	0	10	7	124	131	89	361
67.....	0	2	17	12	111	138	62	342
70.....	0	2	15	9	137	124	146	433
Total.....	0	6	80	69	681	786	538	2,160

CUMULATIVE STATISTICS—JANUARY—OCTOBER 1968

60.....	5	14	179	383	1,278	987	564	3,410
61.....	5	8	126	127	1,624	2,357	1,896	6,143
66.....	4	3	79	100	1,047	825	762	2,820
67.....	0	7	127	97	974	1,007	629	2,841
70.....	2	12	122	91	1,404	1,328	1,105	4,064
Total.....	16	44	633	798	6,327	6,504	4,956	19,278

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, February 16, marked the 51st anniversary of Lithuanian independence. For Lithuanians and for freedom-loving people all over the world it was a day of remembrance, not a day of joy, because Lithuania no longer exists as an independent state in the world's nations. She exists as a spirit, as a people with an ethnic and linguistic identity.

Independence for Lithuania has had all too brief an experience in this century. Her freedom was proclaimed in 1918 and it lasted only until 1940 when her borders were overrun by German and Russian Armies. The Soviets annexed this small Baltic country, along with her sister states of Latvia and Estonia. And with the end of World War II, they were absorbed into the Russian political structure.

The strong identity of the Lithuanian

people, however, remains. The desire for freedom still burns bright. And as we salute these resolute people on the commemoration of their independence, we join them in their hope for a day when all men will be free to direct their own destinies, and we dedicate ourselves to the realization of these hopes.

BIBLE READING IN OUTER SPACE

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, as one might have expected, the voices of the atheists were raised in protest immediately upon the reading of the Bible by our astronauts while in outer space. Personally, I wish to take this opportunity to commend Col. Frank Borman, Capt. Frank Lovell, and Lt. Col. William Anders for their deep religious conviction and for their choice of reading material while in outer space.

I shall always defend and uphold the right of all Americans, including astronauts, to read from the Holy Scriptures wherever and whenever they please. To do less would be to sanction the imposition of a restriction on freedom of religion, which I do not believe straight-thinking people want to impose. I am not alone in my beliefs, and I am pleased to inform the House that a campaign is now underway to obtain 500,000 signatures commending our astronauts for reading from the Scriptures. I understand that the Reverend Fred Taylor, of Toledo, Ohio, and Mrs. Loretta Fry, of Detroit, Mich., are presently directing a campaign to obtain these signatures for presentation to Mr. Paul Haney, the Public Relations Director of NASA, in Houston, Tex., on March 7, 1969. To date, they are reported to have obtained 175,000 signatures, and I wish them Godspeed in obtaining the remainder of them.

PUSEY CAUTIONS STUDENTS ON ATTACKING ACADEMIC FREEDOM

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this morning's New York Times carried a story about the president of Harvard University, Nathan Pusey, which has great significance.

Dr. Pusey has wisely pointed out that while the dangers to academic freedom traditionally have come from outside the university community, on today's campuses academic freedom is endangered because of coercive methods used by some students within the university community. This note of caution desperately needs to be voiced by men like Dr. Pusey in academic institutions across this country. I include it as such for the information of the Members of Congress:

PUSEY WARNS OF STUDENT ATTACKS ON FREEDOM—HARVARD PRESIDENT DEPLORES USE OF "COERCIVE METHODS"—HE ISSUES STATEMENTS AFTER PROFESSORS PROTEST SIT-IN

(By Robert Reinhold)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., February 18.—Nathan M. Pusey, the president of Harvard University, warned today against assaults by students on academic freedom. He said that such assaults had accompanied disruptive campus protests.

"Growing numbers of students have chosen to exercise their frustrations in the academic arena in insufficient awareness of what a university properly is and sometimes at the expense of the rights of others," he said.

"Each time we thoughtlessly or emotionally allow ourselves to chip away at the painfully erected structure of academic freedom for which time and time again in our role as leaders we have had to man the barricades we not only do ourselves but also our country an irreparable disservice."

Dr. Pusey's statement came as a response to an open letter signed by more than 100 leading faculty members at Harvard.

SET-IN PROTESTED

The professors protested a recent incident at Harvard in which Negro students had staged a sit-in to force an instructor to scrap the syllabus of a course they felt was racist.

In thanking the professors for reiterating "the ancient privilege of the teacher to teach and the student to learn in an atmosphere of free inquiry," Dr. Pusey said that in the past the chief threats to academic freedom had come from outside the university.

"The irony and tragedy of the present," he went on, "is that now the threats to academic liberty and integrity often come from within."

"Harvard has the right to expect that the members of its faculties and the great majority of its students will have sufficient understanding, historical sense, reason and self-control to insist that coercive methods have no place in this university community."

The faculty letter, published in The Harvard Crimson, called on the Harvard administration to "take measures appropriate to insure the inviolability of instruction and examinations."

A PLEDGE TO FREEDOM

Dr. Pusey, in his reply, did not specify what measures he was prepared to take, except to say:

"I shall do everything in my power . . . to see that the freedom of this university continues unabated, proof against attacks, however well-intentioned or from whatever quarter they may come."

The Harvard faculty has been highly disturbed by the Negro students' coercive action, although most feel that the course in question, which was to have studied means of riot control in the cities, was inappropriate.

However, informed campus sources believe that the Harvard administration is prepared to take no action against the Negro students aside from the general statement of principle expressed in both the faculty letter and Dr. Pusey's report today.

The course, to have been given under the city planning department of the graduate School of Design, has not been canceled but the original syllabus scrapped and replaced by an unstructured seminar in urban studies.

SENTINEL ANTI-BALLISTIC- MISSILE PROGRAM

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, in the past month we have seen the Sentinel anti-ballistic missile program go from preliminary acceptance to controversy. In a free system, this is only right, but it seems that judgements affecting the national security of this Nation should be based on cool and rational perspective rather than on emotions.

We in the West, unlike a number of those from other parts of the Nation, are willing to accept the risks that the defense of our Nation entails. I would evidence this by a telegram I received this morning from a group from my district, the great State of Wyoming.

I include at this point the telegram from the Greater Cheyenne Chamber of Commerce and an editorial by the editor of the Wyoming State Tribune, James A. Flinchum in the RECORD:

CHEYENNE, WYO.
February 17, 1969.

HON. JOHN WOLD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We of the Cheyenne community convey our enthusiasm to have within our community and all Sentinel anti ballistic defenses.

We are the home of the first free world. First operational ICBM base and the Minuteman and welcome any further expansion to our area. Your affirmative action will be appreciated.

ROBERT G. SMITH,
Greater Cheyenne Chamber of Commerce.

WELCOME, SENTINEL

Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird's statement yesterday that the Defense Department is considering removal of Sentinel Anti-Ballistic Missile sites from the immediate environs of some eastern metropolitan areas to more remote locations at first glance suggested that some of our western states might be in line for additional ABM locations.

But a more careful examination of Laird's remarks, made on NBC's "Today" show, in reality indicated something else. Laird is thinking of new locations 20 to 30 miles from Boston where a proposed Sentinel installation has produced all sorts of vocal reverberations. Twenty to 30 miles wouldn't make much difference, we believe, in the event of a nuclear accident.

Whether some of the more liberal senators and congressmen such as Massachusetts' Sen. Edward M. (Ted) Kennedy and South Dakota's George McGovern, both Democrats, are really worried about the possibility of nuclear accident, or are opposed to further expansion of our missile and anti-missile systems, is difficult to determine. The latter may be much more probable since it must be recalled that nuclear weapons have been in considerable abundance within the past 10 years on missile warheads and to a much greater degree in B52 bombers over the past two decades.

As a matter of fact, H-bomb equipped bombers located on airfields in this country could have posed a much greater danger than missiles equipped with nuclear warheads.

The fact, of course, that no accident has occurred is no indication that none will; but there seems to be no other choice in this age of sophisticated and devastating weaponry. The H-bomb is something we have got to live with. Hopefully we shall not die by it, either accidentally or deliberately.

If the Nixon Administration finds the metropolitan areas of the country unwilling to allow these installations for their own defense, then possibly some of our remoter and less settled areas such as, well, Wyoming, might be acceptable. Chances are the citizens here wouldn't have any objections; quite the contrary, they probably would welcome further ABM installations than those already proposed.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS MUST BE CONSIDERED IMPORTANT

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

M. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. Speaker, the nomination of Willie Mae Rogers as assistant to the President on consumer affairs has been withdrawn. This is probably the wisest course of action in this instance.

Comments on the selection of Miss Rogers are still relevant in the context of the importance of consumer protection. If the selection of Miss Rogers is an indication that recent improvements in consumer education and protection are to be ignored, then the Congress must be prepared to work doubly hard on this issue.

The Saturday edition of the Boston Globe included an article by James Doyle of the Globe Washington Bureau. Mr. Doyle's article is relevant today because it questions the role that consumer affairs will play in the new administration. Jim Doyle sees the nomination of Miss Rogers as an indication that consumer affairs may be relegated to the background.

I hope this is not so. Legislation passed by the 89th and 90th Congresses in the area of consumer protection, although meaningful, is only a beginning.

I recommend Mr. Doyle's article to my colleagues, as follows:

NO CHEERS GREET NIXON CHOICE TO PROTECT
CONSUMER

(By James Doyle)

WASHINGTON.—When Betty Furness sat down to play consumer protection tunes on the piano, Washington laughed. She turned out to be a strong performer possibly even stronger than President Johnson had in mind.

The new administration gave Miss Furness her walking papers, supplanting her with a woman who claims "every job I have ever had has been one in which, in a sense, I represented the consumer."

Nobody here is laughing.

Willie Mae Rogers, who collects a salary as the head of Good Housekeeping Magazine's Institute in New York, will be the presidential consultant on consumer affairs.

Both she and President Nixon's press secretary insist that this is an attempt to strengthen the government's efforts at protecting the millions of Americans who can get shortchanged on everything from soup to nuts, who get snookered by misleading claims and phony warranties, and who have no high-priced lobbyists in Washington to present their case to the government.

Remembering the lesson of Miss Furness, most of the consumer interests people have have remained quiet about Miss Rogers. They remember, blushing, displaying their shock publicly when President Johnson chose a lady best known for opening refrigerator doors, with no experience in consumer affairs on the legislative mills.

Miss Furness, who came to the job with a blank slate, worked out well. Miss Rogers may do as well.

She claims to have spent her life tolling for the consumers, but that claim is disputed by some in the field. Mrs. Erna Angevine, who heads the Washington office of the Consumer Federation of America, notes, "to the best of my knowledge, I've never seen her at what we call consumer meetings."

Dr. Stewart M. Lee, chairman of the department of economics and business administration at Geneva College in Pennsylvania, is more distressed than Mrs. Angevine.

"When Betty Furness was appointed, I was appalled," Prof. Lee says. "She proved how wrong I was, and the rest of us were, in our judgment."

"But she also proved the need for a White House assistant on consumer affairs."

"I'm not impressed by having somebody move in now to see if the job is needed."

Prof. Lee remembers the case of California. "Gov. Pat Brown had a strong consumer council, and Governor Reagan appointed Mrs. Kay Valori, whose job, apparently, was to emasculate the council. And that's what she did."

Gov. Reagan managed this, according to Dr. Lee, despite legislation creating a consumers council. President Nixon would have much less trouble liquidating a job created only by the mandate of his predecessor.

"Lee's views are interesting because he is the co-author of a book called "Consumer Economics," which included in it three pages

that discuss the history of Good Housekeeping's Institute from 1912 to 1966. Miss Rogers has been director of the Institute since 1953. As soon as Dr. Lee heard about her appointment, he dashed off letters of protest to President Nixon, his senators and his congressman.

Rep. Benjamin S. Rosenthal of New York says "I am distressed about the appointment of Miss Rogers because of a possible conflict of interest with her association with a profit-making publication, because of that publication's questionable role in the consumer field."

It develops that long before the Nixon appointment, Rep. Rosenthal's House subcommittee on Consumer Affairs had been investigating Miss Rogers' Institute for the adequacy of its product-testing methods.

Even if she were not continuing under salary in her magazine job, she would not be suitable by Rosenthal's standards. "Miss Rogers is put in the difficult position of having to snitch on her friends," he says.

This very question came up at the Wednesday news conference that Willie Mae Rogers held at the White House. The question won't arise, Miss Rogers said, because any product with the seal of Good Housekeeping wouldn't be found wanting. Rep. Rosenthal suggests he may have evidence to the contrary.

He told a news conference yesterday that Good Housekeeping continued to advertise a product after the Food and Drug Administration had moved against it, and that when the truth-in-packaging bill was being fought by grocery advertisers, Miss Rogers testified against it.

The White House assures questioners that at some future time a replacement for Betty Furness will be named and that meanwhile the old Furness staff will continue to operate within the executive branch. But some of its top members have already left.

The jury is still out on Miss Rogers and on Mr. Nixon's approach to the bread-and-butter issues that affect consumers. It may be that Miss Rogers' appointment will serve as the alarm bell to keep the industry foxes out of the chicken coop.

Robert Smith, assistant director of Consumer's Union, the most respected of the watchdog groups, said yesterday his organization will wait and see before judging Miss Rogers and the Nixon Administration.

But the C.U. monthly magazine noted in its current issue, "during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, it was evident that consumer affairs occupied a niche somewhere on the government's priority list.

"Whether or not President Richard Nixon considers consumer problems worth paying much attention to remains, at this writing, largely unrevealed."

CU could find little ground for optimism during his election campaign or in his early statements as President-elect.

"The nation will simply have to wait and see."

SP4C. SALVATORE MANCUSO, U.S. ARMY, KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to report that another one of my constituents, Sp4c. Salvatore Mancuso, U.S. Army, of Ossining, N.Y., died in Vietnam on February 5.

I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by inserting herewith, for inclusion in the Record, the following article:

[From the Ossining (N.Y.) Citizen Register, Feb. 6, 1969]

MANCUSO AREA'S 10TH VIETNAM WAR VICTIM—
WAS OSSINING HIGH SCHOOL THREE-LETTER
MAN IN 1966

A 20-year-old Ossining serviceman, Spec. 4 Salvatore Mancuso has been reported killed in Vietnam.

He was the only child of Mr. and Mrs. Peter Mancuso of 231 Spring St., and the 10th from the area to lose his life in Vietnam. He would have been 21 on Monday.

The Mancusos yesterday received notice of their son's death and are awaiting further information from the Army. He was attached to Co. B Second Battalion, 12th Cavalry, 1st Cavalry Division.

Besides his parents, he is survived by his grandfather, Salvatore Mancuso of 66 Wolden Road. His father is the owner of Daddy Pete Inc., 207 Main St.

Salvatore was born in Ossining on Feb. 10, 1948. He attended local schools and was graduated in 1966 from Ossining High School where he received a varsity letter for wrestling, baseball and football.

High school principal George Allison described the youth as a good school citizen, loyal and cooperative. "He was respected by all the faculty and students," he said today.

He was a three-year man on the wrestling team. Salvatore's coach, Michael Nardone credited him as being a hard worker and reliable. "He could always be counted on to do his best," he said.

Following graduation he was employed as a teller with the County Trust Co. in Tarrytown from July of 1966 to June 1967. He was working with his father before beginning military duty.

Salvatore was drafted by the Army on Jan. 8, 1968, and received his basic training at Fort Jackson, S.C., and Fort Gordon, Ga. He was home on leave in June and shipped to Vietnam last June 23.

CAMPUS UNREST

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, the news is continually dominated by unrest on college campuses. The reasons for the unrest and possible solutions are many and varied. One clear proposition has emerged—solutions in this area will be as difficult and challenging as in other areas. The college campus is caught up in the social problems of the Nation—indeed, of the world. The university campus cannot and indeed must not be isolated from the national environment. In fact, our young people have continually been urged to involve themselves in political and social change. The avenues of active participation in national progress must be widened for young people.

How is this to be done?

How is the college campus to be integrated with national and international goals? These are hard and tough questions—deserving of well-reasoned answers. The answers to these and other similar questions will shape the future for higher education in the United States.

The statement I am inserting in the Record today is an enlightened discussion of this problem. The author is Dr. Ivan Hinderaker, chancellor of the Uni-

versity of California at Riverside. I think that in the cloud of smoke raised by a small group of agitators or by undue political interference in campus affairs, the progress of the universities brought about by the endeavors of people such as Chancellor Hinderaker are often obscured.

The statement follows:

THE UNIVERSITY AND RACE RELATIONS
(By Chancellor Ivan Hinderaker)

Two months ago, in my "State of the Campus" message on November 6, I discussed four topics important to this campus: The first was academic freedom and responsibility; the second, the student role in decisionmaking; third, a new academic plan; and fourth, minority students at UCR.

Today, I will talk further about minority students at UCR. In doing so, I want to begin by relating our problems to the black and the Mexican-American movements in our society.

Of the many issues which the United States must decide, one stands out above all the others. It is the most critical question which we, as individuals, are going to be called upon to answer in this century, and, perhaps in the next as well.

Can people whose color is more or less white, and people who are more or less black, or brown, or red, or yellow—can we all, working together, create a society in which equal opportunity genuinely exists for all? That is not really a question. There is no other alternative.

The United States does not offer equal opportunity now. It never has. We have a long way to go.

There is racial discrimination in our society. We all know it. One would have to be unable to hear and unable to see, not to know.

That pattern dates back over 300 years. Its most brutal form was slavery, practiced first in the colonies, and then sanctified in the Constitution from 1789 until after the Civil War.

Only a little less brutal than slavery were the practices used by southern states to undermine the rights given to black people by the 13th, the 14th, and the 15th amendments to the Constitution. The Ku Klux Klan reinforced these practices with its own special brand of terror and intimidation.

What replaced slavery after the Civil War was not freedom. It was not equality of opportunity. It was a kind of "permanent purgatory," somewhat above the hell of slavery but somewhat below acceptance into American society. It was a kind of second, third, or low class citizenship—in job, in house, in school, in church, under the law, at the lunch counter, on the sidewalk, at the drinking fountain, in the restroom, at the voting booth.

Discrimination against black people has not been confined to the South. In different forms, and in some of the same old southern ways, it is found throughout the United States.

Racial discrimination has not been confined to black people. Those who are brown, and red, and yellow, as well, have been the victims of prejudice.

The plain fact is that we who are white have withheld from people who are not white something which should be everyone's sacred right. That is the right of every man, in this his one and only life on earth, to develop himself to the limit of his ability.

A non-white is less likely than a white man to be able to get and to advance in any job to which he might aspire, even if there is no question about his qualifications.

A non-white is less likely to be able to buy or rent any house or apartment he might want, even though he has the cash in his pocket.

A non-white is less likely to be able to achieve any educational opportunity of

which he might dream, even if he has the ability and the willingness to work.

A non-white is less likely to be welcome at the door of any church in which he might choose to worship, even though he, too, is a child of God.

Since the Declaration of Independence, we have been telling ourselves and the rest of the world that a new and truly equalitarian social order was emerging in America. We defined this social order as one in which the fortunes of individuals were determined by their ability and willingness to work, rather than by the privileges of caste, or class, or race.

We have given credit to this dynamic system for the rise of the United States as a world power. We have offered ourselves as a model of democracy for other countries of the world to emulate.

We have talked about the importance of individual freedom, about the value of providing an equal opportunity for all, about equal protection under the law, about the dignity, under God, of each human being. We have talked about these ideals for nearly 200 years. But, in the main, it has been whites talking to whites. It has been whites thinking in terms of whites. It has been whites forgetting there were others besides themselves.

When we spoke of race being no bar to opportunity or advancement, what we really meant was that people of Polish, or Irish, or Italian extraction were being allowed to compete on equal terms with Anglo-Saxons. That was about all that was really meant.

But black Americans and Americans of other races regarded themselves as Americans, too. They, too, were listening. They, too, got the message about this Nation's ideals. They, too, thought it was a good message. They wondered why these ideals did not apply to them.

As the answers to their questions became more clear, 300 years of pent-up anger came pouring out in the black rage and the brown rage of this decade of the 1960s.

That there should be fury from those in the minority should cause no surprise. The only wonder is that it took those in the majority so long to become aware of it.

Neither should there be surprise at the white backlash which followed. The habits of majority thinking have developed over generations. They are grounded deep in the emotions. They are hard to change.

And so, in a spiral with a terrible logic all of its own, the tensions continue to build. With each turn of the spiral, the explosions become more destructive and more frequent. If that spiral is not stopped, the result might well be a second civil war.

Is this an unreal threat? I don't think that it is. Neither the Nation, nor we in California, nor we in this area, nor we at UC Riverside, can behave as though it is unreal.

Such a civil war would not be between the North and the South. It would be between some outraged second class citizens and the rest of society, with urban areas all over the country as the battlegrounds.

It would not be fought with massed armies lined up on a Gettysburg farm. Strategy and tactics would be those of guerrilla warfare, with the guerrillas aiming to cut the many vulnerable arteries of our cities.

It would not be over in two, or three, or four years, to be finished with a formal treaty of surrender. It would be stretched out over decades, slowly draining the lifeblood out of America.

Such is the destructive potential of forces at work in our society today. Such are the stakes for all of us in the answer to the question which I first posed. Can we, people of all colors, working together, create a society of equal opportunity for all?

It is time to stop thinking that the problem of racism will go away if only a few rabble-rousers will quit inciting black peo-

ple, or brown people. Or, that it will go away if only the magazines, the newspapers, and television will quit reminding black people, or brown people, of the inequalities that exist. The problem won't go away.

Neither will it be solved solely by court decisions, or by civil rights acts, or by educational opportunity grants, or by anything which money alone can buy. These things will help. They are necessary. But they cannot, in themselves, solve the problem.

It is time, now, for each one of us, personally, to do something about racism. Us. Today. Our personal commitment must be to the rejection of racism in every facet of our lives. We must do this not only because we are afraid of what will happen if we don't do it. We must do it because we know in our hearts it is right. It is moral. It is what we want to do.

This, then, is the larger context into which we must place the problem of race relations on the campus. What we have is not a game, to be played like a water fight or a panty raid. It is a deadly serious struggle for the soul and for the destiny of America, and we on the college campus are right in the middle of that struggle.

It is necessary for us here to provide an equal chance for all who want to build, an equal chance for all who want to earn the respect of others, an equal chance for all to express themselves in the ways most meaningful to them, an equal chance to feel and to know pride in one's person and in one's culture of whatever color it may happen to be.

It is also necessary for us here to protect the integrity of our institutions from those who despair so deeply or whose anger is so uncontrolled that the overriding emotion is hate; the overriding goal, destruction. Such protection cannot be insured by force alone. Chiefly, our institution is protected through the voluntary consent of its members. For that to be possible, individuals must respect the rights of other individuals. They must respect the institution—its goals, its performance, its leadership, its capacity for change. There must be a feeling by individuals that they have a personal stake in the success of the institution. There must be enough of all of these things so that consent is voluntarily given.

