

A. Ronnie J. Straw, 1000 Connecticut Ave. NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Phillip Tocker, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Venable, Baetjer and Howard, 1400 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

B. Maryland State Fair & Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md.

A. James H. Wadlow, Jr., 952 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Water Company Conference, 952 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas G. Walters, president, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Washington Consulting Service, 1435 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Schools of Allied Health Professions, 2011 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Milburn E. Wilson, Route No. 1, Fremont, Mich.

B. Gerber Products Co., 445 State Street, Fremont, Mich.

A. Nicholas H. Zumas, attorney at law, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Emergency Committee on Gun Control, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### SLEEPING BEAR DUNES: LEGACY OF THE UNSPOILED GREAT LAKES SCENE

#### HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see that legislation to create the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore has again been introduced in the Senate by Senator PHILIP A. HART.

The Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore is now the top priority conservation issue before the Congress. As a member of the House Interior Committee's Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, I have been working for the establishment of this national lakeshore.

We seek to preserve, for all the people, a truly beautiful area of undoubted national significance for its scenic, recreational, and scientific values. We seek to preserve this area now in the face of accelerating threats to these precious values.

#### THE HERITAGE OF ALL AMERICANS

The Sleeping Bear Dunes area offers the American people a legacy—the best we still have—of the unspoiled Great Lakes scene. The purpose of our national lakeshore proposal is to assure that this national legacy is perpetuated as a part of the heritage of all Americans and for future generations.

As Senator HART said, the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore "will serve, as few other areas can, the recreation and green space needs of our heavily populated and growing midwest urban centers."

Last July, the House Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation held hearings on Sleeping Bear Dunes legislation which I introduced in the House.

The Director of the National Park Service, Mr. George P. Hartzog, testified at those hearings, and summarized the values in the Sleeping Bear Dunes area:

The Sleeping Bear region was first identified as having possible national significance in 1957 and 1958 when the Department of the Interior studied the Great Lakes shoreline. Later, more careful studies of the Sleeping Bear region revealed it to be a remarkably diverse area possessing such out-

standing and varied scenic, scientific and recreational values that it clearly merits preservation as a national lakeshore.

As it now exists, it has the quality of being both remote and accessible; remote in the sense that most of its natural features are still untrammeled and wild, and accessible in that it lies within one-day's drive of some 20 million people.

The combination of shoreline, high dunes, inland lakes and green forests make this area outstanding in terms of scenic beauty. For sightseers, campers, hikers, hardy swimmers, fishermen, nature lovers and boating enthusiasts, the shore area will provide a great recreation opportunity.

The Sleeping Bear Dunes area along the Lake Michigan shore is a magnificent landscape composed of a great diversity of elements—natural as well as lightly developed, pastoral as well as wild. It is the purpose of this legislation, by establishing a 61,000-acre national lakeshore, to protect the existing diversity of the landscape and its ecological features—for these are the elements which give the region national significance. The boundaries will include not only 64 miles of Lake Michigan shoreline and the great plateau of dunes, but also quiet, free-flowing streams, wooded slopes and hills, high bluffs, deep forests, and beautiful inland lakes. A fascinating series of geological and ecological events is evidenced in the shape and beauty of the landscape of Sleeping Bear Dunes. What we must protect—quickly and fully—is the inherent character of this landscape, in which these many elements are blended to create unusual visual beauty and scenic appeal.

#### A GREAT RECREATION RESOURCE

In its favorable report on an identical bill in the 89th Congress, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs stated its expectation that "most of the land within the boundaries of the national lakeshore will remain in its present condition." There will be necessary developments to provide for public use and enjoyment, but these will be only those which serve to better display the landscape and enhance appropriate recreational opportunities—including visitor centers, beach-use areas, and nature trails. Along the high ridges inland from the main lakeshore, a 30-mile scenic parkway will afford the leisure motorist spectacular, ever-changing scenic vistas over the dunes and lakes below.