It is necessary for us here to decide what we want to accomplish. If we don't want to get anything done, then it doesn't matter much how we do it. If we do want to get something done, then it matters very much how we do it. Let me cite three examples.

First, there is the problem of timing. Some things are possible today. Some next week. Some next month. Some might take a year. Some, more than that. Just as surely as progress depends on our acting soon enough, so also does it depend on not acting hastily.

Second, there is the problem of pressure. Without strong pressures, even if ideas are good, nothing is likely to happen. But just as surely as progress depends on pushing hard enough, so also does progress depend on not pushing too hard—so hard that we blow both the system and our objectives.

Third, there is the problem of winning support. To win support, it is necessary to attract allies to the cause. To attract allies, it may be necessary to compromise. But to maintain the integrity of the goals, it is necessary not to compromise too much.

I appreciate the dedication of UCR students to constructive achievement. You have concerned yourselves with both your needs and my problems. You have generated both constructive criticism and constructive pressure. You have shown respect for your fellow students and for the needs of the whole campus.

I think we can say that, together, we have made a start toward campus solutions for some of the problems of race. Compared to what we can do, however, it isn't much of a

start. Even so, I would like to describe to you some of our beginnings.

Our most rapidly growing project is the Educational Opportunity Program. Its purposes are two. One is to provide financial help for students who would not otherwise be able to attend UCR—particularly from minority groups. The other purpose is to provide special counseling and, if necessary, tutorial assistance.

From five students in 1966, the Program has grown to over 80 students this year. The percentage of entering Freshmen who come from other than white racial backgrounds was doubled over last year, with the total representing nearly ten percent of the class.

The EOP grants \$1,900 for each of the student's first two years. This is to permit him to work full time at his studies. Each grant starts with a contribution of \$165, raised by the campus. This is matched five-to-one from special funds of the Regents. The Federal Government adds the rest. After the sophomore year, EOP students work part-time to earn one-half of what they need, thus making more grant money available for additional EOP students.

Recently, EOP programs have come under attack because of the activities of some EOP students on such campuses as San Francisco State and San Fernando Valley State. Why, it is asked, should I help contribute to an EOP grant for someone who is not seriously committed to his academic work? Why should the University contribute to a grant for one who is not willing to live within campus rules? Why don't we eliminate the EOP and support instead those students who really want an education?

I can't speak about the substance of these charges as they relate to other campuses. I can state forcefully that they do not apply to UCR.

Furthermore, I am, as Chancellor, working to substantially expand the EOP program of this campus each year for as far as I can see into the future. That expansion should be not only in the number of grants, but in the quality of our programs for counseling and tutoring. And next year, EOP will get underway with still another dimension—a graduate fellowship program.

As I have a responsibility to EOP, so also does each student who is enrolled under the Program. It is his responsibility to do everything in his power to succeed in his academic work. His success will help make the Program succeed. As the Program succeeds, the greater will be the help which will be available for future UCR generations.

The Program is sound. EOP students are doing well. Many of them are represented in the brightest segment of our student population. EOP deserves the support of every one of us.

Closely related to EOP is the policy of the University of California and the State College System which permits a chief campus officer to admit each year, in exception to regular admission rules, a number of students equal to four percent of the total number of entering students. This policy has been in effect for ten years, with the exception level originally set at two percent. Recently, the exception level was doubled to four percent.

Although many of our EOP students have qualified under regular admission requirements, some have not. The latter have been admitted by my special action, on the recommendation of the Dean of the College of Letters and Science after he has consulted with the EOP advisory committee. In each admission, there is a determination made that the student has a good chance for academic success at UCR.

Recently, as with the EOP, this policy of making exceptions to the admission rules has also come under attack. The reasons have been much the same as they were with the EOP; namely, the alleged activities of some special admission students at other college

campuses. There are strong pressures to reduce the four percent back to two percent.

Why, critics ask, should students who do not meet regular admission standards be admitted when others who do meet these standards are being turned away from campuses which are already full? That is a difficult question. I will answer it in two parts.

One answer is that, in the experience of UCR, grade reports clearly indicate that special admission students have satisfied UCR's academic requirements. Beyond this, they have made many important contributions to the life of the campus.

The second part of my answer is this. The majority student who did not get into the campus of his choice is more likely to find a satisfactory alternative than a minority student who has the capacity but, for some economic or social or other reason of background, has a record which is technically deficient. Call this discrimination in reverse, if you will, but whatever the term, I believe the policy to be both necessary and desirable. Hopefully, the State, through the University, the State College System, and the community colleges will not allow unsatisfied enrollment demand to build up to the point where it might itself tend to produce its own set of social tensions.

Our UCR four percent special admission program is sound. It is my responsibility to see that it continues to be administered in that way. It is the responsibility of UCR's special admission students to continue to succeed, not only for what that means to them personally, but also for what it means to the continuance of the program.

Both the EOP and the special admissions program have helped to begin to correct some deficiencies of UCR student life which should have been attacked long ago. As UCR has been a white student campus, so also has it been white in its non-academic and academic personnel.

In the field of non-academic personnel, three types of policies have been directed to this particular problem. One is a general push by the administration to have all departments explore thoroughly all recruitment sources, including black and brown, prior to filling a vacancy. Overall, the proportion of UCR non-academic employees from minority groups has been increased by nearly fifty percent over the last two years.

The second of these non-academic personnel policies is illustrated by UCR's membership in the Riverside Job Opportunities Council. The purpose of the JOC is to help find jobs for so-called hard core unemployed persons—persons not likely to be hired because of some physical handicap, or a record of having been in jail, or for such a simple reason as having given up hope of ever having a job. Each of the thirteen employer members of the Riverside JOC has agreed to fill at least fifteen percent of their vacancies from candidate lists developed by the JOC. They have also agreed to supply whatever are the special training needs of the employee to bring him to the standard level of qualifications for the job. Of the 117 persons placed so far by the JOC, eleven are at UCR, and ten of these are members of minority groups.

Third among these non-academic personnel programs is a special drive to recruit for high level decision-making positions from minority groups. Since July, six such appointments have been made. We had been told that there were no blacks or Mexican-Americans qualified for these jobs. The contrary, in fact, was the case.

These three non-academic personnel programs add up to a major plus for UCR. I don't mean this in the sense that it is enough. But I do mean it in a qualitative sense. The functions and life of UCR have been much enhanced by these new presences who are here among us.

The problem in the field of academic personnel is more difficult. The degree of specialization required is so high. Its long-range and short-range aspects tend to be so different.

Presently, in the long-range context, UCR has two members of the faculty who are black, and not many more of Mexican-American extraction. Each of these individuals came here by the traditional route, and that included graduate education at a well-recognized university.

In the filling of vacant faculty positions, all academic departments have been urged to make every possible attempt to find qualified faculty members from minority backgrounds. I expect to have some progress to report before the start of the next school year.

This illustrates the long-range aspect of the problem. It will really be solved only when many more black and brown students go on to undergraduate work, when they decide to make college and university teaching their career, when they go on to graduate school, and when they enter the faculty job market. This is one reason why the continuation and improvement of the EOP and the admission waiver programs are so critical to all of higher education. Each provides a significant assist in increasing the number of black and brown teachers, currently in such short supply.

There are also the possibilities of short-range solutions. A committee of the Academic Senate has made several proposals. They relate both to faculty recruitment and to matters of curriculum, which is the responsibility of the faculty. As has previously been announced, it is my intention to appoint as soon as possible an individual to a high level position in campus administration, whose major responsibility will be in this field, working with the faculty in developing ideas for faculty recruitment and curriculum, and working with the faculty, the students, and the administration in an attempt to put the ideas into practice.

In addition to these functions, this officer will be responsible for coordinating a whole range of other programs. One is the EOP. Another is the Upward Bound project. Still another is UCR's cooperative program with California State College at San Bernardino and neighboring community colleges to enable teachers who have never had an opportunity to complete their education to do so. This officer will also relate closely with such other units as Tutorial Project, the Community Service Office, the School of Education, the Dean of Students, the Admissions Office, and the Riverside Urban Coalition.

The entire University of California has made a major commitment to the urban crisis. Funds which UCR has just received from the President of the University make it possible to apply new ideas to the recruitment of minority students, to give support to the efforts of United Mexican-American Students to provide special services for the Mexican-American community, to assist Tutorial Project in its work with Riverside schools, and to further develop student internship opportunities with task forces of the Urban Coalition. Underway, as well, are programs to bring black and brown, along with white, culture to the campus.

On Friday, primarily through the efforts of the Student Committee on Undergraduate Education and the Black Students Union, you will have the opportunity at noon of hearing Mr. Lou Smith, Director of Operation Bootstrap in Los Angeles. This talk will be followed by a series of encounter groups through which there will be an opportunity for all students to become more aware of, and more sensitive to, those who are different from them. After Mr. Smith's presentation and the Friday afternoon group meetings, the administration, through the Counseling Center, will continue the encounter group

program throughout the remainder of the year.

Perhaps there are some who feel that this is a great to-do about nothing. I hope that it is a great to-do. But I assure you that it is not about nothing. It is about the most critical issue in our Nation. It is about the most critical issue at UCR.

I invite you to join with me in the recognition of this fact. I invite you to act with me on the basis of this fact.

IT IS TIME FOR A REAPPRAISAL OF OUR RHODESIA POLICY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, as the United States continues to participate in the economic sanctions against Rhodesia and as some press for implementing these and new sanctions with renewed vigor, I suggest that the question be fully reviewed with emphasis on two areas.

First, in discussing the question of Rhodesia and her independence, let us look objectively at the problem and our participation. Second, let us examine this problem in the proper context, the context of Africa.

Too many times and for too long a time we have allowed emotion and our particular political prejudices to govern our actions, and in doing so we have at some moment failed to even apply these standards with consistency.

We are quite naturally prejudiced toward our system of one man, one vote, and believe it best for true self-determination. But there is the practical question of whether it will work, immediately, in all nations, and especially at this time in Rhodesia. If we are to take this position we should at the least apply it to all nations, that is, to all Communist nations, to all dictatorships, and so on. Only emotionalism allows us to cover over our contradiction and double dealing.

Relating to this is the problem of forcing—and we are engaged in just that—a nation with different culture, political heritage, economy, levels of industrial, educational, and agricultural development to assume a potentially dangerous and in many ways alien and unworkable political system. The results of our forcing should it succeed will be the disintegration of a modern state. And with this disintegration the loss of opportunity for the African population which we profess so much concern. It will be a tragic example of political myopia should it happen.

Prof. Svetozar Pejovich recently presented his views on the Rhodesia question during a lecture seminar at De Paul University. I would like to include them in the RECORD. He treats these problems and our policy positions in a controlled, unemotional, revealing manner. I hope they can be examined in the same way. They follow:

RHODESIA TOMORROW: AN EXPERIMENT IN RACIAL COEXISTENCE
(By Svetozar Pejovich, associate professor, Texas A. & M. University)

The proclamation of Rhodesian independence in 1965 has led to a general revolt

against this small country. The revolt is spearheaded by the African bloc in the United Nations, and actively supported by the governments of Great Britain, United States and Soviet Union. The justification for economic and political sanctions imposed by the UN, whose explicit goal is to defeat the Rhodesian quest for its independence, was editorially explained by the London *Economist* as follows: "... the suburbful of whites who are now attempting to grab for themselves a sunny slice with four million black servants must be convinced, not necessarily gently, that history will not allow it. For Britain, and above all for its Prime Minister, this is one of those moments when destiny throws down the challenge."¹

The purpose of this paper is to make a contribution towards an objective evaluation of the current crisis over Rhodesia. The paper is divided into three parts: it begins with consideration of the facts of political and social life in Rhodesia, proceeds to the subsequent analysis of two major criticisms against Rhodesia raised by the opponents of that country, and ends with the author's opinionated interpretation of the implicit reasons for the current hostility towards Rhodesia.

I

One could hardly think of a better source of information as to what the government of Rhodesia wants the country to be like than the proposed Constitution. A careful analysis of the 1968 Report of the Constitutional Commission² should help the reader to form his own judgment.

The Constitutional Commission was formed shortly after the proclamation of independence in 1965. Its Report was published in the summer of 1968, after rather long and extensive hearings which included representatives of all races and professions. Barring some "external" interferences the proposed Constitution will, in all likelihood, be adopted in the near future.

Some important, and for the purpose of this paper relevant, recommendations of the Constitutional Commission are: *System of Government*. The Report acted for a unitary system of government. It rejected, and the significance of this rejection must not escape us, the policy of separate development of races (apartheid). The Commission found that all races in Rhodesia are already integrated in the economic sphere, and that no majority of any ethnic group supports complete partition.

The Commission also rejected a federal form of government on the ground that in the Rhodesian situation it would be no more than an unhappy compromise between a unitary form of government and complete partition. The Report took some pleasure in quoting Sir Ivar Jennings, who is reported to have said: "Federation is not a magic formula. It is nothing more than a name of a complicated system of government which nobody would wish to see established anywhere if he could think of a better."³

Parliamentary Structures. The Commission recommended complete racial parity in the Legislative Assembly as the most practical solution for a multi-racial country like Rhodesia. The recommendation was made in expectations of the following benefits: (1) complete racial parity will tend to remove suspicion among Rhodesians of anyone of the main races or ethnic groups that they may be permanently dominated by one or more of the other main races or ethnic groups; and (2) complete racial parity will keep the representatives of different races together in the Parliament. They will sit there as equals with a likely result that both the elected representatives as well as the people in general will develop confidence in each other.

The Commission rejected the majority rule out of fear that it would lead to the supremacy of one race over all others. Also, the idea of two chambers (one European and one African) was rejected on the ground that it could lead to a strong rivalry between them resulting in frequent deadlocks on legislative matters.

Composition of the Parliament. The Report proposed a Legislative Assembly of eighty seats allocated as follows: forty seats for representatives of European voters, twenty seats for representatives of African voters and twenty seats for representatives elected under a qualified common roll.

It is precisely on this point that the Commission tackled the major issue of the current crisis over Rhodesia. The Report makes it abundantly clear that the white minority will have a majority in the Parliament for an unspecified period of time. Yet, it leaves no doubt that the objective of complete racial parity will be attained as soon as the majority of voters on the common roll are Africans. The important question is how long it will take the Africans to gain a majority on the common roll. Obviously, it depends on the required franchise qualifications and the rate at which black Rhodesians can attain them.

The franchise qualifications are the same for all Rhodesians over twenty years of age. They are:

- (1) citizenship; and
- (2) the annual income of not less than £900; or
- (3) property valued at no less than £3,000; or
- (4) the annual income of no less than £600 plus four years of secondary education; or
- (5) appointment to the office of tribal chief or headman; or
- (6) serving as a member of a religious order which practices a vow of poverty.

How soon the black Rhodesians may hope to attain these qualifications must await a detailed economic analysis. The current situation is as follows: the average wage of about 350,000 Africans (compared to the total white population of about 225,000) is above £200 per year,⁴ and the number of African students enrolled in secondary schools is about 14,000.⁵

Senate. The Commission proposed to add a conservative bias to the Rhodesian system of government by recommending the establishment of a second chamber, the Senate. According to the proposed Constitution, the Senate will possess effective power to review and delay the passage of legislative measures. It will consist of six chiefs elected by the provincial assemblies of tribal chiefs, six African members chosen by tribal and urban electoral colleges, twelve Europeans chosen by an electoral college, and seven members appointed by Head of the State.

Head of the State. He will be elected by both houses of the legislature. Head of the State will perform duties of a conventional nature, that is similar to those discharged by the sovereign of Great Britain.

II

Let us now turn to the arguments raised by the opponents of the present government of Rhodesia. They, that is a substantial majority of the United Nations, claim that (1) Rhodesia is a threat to the peace, and (2) its refusal to recognize the one man—one vote principle is a flagrant denial of human freedom.

The Security Council of the United Nations accused Rhodesia of being a threat to the peace by citing statements made by the authorities in Rhodesia such as a threat of economic sabotage against its northern neighbors. Yet, it is generally recognized that Rhodesia's northern neighbors are the ones that threaten to launch attack on a substantial scale. It is from Zambia and not from Rhodesia that radio broadcasts say: "They (i.e. the Rhodesian white) are lice; destroy

them; you know how."⁶ The terrorist activity in Rhodesia is carried out by saboteurs trained in Zambia and Tanzania. For example, on the night of May 16-17, 1966, Mr. and Mrs. H. Viljoen and their two small children were sleeping in their farm house in the Hartley district. A noise outside the house prompted both parents to get up and investigate. They were gunned down by a group of terrorists armed with made in China weapons.

It would violate one's sense of elementary logic to accept or take seriously the claim that a small country like Rhodesia is a threat to the peace. No terrorist has ever been sent from Rhodesia to another country, no radio broadcast from Rhodesia has ever called on other people to revolt against their governments, and no Rhodesian official has ever threatened other countries with armed intervention. Yet, other countries, who have been doing all those things to Rhodesia have taken it upon themselves to condemn Rhodesia for being a threat to the peace.

The difficulty which arises in substantiating the claim that Rhodesia threatens the peace is readily seen from the following quote: "On the occasion in point, I heard a State Department official answer relevant questions; a doubter put a query: How, in actuality, was the purported miscreant, Rhodesia, threatening the peace? The answer came: Obviously, the United States could not condone the situation there. The inquirer persisted: What country was Rhodesia presumably about to attack? The answer: Not precisely any country; the situation was subtler than that, some of Rhodesia's neighbors were acutely unhappy about it... a sort of thing that could not be accepted. A third question: Wherein precisely was Rhodesia in rebellion? The answer: The British government had left no room for doubt about the matter, and so it would be pointless to go into technicalities."⁷

The second major criticism of Rhodesia concerns its refusal to grant voting rights to all its citizens over twenty years of age. A good many people, by habit and sentiment, subscribe to precepts of majority rule. The United Nations request, as a condition for the recognition of Rhodesia, one man—one vote political system.

In other words, the United Nations reject the system under which the right to the franchise in Rhodesia is independent of race and color, and based on educational and property qualifications. Moreover, the frankness of Rhodesian officials in expressing their fear of the unconditional enfranchisement of Africans has been used to create an impression that the Rhodesian government is keeping Africans in political subjugation. For example the following statement has been attributed to Ian Smith: "There will be no black rule in my time." This alleged assertion made headlines everywhere and it is constantly repeated; but the repeated denials seldom get printed. What Smith had actually said, in a CBS telecast was: "If we had a black nationalist government—a black extremist government in my lifetime, then I believe we would have failed in our policy... which has always been no discrimination between black or white."⁸

A somewhat puzzling picture emerges when the behavior of those who preach the one man—one vote system for Rhodesia is examined. The London *Economist* said: "Britain should make very clear its eventual aim for Rhodesia. This is to reach majority rule there. But it should be made quite plain that when Britain regains control over its colony's destiny it will not hand power over immediately; rather it will go for a slow version of the stage-by-stage advance."⁹

On May 26, 1966, President Johnson said: "The United States could not condone the perpetuation of racial or political injustice anywhere in the world." Yet, at the onset of American independence the franchise was limited to a small portion of American adult

Footnotes at end of speech.

males, qualified on a basis of property and income. "The Declaration of Independence did not enfranchise females, or any non-whites whatsoever, elevate any Indians, or emancipate a single slave. The realization of American rightly vaunted equality and wide participation in public affairs took much time and effort and even yet does not proceed without disorder."¹⁰

Finally, the African countries themselves are not known for strict respect of free elections based on the one man—one vote principle.

In summary, the governments of Great Britain, United States and many African countries, whose explicit purpose is to defeat Rhodesia's quest for independence for that country's alleged threat to the peace and its refusal to confer unconditionally the right to vote upon four million tribal Africans, have no moral basis for their criticism. It is not to imply that one should not, given his philosophical orientation, criticize Rhodesia. The point is that those who are most outspoken critics of that country should, for the sake of objectivity, be subjected to the exact same kind of criticism.

III

To discover true reasons for Great Britain, United States and many African countries' hostility towards Rhodesia one must obviously go beyond the facade of words and speculate about various alternative possibilities.

It can be argued that the proposed Constitution and the goal of eventual racial parity is merely a screen of smoke behind which the white minority in Rhodesia is trying to conceal its intention of permanent domination. If this were the case the ruling elite in Rhodesia would pay, sooner or later, for its shortsightedness. Thus, to accept this argument one would have to assume that white Rhodesians are an utterly unrealistic bunch of people.

The recent emphasis on African education in Rhodesia indicates that they may not be that foolish after all. "A team of three Americans headed by Rep. John Ashbrook has recently reported that there have been spectacular advances in education and that the demand for places in secondary schools has yet to equal the supply. Far from being excluded from opportunities, Africans are not yet voluntarily taking advantage of the facilities available."¹¹ Over two decades (1947-66) the number of African primary and secondary schools operated by the Rhodesian government increased from six to seventy-seven and from one to seventeen respectively.¹² Also, the objective is for 50 per cent of Africans to go to school after age 15, while in Britain only 34 per cent continues to go to school after that age. Finally, expenditure on education stood at 18.5 per cent in the 1966 budget in Rhodesia, and only at 14.3 per cent in Zambia.

Secondly, the concept of racial parity can be criticized on the ground that it prevents the majority race from governing the country. The validity of this criticism depends on a very important assumption that the one man-one vote principle is universally applicable.

This principle was developed by a Western man for a Western community. Its major implication is, upon which the whole concept of classical democracy rests, that the minority can change status quo and become the majority in due time. The only thing the minority has to do is to convince a sufficient number of people to side with it at next election.

The problem is more complicated in a multi-racial African country like Rhodesia. Its two major races belong to two diametrically different cultures. Thus, the majority rule there would render the white minority a permanent minority. The minority would stand no chance of changing status quo at

next election via selling its ideas to the majority. The latter would feel those concepts to be either alien to its structure of value and aspirations or it would simply fail to understand them. Moreover, the problem would be aggravated by racial prejudices. In any case, the majority rule would do to the rise of democracy in Rhodesia just opposite from what it was created to do and has done in the West.

The proposed Constitution in Rhodesia, if analyzed in the light of preceding paragraph, represents an attempt to preserve democracy there by adopting the Western concept of majority rule to the specific conditions prevailing in a multi-racial community where alien cultures meet. Complete racial parity will, it is hoped, free both races from fear of being dominated one by another.

The question that remains to be answered is: why doesn't the Rhodesian government introduce complete racial parity here and now rather than at some future time? The answer can be found, assuming that white Rhodesians are sincere in saying that they want racial parity, in the franchise qualifications. The African representatives in the Parliament will be responsible to those citizens who either have interest in preserving the state (on account of property qualifications) or have become "Westernized" (on account of educational qualifications). In this manner the white Rhodesians hope not only to achieve complete racial parity but to preserve their island of Western civilization in a relatively hostile environment as well. If not, the Africans qualified to vote will know what they are rejecting if they chose to reject it. And many people believe that to reject an alternative with full understanding of what is being rejected is preferred to a rejection based on emotion, hatred and ignorance. In other words, the only hope of survival for white Rhodesians is to have the equal number of representatives of various races working together in the Parliament being responsible to responsible citizens, and eventually gaining enough confidence in each other so that the differences between them could be attributed to differences in policy rather than racial differences.

Finally, the most likely reason for economic and political sanctions against Rhodesia is that "American and British politicians tend to think in terms of the aspirations of African politicians. They are not directly concerned with the welfare of the African masses who, unlike their leaders, are not possible future voters at the United Nations; and sometimes the Western politicians seem to think that it is expedient to retain the friendship of moderate leaders in African territories; while even the moderate leaders find it desirable to appease the racial emotions and resentments of the black people. If they did not, they could not survive, it is felt, against more extreme rivals, who feel that they cannot afford the entrenchment of a non-racial political equality, a reasonably achievable franchise available on equal terms for every literate and responsible Rhodesian whatever his color."¹³ It is a tribute to the *instinct of survival* of African leaders that they have realized that to defeat Rhodesia is crucial to their accumulation of political power. It is a tribute to their *political skill* that they have been able to conceal that behind the facade of propaganda about the enslavement of black Rhodesians. It would not be a tribute to the intelligence of the reader to let that distinction pass unnoticed.

The major results of discussion presented in this paper are: (1) Rhodesia does not intend to pursue the policy of separate development of races (apartheid); and (2) the proposed concept of complete racial parity, that is one race—one vote principle is an attempt, which some people will approve of while some others will not, yet a *bona fide* attempt to solve the problem of peaceful

co-existence of various races possessing completely different cultures.

The future of Rhodesia? It will depend on the extent of true determination of its rulers to carry out the experiment of complete racial parity, as well as on the willingness of other governments to let them do it.

FOOTNOTES

¹ "Tackling Rhodesia," *The Economist*, November 13, 1965, p. 689.

² *Report of the Constitutional Commission*, Salisbury, Rhodesia: Government Printer, 1968.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

⁴ *Economic Survey of Rhodesia, 1966*, Salisbury, Rhodesia: Government Printer, 1966, pp. 26 and 28.

⁵ F. Rich, "The Economics of African Education," *The Rhodesian Journal of Economics*, August, 1967, pp. 13-24.

⁶ A. Williams, "Rhodesia—Land of the Fearful," *Houston Post*, April 6, 1966.

⁷ C. Marshall, *Crisis Over Rhodesia*, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1967, p. 4.

⁸ W. Hutt, "The Rhodesian Columny," *New Individualist Review*, Winter 1968, p. 8.

⁹ *The Economist*, *op. cit.*, p. 689.

¹⁰ C. Marshall, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

¹¹ Hutt, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

¹² F. Rich, *op. cit.*

¹³ W. Hutt, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

TRIBUTE TO DR. WELSH

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, after some 27 years of dedicated public service, Dr. Ed Welsh has resigned. During this period he served directly under two Presidents—Kennedy and Johnson—and has the distinction of being the only formally appointed Executive Secretary in the history of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, a post which he has held with great distinction for the past 8 years.

Thanks to his years of experience on Capitol Hill, he was able to serve the needs of both the executive branch and the legislature in a mutually cooperative and productive manner. During his tenure as Executive Secretary he made numerous appearances before committees of the Congress, and he and his staff have been instrumental in supplying the committees with insights and information which served to promote the most efficient management of the Nation's investment in the space resource. Thanks to his endeavors, the business of the Council and the operations of its staff were organized with great effectiveness. He personally was responsible for the first public articulation of the basic policy of U.S. space activities—that they included space projects to keep the peace and space projects to increase the well-being of all mankind.

He played a key role in Council activities that led to recommendations to the President with respect to the Apollo, MOL, SST, and communications satellite program. He was a principal drafter of the President's basic communications policy statements and of the substantive

legislation which established the Communications Satellite Corp.

Thanks to his organizing ability, the Council staff represents a broad spectrum of high professional skills in space and aeronautics activities. It is notable that the Council's staff budget has always been kept small to support only essential functions, and that the present budget is 4 percent less than that initiated in fiscal year 1962.

As a spokesman for the space program, Dr. Ed Welsh has been instrumental in keeping the public informed as to the economic, social, and technological benefits which are constantly being obtained from the national air-space investment. He has also helped to educate the public with respect to the extent and scope of the space and aeronautics accomplishments and potentials of other nations, particularly the U.S.S.R.

So as Ed Welsh departs for new endeavors in an illustrious career, we wish him every success. He will be missed.

MOORHEAD LAUDS PITTSBURGH ACTIVIST

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Dorothy Mae Richardson has given more than a few people in Pittsburgh evidence why she merits the description "community activist."

A dynamic persevering woman, Mrs. Richardson has led the fight for better housing in Pittsburgh from the neighborhood level. She rallied her neighbors to fight the environmental conditions that breeds slums and she has seen her efforts blossom.

Defiantly admitting that she lives in a slum, Mrs. Richardson and her organization CASH have worked closely with—and sometimes in defiance of—Pittsburgh housing agencies.

On numerous occasions she provided me with assistance in my urban housing endeavors.

Most recently, she helped coordinate a housing symposium that I initiated in Mrs. Richardson's community, the northside of Pittsburgh.

The February 15 issue of the Pittsburgh Press chronicled the story of Dorothy Richardson and her crusade to better the neighborhood she calls home—and other areas of the city.

Today, I would like to introduce this article into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in recognition of an outstanding contribution to Pittsburgh's drive to eradicate its housing problems:

Mrs. Dorothy Mae Richardson is a large woman, with tolerant eyes, a gentle voice, and an overwhelming impatience with the status quo.

But unlike most of us, who are content in our placid routines, she has allowed her discontent to boil over, but in a carefully controlled way. As a result, today Mrs. Richardson has a voice of some power in the community.

"Mayor Barr calls me Dorothy," she confides with a grin, and she's on a similar first name basis with professors, builders, realtors, politicians, churchmen and other leaders.

"Just because a person gets a big job doesn't mean he turns into a sage overnight. They're just people, trying to do a job. Now I'd like to help them do a better job," she says in her slow voice. "They can't know what's going on in the slums unless someone shows them. That's all we're trying to do."

Mrs. Richardson helped found and now heads CASH, Citizens Against Slum Housing. Because of her drive and determination, "120 really hard workers," as she calls them, are chipping away at Pittsburgh slum problems.

"It's frustrating and very slow but I always say that we just have to 'keep on keeping on.' The minute we stop the pressure, it's bad. We just can't afford to get tired."

Mrs. Richardson would make a good general, because she's expert at assigning specific duties. She laughs as she recalls one example:

"Our housing demonstration in City Council—well, we had so much talking round and round the subject, you know, and nothing being said. Well—I put one lady in charge of talking about rats, another one in charge of roaches, another one the high rents and no repairs, the holes in the floor. It was really something. We never let up. They'd try to ramble on and get us off the subject, but we wouldn't let them. Know what—it worked!"

Mrs. Richardson feels she's an authority on slums because she lives in one. North Side's Charles St. winds along the hill from Perrysville Ave. to Brighton Rd., and in the last few years, the lower end of the street has gone from middle class to downright depressed housing. On a cold winter day, driving down the street can be a lesson in desolation. Some houses are boarded up, others sag in forlorn rows, and there are the hallmarks of poverty—rubbish, garbage and trash.

Mrs. Richardson's small brick row house is painted gray, and inside, the living room walls are yellow, the rug is green, the furniture modern, and symphony music plays softly on the hi-fi.

In fact, once you're cozy inside, the tendency is to forget what's outside, but Mrs. Richardson never does.

Her phone is constantly ringing, and she handles problems of procedure, tactics, and very often, personality with some dispatch. She says:

"It's hard to get people to stick to a project. Nobody minds showing up for the speeches or marches, but there's so much groundwork to be done, and it's not glamorous."

She's really dedicated to the "elbow grease philosophy," to the premise that Negroes must learn to help themselves—in running their own organizations, as well as simple housecleaning jobs. She says:

"When we moved here 21 years ago, it was mostly white. It was a nice neighborhood. Then they tore down houses to make room for the Arena, and some Negroes starting moving in. Maybe one family in a block, then all the whites moved out.

KNOWS VIOLENCE FIRSTHAND

"Then the changes came. The streets weren't kept clean, the sewers would stink—but then I was prejudiced myself. I thought I was too good for that rough element moving in. 'My stars,' I used to say to myself, 'soap and water's free—they could at least scrub their floors—but they're just too lazy.'

"But then I thought it out. These young people were brought up during the second World War. Their parents were out working in the steel plants or wherever, and they just didn't get the right bringing up. They just never learned how to clean. That's when we got together some block parties."

This means Mrs. Richardson recruited some women from her church and neighborhood, went around pounding on doors and teaching homemaking skills.

"We scraped grime and grease off baseboards, hauled rubbish away. We got the City to haul 22 truckloads of junk away from one court. We even got the landlord to agree to give us enough poison and spray to fumigate the houses."

The only trouble was, the crew went through the first house from cellar to attic, and used up five gallons of roach spray.

"When we wanted more, the landlord reneged," recalls Mrs. Richardson with a disgusted look. "Now those places are as bad as they ever were, in fact, they're boarded up. Roaches travel, you know, you can see them even on the sidewalk."

(At last report, to Mrs. Richardson's delight, the boarded-up houses are scheduled to be rehabilitated by the North Side Civic Constructors.)

But she doesn't make saints out of tenants and bad guys out of all landlords.

"One woman's house was so awful and we made so much fuss that the City moved her into the projects. Now you should see how she's wrecked that apartment there, and the neighbors are up in arms. We made a real mistake there. She's just not a responsible person."

One of Mrs. Richardson's plus qualities is her humanity and practical frame of mind. She doesn't insist that she's always right. One realtor respects her because she "is militant but in a reasonable way—she knows both sides."

Mrs. Richardson, a widow for two years, trained for her present position all her life without knowing it. She always did church charity work (she's a member of the Tabernacle Baptist Church), is a Democratic committeewoman and Boy Scout den mother.

"We were scared, so we planned our son's activities through Scouting, and planned their friends that way too. (Her two sons are 26-year-old Brother Timothy of the Capuchin Order, and Air Force Sgt. John, 22.) We used to have awful gang fights—they'd use that ball field back of here—one gang from Manchester ripped the boards out of my fence as they marched up the street. That's when I knew it was bad. This kind of violence is awful.

"We always had mischief—boys would steal potato chips or cokes, but this new breed is something else—the ones with the greasy rags tied around their heads and the knives.

"Those kids that steal food—you should see where they live—not a chair to sit on, no table, no heat or light—maybe a pot of greasy cold beans—nothing else. That kid wants something different to eat. I don't approve of it, but I can understand it at least."

So Mrs. Richardson has had much experience with the Youth Squad, Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Action Housing, ministers, priests, social workers, neighborhood groups like Perry Hilltop and Pleasant Valley Council. And, of course, all this training has made her an efficient leader of CASH. She could dramatize slum conditions for City leaders from firsthand knowledge.

And CASH's accomplishments have been steady and gratifying. Pittsburgh now has a Housing Court, a new housing code enforcement division combining City and County inspectors, a City Relocation Agency to help displaced persons find adequate housing; and adoption and enforcement of the State Rent Withholding Law.

And Mrs. Richardson's next project is the Housing Clinic.

"I want to work with sociologists and psychologists at Pitt to find out the best way to set this up—how we can inspire pride and cleanliness in people. You know, there's got to be some way. We have to find a way to teach homemaking."

The clinic, still in the planning stage, is tentatively scheduled for some time this spring.

Her vice chairman in CASH, Carl Brown, has no doubt that the clinic will become a reality.

"Dorothy's like the toughest bulldog you ever saw. Once she's on to something, she never relaxes. And she probably knows Pittsburgh's housing problems better than anyone else in the City. We never worry when she talks—because she's got the facts.

BULLDOG DETERMINATION

"She knows she's fighting a giant—lots of things have been sacred cows for years—like the Housing Authority—but Dorothy doesn't let that scare her.

"And the people she knows are fantastic—who else would have the nerve to march out to Pitt to ask the best people to help us. That's what she does, and it works. She doesn't use fancy words, but she's great with those words 'why' and 'when can we start?'

"She never takes any money for herself, and you can imagine the jobs she's been offered. She's a born organizer, but she thinks if she took money, it would tarnish her and hurt our cause. So she still does occasional day work for one woman. She's really a spiritually strong person.

"Schools used to teach home ec—but now you make a few cookies and that's it. Dorothy knows our girls have to learn housekeeping somewhere—so we'll have a clinic, don't worry."

Mr. Brown considers Mrs. Richardson's ability to get Dr. Clifford C. Ham, urban affairs expert at Pitt, to help CASH with its presentation before City Council, one of her real triumphs.

"Can you imagine what it would have cost if we'd had to pay for this kind of a study? We'd never have been able to do it," he says.

Although Mrs. Richardson is noted for her calm and easy manner, she has been known to show tears and temper as tactics to get things done. She despises violence, suspects many riots are Communist-inspired, and she thinks the Afro haircuts and costumes and separate black nation "a lot of nonsense."

"I don't need that stuff to know who I am. I'm a Negro, but an American Negro. The only way we're going to get anywhere is to live with white people on an equal basis—to work together to live better. It's going to take a long time, but I think we'll make it."

That's the credo of Dorothy Mae Richardson, whose dream is to take the word slum out of the American vocabulary.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy speech contest. This year over 400,000 high school students participated in the contest competing for five scholarships which are awarded as top prizes.

I am very pleased that the winning speech for the State of Michigan was delivered by a constituent of my Third Congressional District, Miss Bozena K. Bienias of Battle Creek. In order that my colleagues may share its contents and appreciate its message, I insert it at this time in the RECORD:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Bozena K. Bienias)

It is commonly known in every country of this world, that America holds and has to offer the most desperately fought over, and most revered of all man's treasures, freedom. We do not sell America calling it a utopia though. It is enough that we Americans have within our grasp the power to choose. Here lies the difficulty. Here waits the challenge.

We know that the world is not as it should be, that while knowledge has increased, happiness from liberty hasn't always. In the presence of hunger, unemployment, faults in government, and countless other handicaps, it's no wonder that democracy has had a hard time all over the world and in our country too.

America can offer its people a valuable weapon in her constant struggle to keep freedom. A well-planned, coordinated educational system is America's only light to search out and remedy tomorrow's problems. Through education and subsequent knowledge, the individual can learn and come to understand the enormity and awesome complexity of a democracy. Education will develop and nurture what will come to be his own logic and reasoning. From this point, the wisdom required to deal with the problem will come from himself.

Freedom offers its challenge to all of us. Undeniably it is a relatively difficult challenge to accept for those Americans who have felt the agony of its absence in our country. But freedom asks us to exchange our bitterness for the thought of the common good. It is a difficult challenge, and it takes the strength of an American who refuses to let his emotions control his reasoning, justified as they may be. Freedom orders us to demand it of others, but dares us to take it away from them.

I feel happy that every day I can do something for freedom. I can study it, trying to find flaws and ways of eliminating them. I can discuss these questions with my friends, knowing that it will increase stimulation and even implant interest. I can participate in class and thereby double general enthusiasm. In simply living each day, I'm learning about myself and all men. This in itself is a service in the name of freedom, for it isn't a mass of historical puppets that are involved, but humans like myself.

In conclusion, I have hope that my country will forever stand the representative of democracy, as long as she continues on the road that she follows today. As long as we keep on looking to freedom, keep on straining for it, as long as we come near to it, freedom will spread and deepen its influence, convincing the world that it is possible.

JACOB D. BEAM: SAME OLD CROWD

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, if there is a national buildup of concern and loss of faith in the leadership of our country do not blame it on the people, their anguished cries are but an effect.

The cause of any citizen's frustration lies in the many provocations from our leaders.

With 200 million Americans to choose from the folks at home just cannot take the same old "soft" crowd. There is bound to be a few pro-Americans who can restore confidence with our people.

Edward Hunter has expressed the sentiment well in Tactics for February 20, 1969, which I ask be reproduced in the RECORD followed by a portion of the Publishers Hall Syndicate column by Evans and Hall.

The material follows:

[From Tactics, Feb. 20, 1969]

SAME OLD CROWD AT STATE DEPARTMENT

The Washington bureau chief of one of the major London newspapers told an American associate that the projected appointment of Jacob D. Beam to be American ambassador to the U.S.S.R. was being interpreted in Europe as the signal to it that the new Administration "is afraid of the Soviet Union." He declared it widely known that Beam's record, clearly documented, portrays a man who is highly vulnerable to intimidation and seduction by pro-Soviet apologists and agents. He stressed that this assessment is accepted in the foreign ministries of Europe, especially in Germany and behind the iron curtain.

Beam's selection, if it goes through, will be regarded as the pivotal choice of the new, Nixon Administration. The attitudes and policies toward it by the European governments will be based on this premise. Even if the appointment were withdrawn at the last minute because this reaction became known at the White House, the damage would not be fully eliminated. The fact that even consideration could be given to such an appointment is damaging.

Beam is well known at the United Nations, where he frequently shuttled during his State Department service domestically. Members of such delegates as Burma, Thailand, the Philippines, and other Southeast Asian states concerned with a longrange solution to the Viet Nam fighting called the prospective appointment "a disaster." A German foreign correspondent accredited to the United Nations obtained this reaction by canvassing the delegates.

The reaction among top American diplomatic and military observers in Washington reinforces this appraisal. They include those who have sat with Beam on the policy planning staff of the State Department or dealt with him as representatives of the Pentagon and the C.I.A. Beam is regarded by them as belonging to the "older generation" of pro-Soviet, socialist-oriented officers closely allied with the younger members of such agencies as the State Department, the National Security Council, and the Intelligence agencies.

Included in this element are a number of assistants now in the White House as aides to Henry A. Kissinger, the Nixon Administration's major foreign policy adviser. Knowledgeable observers in Washington note, too, that Beam in Moscow would deal mainly with Helmut Sonnenfeldt in Washington, one of Kissinger's aides, the most important on Soviet affairs, until January, the State Department's top intelligence research official dealing with the Soviet Union.

Sarah McClendon, courageous veteran Washington correspondent, recalled in a recent column that Sonnenfeldt "was the one who predicted the Soviets would never put missiles in Cuba." He scoffed at naval reports that Soviet vessels were transporting these missiles to Cuba, and was instrumental in delaying our reaction until the last, dangerous moment. The common characteristic of today's so-called "liberals" is that they refuse to believe anything opposed to their appeasement line until it hits them—or rather the United States—over the head. Yet these types manage to occupy our most vital research and even policy posts.

The take-over of our foreign service by such types that hitherto denounced Nixon the most has astonished even the ultra-liberal, socialist organs that consistently have been hitting Nixon with a barrage of virtual vituperation. An example is the New

Republic. Its Feb. 15 issue goes into detail regarding the unanticipated staffing of the White House and the State Department by these characters.

An article regarding this phenomenon by John Osborne, New Republic associate editor, entitled "Nixon's Command Staff," declares this of Nixon's prize appointee:

"Kissinger turned to State, Defense, and the academies for a talented staff—a real powerhouse," said a departing Johnsonite—that by last week totalled 25 substantive officers and is to peak at around 30, twice the number that served Kennedy and Johnson. It is hardly the aggregation of 'new faces' that Mr. Nixon seemed to have in mind before he took office, but there are dissenters in every establishment and Mr. Kissinger may have some of them among his recruits.

"They include such career Foreign Service men as Viron Vaky (Latin America), Helmut Sonnenfeldt (Soviet affairs), Donald Lesh and Robert Houdek (who worked in Dean Rusk's personal secretariat), Morton Halperin, chief of the McNamara-Clifford policy and arms control planning staff at the Pentagon and a writer of distinction on foreign affairs, is one of three recruits who ranked as deputy assistant secretaries at State and Defense. Another of them is Richard Cooper, a Yale economist and specialist in international monetary affairs. Col. Alexander M. Haig, lately a deputy superintendent at the West Point Military Academy, has been brought in to record the discussions and decisions at NSC (National Security Council) meetings and to assist in NSC staff management. One of Mr. Nixon's campaign advisers, Richard V. Allen, was appointed deputy to Mr. Kissinger before the serious work of staff organization began after the Inauguration. A Kremlinologist with stern views on how to counter Soviet and Chinese Communist power, he has taken some lumps from columnists, and for the present, has been put under wraps in an office well removed from Kissinger's."

Various Senate and House staffs were at first unbelieving and then shocked that Beam could be considered for our decisive Moscow post. "The kindest description that can be made of him is that he's a compromised boob!" a Senate analyst exclaimed. He recalled that Beam was ambassador to Warsaw when the embassy was virtually peopled by Polish mistresses assigned to its staff by the Soviet and Polish intelligence agencies. They idled around the offices, toying even with the files—seeming just to be "toying" with them. Even if the head of such a mission were no communist—and there is general agreement on this as regards Beam—to allow such dangerously scandalous conduct by members of a diplomatic staff would disqualify anyone from any position of trust.

These indiscretions characterized our Warsaw embassy under Beam from top to bottom. Some of the disastrous consequences have become known. We lost the services, for instance, of our top informer-in-place in the Polish capital, the strategically located "Michael Goleniewski," the cover name under which he became widely known in the United States; he now is known as Aleksei Nicholaevich Romanoff. He had to flee to the United States.

When the scandal under Beam became too obvious to be concealed any longer, Irvin N. Scarbeck was surfaced, and returned to Washington for trial and a prison sentence. He probably was the least of the security cases on our foreign service staff in Warsaw. Under Beam's supervision, too, the communists were able to do the actual constructing of our new embassy in Warsaw with such slight control that they could go to fantastic extremes in making it a sieve for their intelligence network, room by room!

Beam allowed the reds to bring the bricks for the new embassy from Yugoslavia, where they were made to custom-made specifications of the communists, so that every critical

room in the embassy building, including the decoding and encoding rooms and the top secret file rooms, had listening devices implanted in the walls. Imagine! For at least a year, Moscow and Warsaw agents could sit comfortably in their offices, sipping tea and gulping vodka, while hearing every word of every conversation that took place in our embassy, including the coding and the decoding of the top secret cables by the American coding clerks. They even could keep check on how the girls were doing their job.

Beam, as has become customary in the State Department in such affairs, was promoted. Obviously, there were those who considered this as work well done. Maybe this is why he is slated, as this is being written, to be elevated to the ambassadorship in Moscow. He is ambassador to Prague at present, and was there when we were surprised by the Soviet invasion of the country to which he was assigned, Czechoslovakia.