We want to provide a full opportunity for all to enjoy this great landscape and to benefit by experiencing its exquisite beauty and natural values. Here our

people can learn, through park interpretive programs, the geologic history responsible for the present landforms of our Great Lakes States region. Here, too, the visitor can find quiet beauty, broad scenic vistas and a kind of tranquil recreation we need increasingly. This legislation provides for careful professional planning to meet these recreational needs.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this legislation is a positive and protective measure for the interests of the local communities and property owners, as well as for the broader national interest. At the same time the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore will constitute a major contribution to the recreational needs of the 20 million people who reside within convenient distance in the Chicago and Detroit metropolitan areas. And it will carry us forward in our national effort to protect important samples of our native American landscape for the heritage of this and future generations.

#### AREA RANKED "NATIONALLY SIGNIFICANT"

In an editorial endorsing the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, the New York Times called it the "Cape Cod of the Middle West." Roland Clement, staff biologist of the National Audubon Society, has said of "the Bear": "I know of nothing else like it in the Eastern United States or Canada." The national significance of the area and the urgent need for its careful protection and preservation are beyond debate.

In addition, the project will certainly benefit the local area by assuring orderly control of development, and by a healthy economic contribution. Michigan State University economists estimated in 1967 that—

When both the expenditures of the tourists and the National Park Service are infused into the economy at the appropriately multiplied rate, the estimated annual economic impact resulting from the establishment of the park could reach \$20 million a year.

On the basis of the best estimates which can be made at this time, it would appear that the proposed park would make a substantial contribution to the economy of the two-county area.

#### LANDSCAPE THREATENED AS NEVER BEFORE

Today the urgency of this proposal is greater than ever before. The pressure of unplanned development and subdivision, with few if any zoning controls, is growing at a rapidly accelerating rate. We have already lost some particularly valuable features because action has been

delayed and adverse development proceeds. New development of cottages and summer homes in the area, badly overcrowded in some cases, results in despoilation of those very landscape features which have attracted nationwide conservation attention to this area.

This destructive pressure redoubles itself all too quickly, becoming a sort of unintentional, unplanned developmental vandalism. In a short time the public interest and values of clear national significance can thus be destroyed. As former Governor George Romney said of this bill:

We need this legislation before further commercial and residential development destroys the very qualities which have given the Sleeping Bear Dunes national significance.

This is why I feel action now—promptly—is so imperative. This proposal has a long history. The legislation has received thorough study by the Congress, in hearings both in Washington and in Michigan. Viewpoints and differences have been carefully discussed and, where reasonable concerns have been raised, care has been taken to refine the bill in order to protect private rights and the public interest. The bill has twice been approved by the Senate, and in 1966 our Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported it favorably to the House. In the last days of that Congress, however, the bill failed to reach the floor for a vote. We have come close to fulfilling our responsibility—now it is time to finish this urgent job.

The proponents of the national lakeshore have responded to the concerns of residents of the area, and have worked to fit into this one bill the objectives of conservation and the objectives of protecting private rights. I believe the bill now reflects the best kind of product of our legislative efforts in a well-balanced package. It can be supported by all, and I know from my own mail that residents of the Sleeping Bear Dunes area who understand the bill are strongly in favor.

I believe the Congress must act now, and I am pleased to see that our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. NEDZI), has introduced the identical bill as H.R. 4287. My own strong support will continue as in the past, and as a member of the subcommittee, I want to express my hope that we will have an early report on this bill from the administration, so that the Congress may move promptly to fulfill its responsibility in this urgent conservation project.

#### A GLORIOUS CORNER OF CREATION

In testimony in 1961, when the bill was first introduced, Senator HART pointed out:

The basic objective is to preserve the beauty and values which make this area so matchless. It is not proposed that homes fall to the bulldozers; rather, it is hoped that we can spare them from changes which will result from the uncontrolled passage of time. A record of such changes we can find in all too many areas that were once glorious corners of creation.

Sleeping Bear Dunes is a "glorious corner of creation" indeed, and in the new, enlightened spirit of conservation which has swept this Nation, we recognize our obligation to preserve such an

area for all men, for all time. To that end I pledge my continued support and effort, and to that end I call upon concerned citizens to let their voices be heard.