Moscow already has been contacted in accordance with protocol, this editor has been informed, and asked whether Beam would be acceptable as the new, Nixon ambassador. The Soviet Russians must have laughed as they made their formal acceptance. A communist as envoy would be less useful to Soviet Russia's relations with us, in its preparation to Pearl Harbor our mainland from space, than a compromised boob.

This Warsaw spy and sex scandal, as it is referred to worldwide, covers such an extraordinary area, touching upon all of our worldwide diplomatic undertakings, that it seems unbelievable, even as a fictional spy thriller. Indeed, because of its fantastic ramifications, one Congress staff in discouragement even recommended that no speech be given on the floor in the case, because it would be ridiculed at once by the fake "liberal" press as ridiculous on its face. Indeed, the fantastic proportions of the Warsaw sex and spy scandal have evoked skepticism and even disbelief among even normal critics of the State Department who are unacquainted with this area, and who simply declare, "I just can't believe it."

The sinister background to the bizarre nomination for our vital Moscow ambassadorship includes a press operation. The N.Y. Times and the State Department frequently work hand in glove on critical issues involving American security, particularly as regards Soviet-American relations. The case of John Paton Davies, who was technically cleared as one of the last, sly acts of the Johnson Administration, is a scandalous case in point.

The N.Y. Times came out with a purported "scoop" on Feb. 1, in a 28-inch story by Peter Grose from Washington. It came forth with the flat announcement: "President Nixon has chosen as his envoy to the Soviet Union a cool career diplomat who is well versed in both Communist affairs and disarmament." Thereupon it produced a highly laudatory biography of the amorously hoodwinked gentleman, referring to him as "reticent and discreet." He surely was all of this in regard to the behavior in his embassy at Warsaw.

Not a word was printed, however, regarding this extraordinary experience of his during the period of the sex and spy scandals in this embassy. Indeed, while space is given to practically all his other assignments, this important Warsaw period becomes an unevent. At least, in New York City.

Not so, though, in the N.Y. Times News Service, article, also under Peter Grose's byline, as syndicated across the country, and published, for example, in the Philadelphia Bulletin as a page-one article. This story, also with a picture of Jacob Dyneley Beam—his whole name is given—is 27 inches long. One paragraph of seven lines refers to his service in Poland as follows:

"In 1957, he received his first ambassadorship to Poland, which carried with it conducting negotiations with Communist China. In 1960, he returned to Washington to work with the disarmament agency."

The N.Y. Times knows better than that. This isn't even news management; it is news fabrication, the rewriting of history. Soviet Russian historians are obliged to engage in this practice, conforming to the dialectical materialist conception that some persons are un-persons, some events are un-events—they never existed. An intriguing television program, "My Favorite Martian," has the man from Mars improvising a time clock that can put you back in history to any period, and anything you do then—or don't do—will determine everything that happens afterwards, bringing about changes accordingly. History, under Marxism, is rewritten accordingly, for operational purposes.

Beam did not return to the United States in 1960. He still was ambassador. He remained so for more than a year, to 1962, during the culminating period of the Warsaw sex and spy scandals in his embassy. While detailing his career at all important points, this is what the rewriters of history would want to leave out, as an un-event, in any build-up of the man to pressure President Nixon into appointing him to a new and even more strategic post. The syndicated article, interestingly, does not have the appointment already determined, as was declared in the N.Y. Times, but says: "President Nixon will announce this week his choice" and that it would be Beam, a subtle difference. In one, we have the past tense used; in the other, the future tense.

Actually, the latter was closer to the facts. An article written this way can have either of two purposes, or both. The operation—and in this case it is an operation—may present a desired event as a fait accompli, or as already decided. In the latter instance, this falls into the category of the balloon d'essai, the well-known, political trial balloon that determines public reaction, enabling a politician to find out what he can get away with.

How was Nixon maneuvered into this? He has made himself particularly vulnerable to such intrigue. The recommendation of Beam, a compromised boob with a public record of security laxity extending to his personal life, and administrative incompetence of disastrous proportions, was made by Kissinger and Sonnenfeldt. Both have worked with Beam when he was connected with the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and later. Since Secretary of State Rogers and Elliott Richardson, undersecretary for the department of state, both are newcomers, and since Idar Rimestad, undersecretary for administration, also was at the Arms Control agency simultaneously with Beam, the facts known to practically all other persons in the State Department were glossed over or suppressed in presenting Beam's nomination to Nixon.

The operation to put Beam over is a quickie that recalls such similar attempts, as recently with Abe Fortas, that only narrowly we defeated, thanks to the alertness of Sen. Thurmond and his fortunate membership on the Judiciary Committee before which the nomination had to go. Beam already had been returned from Prague conveniently for consultation so he can be on hand for a quickie testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

At least two senators have brought the pertinent information graphically to the President's attention. Others unrelated to government have done so likewise. The quickie operation was derailed, and as this is being written, the nomination has not yet been announced, half a month after the N.Y. Times sought to make it a fait accompli. "It's a thing floating around," and "it's dropped out of sight," were two baffled reports from up high, with the emphasized clause added, "for now." Readers of Tactics and their contacts can continue to have such impact, if not distracted by our greatest obstacle, the defeatism in conservative ranks.

Ample warning, reinforced by documentation, was provided by Tactics for this en-

ture operation of infiltrating the Nixon Administration with the people Humphrey likely would have appointed. Tactics ran what constituted a series on this crucial problem. Developments show the accuracy in detail of these analyses, which could have remedied the situation if too many persons had not relaxed into the comforting, "Ain't it awful" syndrome, or simply took refuge in rooting for Wallace. Nothing stopped them from simultaneously exerting tactical influence elsewhere. A major reason for red gains is that they fight in all echelons. We can do so, too, and this case is a fine opportunity.

[From the Publishers-Hall Syndicate]

To the predictable outrage of the anti-Communist far right, their lone representative on the White House staff—Dr. Richard V. Allen—is being quietly submerged in favor of solid, professional foreign policy specialists.

Included among the aides being selected for the Kissinger staff, besides the previously announced Daniel Davidson (presently assistant to Ambassador Averell Harriman), are Mortimer Halperin (an arms control expert) from the Pentagon and Helmut Sonnenfeldt (Soviet Intelligence), Lawrence Eagleburger (Under Secretary Nicholas Katzenbach's office), Richard Snieder (Japanese desk) and Viron Vaky (Latin American affairs) from the State Department. From outside the Government, Prof. Robert E. Osgood of Johns Hopkins is a top prospect to join the staff.

WOOLING BLACKS

Instead of screaming, Southern political agents of Mr. Nixon have fully backed the Republican National Committee's unannounced decision to lift its 1969 budget for political work among minorities to a record amount for a nonelection year.

The plan, originating with minorities division leader Clarence Townes, is to spend \$175,000 at the National Committee to proselytize Negroes and Mexican-Americans for the Republican Party.

Strongly backed by National Chairman Ray C. Bliss, there was nevertheless some opposition among party pros to this high spending among voters who spurned the Nixon-Agnew ticket.

Harry Dent, the Republican South's chief resident political agent in the Nixon White House, heard about the complaints and immediately came down hard for Bliss and Townes. More surprisingly, so did Mississippi State Chairman Clarke Reed.

In 1968, the National Committee allotted \$150,000 for election-year work with minorities but spent a good deal more. The budget in 1967 was \$90,000—but \$124,000 was spent. With Mr. Nixon determined to build a majority party, spending well above the 1969 budget is probable.

WHITHER CHOTINER?

A major question at the Republican National Committee: Will Murray Chotiner go away?

Chotiner—Richard Nixon's first political manager and most controversial adviser—has had a desk at the committee since election day although he is limited to Inaugural activities. Committee staffers are uneasy as to whether he will leave on Tuesday as scheduled or remain as Mr. Nixon's agent.

SOLICITOR STAYS

Another sign of the Nixon policy of maintaining continuity is the decision by Attorney General John Mitchell, likely to be announced Tuesday, to retain Erwin N. Griswold in the key post of Solicitor General at least through the current Supreme Court term ending in mid-June. Griswold, longtime dean of the Harvard Law School and a nominal Republican, had a protracted and congenial conversation with Mitchell two weeks ago.

LAW AND ORDER

HON. MARTIN B. MCKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. MCKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, the national commander of the American Legion, William C. Doyle, recently gave an address before the New York State legislative banquet in which he made some timely remarks concerning the crisis in law and order which confronts this Nation. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

AN ADDRESS BY WILLIAM C. DOYLE, NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION, BEFORE NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATIVE BANQUET, ALBANY, N.Y., FEBRUARY 10, 1969

This traditional dinner in honor of New York State Legislators who are veterans is as venerable as The American Legion itself for this is the 50th Annual event that we participate in here tonight, and next month the Legion observes the 50th anniversary of its founding.

These are golden moments for us, and we trust for you, as we mark a half century of splendid Legion-Legislative relationships here in the Empire State and, for our own organization, a half century of dedicated service to God and Country and to our fellow man.

Unfortunately, we do not observe these golden moments in a bright period of American history where we might reasonably expect to relax for a moment in the reflected glory of past achievement. These are demanding times that exact from each of us full attention to the problems of the moment, with little time for basking in reflected glory.

The American Legion, in observing its 50th Anniversary, is operating this year under the theme of: "Fifty Years of 100 percent Americanism—a Commitment to Freedom." We don't consider that phrase an idle boast or a claim to super patriotism, but a simple statement of fact fully supported by the performance of the Legion over a half century.

However, we have conceded that we cannot rest on performance, but must live with the realities of today and, in the light of those realities, seek to plan for the future as effectively as we can. We have to live with the realities, and give our best efforts to the seeking of sound solutions to the problems of today, or there will be no future for which to plan.

Be assured that the Legion is making plans, and we are making them with confidence, because we are convinced we can unravel these terrible problems which seem to be without solution. We are convinced America can produce the leadership to inspire the better qualities of citizenship within each of us, and we believe that right now the very best any of us can produce is demanded of all of us.

It matters little who we are, or what our role may be. What does matter is that each of us is a responsible human being, that our responsibilities are to each other and to the society of which we are a part, and that each of us had better start exercising that responsibility whether it be as a parent, as a leader of men, or as an individual.

We are not going through a period of turmoil and unrest for the first time in the history of this country—not by any means—but what makes this particular period of unrest so important to us is the fact that we are involved in it. As some of you may know, my visit to New York is being interrupted by the annual American Legion pilgrimage to the Tomb of Abraham Lincoln, in Springfield, Illinois.

While we are immersed in our problems of this moment of history, a quick look at the life and times of Lincoln impresses us with the fact that the concerns of other eras were not unlike our own. We are concerned about the rule of law in today's society. We are concerned with the concept of people taking the law into their own hands. We are concerned that some people feel they can be selective in their regard for the law—obeying those laws with which they agree, disobeying those with which they do not agree. We are concerned that some resort to violence, rather than to lawful recourse, to correct their grievances.

There had to be similar problems in Lincoln's day to have prompted this line in a message to the Illinois State Legislature in 1837. Lincoln said then, and we still know it to be true today: "There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob law." This is a typical example of the wisdom of the great emancipator, an example of the timelessness of his pertinent observations about his fellow man and about our form of government.

Our 16th President, long before he assumed the presidency, was well aware of the need for high regard for the law on the part of all citizens and of the insecurity that could come to the many because of the lack of responsibility of the few.

You members of the New York State Legislature, and other distinguished guests of the official family of the Empire State, are as aware of and as concerned about this need for the maintenance of law and order and for the strengthening of our system of justice, as anyone else in this great land.

When I speak of a system of justice, I mean a system that has as great a regard for the rights of law abiding citizens as it has for the rights of the violator of the law. Believe me when I say we stand four-square behind a system of justice that is equally concerned with the rights of every citizen.

A free society is vulnerable to the action of extremists, for extremists too are afforded the protection of a system of equal justice and they are the first to exploit that protection even as they seek to destroy the system that provides it.

We have seen instances time and again across this great land where radicals of one breed or another have taunted and baited the forces of law and order and goaded these forces into action. Then comes the old familiar cry of police brutality. I suspect you and we are in agreement in the belief that there are many more charges of police brutality than there are cases of such brutality.

As a part of this 50th Anniversary observance of The American Legion, we seek new methods of impressing upon all Americans the need for an effective system of law and order. Needless to say, that system must be administered with justice, yet some seem to think they have made a new monumental discovery by adding those two words "with justice," to any mention of law and order.

We see all about us the signs that point up the need for our society to turn again to a healthy respect for law and order. These are tragic signs of the kind we have come to expect from other corners of the world, but not in America.

Among these ominous signs that call a nation and its people to order are rioting, burning, looting, and other criminal acts sometimes masked in the issue of civil rights. Undoubtedly there is a cause and a case for those who labor legitimately in the vineyard of civil rights, but let's recall once more the words of Lincoln: "There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob law."

President Nixon, just days after his inauguration, told a group of employees of the Department of Justice: "There's never been a time in this nation's history when more Americans were concerned about law enforcement," and the very same day that word appeared in our daily papers there was a progress report published by the National Commission on Violence, suggesting the so-

lutions to rising street crime, city riots and campus disorders will demand a national effort embracing "the active engagement and commitment of every citizen."

A most pertinent note in this progress report says: "The key to much of the violence in our society seems to lie with the young."

"Our youth account for an ever-increasing percentage of crime, greater than their increasing percentage of the population. The thrust of much of the group protest and collective violence—on the campus, in the ghettos, in the streets—is provided by our young people. It may be here, with tomorrow's generation, that much of the emphasis of our studies and the national response should lie."

Surely there is a responsibility of government here to determine the underlying causes of this national problem and to seek solutions. However, there is a more fundamental responsibility to these young people—a more personal responsibility—and one which, in the long run, should prove to be more influential than anything the government can do, and that is the proper exercising of family and parental responsibility to our children.

Every parent, every family, has a great deal to do with the way the young people coming out of that family environment will react to society and to life. None of us, as parents, can afford to be too busy to give proper guidance to our children, nor can we afford not to listen to their problems and try to help them solve them.

You and I, as parents, have a great deal to do with moulding the character of our children, and we had better step up to that responsibility or be prepared to accept a major share of the blame for the storms of protest and the backlash of disorder and violence which accompanies it.

Our generation is not totally to blame for what is taking place in this country today, but neither are we without blame if, in any way, we have failed to give guidance and counsel to our youngsters in the home when they have needed and wanted it.

By our teaching and by our example, parents have a great deal to do with the attitudes with which youngsters will face life. It should be in the home that a youngster learns right from wrong, that he learns something of the values for which his country stands, that he learns a respect for law and order and common decency and a respect for the rights of others. The American Legion never has discounted the role of the church and the school in this all-important matter of formulating attitudes of the young, but if a youngster comes out of the home without proper guidance the work of the church and school is made increasingly difficult, if not impossible.

This is one method by which we can shore up our defenses against lawlessness and violence, and one in which every citizen has a part to play.

The interim report, or progress report of the Commission reveals other shocking statistics, such as more than a million persons participating in demonstrations over the past five years. This is less than one-half of one percent of the population, but it still is a lot of people. More than 200 persons have died and well over 8,000 have been injured in violent urban outbursts.

The American Legion's National Executive Committee has given voice to the Legion's concern for this problem and has adopted a resolution calling for the Legion at all levels, and most importantly the Post right in the local community, "to assume positive roles in American communities, whereby Legionnaires at all levels may assist in finding and contributing to solutions to the complex problems that are eroding the peaceful, prosperous life of many cities and towns."

Local Legionnaires and local Posts are best qualified to know local community problems

and to devise methods which they feel will be most successful in helping to cope with those problems. We believe we can and should go beyond the matter of recognizing our police for a job well done. We believe we should roll up our sleeves and pitch in and help them get it done. I don't mean to suggest we take the law into our own hands, not at all, but there are things that can reasonably be done to help. For example: Many metropolitan police departments are engaged in activities such as community relations programs, designed as crime prevention programs and through which people get to know them better. Police sponsored athletic programs are a case in point. The Legion can well involve itself in this crime prevention type of activity, and Legion Post homes can be made a haven for activity aimed at the prevention of crime.

We can be of help in other ways, one of which is important to you as members of a state legislature, and I'm here to insure you that you will have the wholehearted support of The American Legion for any legislation you may consider that will strengthen the hand of our courts and our law enforcement agencies in dealing with crime and the criminal.

Finally, there is the matter of student unrest on campuses across the country and this certainly is a problem of considerable concern in New York. The American Legion believes in freedom of speech. The American Legion believes in all freedom, including academic freedom, but we do not believe any freedom is absolute and we are concerned over those who mistake license for liberty.

I have said it before, and I repeat it here: Youngsters who are smart enough to gain admission to our institutions of higher learning are smart enough to know there are rules and regulations by which those institutions are governed. If they don't want to abide by the rules they should get out.

Those in positions of some authority, teaching assistants, or full fledged faculty members, who join in these demonstrations and who encourage them, must shoulder a substantial volume of the blame for these incidents when they become violent and lawless. Lending support to an incendiary situation with the full knowledge that it can get out of hand is just the same as touching a match to that situation.

Are these the kind of people who should be entrusted with the all-important responsibility of teaching our young? I'm simply asking the question, but I think it is a question that should be asked by those who are called upon to support these institutions by tax dollars, and one for which they deserve an answer.

GOVERNMENT CONFUSION

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the enclosed is an excellent editorial written by Mr. Homer Lane, of KOOL radio and television. He points out the schizophrenic character of the Government. The Federal Communications Commission's recent proposal to bar advertising from radio and television stations is discussed in this editorial. The thoughtful points he makes deserve full consideration:

GOVERNMENT CONFUSION

Tobacco companies spend more than 200 million dollars a year advertising on radio and television. That's a lot of money, and

because it is, there will be many who think that's the only reason for this editorial. They will be wrong.

Personally, I don't smoke, I used to smoke as many as three packs of cigarettes a day. However, I made the decision not to smoke about ten years ago.

We don't believe that cigarettes are beneficial. We don't know anyone who says they are. However, and we know this is not the popular thing to say, the truth is that no one has ever proven that cigarettes are harmful or that they are the cause of any disease. In fact, there is a large body of research although little publicized, that indicates cigarette smoking to be relatively harmless.

The Federal Government encourages the production of tobacco by subsidies to growers. In fiscal 1968, the government paid out 61 million dollars in price supports. We sent nine and a half million pounds of tobacco to Viet Nam under our food for peace program. Last year, federal, state and local governments collected from the sale of cigarettes four billion, 96 million, 696 thousand dollars in taxes, of which two billion, 66 million went to the Federal Government.

These are some of the reasons we believe it is wrong for the government to say that cigarettes, a perfectly legal product whose production is encouraged by government, from whose sale the government collects billions in taxes, cannot be advertised on radio and television. Now, if the government really believes that cigarettes cause disease and death, then let's make it illegal to grow tobacco and sell cigarettes. Let's not be hypocritical and widen the governmental credibility gap.

CAMPUS DISRUPTIONS

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, Michigan State University president, John M. Hannah, has been named by President Nixon as the Administrator of the Agency for International Development. Dr. Hannah, in his last convocation address, stressed that university faculties must realize the need to provide education for the majority and not submit to the disruptions by the minority.

A fine editorial referring to Dr. Hannah's address and the problem of rebellion on college campuses, recently appeared in the Muskegon Chronicle. Under unanimous consent I include the editorial in the RECORD; it is as follows:

AS THE CHRONICLE SEES IT: A CALL FOR FIRM LINE AGAINST CAMPUS HELL-RAISERS

The farewell "State of the University" address by Michigan State University President John M. Hannah laid directly on the line some important truths about student dissent and anarchism, and the place and responsibility of the university faculty in the face of "the protagonists of disruption."

As he spoke, squads of Lansing, East Lansing and campus police stood guard outside MSU's Fairchild Theater, facing a shouting rabble of student demonstrators who chanted "Open it up or shut it down. Pigs (police) off campus." At the end of the convocation, President Hannah, MSU trustees, faculty members and others who made up the audience had to be escorted by police through the auditorium's back entrance.

The demonstration was thoroughly disgraceful, and it is encouraging to sense that its most probable effect was to underscore

and make the more memorable President Hannah's challenge to the faculty—and, by extension, all faculties—to take steps to assure "that those who teach, and those who learn, and those who do research, and those who do public service will not be interfered with by those who would destroy the establishment and who would substitute chaos for order, repression for opportunity, allegiance to their point of view for freedom.

"The basic question," he said, is "only whether you have the courage and the willingness to defend order and freedom and basic decency and ethics, and integrity and morality.

"Or," he asked, "are you going to behave like an ostrich and dive your head into the library or laboratory and say, 'let someone else worry.' If you do, you run the risk of seeing chipped away the very attributes that make your profession attractive to you and useful to society."

The line established on the MSU campus, he said, "is simple and easily understood."

"It is that in granting full freedom to examine, to listen, to speak, to dissent, to picket, that there shall be no interference with the rights of all others to carry on the work that seems to them to be important—to teach, to learn, to do research, to perform public service.

"I hope," he concluded, "you have the courage to hold that position."

So, certainly, do we.

The president called on the faculty to "continue a firm position," supporting and requiring "that whenever the protagonists of disruption interrupt the orderly operation of the university, that at that point the university request the civil authorities to take whatever steps required to permit the university to function in accordance with its objectives."

It is interesting—and relevant—to note that the MSU demonstrations of the past week were triggered by the firing of a member of the faculty—Bertram Garskopf, a psychology professor. Prof. Garskopf, one of the faculty "activists," was on the scene outside during President Hannah's address, rallying the demonstrators and manning a bullhorn, calling for "student action against the establishment."

This brings us to comment on what is the really hair-raising part of the campus protest movements. It is not the irrational, irresponsible and obscene actions of the student demonstrators themselves, although this is ugly enough. What is more unsettling is the eager acquiescence in anarchy on the part of some of the faculty members who purposefully promote the disruption of their own institutions by aiding and abetting the rioters and the pornographers.

The sad probability here is that it is the great majority of their dedicated, sober and scholarly colleagues who will wind up with the short end of the stick, facing a public that is becoming increasingly outraged.

Through their own unwillingness to get involved they are turning their campuses over to a rabble of misguided toughs and naive misfits who are being led around by a small coterie of dedicated campus Reds bent, as Dr. Hannah observes, not on the improvement of our society, "but on confusion, disruption, destruction and chaos." The very impracticability of many of their demands shows their true purpose, which is destruction of the university system through hell-raising and commotion.

Only a handful, of course, is speaking. The overwhelming majority of college students would like to get an education. But the handful has demonstrated its horsepower and in many cases the faculties, in the name of academic freedom, are abdicating their responsibilities and, in a real sense, selling out their own futures.