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked the 51st anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. It is very fitting that the Congress of the United States devote time to commend the Lithuanian people and to remind the world that Lithuania and its people will continue to fight for the reestablishment of complete independence and self-government.

In the 22 years of Lithuanian independence a record was written in successful self-government of which any people could be proud. In two decades when Lithuania was free the number of primary schools was increased from 1,036 with 1,232 teachers and 45,540 pupils to 2,956 schools with 10,024 teachers and 379,233 pupils. In addition there were two universities and eight institutions of higher studies with 447 professors and 6,000 students. Every city in Lithuania of more than 5,000 population supported opera seasons with the world's great operas, many of them translated into Lithuanian, given under conditions making it possible for all who so desired to attend. Everywhere there was special schools for music, art and ballet. Industry and commerce reached peaks never before attained in a country of a population of not many more than 3 million. Practically everyone owned his own home or his own farm. This is the record made in 22 years when the people of Lithuania were free.

Only the people of Lithuania know the burdens, the heartbreaks, and suffering which have been endured since Soviet Russia lowered the yokes of oppression on their shoulders. Let us hope that soon the great Lithuanian nation can again be restored to their rightful heritage of liberty and independence.

#### AIR SAFETY

### HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, air safety has recently become of greater concern to the American public. The capacity of the users of the Nation's skies is growing at an unprecedented rate. Half a dozen jets a month are being added to the fleets of this country and dozens of planes a month are produced for the general aviation users. Passenger miles being flown throughout the country are increasing in multiples of those being flown only a few years ago. This in-

creasing capacity of the aviation industry adds daily to the complexities of air safety, and the burdens and responsibilities of air safety fall ultimately and finally upon the less than 10,000 air traffic controllers of the Federal Aviation Administration.

The fact of the overburdened air traffic control system and the ultimate responsibility for safety was abruptly and dramatically brought to our attention last July when many of these controllers on advice of counsel, in unison, decided to follow the rules of the FAA as they pertain to spacing for safety. Investigation of the lengthy delays in the air, flight cancellations, and a general tie-up, led to the conclusion that the air traffic controllers were not slowing the movement of aircraft for their own narrow gains, but were forced through oversaturation of the air traffic system to take the action they did. Investigations revealed that controllers do not enjoy the luxury of even temporarily "passing the buck." They must discharge their responsibilities for safety immediately, as aircraft come into the system, and must restrict the movement of air traffic to reduce the demands upon the system, that they may be able to space aircraft as safety demands. Any lesser action would be the prelude to a catastrophe.

As we move into the seventies, greater demands will be placed upon the air traffic system. Against the backdrop of confusion, inadequate equipment, lack of runways, outmoded procedures and deficiencies in quality and quantity of personnel, the seventies will add the jumbo jets, supersonic aircraft, and greater increases in the existing fleets.

Some of these problems will require engineering studies before action can be taken. Other problems will require technological breakthroughs, in-depth studies, and so forth, but the problem of how to recruit able persons, retain qualified persons, and adequately compensate air traffic controllers for the demands placed upon them, and the responsibilities they hourly discharge, can be met now.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to raise and maintain the qualifications and standards for air traffic control personnel.

It is imperative that action be taken now. A revolution has taken place within the last 5 years in the aviation industry while the state of the art in air traffic control has remained stagnant. In fact, during this growth period the staff of frontline traffic controllers has actually declined. Congress has delegated the responsibilities for our Nation's air transportation system to the Federal Aviation Administration. FAA has not only failed to judiciously prepare for the future of air traffic control but cannot now operate a safe, efficient system.

The demands of the users of our Nation's skies, the safety of the flying public, the necessity for an operative, safe, and efficient system reverts by default to us today. New cloth must be spun to replace the patch work system we have.

The bill I offer today will upgrade the entrance requirements for trainees requiring air traffic controllers to have ei-

ther a bachelor's degree in an accredited institution offering a course in air traffic control or a mixture of experience with a 2-year college program; require annual physical checkups and semiannual proficiency examinations, increase the minimum salary commensurate with the job requirements and responsibilities; align retirement benefits with declining abilities as age reduces competence; establish three categories of controllers for proficiency, training, and compensation; require continuing training for all controllers to take place in the cockpit of an aircraft; distribute workload through the adjustment of personnel and the placing of facilities; and will economically penalize the FAA when controllers must work in excess of a 40-hour week.

#### NOTRE DAME'S TOUGH POLICY ON DISORDER

### HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal this week published two articles that I believe reflected a sensible and proper attitude in respect to campus demonstrations which have been almost a permanent feature of the university scene in recent years. One article from the Journal for February 25, 1969, contains excerpts from an article by Sidney Hook which originally appeared in the Atlantic magazine. The second is an open-letter to the students of Notre Dame University by its president, Rev. Theodore Hesburgh that was published the following day. They follow:

#### NOTABLE AND QUOTABLE

(NOTE.—Sidney Hook, professor of philosophy at New York University, writing in the February issue of the Atlantic Magazine on "The War Against the Democratic Process.")

It is a striking phenomenon that more has been written about civil disobedience in the last few years than in the entire period of American history which preceded it. But the nature of civil disobedience in the political democratic process has been radically misunderstood by many, and when these misunderstandings are applied to the academic world, the results border on the grotesque.

There are two fundamental misapprehensions about civil disobedience in general which have seriously misled many. The first is the assumption that each law in a democratic community poses as a legitimate question to every citizen whether to obey that law or to disobey it.

What is overlooked is the fact that, except on rare occasions, the prior allegiance of the democrat is to the legitimacy of the process by which the law is adopted. There is always, to be sure, a moral right to reject the whole democratic process on revolutionary or counter-revolutionary grounds, but we are now speaking of civil disobedience in a democracy. The democrat cannot make an issue of obeying or not obeying every law without repudiating the principle of majority rule and the democratic process to which that rule is integral. It is only on a matter of the gravest moral importance that he will be civilly disobedient, and the limits of his civil disobedience, if he wishes to remain a democrat and operate within the democratic system, will be drawn at that point in which the conse-

quences of civil disobedience threaten to destroy the democratic system. . . .

An analogy may make this clear. In the ethical universe of discourse and behavior, we assume that the truth must be told. But only a fanatic will assume that we must tell the truth all the time; and we can all conceive of circumstances in which a moral man will tell a lie.

The trouble with much of the literature on civil disobedience is that in recognizing that it is sometimes justifiable, it does not recognize the presumptive validity (not wisdom) to a democrat of laws passed by means of the democratic process. (Whoever, like Thoreau, says that as an individual he will obey society's laws when he can benefit by them but will not accept its laws when they limit his freedom of action or offend his conscience, is a freeloader.)

The second misconception of civil disobedience has far more dangerous fruits. The civilly disobedient democrat violates the law and accepts punishment in order to bear witness, to re-educate the majority by provoking them to second thoughts. Having failed to persuade his fellow citizens about the wisdom or justice of some measure by using all the methods open to him through the democratic process, he cannot honestly use civil disobedience as a strategy to prevent the majority of his fellow citizens from achieving their ends.

A citizen may refuse to pay tax which he regards as morally objectionable and go to jail to bring about the repeal of the tax; he has no right to prevent others from paying it. A student may refuse to take a course required of him and may suffer the consequences; he has no right to prevent other students who wish to take it from doing so. He may even strike and urge other students to join him, but he has no right to prevent his fellow students from attending class if they so desire.

What I particularly wish to challenge is the application of the principles of civil disobedience to the university as fundamentally misconceived. The university is not a political community. Its business is not government but primarily the discovery, publication, and teaching of the truth. Its authority is based not on numbers or the rule of the majority, but on knowledge. Although it can function in a spirit of democracy, it cannot be organized on the principle of one man, one vote, or, if it takes its educational mission seriously, of equal vote for student and faculty in the affairs of the mind or even with respect to organizational and curricular continuity. The fact that a society is politically organized as a democracy does not entail that all its other institutions be so organized—its families, its orchestras, museums, theaters, churches, and professional guilds.