President Hannah is saying that the time has come for faculty, administrations,

trustees and regents to decide whether to give battle or surrender. Giving battle will mean the prompt calling of police when classes are interfered with and the free movement of students is blocked. It will mean the prompt dismissal not merely of the ringleaders, but of all who actively participate in riotous efforts to seize control.

University authorities can't win the battle alone. The press, the courts and the general public will have to make it plain—and there are indications they are ready—that the right to teach school overrides any right to wreck a school. Using muscles instead of minds to express dissent has no place in a democratic society.

The way to run a university is to run it, first, and improve it, second. The student activists must understand that the right to attend a university is a privilege. Those who abuse that privilege by striking at the freedom of the university have no just cause for complaint if their misconduct leads to expulsion from the community whose rules they refuse to accept.

BIAFRA

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I was able to visit first the secessionist Republic of Biafra and the Federal Republic of Nigeria. However, this visit filled me with dismay at the future of these two peoples as they struggle to find a means of mutual existence. There are many facts that complicate the Nigerian-Biafran situation. Let me make it clear that I am interested in political, military, and economic neutrality by the United States in this conflict. However, I am deeply disturbed by the feeling that our country has not done enough to aid the starving Biafrans nor to facilitate relief for either side. I do not endorse the proposal of secession for Biafra. I do, however, share the conviction that there is a future for both these peoples and governments living in unity and peace in the future. Although I support the conception of a unified Nigeria, I will not support it now in view of this unity being achieved at the cost of 10 million dead Biafrans.

Starting from this premise then, there must be something that our country can do. I would like at this time to submit eight proposals which I have endorsed on my return from Biafra. My companion for this trip was Fulton Lewis, the well-known news commentator for the Mutual Broadcasting Co. Mr. Lewis has endorsed these proposals and is similarly inclined and active in Biafran relief efforts in the United States.

I, therefore, submit these proposals as a guideline and a source of information for my colleagues.

First. The United States must immediately utilize all of its diplomatic and economic resources for the purpose of bringing about a cease-fire between the Nigerian and Biafran forces. The situation is even worse than has been reported. More than a million Biafrans, mostly women and children, lie dead as a result of 19 months of warfare and mil-

lions more face a certain and horrible prospect of death by starvation in the future unless something is done to achieve an end to the fighting and a dramatic increase in relief efforts.

Second. The United States should sponsor the construction of a new airfield inside Biafra which would be operated by neutral international authorities and would be used only for humanitarian purposes. The Biafrans can continue operating the existing Uli airfield at their own risk for whatever purposes they wish, but the new facilities would enable international relief organizations to initiate the daytime mercy flights which will be essential if the current rate of death by starvation is to be curtailed. Present night operations at Uli satisfy only 10 percent of the need for food and medical supplies. In addition, the United States should also take the lead in trying to negotiate the establishment of a demilitarized land route from Port Harcourt to Umuahia and a river passage using channels of the Niger River. Both of these would be used only for humanitarian purpose.

Third. The United States should accelerate sharply its role in the international relief operations and that role should be more realistically geared to the needs of the suffering. At present, 90 percent of the U.S. Government-sponsored relief shipments are sent to Nigerian-held territory where 10 percent of the need exists. Only 10 percent of our shipments reach Biafra where the 90 percent of the need exists. In addition, some 13,000 tons of U.S.-purchased food continues to sit and rot on the docks in Lagos while millions go hungry only a few hundred miles away.

Fourth. The United States should take immediate steps to insure its military neutrality in the Nigerian-Biafran conflict and should insist that neither side use U.S.-made weapons of war. The Nigerians, in particular have used 105-mm. howitzers and 106-mm. recoilless rifles given to them by the U.S. Government prior to—and according to Biafran spokesmen during—the current conflict.

Fifth. Likewise, the United States should adopt a policy of diplomatic neutrality, giving neither side in this war a favored diplomatic status. If present diplomatic contacts are maintained with Nigeria, similar contacts should be opened with the Government of Biafra.

Sixth. The House and Senate Foreign Affairs Committees should immediately appoint a special subcommittee to conduct an on-site inspection of the situation in both Nigeria and Biafra.

Seventh. The Nixon administration should conduct a sharp reappraisal of attitude and policy regarding the situation in western Africa with a view toward adopting a new program which will be in the best interests of our own country, of Africa, and of the people of both Nigeria and Biafra. Such a policy should be consistent with our own professed devotion to the doctrines of justice and the rights of peoples to self-determination. U.S. policy for the entire African continent must be conceived and written in Washington, and not in London. British interests are not always consistent with our own.

Eighth. The Nixon administration

should streamline existing State Department machinery so that when the decision is made to dispatch U.S. relief assistance, these shipments will reach their destination with all possible speed and efficiency. A "relief coordinator" should be responsible for stimulating private relief efforts and for coordinating these with Federal Government relief programs. He would also have the task of working to overcome diplomatic obstacles which frequently delay or divert relief shipments.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the conscience of the American people is growing increasingly outraged over the tragic war between Nigeria and Biafra. As Richard Nixon stated on September 10, 1968:

The terrible tragedy of the people of Biafra has now assumed catastrophic dimensions. . . . This is not the time to stand on ceremony or to "go through channels" or to observe the diplomatic niceties. The destruction of an entire people is an immoral objective, even in the most moral of wars. It can never be justified; it can never be condoned.

It is a source of great encouragement to me that so many Americans from every part of the Nation, representing every phase of the political spectrum, of every race and religion, the young and the old alike, have joined together to achieve an end to the horrendous suffering which this war has caused. The Vietnam war issue has divided our people. The Nigerian-Biafra war issue has cemented them together into a harmonious chorus which is crying for its leadership to get off the sidelines. On this question, Americans are most definitely marching "forward together."

It is my hope that this "sense of the Congress" resolution that I have introduced—the need for an immediate ceasefire—will get the support it deserves, and the action it demands.

In addition I am including some quotations from Mr. Lewis' weekly newsletter Exclusive which I feel are of major influence as his opinion is respected throughout the United States and in many parts of the world:

[From Exclusive, Dec. 20, 1968]

UMUAHIA, BIAFRA.—"We are Biafrans, fighting for our freedom! By the name of Jesus, we shall conquer!" Those are the words of the most popular battle song in this besieged part of the world known as Biafra, and those two sentences express very vividly the strong sentiments of the more than twelve million people who live here.

With the conviction of a *Patrick Henry* and the courage of a *Moshe Dayan*, Biafra has voluntarily proceeded to take on what sometimes must seem like the entire outside world in her struggle to preserve the economic and political independence declared May 30, 1967. With no air force and no navy, and with an army which consisted of only several thousand untrained and inexperienced soldiers—armed with a grand total of 125 rifles—Biafra went to war nearly eighteen months ago against an enemy, the Nigerian Federal government, which boasted an infantry of 50,000, supplied and supported actively by at least two major world powers—Great Britain and the Soviet Union.

Through unexcelled courage and determination, the Biafran forces have defied predictions by international military "experts" who said they would be crushed by the Nigerians in just 48 hours. After a year and a half, the secessionist eastern region of

Nigeria continues to exist and may, indeed, be on the verge of scoring some dramatic military victories of its own which could turn the tide of this war.

It is impossible to spend any time at all here without being extremely impressed by the Biafran people. I have had the pleasure of meeting and talking to hundreds of them during the past few days ranging from Lt. Colonel *C. Odumegwu Ojukwu*, the head of state, to a vast array of his military and civil leaders, to civilians in the market place and in the villages throughout the Biafran stronghold. Without exception, they are agreed on a number of points:

(1) Biafra's cause, they say, is a just one. The citizens of this "nation" feel that they have been denied their God-given human rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness by the Nigerian Federal government. As a minority in the Federal setup, they believe they were exploited and persecuted during seven years of Nigerian independence from the British Crown, and now the Biafrans insist that they be allowed to create their own independent country—the Republic of Biafra.

(2) This, Biafrans say, is a war of survival and there is no hope of reunification or even reconciliation with the Nigerian Federal government which, they earnestly believe, is bent on a course of action which can only be defined as genocide. As a number of persons here have expressed it, "If we lose or surrender in our battle, we will be slaughtered. Thus we have no choice but to fight on to the last man, woman or child."

The cost of this war for Biafra has been great. Estimates of starvation are debated even here and there is no way of determining what the actual daily death toll is, but Red Cross officials and others charged with the responsibility of trying to alleviate the hunger in Biafra are agreed that the picture has improved somewhat during the past two months as more relief flights have arrived at Uli airport. Even so, they add, there are a minimum of 5,000 Biafrans—mostly women and children—dying each day through malnutrition (lack of adequate protein or carbohydrate in their diets) or through outright starvation, and this situation is destined to get much worse in the first months of 1969. The basic staples in the daily meal here are the yam and the cassava. The latter is in abundant supply since it can be easily rooted each year from the stalks of the previous year's crop. The cassava, however, has a protein content of only 2%. The yam, which has twice as much protein content, must be planted annually from seeds conserved from some of the previous year's harvest, and these seeds are not available since virtually all of the 1968 crop has been consumed.

In short, the present daily death rate is expected to double or perhaps triple in January and February. The real crisis of Biafra lies ahead.

The Biafran charge of "genocide" is based on several things. In the first place, the citizens here remember the pogroms of July-August and September-October, 1966, when Biafrans were forcibly ejected from Northern Nigeria. An estimated 30,000 Biafrans, mostly members of the Ibo tribe, were murdered as they tried to flee back into the Eastern region. A Time magazine correspondent gave this eyewitness account of one incident in which several hundred Ibos were killed:

"The massacre began at the airport near the Fifth Battalion's home city of Kano. A Lagos-bound jet had just arrived from London, and as the Kano passengers were escorted into the customs shed, a wild-eyed soldier stormed in, brandishing a rifle and demanding, 'Ine Nyamiri!'—which is Hausa (a predominately Muslim tribe of Northern Nigeria) for 'Where are the damned Ibos?' There were Ibos among the customs officers, and they dropped their chalk and fled, only to be shot down in the main terminal by

other soldiers. Screaming the blood curses of a Moslem holy war, the Hausa troops turned the airport into a shambles, bayoneting Ibo workers in the bar, gunning them down in the corridors, and hauling Ibo passengers off the plane to be lined up and shot.

"From the airport the troops fanned out through downtown Kano, hunting down Ibos in bars, hotels, and on the streets. One contingent drove their Land-rovers to the railroad station where more than 100 Ibos were waiting for a train, and cut them down with automatic weapon fire.

"The soldiers did not have to do all the killing. They were soon joined by thousands of Hausa civilians, who rampaged through the city, armed with stones, cutlasses, machetes, and homemade weapons of metal and broken glass.

"All night long and into the morning the massacre went on. Then tired but fulfilled, the Hausas drifted back to their homes and barracks to get some breakfast and sleep. Municipal garbage trucks were sent out to collect the dead and dump them into mass graves outside the city. The death toll will never be known, but it was at least 1,000."

Such accounts were repeated by eyewitnesses of other massacres. Those Ibos who were fortunate enough to make it back safely to the Eastern or Biafran region—some beaten and burned almost to the point of death—related tales of horror and these have been deeply imbedded in the memory of all surviving Biafrans. They are convinced that Nigerian forces, if successful in their present war effort, will not stop until they exterminate all of the Ibos' population of eight million and the six million other tribesmen who have chosen to associate themselves with the Biafran cause.

If the 1966 pogroms have not convinced Biafrans of the Nigerian "genocide" campaign, recent developments here have.

The Nigerian military effort has been directed primarily against the civilian population, and I can give personal testimony along these lines. At noon on Friday, December 13th, I sat in the office of Biafra's Chief Justice, Sir *Louis Mbanefo*, conducting a taped interview. In the midst of our conversation, there were a series of blasts just outside the window. A Nigerian air attack by two MIG and two Ilyushin 28 bombers (all Soviet supplied) was underway and the rockets and bombs rained down for approximately fifteen minutes. Chief Justice Mbanefo and I continued our interview crouched under his desk and later went outside the building to survey the damage. Less than 100 yards away from the Hall of Justice is a Methodist clinic for underprivileged children; inside, two young boys and a girl lay dead on the floor, victims of the attack. In the market place less than a block away, at least twenty other civilians were killed and scores injured. Across the street, at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital (which has two red crosses painted on the roof), several rockets had killed three nurses and one patient and had injured dozens more. There is no target which in any sense could be considered "military" within five miles of the city of Umuahia.

On Saturday, the following day, I was conducting another interview with General Phillip Eflong, Biafra's Chief of General Staff and the commander of this nation's military forces, while en route to a training center eight miles outside of Umuahia. Another air attack by two MIG's and two Ilyushin 28's forced us to abandon our cars and dive in a roadside ditch. Again, the rockets and bombs were dropped in Umuahia, although as the jets passed overhead at no more than 5,000 feet altitude they would occasionally sprinkle rockets in some of the city's outlying sections. Surveying the damage later, we found that the struck areas were again civilian markets and housing areas. The Red Cross headquarters at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was

hit, as was, ironically a prisoner of war camp. Fourteen Nigerian POW's suffered wounds.

The total casualties in just two days of air attacks were 67 dead, and more than 400 wounded—excluding the prisoners of war, all casualties were civilians.

The Nigerian commander, General Gowon, has stated that his pilots are under orders to strike only military targets but it was very obvious from the raids staged while I was in Umuahia that the attacks did not even come close to hitting areas which have any military significance or importance. Such attacks, therefore, have only reconfirmed Biafran suspicions that the Nigerians are intent upon slaughtering the people of this region including innocent men, women and children—that they are, in short, intent upon committing "genocide."

At least fourteen hospitals throughout Biafra have been either destroyed or attacked, as have dozens of churches and feeding centers. Nigerian air attacks continue to threaten the life-giving airlift of food and medical supplies into UII, an airlift which is conducted at night under maximum security to avoid the rocket and bombing raids.

The net effect of Nigeria's air campaign has been to make the Biafrans more determined than ever to fight for their survival, thus lessening any hopes for a peaceful settlement of this conflict.

(3) The Biafrans are unanimously convinced that they will be victorious in their uphill battle to preserve their independence. Their unusually high morale, they believe, is their most potent weapon. As they have held on far beyond the predictions of the enemy commanders, they feel that they have created dissension in the ranks of the "aggressors." Nigerian-held cities like Owerri and Enugu are slowly being surrounded and cut off by Biafran guerrilla forces, according to military commanders here, and these will soon be recaptured. Once the tide of the war is turned in Biafra's favor, it is reasoned, the Nigerian troops will retreat in a state of disarray and Biafran leaders are also encouraged by reports of an increasing desertion rate in the enemy army.

Although some of this talk is certainly exaggerated optimism, the Biafrans do have grounds for hope. A team of expert scientists, many of whom have only recently come "home to Biafra" from all over the industrialized world, are working day and night to develop some sophisticated, home-made weapons which will help reduce the odds which are now heavily on the Nigerian side. Grenades, copied after captured Soviet-design Nigerian models, are being mass-produced here already and surface-to-air missiles—heat seeking devices which are fired from something which resembles a stove pipe—have just been introduced in the Biafran defense arsenal. Official reports here claim that one such missile knocked out one of the attacking Ilyushin 28 bombers in last Saturday's attack. Although the plane went down behind enemy lines (and this fact has been confirmed by Nigerian spokesmen although they say only that it "crashed" from undisclosed causes) "guerrilla Biafra forces" identified the jet as bearing the serial number "BJ 10002" and named a Nigerian casualty as "Captain Salami." The three other persons aboard, all killed in the crash, were identified only as "one Russian and two British officers."

The Biafran leaders are now convinced that time will be on their side. They view the next month as being the "critical" period and if their war effort can survive this, they will be on the road to victory.

[From Exclusive, Jan. 10, 1969]

WASHINGTON, D.C.—"We are willing to pay any price, but tell me: How much more do we have to suffer? How many more of us will have to die? How much more hell are we expected to endure before we, too, achieve our

rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness?"

With this, a Biafran mother in a refugee camp some fifteen miles from Umuahia sat back down on the ground in front of a kindling fire and returned to her daily task of fraying shredded cassava which would then be mixed with water into a mashed potato-like consistency and fed to the camp's 400 children. Africans, for some reason, rarely cry but her eyes were moist and she was obviously a little embarrassed over having been a little too outspoken to the two visiting American guests, Ohio Republican Congressman Donald Lukens and me. Later, it was explained to us that this woman had lost her husband in the battle of Enugu. Two of her children had died, one from bullet wounds and the other from starvation—during the long trip back into the Biafran heartland through "enemy" Nigerian lines. One of the two remaining children had died from lack of proper nourishment at the refugee camp. Her last child, a 10-month old son, I was told, is "very sick" which, in Biafran language, means that his chances of survival are virtually non-existent.

This Biafran mother has suffered more than most, but, significantly, she has not slackened or become discouraged insofar as Biafra's struggle for independence is concerned. She asked only how much more she and her fellow countrymen will have to endure before they earn peace and freedom.

Of all my many experiences in Biafra, this brief conversation will be the most difficult to forget. This woman's words typified the attitude of every Biafran I met and they represented the qualities which make the Biafran Africa's most outstanding native product: courage, determination, endurance, faith and confidence.

Biafrans make no secret of the fact that they are disappointed in the United States stand on the 19-month-long war in western Africa. Aware of the fact that the U.S. has sacrificed tens of thousands of American lives fighting for the right of self-determination for the peoples of South Korea and South Vietnam, in conflicts which have been labeled by some as "civil wars," the Biafran questions what makes his cause different.

The analogy between Biafra's situation and that in South Korea and South Vietnam is a valid one. In each case, a formerly united territory (Nigeria, Korea and Vietnam) has been divided into two parts—the people, in one, claiming their right to independence and self-determination, while the leaders of the other initiated military action to force reunification under their domination. In the instances of Vietnam and Korea, the United States was a principal sponsor of territorial division and went so far as to militarily support the sectors which were fighting for independence and the right of self-determination. In these two struggles, American troops were aligned on the side which was combating communist forces.

In the war between Nigeria and Biafra, the United States has adopted a completely opposite policy. It has diplomatically supported Nigeria's demands for reunification, and has thus endorsed the philosophy that the people of Biafra shall not be entitled to their political independence and their right to self-determination. In this conflict, the United States has aligned itself with Moscow's communist rulers who have been the principal contributors to the Nigerian war effort.

State Department officials here offer a weak argument in support of this apparent hypocrisy. To become involved in the struggle in western Africa, they say, would be the beginning of a new Vietnam-like military confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union. In addition, to take a pro-Biafran stand in this war would be offensive to our allies in Great Britain (who are also supporting Nigeria). For these reasons,

our diplomats explain, "The United States is necessarily locked into a position of non-involvement and non-intervention."

From the Biafran point of view, the policy of the United States has been anything but neutral in this conflict. Biafran forces have captured numerous American-made weapons which somehow had made their way into Nigerian hands, including powerful 105 mm. howitzers and 106 mm. recoilless rifles. The Biafrans also feel that they were sabotaged by an American citizen—a bizarre story which was published in the November 22, 1968 issue of "The Leopard," the weekly newspaper of the Biafran armed forces:

"About twelve weeks ago, the enemy entered Aba. Two weeks later, they sneaked into Owerri. Almost at the same time the vandals wangled their way into Okigwi town.

"Few of us knew why the Nigerian vandals moved so fast. The world now knows what happened.

"What really happened? What made the vandals achieve those temporary victories? The answer is British and American treachery!

"... They got the man who had made millions of dollars from Biafra. His name is Hank Wharton—the man who was under contract to fly in the arms we had paid for to supplement our locally made ones. Their agreement with Wharton was that whenever the Nigerians planned a big offensive, Wharton should not fly in vitally needed arms and ammunition into Biafra.

"That was why our gallant forces were issued only five bullets each to defend Aba and Owerri and Okigwi."

Those sharp words printed in "The Leopard" are not exaggerated as they may appear to be. A highly respected and authoritative British magazine that specializes in intelligence and espionage stories—"Private Eye"—wrote in its issue of October 25, 1968:

"The one vital thing Biafra lacked was an outside base from which to fly in arms and other essential materials. The only country willing to give such facilities was Portugal. This decision placed the Biafrans in the hands of the international arms dealer Pierre Lorez, a Frenchman with considerable influence in Portuguese government circles. Lorez provided Biafra with Mauser pattern Czech rifles using 7.92 mm. ammunition, a calibre exclusive to that rifle. Biafra had in the meantime tied up with Hank Wharton, an American, who organized the airlift into Biafra.

"The then Commonwealth Relations Office, through the British Embassy in Lisbon, had been lobbying persistently to try and persuade the Portuguese to stop helping Biafra but they failed. At the same time, together with representatives of the Nigerian government, the Commonwealth Office tried to bribe Wharton's pilots to hijack planes and land them in Lagos (the capital of Nigeria). They were comparatively unsuccessful in this until August 1968 when they finally succeeded in persuading Wharton to change his loyalties to their side.

"At this time some 15,000 Nigerian troops were attacking Aba and 1,000 Biafran commandos had five rounds of ammunition per man per day to hold their advance. Meanwhile, two million rounds of ammunition were awaiting air shipment in Sao Tome, the Portuguese island south of Biafra. Hank Wharton made several excuses for non-delivery, among them bad weather, flat tires and lack of spares. The Biafrans were finally informed that one of Wharton's aircraft had 'lost' two engines and had been forced to dump eleven tons of vitally needed ammunition in the sea. During last August and early September (for a period of three weeks) the Biafrans received no arms or ammunition at all."

It was during that time that the Biafran forces were pushed back and the Nigerians took three major cities: Aba, Owerri and

Okigwi. Later in September, the Biafran government completely reorganized its plan for importing arms and ammunition. It established a new airline using new pilots, new aircraft and new spares. This one is being manned by mercenaries from the Scandinavian countries who use Libreville, Gabon as their principal base. More recently, the Biafran forces have been able to launch new offensives. They predict that within the next few weeks they will retake Owerri and Okigwi. If that prediction comes true, these Biafran victories would probably cripple the morale of the Nigerian forces and could turn the tide of this war against Nigeria for the first time.

It is doubtful that Hank Wharton sabotaged the Biafran war effort as part of a pro-Nigerian plot hatched by the State Department or the CIA, but he is nevertheless an American citizen and thus, his actions were understandably interpreted by the Biafrans as being representative of, or at the least condoned by, the United States government. The Hank Wharton incident, coupled with the declared State Department policy of diplomatic support of Nigeria, coupled with the fact that Nigerian forces have blasted away at Biafran troops with American-made weapons—all of this has created an impression in Biafra that the United States is anything but neutral in this conflict. The Johnson Administration has been callously negligent of its responsibility to ensure our neutrality and this fact may indeed be no accident. The man who is in charge of writing U.S. policy for Africa, Joseph Palmer, is admittedly pro-Nigeria. He served as the U.S. Ambassador to Lagos before being promoted by LBJ to the position of Undersecretary of State for African Affairs. And there are recurrent and disturbing reports here that the Nixon Administration intends to retain Palmer in his present post after January 20th, which would mean a continuation of the bankrupt American policies toward Africa not just insofar as the Nigerian-Biafran conflict is concerned but as they also apply to: the Rhodesian issue; the white governments in South Africa, Southwest Africa, Mozambique, and Angola; a series of other complex problems involving the black-controlled nations on the African continent—problems which will lead to many future wars in that part of the world if they are not resolved soon.

State Department spokesmen rationalize that if Biafra is allowed to divide Nigeria, it will result in a series of independence movements which will destroy the unity of nearly every other nation on the African continent. There are two answers to that speculation. First, would that necessarily be bad in view of the fact that no African nation today—even those which are united—is a model of political or economic stability. None has fulfilled the State Department's dream of "the newly-emerging democracy." The second answer was told to me by Biafran Chief of State, Col. Odumegwu Ojukwu: "Just because you legalize divorce, it doesn't mean that everyone is going to rush out to get one." That is certainly true. The only areas which would pursue their independence would be those which feel that they cannot endure or prosper under their present, oppressive situation and, according to the American philosophy at least, these people have a God-given right to pursue their freedom.

Lastly, it will be necessary for the State Department to distinguish between "involvement" and "intervention." It is true that the United States cannot spread itself thinly and risk its own national security by intervening in all of the world's disputes as an international policeman. Nobody has suggested this in the case of Biafra. It would be equally dangerous, in this small world of today, however, to ignore conflict like the one in western Africa because there, as in the Middle East and in Southeast Asia, the communists

are pursuing a policy of colonization which is part of their overall plan of world conquest. At long last, we have learned of the necessity to become "involved" in the Middle East crisis. We have shipped arms to the Israelis to counteract the massive Soviet military subsidy of the Arab nations. In the Middle East, we have also learned the art of "involvement" without the kind of "intervention" which has cost us the lives of 80,000 American boys in Vietnam and Korea. If the Soviet drive in western Africa is to be stopped, if Moscow is to be denied control of that area's rich oil deposits which are essential to the security of the NATO nations, and if the Soviet Union is to be blocked in its campaign to acquire a seaport on the Atlantic Ocean (Lagos), it will require a considerable amount of U.S. "involvement" in the Nigerian-Biafran struggle. Such "involvement" now will preclude the necessity of "intervention" later.

THE IMPORTANCE OF CONSERVATION

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Wescott E. S. Moulton, of Williston Academy, Easthampton, discussed the importance of conservation and the very serious problems our industrial society has created for our natural environment. Because of the importance of this subject, I place this speech in the RECORD:

WILLISTON ACADEMY CHAPEL,
February 1, 1969.

My text this morning is taken from various parts of the Bible.

Genesis, Chapter 1, Verse 1: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." 115th Psalm, Verse 16: "The heaven, even the heavens, are the Lord's: but the earth hath he given to the children of men."

In September 1870, on the banks of the Yellowstone River in Wyoming, an exploring party of 19 men sat around their campfire discussing what should be done with this unbelievable country they had been traveling through. Some wanted to stake personal claims for their own advantage, but Cornelius Hodges, a judge in Montana Territory, proposed the idea that Yellowstone's unique natural, spectacular beauty not be owned by a few individuals. He said, "I feel it should be a national park."

Thus a wonderful new concept was given its birth. The other men present on that historic night were persuaded and each promised to urge the proposal as vigorously as they could. These men kept their word and such was their prominence, their energy, and their followthrough that Congress two years later, in 1872, established Yellowstone as the first national park in the world.

The idea grew and prospered—You know their names: Sequoia (1890), Yosemite (1890), Crater Lake (1902), Grand Canyon (1919), The Everglades (1947), and many others all over the country even in Alaska and Hawaii.

If ever you have camped and visited such places as the Petrified Forest, White Mountain National Park, hiked the Appalachian Trail (from Maine to Georgia) and other such wonderful nature centers, you have a first-hand idea of how much these parks mean to you and will mean to your children.

If you have been to them recently you know how overcrowded they are.

The danger and the urgency are great. As

those men planned way back in 1870, on the banks of the Yellowstone, we not only should protect these parks, we must explore new possibilities for the millions of Americans yet unborn.

I return to the Bible:

Psalm 104, Verse 24: "O Lord, how manifold Thy works: In wisdom hast Thou made all: The earth is full of Thy riches.

And Ecclesiastes, Chapter 1, Verse 4: "One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh: But the earth abideth for ever."

But does it? Listen to these words.

The speed in which our world is being altered is incredible.

Forests are taken down, hillsides eroded and bulldozed. Waters filled in, and air and water polluted.

The hidden danger, the mistaken assumption is that Man is the Master of Nature.

If we so alter our environment eradicate that so it of ingredients we need for life, then we will surely pass the way of other life forms that have become extinct.

Man needs oxygen to live.

It wasn't until green plants and certain ocean plankton had evolved that the natural process was begun by which oxygen is maintained in the atmosphere. This life-giving process is called photosynthesis.

In the United States alone, oxygen-producing greenery is being paved over at a rate of one million acres per year.

The oceans have become the dumping ground for as many as a half million substances, few of which are tested to see if the plankton we need can survive them.

New factories, new automobiles, new homes, and new jet airplanes have incredibly increased the rate at which combustion takes place which results in oxygen being used and replaced in our atmosphere by carbon dioxide and carbon monoxide.

When and if we reach the point where the rate of combustion exceeds the rate of photosynthesis, the oxygen content of the atmosphere will decrease. Indeed there is evidence that it may already have begun to decline around our largest cities.

U.S. and Russian meteorologists agree that air pollution is already causing colder winters.

Recently, deposits of D.D.T. have been found in human beings all over the world. Its extreme danger is that its residue lasts longer and is more deadly than scientists had previously held.

The evidence has become overwhelming that effective pesticides of much lower general toxicity are now available and that the use of D.D.T. should be outlawed.

No one in the world knows, when we aim at a particular pest, which other organism may be eliminated by a ricochet.

If some pesticide, herbicide or defoliant should by inadvertence kill too many of the nitrogen-living organisms—those organisms that enable living things to make use of the nitrogen in the atmosphere—then life on Earth could end.

It is that simple. It is that dependent. It is that fragile.

What can you as an individual do about all this?

You can write your Congressmen. The most effective way to present your view and concern is to write your Senators and Congressmen in your own words by personal letter.

A couple of weeks ago, our teacher, The Reverend Douglas L. Graham, because he was concerned about the nomination of Alaskan Governor Walter J. Hickel to be Secretary of the Interior, wrote to Massachusetts Senator Edward W. Brooke about his concern.

Mr. Graham received a four-page letter in reply.

You, too, can make known your ideas and each one will be counted.

Ecclesiastes, Chapter 5, Verse 9: "More-over the profit of the earth is for all: The King himself is served by the field."

Here is one urgent example where you can test your importance, influence, and follow-through.

The Everglades National Park in Florida was established in 1947. Now it is facing extinction. Here is 1½ million acres of the largest sub-tropical wilderness in the U.S., with a tremendous variety of plant, animal and bird life.

The Everglades needs water if it is not to become a dump.

It took thousands of years to create the Everglades. Now men have the ability, the machines, and the will to destroy it quickly.

The draining of land for buildings and now the proposed new Jetport in Florida could kill this wonderful recreation area.

The Lord gave us this world, but what we do with it is up to us.

If the Bible teaches us anything, it points the way to keep ourselves and our world livable.

Let us pray—

Oh Lord, give us the wisdom to plan for the future.

Give us the will, the courage and the follow-through to make our constructive ideas known to the leaders of our country.

And help us to preserve your world and ours.

In Thy Name we ask it—Amen.

THE GREATER SIGNIFICANCE OF THE "PUEBLO" CASE

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the awesome scope of the problems involved in the *Pueblo* case is sharply presented by Herbert W. Armstrong writing in "The Plain Truth Issue" of January 1969. I commend the reading of this article to the thoughtful review of Members of Congress and others who are deeply concerned to assure nonrepetition of such disastrous incidents in the future:

WHAT PRICE HONOR?

(By Herbert W. Armstrong)

Of course we all rejoice that the crewmen of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* are back home safe—even if not as sound as they might have been had they not been subjected to almost unbelievable beatings and inhuman torture.

But many are overlooking the other side of the coin. I'm not a military man. I personally do place the value of human life far ahead of the value of matériel, ships, and military equipment. I did not vote to make the United States a military power. But it is a military power—in a world of military powers. And as such it must conduct itself as military powers are conducted—or lose face, lose honor—and, in the end, lose all freedom!

And this poses some serious questions:

To what depths of disgrace is the most powerful nation in the world willing to stoop? The United States stood disgraced before the world when it allowed the U.S.S. *Pueblo* to be captured, or to be in such position that it could be taken.

WHAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE

To maintain honor and prestige in the world the U.S. Navy should have: (1) either protected the *Pueblo* so that it could not have been taken, or (2) sent superior naval forces immediately after it and taken it back

at any cost—even to obliterating all North Korean naval forces. This nation had the power to do it. But that power is not worth much when held in disrespect and contempt by even little nations.

The manner of release of the *Pueblo* crewmen after 11 months of torture and inhuman treatment was one of the most disgraceful and bizarre diplomatic episodes in the history of international affairs. Orientals would die before they would lose face.

If they knew the truth, no nation need ever go to war. But they do not know. And they do go to war. If America is going to be part of such a world, participating in its ways and its wars, it cannot continue to endure as a free country if it is willing to cringe and crawl before little pip-squeek nations like North Korea. Do we not suppose North Vietnam, the Kremlin, and the Chinese Communists are watching and now are laughing contemptuously at us?

Yet big, powerful United States, with the mightiest military power any nation ever had, has lost all pride in that power. It signed a document drafted by North Korea meekly apologizing for offenses it says emphatically it did not commit. It is like signing an unconditional surrender to a conqueror in time of war. The very fact that the United States repudiated the contents of the document, branding its statements as lies before signing, dishonors this nation the more.

If this nation has so little honor left that it publicly confesses to signing officially to a lie, it brands itself as a liar! Military men enlist, or are drafted, as men risking their lives for the honor and freedom of their country. When the United States did have honor, it often lost a hundred times as many men to win a single battle. Military men have taught that human lives in certain instances are more expendable than military equipment or ships. Repeatedly in past wars that policy has been acted on.

But now the weak excuse is that they saved the lives of the men. The men who were not required to sacrifice their lives, are home. But the ship is not. The North Koreans still have it.

Had Theodore Roosevelt been President, the ship would have been rescued immediately after capture. Authorities today protest that to have gone in after the ship would have cost the crewmen their lives. *Of course* we don't want to sacrifice those lives! But when a U.S. Naval ship was attacked and captured by an enemy naval force, that was an act of war. And right or wrong, this nation has adopted the means of war—or maintaining and using military force—to protect its honor, its freedom, and its sovereignty as a free nation. And to accept military defeat, when attacked in an act of war, on the excuse that we were saving the lives of our military men, is to surrender in battle rather than fight and risk the lives of soldiers or sailors. To carry that policy out to its ultimate conclusion, in repeated surrenders, is to lose not only honor, but ultimately all freedom.

UPHOLDING NATIONAL HONOR

In previous wars, the United States has sacrificed hundreds of thousands of lives in uniform—for what purpose? Why, officials would answer, to protect the Nation's honor, and its freedom! No military nation can operate a military force, by accepting defeat in an enemy attack, on the excuse we wanted to save the lives of men who had offered those lives to protect our honor and our freedom!

The United States military saved those lives. We are glad they are home. But at what cost? First, they are home in obvious mental and moral exhaustion. They report having suffered inhuman tortures and beatings, prolonged isolation, attempts at brainwashing. But how many more lives will yet be lost in future battles because enemies will now be

emboldened by this display of weakness to anticipate easy victories over a United States that is afraid to fight?

Those lives were put on the block when those men donned their uniforms. If men sacrifice their lives for the honor and freedom of their country, then, even at cost of their lives—the way things are done in this world—the nation's honor should have been upheld before the world. It should have been an example that shouted to the world: "Don't tread even lightly on U.S. honor—because any nation who dares to do so will suffer the consequences." Then we should have been respected.

I have mentioned before how I was standing not more than six feet from former President Theodore Roosevelt, during President Wilson's campaign for a second term in early autumn of 1916. President Wilson was running for re-election on the campaign slogan: "He kept us out of war."

Mr. Roosevelt repeated the slogan contemptuously. Mr. Wilson had been sending the Kaiser note after note, protesting the sinking of United States ships by German submarines.

"I was President for seven-and-a-half years," said Mr. Roosevelt. "And if I were President now, I would send the Kaiser just one note—and he would know that I meant it! I did send the Kaiser a note when I was President. A German battleship was steaming toward Manila Bay to take the Philippines, then a United States possession. I sent a note to the Kaiser demanding that he turn his battleship back immediately! The Kaiser did not act. Immediately I sent a second note. But I did not send the second note to the Kaiser. I sent it to Admiral Dewey, in command of the U.S. Pacific fleet. My note ordered Dewey to steam full speed upon the German battleship, fire once over her, and order her to turn back. 'And if she does not turn back, sink her!' my note said. The Kaiser learned that I meant it!"

Yes, the United States had pride in its power then. Today we have multiple times that power, but we are afraid to use it.

Not only did this country lose face the world around by this incident, that disgraceful release was made to look like a heroic act. What a travesty on honor!

Of course we are glad these men are back and alive. We would also like to have thousands of others back alive who died in battle to protect their country's honor and its freedom.

Many, many centuries ago, the God of our fathers promised unconditionally to Abraham the overwhelming national greatness, wealth and power that has come to the United States and Britain. In Moses' day it was promised to the children of Israel of that day—*IF* they would be ruled by His laws and statutes. Otherwise, penalties would follow naturally for disobedience, and this great promise would be held back for a duration of 2,520 years. That 2,520 years came to its end in 1800-1803. Since the promise to Abraham had been unconditional, God was bound, and such vast national wealth and greatness as no nations had ever enjoyed came quickly—first to the British, then to America.

But if we disobey God's right laws and reject Him, once He has kept His promise by bestowing on us that promise, He foretold multiplied national punishments, and a complete FALL of our nations. Britain already has been reduced to a third-rate world power. Among the punishments was this: "And I will break the pride of your power" (Lev. 26:19).

This nation has rejected God in its schools and institutions of learning. Science has rejected God (though some scientists as individuals still profess Him), and set itself up as the Messiah to lead us out of our troubles. Our morals have hit a toboggan slide. Our homes and family life are breaking down. Our juveniles are delinquent. A tenth of us

are mental cases. We are rapidly becoming a nation with crime running rampant. Our people are taking to stimulants, depressants, drugs, narcotics, in alarming proportions. Respect for law and order is breaking down—and, though we don't seem to know it, our Nation is breaking down!

And here is another example: God has kept His word—He has broken the pride of our power!

HUNGER IN AMERICA

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, following is the fourth installment of the current series of "Hunger in America" which is running in the New York Times:

HUNGER IN AMERICA: MEXICANS AND INDIANS ITS STOICAL VICTIMS (By Homer Bigart)

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.—Tacked on the wall of the inner City Apostolate were four new slips from hungry Mexican-American families for food.

The Rev. Ralph H. Ruiz, who runs the mission for the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of San Antonio, glanced at the slips and exclaimed angrily: "The whole welfare system in Texas stinks."

The mission is on the fringe of Alazan-Apache Courts, the city's oldest public housing project, where some 6,000 Mexican-Americans live in wretched poverty and frequent hunger. Of all the nation's ethnic groups—white, black, brown or red—the "Mexicanos" are suspected by nutritionists of being most vulnerable to hunger.

For although there are nearly five million of them scattered through the Southwest, the Mexican-Americans have generally been undemonstrative about their misery, complaining so seldom of empty stomachs that the "Anglos" (the non-Mexican whites) give them scant attention. "Brown Power" has not yet taken to the streets of San Antonio.

Hungrier even than the Mexican-Americans, but less obtrusive because they are smaller in number and confined mainly to isolated wastelands, are the reservation Indians. Of the more than 300,000 Indians living on reservations by far the largest tribe is the Navajo of northeastern Arizona. Altogether, 115,000 Navajos exist on an arid plateau bigger than the whole state of West Virginia.

THE LAST FRONTIER

The western half of this remote region, the state's last frontier, was not opened up by roads until about 13 years ago. Even today there are Navajos who live 50 miles from the nearest improved road. Last year 20 infants were brought in dead at medical stations, according to Dr. George E. Bock, the United States Public Health Service medical director, and 18 of those deaths were attributable to delay in reaching medical aid.

At Tuba City, administrative center for the western half of the reservation, Dr. Jean Van Duzen, chief of pediatrics at the Indian Hospital, reported 27 cases of marasmus (calory starvation) and 17 cases of kwashiorkor (extreme protein deficiency) among Navajo children in the last five years. The high incidence of those two rarely found diseases would be considered fantastic anywhere else in the nation. Dr. Van Duzen said that 15 of the 44 victims died.

Among Mexican-Americans in the slums of San Antonio the ravages of hunger may be less spectacular but more degrading. Father Ruiz said Mexican-Americans found

the welfare apparatus unbearably cold and inhuman.

Father Ruiz's irritation with Texas welfare was mainly a recent lowering of the ceiling on monthly welfare payments from \$135, for a family of four or more, to \$123.

"Texas is the only state, I believe, that requires legislation every time it wants to raise the level of welfare. A referendum to increase the payments was defeated last year. The cut was made because the increasing relief load threatened to exhaust the welfare appropriation. And now there is talk of another cut."

FOOD STAMPS RUN SHORT

He took a visitor on a tour of Alazan-Apache Courts, a sprawling expanse of low, concrete block buildings with small apartments. In one home, sparsely furnished but very clean, Mrs. Joanne Gutierrez told how she and her four children existed on a \$123-a-month welfare check.

"I buy no clothes for myself," she said. "I wear castoffs from my mother and sister-in-law."

Each month she paid \$54 to get food stamps that bought her \$94 worth of commodities. She echoed a familiar complaint about the food stamp program—instead of providing enough food to last a month, the supply ran out in about two weeks. Fortunately two of the children were getting free lunches in school, she said.

The rent was \$23 a month, plus \$1.20 for extra utilities and 50 cents for "pest control." The baby's diapers required "decent soap", and there were pencils and crayons to be bought for the three daughters of school age. There were only two beds; the three girls, Mrs. Gutierrez explained, "slept crosswise" on one.

In worse plight was a Mrs. Espinosa, found with 10 children in another tiny flat. She, too, was getting the maximum \$123 monthly welfare payment, out of which she had to invest \$58 to get \$128 worth of food stamps and pay \$39 rent. That left only \$26 for all other expenses. The family subsisted mainly on tortillas and beans. Three of the children had no shoes.

Nothing infuriates a Mexican-American more than to have some Anglo suggest to him that all his troubles would vanish if he would only stop eating beans and tortillas and get on a "balanced diet."

"If you have one dollar," explained Father Ruiz patiently, "and you can buy either one pound of meat or 10 pounds of pinto beans, what are you going to buy? You are going to fill the stomachs of your kids with beans. And they call this ignorance!"

"I'd like to meet the home economist who says you can take care of 10 kids on \$123 a month! It would take a genius to survive on that amount of money."

He said he had been asked to appear on a television show called "Buen Appetito", an educational program intended to get Mexicans off starch. He had told the producers that the idea was preposterous: the poor simply did not have the means to buy the "balanced" foods.

Downtown, Albert A. Pena Jr., a Mexican-American member of the Bexar (San Antonio) County Commission, said he believed there were "100,000 hungry people" in Bexar (pronounced Bear) which has a population of about 800,000 (48 per cent Mexican-American, 40 per cent Anglo, 12 per cent Negro).

They are hungry, he said, because San Antonio is "a cheap-labor town—about one-third of the wage earners earn less than the accepted poverty level of \$3,000 a year."

CITES MEXICAN PRIDE

Yet Anglos, he said, cling to the myth best expressed last year by a state welfare official: "You can give a Mexican mother a bushel of money and she'll still feed her children beans and tortillas."

"This is a base canard and he knows it," Commissioner Pena said.

Many Mexican-Americans are too proud to admit they cannot feed their children properly, Father Ruiz explained, and are bruised by the coldness of welfare personnel. So "cells" have been set up in the housing project to detect and report families in trouble. Rummage sales and bingo parties are held to assist the unfortunate.

Texas was the first state to complete a nutrition study of its low-income population for a national survey by the United States Public Health Service.

The findings confirmed the presence of serious malnutrition among the Mexican-American, Anglo-American and Negro poor.

In the lower Rio Grande Valley, the investigators discovered an infant suffering from marasmus and another afflicted with what Dr. William M. McGanity, one of the directors of the survey, called "pre-kwashiorkor."

The findings of malnutrition and of evidence of growth retardation among children gave some substance to an earlier report by Dr. Francis J. Pierce of the eating habits of low-income families in San Antonio.

Dr. Peirce, who is an associate professor at the Worden School of Social Service of Our Lady of the Lake College, directed a staff of students and faculty in interviews with 967 adults and 561 children, most of them Mexican-Americans.

The findings were sadder. Of the children studied, 272, or nearly half, were judged as having an inadequate diet. A total of 650, or 67 per cent of the adults, had inadequate food intake in the 24 hours preceding the interview.

Some critics challenged the validity of Dr. Peirce's survey. Dr. Peirce said he had "great conviction" that it was reliable.

He was pleased that the preliminary report of the National Nutrition Survey tended to support his bleak picture of diet inadequacy. But he said he was disturbed by a tendency to "explain away" the exposed malnutrition as the product of "ignorance."

"Let's face it," he said. "People are hungry because they are poor."

On the windswept Navajo reservation, Indians are suffering the traumas of converting from a pastoral living to a cash economy. Traditionally, the Navajos have been sheep and goat herders. But the land is arid ("it takes 10 lousy acres to graze one sheep," Dr. Van Duzen explained) and the population has grown so rapidly that most Indians can no longer live on goats and sheep.

POVERTY SEEMS TO DEEPEN

Efforts to bring industry have had minimal success, providing a few hundred jobs, mostly for women. For most of the population poverty seems to have deepened. The average Navajo sees about \$400 in cash a year, including welfare payments. Dr. Van Duzen said there were many families with no visible income who were kept alive by charity from their clan.

"I'm not saying Navajos are dropping dead of starvation," she said, "but there is hunger—and it shouldn't happen in the United States."

In the children's ward, Dr. Van Duzen observed Navajo infants who she feared had suffered irreversible brain damage from undernourishment. The babies were gaining weight, but some still showed growth retardation. Dr. Van Duzen noted a three-month-old baby described as "marasmic," whose flesh hung loose, like an old man's skin, on pathetically thin arms and legs.

She said she was convinced that many were permanently stunted by hunger.

"Some say these are small little kids that won't grow because they are Navajos," she said. "I say these are small little kids that won't grow because they haven't got food."

At Many Farms, Dr. Robert Roessel, Jr., president of Navajo Community College, the

reservation's first junior college, called malnutrition one of the most acute obstacles for Indian children in classrooms.

ATTENTION LIMITED

"They look weak and gaunt to begin with," he said. "Their attention span is abnormally limited."

He charged that some public school superintendents prided themselves on virtually eliminating free lunches for Indian children. They did this, he said, on the mistaken notion that they were "teaching the Navajos responsibility and helping the children adjust to the world in which they live." But they were driving away Indian children unable to pay \$1.50 a week for lunches, he said.

The community college is the first reservation school with an all-Indian school board. Six board members have never been to school and the seventh has only a second-grade education. Yet Dr. Roessel said the involvement of Indian parents in the operation of the school had eliminated so many tensions and hostilities that the students were already showing marked improvement in achievement rates.

Impoverished Navajos, he said, received free food under the commodities distribution program. But the commodities available were "woefully inadequate" and "didn't begin to meet the need."

At Window Rock, capital of the Navajo nation, Dr. Bock, the health service director, spoke of some of the difficulties of administering health over the vast reservation with a small, overworked staff.

THIRTY-MILE WALK WITH BABY

He told of a woman who had walked 30 miles from her hogan, the traditional circular hut made of cedar logs and mud, to the nearest traveled road, carrying a sick baby.

He had been urging the training of at least 110 Navajos as local health aides who would teach certain basic health practices and principles to the Indians of their localities. Funds for the project had finally been allocated, he said, but only for the training of 35 to 40 Indians.

Dr. Bock mentioned one promising development—the provision, since Christmas, of supplementary rations for infants and pregnant or lactating mothers who obviously were malnourished. Doctors were authorized to fill out prescriptions for food, he explained, just as though they were issuing prescriptions for medicine.

And the Office of Economic Opportunity has provided \$42,000 for the purchase of a special baby formula fortified with Vitamins A, C and D, niacin, riboflavin, thiamin, calcium, phosphorus, and iron to be given to premature babies.

Unfortunately a year's supply of the formula costs \$308, so only about 130 infants, or just about half of the 250 to 300 premature babies born each year on the Navajo reservation, will be taken care of.

CHURCH RESOLUTION ON VIETNAM

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the Council for Christian Social Action of the United Church of Christ adopted a resolution on Vietnam. The resolution began by expressing general support for the emphasis the President placed on peace in his inaugural address. Then it added four suggestions:

First, Negotiation, "unilaterally if necessary," with the North Vietnamese.

Second. The start of troop withdrawals, "with or without the consent of the Saigon government."

Third. Active participation of divergent groups in South Vietnamese politics.

Fourth. Use of multilateral channels for Vietnam's postwar reconstruction.

All these points, Mr. Speaker, are worth the consideration of our Members. Therefore, I place the full resolution at this point in the RECORD:

We welcome the emphasis which President Nixon placed on the attainment of peace in his inaugural address. We believe he was accurate in stating that because the people want peace and the leaders are afraid of war, "the times are on the side of peace," and that America now has "the chance to help lead the world at last out of the valley of turmoil."

The acclaim given at home and abroad to the President's peace theme shows the widespread support he has to move forward in the "era of negotiation." We join in that support and urge prompt action in the most pressing of the negotiations, namely, those dealing with Vietnam.

While the talks continue in Paris, violence and suffering continue in Vietnam itself. We cry out in anguish over each day of delay. We deplore the continued destruction of the Vietnamese people, their children, their land, their culture as well as the loss of American lives. This level of violence is detrimental to peaceful settlement.

We wish to add to our general support for the President, these specific suggestions:

First. Negotiate, unilaterally if necessary, with the North Vietnamese. It is with Hanoi that agreement must be sought for the withdrawal of troops. We believe our Government has been unduly deterred by the footdragging of the Saigon Government. They are the beneficiaries of tremendous American sacrifices, but it is not for them to decide how and when the U.S. reduces its efforts there. It is important to recognize the self-interest of Saigon officials in the U.S. presence, and realize that the U.S. must make its judgment independently.

Second. Begin troop withdrawal, with or without the consent of the Saigon government. We believe a significant consensus has been reached in this country favoring a de-escalation in Vietnam, and the beginning of withdrawal of U.S. troops. We share this conviction. This means that the U.S. Government should notify the Saigon Government immediately of this intention in order to give it opportunity and time to adjust itself to the new realities, and if it wishes, to make accommodation or arrangements for internal peace with the divergent forces within South Vietnam. Time is short. These arrangements should be concluded without further delay.

Third. Work for the active participation of all divergent groups in the South Vietnamese political arena. We believe our government should strongly recommend to the Saigon Government that political prisoners be released from jail. Many persons in South Vietnam are represented by neither the National Liberation Front nor the Thieu Government. It is quite likely that only these people in a "third force" can bring stability to that unhappy country by providing a catalyst around which the divergent elements in the population can form a viable government. And it is quite possible that any future economic aid the U.S. might give would be wasted unless a broad national government can be established which should include representation of diverse interests, not excluding the National Liberation Front.

Fourth. Use multi-lateral channels for the post-war reconstruction of all Vietnam. We dare not forget that when the killing has stopped and the immediate suffering has

been mitigated, the road to reconciliation is long and the task of reconstruction is massive. We urge the President and Congress to offer ample resources, working through multi-lateral channels, to press forward with haste to bind up the wounds of all the peoples of Vietnam.

With this statement of support and recommendation, we wish the President God-speed in his quest for peace.

CANAL ZONE WINNER OF VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars sponsors a Voice of Democracy contest. This year's theme was "Freedom's Challenge" and over 400,000 students participated in the contest.

The winner from each State and the Canal Zone is brought to Washington for the final competition and will attend the congressional dinner to be held on March 4.

It is my privilege to include in the Extensions of Remarks, the speech of the winner from the Canal Zone, Miss Leslie Marek, which presents some thought-provoking facts:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE: THE FIELDS

One bright April morning I set out to explore my surroundings. After an exhausting walk, I reached the crest of a hill. Looking down, I marveled at what I saw. Below me were three fields. The first field was parched and looked as though it had been subjected to drought for several months. Nothing was growing on it but a few weeds which needed little moisture to survive. Crows were hovering over this area in search of the tiniest morsel of food, and, although only a minority were finding something to satisfy their hunger, all of the birds still remained. I couldn't understand this and wondered why they did not seek greener pastures. It was as if there was something present which was preventing them from searching elsewhere. A few of the crows were quarrelling over a seed with the smaller bird. Moments later, the little bird, his hunger still with him, flew away. Turning my head, I gazed upon the second field. It had a crop of golden wheat growing on it. At first glance, it appeared to be a very healthy crop. Upon closer observation, however, I noted that each stalk of wheat was surrounded by weeds which were interfering with the growth of the grain. Already some of the wheat was drooping and withered. The thin stalks with so little strength and defense against the weeds, held themselves proudly until they could no longer fight and sadly surrendered to their victors. It was almost high noon, time for me to return home. I faced the third field. Its soil was a rich brown and freshly plowed. Sprouts of wheat were pushing up from the soil. I pondered, "Will this field be faced with drought, invasion by a large population of crows, or destroyed by aggressive weeds?" Slowly walking down the hill, I realized that each person in his own way is a farmer. His crop is freedom, and he must work for this crop and the field on which it is grown if he desires a bountiful harvest year after year. He must first "plow the fields" to prepare himself for freedom and then plant the seeds. How well the farmer cultivates these

seeds depends on his character. If he is willing to risk things dear to him and weather the droughts even though the disappointments be great, then his harvest will be rewarding. The two greatest threats to the crop of the freedom farmer are:

- (1) Communist aggression, and
- (2) The increasing poverty all over the world which has created bitter feelings between those who have and those who have not, and served as a breeding ground for widespread disease and illiteracy.

I returned to the hill some weeks later only to find that the crows still hovered over the drought stricken land and the weeds still choked the wheat stalks of the second field. The green sprouts of the third field were now stalks of wheat. It was a very still day and the sun was beating down on the wheat. As I departed, I noticed a stalk of wheat entangled with a weed and drooping, and heard the caw of an approaching crow.

FLIGHT 1969

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege during the month of January to attend a district meeting of the American Legion Auxiliary and there listen to a prayer in the nature of an invocation, by Mrs. Scott Wilson, of Kansas City, Mo. This invocation impressed me so much at the time that I requested a copy be forwarded to our office in order that I might share it with my colleagues and those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The weather has been so bad in Missouri that the next district meeting was canceled. For that reason, the exact wording of the invocation did not reach my office until a few days ago.

Yet even in the middle of February, the consideration of thoughts on the good human characteristics as well as human frailties, such as procrastination, prejudices, excess mental baggage, chips on the shoulder, and an attitude of humility, all of which are contained in this prayer, deserve to be printed regardless of date. After all, if New Year's resolutions are worth anything in January they should be worth just as much in February. The invocation follows:

FLIGHT 1969

The airport terminal was crowded. It was my annual flight. Often as I had made it, the thrill of adventure, of expectancy was still there in spite of a half-bored anxiety as to how it would come out. I always felt a little afraid. What did this flight hold for me? With mixed emotions I waited for my luggage to be weighed. "Your bags are very much overweight." The extremely courteous voice was apologetic, almost as if he felt sorry for me. "That's all right," I smiled at him. "I'm used to overweight, I'll pay the charges." "I'm sorry," he said, "this time you cannot pay. The flight is crowded. You'll have to reduce your luggage." "That is impossible. It contains only the things with which I always travel." "It will have to be done," he said, and shoved it towards me. "The stewardess will help you." Already my bags were being opened and a hand was rummaging through them. "This is quite heavy," the stewardess said, taking out a big bundle. "These old prejudices have outlived their usefulness. We will throw them away." Into a large re-

ceptacle marked "useless" went my prejudices of other days which through the years I had so carefully hoarded. "What ever can this be?" The stewardess was drawing out a big package from the bottom of the bag. "I do declare," she said as she untied the bows of ribbon that I had tried to make attractive. "It is full of 'put-offs.'" "Put-offs?" I said, quite puzzled. "Yes, 'put-offs,' all the things you meant to do, letters to write, friends to call, cheery words to speak, and thoughtful attention to bestow. My, my, how did you ever accumulate so much?" Without waiting for my answer, she tossed the whole package, ribbon and all, into a basket marked "too late" and picked up another bundle. "This rattles," she said. "Must be chips you have carried on your shoulder for a long time." She tossed them into the open fire, and up in smoke went by pet grievances. "This is heavy." The stewardess was holding a brightly colored bottle, filled with a dark, heavy liquid. "That," I said with dignity, "is my precious bottle of pride. It perfumes my personality. I'll keep it, please." I held out my hand. "No." The voice was stern. "Its odor is obnoxious. I shall break it." The bottle crashed to the floor, and through my tears I saw its contents ooze away. "Come," the voice was kind again, "your flight is almost ready. I will help you repack. Here, where you had prejudices we will tuck in opportunity. It doesn't weigh anything and fresh supplies are always at hand. New ideas are so wonderful with which to experiment. At the bottom of your bag where you had 'put-offs' we will pack a whole tray of kindness and put them on top for convenience. We'll not bother with fancy bows of excuses, they only add to the weight. In place of shoulder chips, which must have been very uncomfortable to wear, we will put pads of love and understanding. They give perfect contour to the shoulders. Garments worn over them have a beauty that can never be surpassed." Over the loud speaker came a voice, "light 1-9-6-9 Now Loading." I snapped my bag shut. "I am sorry about the bottle of pride," the stewardess said. "It was quite necessary to break it. In its place I have given you the golden bottle of humility, let its mist surround you and you will walk in the aroma of loveliness." "Flight 1-9-6-9, All Passengers Aboard."

The plane lifted and I was away on my flight of 365 days. Old inhibitions dropped away as the ground receded. I settled into my seat and smiled at my fellow passengers. It was going to be a good flight. The flight of 1969. I was going into it with no excess baggage.

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA MARKS 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the University of Nebraska, which has contributed much to Nebraska and the American way of life, celebrated its 100th birthday on February 15.

As the university moved toward the close of its 100th year, there was a flurry of activity highlighted by selection of its chancellor, Clifford M. Hardin, to be Secretary of Agriculture, and establishment of the University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Though the December appointment of Chancellor Hardin by President Nixon provided exciting moments in the university's continuing history, perhaps no date will be more important than July 1,

1968. It was on that date that the former Municipal University of Omaha, my alma mater, became the University of Nebraska at Omaha in an impressive ceremony on a midsummer morning.

This added more than 10,000 students and new vistas of academic and service opportunities to the University. As classes began last fall, one of every two students attending college in Nebraska was enrolled at the University. Total enrollment reached 29,812 with 19,024 on the Lincoln campuses and at the Medical Center in Omaha and 10,788 at the University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the University of Nebraska and its accomplishment in its first 100 years. I am certain the next century will find it contributing even more to Nebraska and this Nation of ours.

I commend the following article on the University of Nebraska, which appeared in the February 9 issue of the Omaha World-Herald Magazine of the Midlands to the attention of my colleagues:

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA: MANY THINGS TO MANY PEOPLE

On a crisp autumn Saturday afternoon, many people may think of the University of Nebraska in terms of a group of healthy young men in scarlet and cream uniforms upholding the prestige of the state before 66 thousand screaming football fans.

But for a housewife, the university is a place to write seeking information on how to bake a better cherry pie.

For the farmer, N.U. offers an opportunity to learn more about the performance of a certain make of tractor in the field under conditions of stress.

And for a small boy with an inquisitive mind, Nebraska's major institution of higher learning may open the door to a world of physics or engineering.

The University of Nebraska means many things to many people. But just how did the "home of the Cornhuskers" become what it is today—an institution where some 30 thousand young people are savoring the fruits of knowledge?

The university is celebrating its one-hundredth birthday next Saturday, but in the minds of the pioneer settlers—men and women who were thinking of education almost as they sought food and shelter—the university goes back even farther. It was in the mid-1800's—while Nebraska was still a territory—that talk about a state university first began.

In 1855, in his first speech to the first Territorial Legislature, meeting in Omaha, Acting Gov. T. W. Cuming made an impassioned plea for higher education.

At Cuming's urging, the Legislature chartered Nebraska University at Fontanelle and two other institutions in Omaha City and Nebraska City.

Bitten by the education bug, the lawmakers in the next few years approved no less than 24 universities and colleges. One was approved without designation of a site, which led a state senator to declare: "The Nebraska University system apparently is on wheels."

Although nothing came of these early decisions, they were the opening wedge that led Senator Cunningham of Richardson County to introduce a bill on February 11, 1869, which called for the creation of what today still is THE University of Nebraska.

After discussion in both Senate and House—Nebraska until 1937 had a two-house Legislature—the legislation passed on February 15, 1869—the final day of the session. It was sent to Gov. David Butler, who im-

mediately signed the bill into law. Thus next Saturday, February 15, 1969, will mark the Centennial of the signing.

As approved, the act provided: "That there shall be established in this state an institution under the name and style of 'The University of Nebraska.' The object of such institution shall be to afford to the inhabitants of the state the means of acquiring a thorough knowledge of the various branches of literature, science and the arts."

The university's charter provided for these departments or colleges: ancient and modern languages, mathematics and natural science, agriculture, law, medicine, practical science, mechanics and civil engineering. A College of Fine Arts was to be established when the annual income of the university reached 100 thousand dollars.

At first, there were 12 regents—nine selected by the Legislature, plus the Chancellor, the Governor and the superintendent of public instruction. In 1875, when a new State Constitution was written, the size of the Board of Regents was reduced to six, all elected by direct vote. Last fall, a Constitutional amendment was approved which authorizes the Legislature to increase the board's size and to provide for redistricting.

The act establishing Lincoln as the site for the State Capitol also provided for the location of the university in Lincoln.

Some 12 acres on the northern part of the city plot were selected. As one editor of the day put it: "The site must have been selected blindfolded. No angel whispered to them of seats of learning set upon hills. The gentle slopes of this Antelope Creek valley (now southeast Lincoln) were ignored and a site bordering the Salt Creek valley and inevitably in the path of railroads (then imminent) was chosen."

The Legislature authorized 100 thousand dollars, a princely sum, for the first university building. From the very start of construction this structure was the center of a fight involving politicians, architects and educators.

First, a contract calling for an expenditure of \$128,480 was approved—more than 25 percent higher than had been authorized. This brought editorial criticism. Next, before any student was authorized to set foot inside the doors of University Hall, the cry was raised that the building was unsafe.

Repairs were made and, finally, on September 7, 1871, the university opened with an enrollment of 20 collegiate students and one hundred in the Latin School. The state of Nebraska had a university! But rumors continued that the building was insecure. More architects were called to examine the foundations.

Finally, a new foundation was ordered. Foundation walls, as they were torn out, were scrutinized by an architect under the direction of Attorney General J. R. Webster, who reported that the foundation, indeed, had not been built in accordance with the specifications.

But controversy over the safety of the university's one and only building wasn't the sole problem confronting the first Chancellor, A. R. Benton, who came to Lincoln from Alliance, O., where he had served as president of Butler College. There was the matter of his salary. The agreed-upon sum was five thousand dollars, but shortly after he reported for duty it was reduced to four thousand.

Chancellor Benton, in his inaugural address, told Nebraskans: "You have a right to expect constant progress, enlargement, improvement; but we cannot spring into being with the prestige and accumulated resources of some of the other universities at the waving of any magic wand, however potent."

What brought the biggest trouble to Chancellor Benton was not U-Hall or his pay, but his demand for compulsory attendance by students at the daily chapel and Sunday

church services. This was the start of difficulties that resulted in his decision in 1876 to leave Nebraska.

Oddly, in view of the heat of the church-vs.-state arguments, the regents chose another churchman to succeed Dr. Benton. He was Dr. Edmund B. Fairfield, who served six years.

Like Dr. Benton, he was caught in the middle between those faculty members who wanted the university to be free of religious influence and, on the other side, the strong moralists. Dr. Fairfield and four of the liberal professors resigned in protest.

Despite its early setbacks, the university was growing and making progress. A graduate program, first west of the Mississippi, was started in 1885, and the Graduate School was established in 1896. Four years later, as the Twentieth Century dawned, Nebraska had granted 131 Masters' Degrees and nine Doctor of Philosophy Degrees.

By 1905 it was apparent that a bigger campus was needed. There was talk of abandoning the "town campus," or what is known today as the Lincoln City Campus, and consolidating all functions of the university at the College of Agriculture campus—identified today as East Campus.

At about the same time there arose talk that an effort would be made to move the university to Omaha. This created fears among Lincoln business men that their No. 1 industry would be lost forever to the state's fastest growing and largest city. This move was squelched.

In 1913, the Legislature asked Nebraska voters to decide whether to move everything to the Ag Campus (except the College of Medicine, which had finally re-opened in 1902 in Omaha), or to maintain two campuses in Lincoln.

Voters approved the dual-campus system, and also okayed a six-year special mill levy for construction, thereby setting the stage for development under a system that remained unchanged until the former Municipal University of Omaha was merged with the University of Nebraska at Omaha.

In the years preceding the 1913 vote, the university was fortunate to have one of its most effective leaders. He was Chancellor E. Benjamin Andrews, a former history professor at Brown University, who served from 1900 to 1908. During his eight years, enrollment increased from 22 hundred to 36 hundred. The faculty increased from fewer than one hundred to more than 350, and legislation appropriations rose from 450 thousand dollars in his first biennium to more than \$1,300,000 in his last.

Despite his ability to increase financial support for the university, Chancellor Andrews refused to seek money for himself. The regents offered to raise his salary. He turned it down, explaining: "As the university is compelled to the rigid economy it now exercises, so must I turn down this offer."

The next Chancellor, Dr. Samuel Avery, held the post longer than any other—19 years, from 1908 to 1927. It was during his tenure that the present physical appearance of the university took shape: Teachers College, Social Sciences, Andrews and Bessey Halls, the Coliseum and Memorial Stadium went up.

Dr. Avery started the university's Extension Service, which now circles the globe. He was an ardent sports fan, and football during his tenure became big time and attracted new support to the university's functions.

In the depression years of the 1930's, the University of Nebraska, like all institutions—private as well as public—experienced lean days. Serving during this period of economic strife was Dr. E. A. Burnett.

One thing about Dr. Burnett, noted a Lincoln attorney, "He looks like a chancellor!"

History scholar C. S. Boucher succeeded Burnett, and one of his first assignments

was to complete the conversion of the old privately-operated university School of Music to a university department and put it on a sound academic footing. He succeeded in the transition, but some of the music teachers and alumni of the old conservatory never forgave him.

World War II came just as the university was recovering from the double blows of drought and depression. Enrollment in 1945 dropped to a low of 3,262 students, of whom 2,045 were women.

During the war, the brand new Love Library served as a barracks for members of the Army Specialized Training Corps, just as the then-new Social Science Building had doubled as a mustering-out station for World War I soldiers in 1918.

In 1946, the regents selected as Chancellor Dr. R. G. Gustavson, a nationally-known chemist from the University of Chicago and Colorado U. Big, burly Gustavson (he didn't look like a chancellor) helped the institution through a trying experience—the educating of World War II veterans who flooded the campus financed by the G.I. Bill of Rights.

During this period, the university's physical plant was overcrowded, its faculty too small for the number of students seeking an education, and yet, some observers call this the university's finest hour. Certainly the veterans were serious students who knew what they wanted and were willing to work to achieve their goals. It was at this time that the married student—heretofore a relative rarity—became commonplace.

Dr. Clifford M. Hardin was hired away from Michigan State University, where he was dean of the College of Agriculture. He assumed the chancellorship on July 1, 1954, and departed last month under a year's leave of absence to become Secretary of Agriculture in the Nixon Administration. During his absence, Dr. Merk Hobson is serving as acting chancellor.

In Dr. Hardin's 14½ years, the University of Nebraska has experienced its largest building drive and enrollment increase in its history.

Last year, a new campus was added to the system when voters in Omaha approved the NU-OU merger.

Since its founding, the University of Nebraska has granted degrees to 82,837 students. Its physical plant is valued at \$134,900,000, excluding the UN-O campus, which is valued at \$11,025,000.

It is the thirtieth largest university system in the nation in enrollment, serving not only residents of Nebraska but of the other 49 states and many foreign countries. Its full-time faculty, exclusive of medicine, dentistry and UN-O, is 940.

Working with Federal funds, the university helped establish Ataturk University in Turkey and is currently helping the Government of Columbia set up a new program of agricultural education and development.

Looking back on the University of Nebraska after its first one hundred years, it would seem that the prediction of J. Sterling Morton of Nebraska City has more than come true. Morton, a leading citizen of the state who served in President Grover Cleveland's Administration as Secretary of Agriculture, prophesied:

"To graduate from the University of Nebraska shall be an honor among her people even now, and the day is not distant when her diploma shall be set at par with those of Yale, Union, Harvard and other great universities all over the world of art and literature."

DISTINGUISHED ALUMNI

The musical strains of "Dear Old Nebraska U." bring to their feet more than 70 thousand alumni, the great majority of whom have made their homes and built their careers in the Cornhusker state.

On its rolls of persons who received degrees from the University of Nebraska or

qualify as alumni because of attendance for two or more semesters, the Nebraska Alumni Association lists more than 41 thousand current residents of the state, engaged in the events of every Nebraska county and community.

With these statistics in mind, it should be noted that the university is engaged in a three-fold mission: to teach, to conduct research in quest of additional knowledge and to serve the state by disseminating information and making available its unique facilities for the benefit of all citizens.

And by fulfilling this mission, the university has been carrying out, over many years, its most important function, developing people—people educated and trained in the skills that sustain and enhance the lives of all.

Since its founding a century ago, the University of Nebraska has awarded 82,837 degrees, and thousands of other men and women who haven't sought degrees have taken varying amounts of academic work on the N.U. campuses and in their home communities.

The impact of these people, whose lives have been touched and influenced by this university, is felt throughout Nebraska and the nation.

In Nebraska particularly, the impact of N.U. alumni is noticeable on the professions. For instance, 937 of the state's approximately 17 hundred physicians are graduates of the university's College of Medicine. More than half of these Nebraska-trained doctors practice in cities and towns outside Lincoln and Omaha.

Official directories of the legal profession list 1,264 attorneys in Nebraska, and three-fourths of them are graduates of the University of Nebraska College of Law. In addition to private practice, these law graduates serve as judges, county and city attorneys and fill many voluntary civic positions. Five of the seven justices of the Nebraska Supreme Court are university alumni.

The College of Dentistry has supplied more than half of the state's 750 practicing dentists, and the College of Pharmacy about 450 of the state's 1,181 registered pharmacists.

A large portion of Nebraska's leaders in the vital fields of agriculture, agri-business, agricultural sciences and services have received their training at N.U. Three-fourths of the county and area agricultural and home economics extension agents who work directly with Nebraska's farmers and homemakers are alumni.

Ten of Nebraska's Governors—George L. Sheldon, Adam McMullen, Arthur J. Weaver, Robert Leroy Cochran, Dwight Griswold, Val Peterson, Victor E. Anderson, Ralph G. Brooks, Frank B. Morrison and Norbert T. Tiemann—are counted among university alumni.

Twenty-three of the 49 members of the current Legislature are also Nebraska alumni.

Through the years the university has produced men and women of national prominence. Great alumni of the past have included Roscoe Pound, a world renowned authority on jurisprudence, and his sister, Louise Pound, an author; Willa Cather and Mari Sandoz, whose writings reflected Nebraska pioneer spirit; Dwight Griswold, Governor, Senator and chief of a post-war American Aid Mission to Greece, and the late Gerald L. Phillippe, chairman of the giant General Electric Corporation.

More familiar today are national figures as Herbert Brownell, former United States Attorney General; entertainer Johnny Carson; Senator Carl T. Curtis, Dr. Walter Judd, former Congressman, missionary, physician and lecturer; Mick Tingelhoff, all-star center for the professional football Minnesota Vikings; Ted Sorensen, former aid to President John F. Kennedy, and Wyoming Governor Stanley Hathaway.

And there are hundreds of others who may not have received such wide national public notice but who have accomplished great

things, such as Myers Bud Cather, president of Bristol-Myers; Dr. George Beadle, former president of the University of Chicago and Nobel Prize winner in chemistry; Air Force Lieut. Gen. Earl Hedlund; Dr. Carruth J. Wagner, assistant surgeon general of the United States; Wayne Reed, associate commissioner of the United States Office of Education; Harold Edgerton, professor at MIT and developer of stroboscopic light, and Howard Hansen, composer, conductor and teacher at Eastman School of Music.

In addition, there are thousands of university alumni who fill positions at all levels throughout the society of this state.

Such men as Edward Lyman of Omaha, president of the United States National Bank; Thomas C. Woods of Lincoln, president of the Lincoln Telephone and Telegraph Company; George B. Cook of Lincoln, president of Bankers Life of Nebraska; Carl Olson of Lincoln, president of Olson Construction Company; William Gangel of Columbus, manager of Becton-Dickinson plants in the state, and his brother, Robert Gangel of Nebraska City, head of a tire and recapping company, and Harold W. Andersen of Omaha, president of the World Publishing Company, which publishes *The World-Herald*. They are a few among the many major leaders in Nebraska's growing business and industrial community.

Nebraska alumni like Dr. Frank H. Tanner of Lincoln, president of the Nebraska State Medical Association; Dr. Harold Helweg of Lincoln, president-elect of the Nebraska Dental Association; Charles S. Adams of Aurora, president of the Nebraska State Bar Association, and Merle Jansen of Columbus, president-elect of the Professional Engineers of Nebraska, are leaders among professionals in this state.

N.U. graduates hold the top administrative post in more than 60 per cent of Nebraska's school districts, including the largest, Omaha, where Dr. Owen Knutzen is superintendent.

Agricultural and agri-business leaders include Don Magdanz of Omaha, executive secretary of the National Livestock Feeders Association; Roland Nelson of Mead, president of the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation; Albert Ebers of Seward, master of the Nebraska Grange, and Howard Elm of Lincoln, president of the Nebraska Fertilizer Institute and executive secretary of the Nebraska Grain and Feed Dealers Association.

Certainly not all University of Nebraska graduates are company presidents, community leaders, physicians, bankers, lawyers or engineers.

Thousands fill less exalted roles as accountants, farmers, teachers, nurses, journalists, salesmen, clerks, secretaries, social workers, housewives and many others.

Despite the differences in opportunity or accomplishment, they have much in common—excellent training in the field they chose, an opportunity to make continuing contributions to the society of Nebraska and the nation and they all rise at the playing of "Dear Old Nebraska U."

HUNGER IN AMERICA—PART IV

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the fourth article in a series on "Hunger in America" by Homer Bigart appeared in the February 19 issue of the *New York Times*. In the article Mr. Bigart vividly portrays the wretched living conditions of many Mexican-American and Indian citizens in the Southwest.

He draws attention to the need to increase food stamp programs to levels that will adequately provide for a family's nutritional needs, a need to which I hope those responsible for this program in the Department of Agriculture will respond. The conditions Mr. Bigart describes makes it clear that present food programs must be expanded if relief is to be provided to those millions of citizens who continue to suffer from the plague of hunger and malnutrition.

The article follows:

[From the *New York Times*, Feb. 19, 1969]
HUNGER IN AMERICA: MEXICANS AND INDIANS
ITS STOICAL VICTIMS—IV

(By Homer Bigart)

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.—Tacked on the wall of the Inner City Apostolate were four new slips from hungry Mexican-American families asking for food.

The Rev. Ralph H. Ruiz, who runs the mission for the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of San Antonio, glanced at the slips and exclaimed angrily: "The whole welfare system in Texas stinks."

The mission is on the fringe of Alazan-Apache Courts, the city's oldest public housing project, where some 6,000 Mexican-Americans live in wretched poverty and frequent hunger. Of all the nation's ethnic groups—white, black, brown or red—the "Mexicanos" are suspected by nutritionists of being most vulnerable to hunger.

For although there are nearly five million of them scattered through the Southwest, the Mexican-Americans have generally been undemonstrative about their misery, complaining so seldom of empty stomachs that the "Anglos" (the non-Mexican whites) give them scant attention. "Brown Power" has not yet taken to the streets of San Antonio.

Hungrier even than the Mexican-Americans, but less obtrusive because they are smaller in number and confined mainly to isolated wastelands, are the reservation Indians. Of the more than 300,000 Indians living on reservations by far the largest tribe is the Navajo of northeastern Arizona. Altogether, 115,000 Navajos exist on an arid plateau bigger than the whole state of West Virginia.

THE LAST FRONTIER

The western half of this remote region, the state's last frontier, was not opened up by roads until about 13 years ago. Even today there are Navajos who live 50 miles from the nearest improved road. Last year 20 infants were brought in dead at medical stations, according to Dr. George E. Bock, the United States Public Health Service medical director, and 18 of those deaths were attributable to delay in reaching medical aid.

At Tuba City, administrative center for the western half of the reservation, Dr. Jean Van Duzen, chief of pediatrics at the Indian Hospital, reported 27 cases of marasmus (caloric starvation) and 17 cases of kwashiorkor (extreme protein deficiency) among Navajo children in the last five years. The high incidence of those two rarely found diseases would be considered fantastic anywhere else in the nation. Dr. Van Duzen said that 15 of the 44 victims died.

Among Mexican-Americans in the slums of San Antonio the ravages of hunger may be less spectacular but more degrading. Father Ruiz said Mexican-Americans found the welfare apparatus unbearably cold and inhuman.

Father Ruiz's irritation with Texas welfare was mainly a recent lowering of the ceiling on monthly welfare payments from \$135, for a family of four or more, to \$123.

"Texas is the only state, I believe, that requires legislation every time it wants to raise the level of welfare. A referendum to increase the payments was defeated last year. The cut was made because the increasing relief load threatened to exhaust the welfare appropriation. And now there is talk of another cut."

FOOD STAMPS RUN SHORT

He took a visitor on a tour of Alazan-Apache Courts, a sprawling expanse of low, concrete block buildings with small apartments. In one home, sparsely furnished but very clean, Mrs. Joanne Gutierrez told how she and her four children existed on \$123-a-month welfare check.

"I buy no clothes for myself," she said. "I wear castoffs from my mother and sister-in-law."

Each month she paid \$54 to get food stamps that bought her \$94 worth of commodities. She echoed a familiar complaint about the food stamp program—instead of providing enough food to last a month, the supply ran out in about two weeks. Fortunately two of the children were getting free lunches in school, she said.

The rent was \$23 a month, plus \$1.20 for extra utilities and 50 cents for "pest control." The baby's diapers required "decent soap", and there were pencils and crayons to be bought for the three daughters of school age. There were only two beds; the three girls, Mrs. Gutierrez explained, "slept crosswise" on one.

In worse plight was a Mrs. Espinosa, found with 10 children in another tiny flat. She, too, was getting the maximum \$123 monthly welfare payment, out of which she had to invest \$58 to get \$128 worth of food stamps and pay \$39 rent. That left only \$26 for all other expenses. The family subsisted mainly on tortillas and beans. Three of the children had no shoes.

Nothing infuriates a Mexican-American more than to have some Anglo suggest to him that all his troubles would vanish if he would only stop eating beans and tortillas and get on a "balanced diet."

"If you have one dollar," explained Father Ruiz patiently, "and you can buy either one pound of meat or 10 pounds of pinto beans, what are you going to buy? You are going to fill the stomachs of your kids with beans. And they call this ignorance!"

"I'd like to meet the home economist who says you can take care of 10 kids on \$123 a month! It would take a genius to survive on that amount of money."

He said he had been asked to appear on a television show called "Buen Apetito", an educational program intended to get Mexicans off starch. He had told the producers that the idea was preposterous: the poor simply did not have the means to buy the "balanced" foods.

Downtown, Albert A. Pena Jr., a Mexican-American member of the Bexar (San Antonio) County Commission, said he believed there were "100,000 hungry people" in Bexar (pronounced Bear) which has a population of about 800,000 (48 per cent Mexican-American, 40 per cent Anglo, 12 per cent Negro).

They are hungry, he said, because San Antonio is a "cheap-labor town—about one-third of the wage earners earn less than the accepted poverty level of \$3,000 a year."

CITES MEXICAN PRIDE

Yet Anglos, he said, cling to the myth best expressed last year by a state welfare official: "You can give a Mexican mother a bushel of money and she'll still feed her children beans and tortillas."

"This is a base canard and he knows it," Commissioner Pena said.

Many Mexican-Americans are too proud to admit they cannot feed their children properly. Father Ruiz explained, and are bruised by the coldness of welfare personnel. So "cells" have been set up in the housing project to detect and report families in trouble. Rummage sales and bingo parties are held to assist the unfortunate.

Texas was the first state to complete a nutrition study of its low-income population for a national survey by the United States Public Health Service.

The findings confirmed the presence of serious malnutrition among the Mexican-American, Anglo-American and Negro poor.

In the lower Rio Grande Valley, the investigators discovered an infant suffering from marasmus and another afflicted with what Dr. William M. McGanity, one of the directors of the survey, called "pre-kwashiorkor."

The findings of malnutrition and of evidence of growth retardation among children gave some substance to an earlier report by Dr. Francis J. Peirce of the eating habits of low-income families in San Antonio.

Dr. Peirce, who is an associate professor at the Worden School of Social Service of Our Lady of the Lake College, directed a staff of students and faculty in interviews with 967 adults and 561 children, most of them Mexican-Americans.

The findings were somber. Of the children studied, 272, or nearly half, were judged as having an inadequate diet. A total of 650, or 67 per cent of the adults, had inadequate food intake in the 24 hours preceding the interview.

Some critics challenged the validity of Dr. Peirce's survey. Dr. Peirce said he had "great conviction" that it was reliable.

He was pleased that the preliminary report of the National Nutrition Survey tended to support his bleak picture of diet inadequacy. But he said he was disturbed by a tendency to "explain away" the exposed malnutrition as the product of "ignorance."

"Let's face it," he said. "People are hungry because they are poor."

On the windswept Navajo reservation, Indians are suffering the traumas of converting from a pastoral living to a cash economy. Traditionally, the Navajos have been sheep and goat herders. But the land is arid ("it takes 10 lousy acres to graze one sheep," Dr. Van Duzen explained) and the population has grown so rapidly that most Indians can no longer live on goats and sheep.

POVERTY SEEMS TO DEEPEN

Efforts to bring industry have had minimal success, providing a few hundred jobs, mostly for women. For most of the population poverty seems to have deepened. The average Navajo sees about \$400 in cash a year, including welfare payments. Dr. Van Duzen said there were many families with no visible income who were kept alive by charity from their clan.

"I'm not saying Navajos are dropping dead of starvation," she said, "but there is hunger—and it shouldn't happen in the United States."

In the children's ward, Dr. Van Duzen observed Navajo infants who she feared had suffered irreversible brain damage from undernourishment. The babies were gaining weight, but some still showed growth retardation. Dr. Van Duzen noted a three-month-old-baby described as "marasmic," whose flesh hung loose, like an old man's skin, on pathetically thin arms and legs.

She said she was convinced that many were permanently stunted by hunger.

"Some say there are small little kids that won't grow because they are Navajos," she said. "I say these are small little kids that won't grow because they haven't got food."

At Many Farms, Dr. Robert Roessel, Jr., president of Navajo Community College, the reservation's first junior college, called malnutrition one of the most acute obstacles for Indian children in classrooms.

ATTENTION LIMITED

"They look weak and gaunt to begin with," he said. "Their attention span is abnormally limited."

He charged that some public school superintendents prided themselves on virtually eliminating free lunches for Indian children. They did this, he said, on the mistaken notion that they were "teaching the Navajos responsibility and helping the children adjust to the world in which they live." But they were driving away Indian children unable to pay \$1.50 a week for lunches, he said.

The community college is the first reserva-

tion school with an all-Indian school board. Six board members have never been to school and the seventh has only a second-grade education. Yet Dr. Roessel said the involvement of Indian parents in the operation of the school had eliminated so many tensions and hostilities that the students were already showing marked improvement in achievement rates.

Impoverished Navajos, he said, received free food under the commodities distribution program. But the commodities available were "woefully inadequate" and "didn't begin to meet the need."

At Window Rock, capital of the Navajo nation, Dr. Bock, the health service director, spoke of some of the difficulties of administering health over the vast reservation with a small, overworked staff.

THIRTY-MILE WALK WITH BABY

He told of a woman who had walked 30 miles from her hogan, the traditional circular hut made of cedar logs and mud, to the nearest traveled road, carrying a sick baby.

He had been urging the training of at least 110 Navajos as local health aides who would teach certain basic health practices and principles to the Indians of their localities. Funds for the project had finally been allocated, he said, but only for the training of 35 to 40 Indians.

Dr. Bock mentioned one promising development—the provision, since Christmas, of supplementary rations for infants and pregnant or lactating mothers who obviously were malnourished. Doctors were authorized to fill out prescriptions for food, he explained, just as though they were issuing prescriptions for medicine.

And the Office of Economic Opportunity has provided \$42,000 for the purchase of a special baby formula fortified with Vitamins A, C and D, niacin, riboflavin, thiamin, calcium, phosphorus and iron to be given to premature babies.

Unfortunately a year's supply of the formula costs \$308, so only about 130 infants, or just about half of the 250 to 300 premature babies born each year on the Navajo reservation, will be taken care of.

CREATION OF A DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, a Department of Consumer Affairs should be created to give the consumer permanent representation and protection.

As one of the cosponsors of legislation that would establish such a department on a Cabinet-level, and as a consumer, I believe that the rights of consumers have been long ignored. Unless a department is created, consumers will continue to be exploited. A separate department, however, would enable the Federal Government to concentrate on consumer problems and provide solutions through legislative action.

Until a Department of Consumer Affairs becomes a reality, I strongly believe that a consumer affairs consultant should serve the President on a full-time basis and should also be in a position to be completely independent of influence by firms that make consumer products.

Great progress was made in the 90th Congress under the vigorous and effective leadership of Miss Betty Furness, who was President Johnson's full-time consultant in consumer affairs. I hope

that such progress continues during the administration of President Nixon.

The remarkable consumer protection record achieved under the leadership of President Johnson and Miss Furness, will help millions of people because of:

Truth-in-lending; National Commission on Product Safety; fire research and safety; natural gas pipeline safety; flammable fabric improvements; wholesome meat; wholesome poultry; radiation control; an auto insurance study; and others.

Despite this notable record of accomplishment, much more remains to be done. Some of the areas include the providing of reliable electric power; wholesome fish; recreational boat safety; safe drinking water; and several others.

Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress have been active—and still are—in providing the American people with the consumer protection they deserve. I believe, however, that one Member of this House deserves a special commendation for his deep interest, outstanding ability and strong leadership in the con-

sumer protection field—the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL).

The consumers of America are grateful to him.

REDUCED FARES FOR PERSONS OVER 65

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my good friend and colleague, my neighbor from across the Hudson River (Mr. SCHEUER) in cosponsoring legislation to permit reduced fare for persons over 65 years of age.

This would permit seniors to receive the same reduced fares which are offered to servicemen and students.

Mr. Speaker, today the ravages of inflation have hit our senior citizens hard. Too many among this group live on small

fixed incomes. Equally tragic is the fact that many older people live alone with their children married and raising their own children. And we are such a mobile society that often great distances separate parents from their children.

If we could make it just a little easier for parents to see their children and grandchildren would not this be a worthwhile endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, among our senior citizens the difference of a few dollars could mean a lot and a small discount might mean the reunion of loved ones. Could there be a more worthy cause than this? It is in our power, Mr. Speaker.

I commend the gentleman from New York who has been one of the most enthusiastic supporters of legislation to benefit senior citizens. As a member of the Education and Labor Committee and as principal sponsor of the Older Americans Act, I have become well aware of his interest in those Americans who have passed their 65th birthday. I hope all Members of this House will join with us in obtaining approval of this bill.

SENATE—Friday, February 21, 1969

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Right Reverend Monsignor Patrick J. Ryan, major general, U.S. Army, retired, and former Chief of Chaplains, of Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Bless us, O Lord, as we assemble here today to honor the Father of our Country.

May the spirit of dedication, wisdom, courage, and statesmanship with which he was blessed continue with our beloved country.

He was brave in battle, humble in dealing with his fellowmen, opposed to tyranny, strong in his convictions, prudent in judgment, steadfast in danger, and patient in adversity.

His was a vigilant heart. He loved his country with a love second only to his love for God.

May this nobleness of spirit so completely demonstrated in the Father of our Country remain with us and inspire us to the ideals he so completely exemplified. Amen.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT) to attend the Plenipotentiary Conference on Definitive Arrangements for the International Telecommunications Satellite Consortium, to be held at Washington, D.C., from February 24 to March 21, 1969.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT—MESSAGES RE- CEIVED FROM THE PRESIDENT AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DURING ADJOURNMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate sundry messages

from the President of the United States and the House of Representatives, received on February 20, 1969, during the adjournment of the Senate, under the order of Wednesday, February 19, 1969, which, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD without being read, and appropriately referred.

REPORT ON STUDY OF HEADSTART PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 91-75)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, received on February 20, 1969, under authority of the order of the Senate of February 19, 1969, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 309 of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 directed the President to make a special study of whether responsibility for administering the Head Start program should be left with the Office of Economic Opportunity, or whether it should be delegated or transferred to another agency. Congress asked that a report of this study be submitted by March 1, 1969.

I am submitting the report herewith. This report has been prepared in consultation with the heads of the Executive departments and agencies concerned.

The study concludes that Head Start should be delegated to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. It leaves for later determination the question of whether the program should eventually be transferred. As I have indicated in a message to Congress today, I will present a set of recommendations before the end of the current fiscal year on a permanent status and organizational structure for the Office of Eco-

nomie Opportunity. At that time, I will make a recommendation on whether Head Start should be transferred, or whether it should remain a delegated program.

Section 308 of the same Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 directed the Commissioner of Education to make a special study of the means by which the existing Job Corps facilities and programs might, if determined feasible, be transferred to State or joint Federal-state operation. The Commissioner was directed to report his findings to Congress by March 1, 1969.

As my message today indicated, responsibility for administering the Job Corps will be delegated to the Department of Labor effective July 1. The question of State or joint Federal-state operation is a complex one which may well be affected by the over-all manpower-development proposals now being prepared by the Secretary of Labor. In light of these developments, and in order to comply with the intent of Congress, I have asked the Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education and Welfare, along with the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Manpower, and the Director of OEO, to work with the Acting Commissioner of Education in preparing a report responsive to the Congressional directive to be submitted at the earliest possible time. As directed by Congress, the Acting Commissioner will also consult with other Federal officials, with State officials and with concerned individuals.

In its request for these studies, I recognize the interest of Congress in a constant evaluation and review of the way in which new, experimental programs are being administered, and in the measurement of their results. I welcome that interest, I share it, and I will attempt to be responsive to it.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 19, 1969.