. . . The assumption of a political democracy is that there are no experts in wisdom, that each citizen's vote is as good as any other's. If we make the same assumption about universities, and define a citizen of that community as anyone who functions in any capacity on the campus, we may as well shut up educational shop. . . .

#### NOTRE DAME'S TOUGH POLICY ON DISORDER

DEAR NOTRE DAME FACULTY AND STUDENTS: This letter has been on my mind for weeks. It is both time and overtime that it be written. . . . I have tried to write calmly, in the wee hours of the morning when at last there is quiet and pause for reflection.

My hope is that these ideas will have deep personal resonances in our own community, although the central problem they address exists everywhere in the university world today and, by instant communication, feeds upon itself. It is not enough to label it the alienation of youth from our society. God knows there is enough and more than enough in our often non-glorious civilization to be

alienated from, be you young, middle-aged, or old.

The central problem to me is what we do about it and in what manner, if we are interested in healing rather than destroying our world. Youth especially has much to offer—idealism, generosity, dedication, and service. The last thing a shaken society needs is more shaking. The last thing a turbulent, and disintegrating community needs is more noise, turbulence, and disintegration. Understanding and analysis of social ills cannot be conducted in a boiler factory. Compassion has a quiet way of service. Complicated social mechanisms, out-of-joint, are not adjusted with sledge hammers.

The university cannot cure all our ills today, but it can make a valiant beginning by bringing all its intellectual and moral powers to bear upon them: All the idealism and generosity of its young people, all the wisdom and intelligence of its elders, all the expertise and competence of those who are in their middle years. But it must do all this as a university does, within its proper style and capability, no longer an ivory tower, but not the Red Cross either.

#### PROFITING FROM THE PAST

Now to the heart of my message. You recall my letter of November 25, 1968. It was written after an incident, or happening if you will. It seemed best to me at the time not to waste time in personal recriminations or heavy-handed discipline, but to profit from the occasion to invite this whole University community, especially its central Councils of faculty, administration, and students, to declare themselves and to state their convictions regarding protests that are peaceful and those that threatened the life of the community by disrupting the normal operations of the University and infringing upon the rights of others.

I now have statements from the Academic Council, the Faculty Senate, the Student Life Council, some College Councils, the Alumni Board, and a whole spate of letters from individual faculty members and a few students. . . . In general, the reaction was practically unanimous that this community recognizes the validity of protest in our day—sometimes even the necessity—regarding the current burning issues of our society: War and peace, especially Vietnam; civil rights, especially of minority groups; the stance of the University vis-a-vis moral issues of great public concern; the operation of the University as a university. There was also practical unanimity that the University could not continue to exist as an open society, dedicated to the discussion of all issues of importance, if protests were of such a nature that the normal operations of the University were in any way impeded, or if the rights of any member of this community were abrogated, peacefully or non-peacefully.

I believe that I now have a clear mandate from this University community to see that: (1) Our lines of communication between all segments of the community are kept as open as possible, with all legitimate means of communicating dissent assured, expanded, and protected; (2) civility and rationality are maintained as the most reasonable means of dissent within the academic community; and (3) violation of others' rights or obstruction of the life of the University are outlawed as illegitimate means of dissent in this kind of open society. Violence was especially deplored as a violation of everything that the University community stands for.

#### WHAT WILL HAPPEN

Now comes my duty of stating, clearly and unequivocally, what happens if I'll try to make it as simple as possible to avoid misunderstanding by anyone. May I begin by saying that all of this is hypothetical and I personally hope it never happens here at Notre Dame.

But, if it does, anyone or any group that substitutes force for rational persuasion, be it violent or non-violent, will be given fifteen minutes of meditation to cease and desist. They will be told that they are, by their actions, going counter to the overwhelming conviction of this community as to what is proper here. If they do not within that time period cease and desist, they will be asked for their identity cards. Those who produce these will be suspended from this community as not understanding what this community is. Those who do not have or will not produce identity cards will be assumed not to be members of the community and will be charged with trespassing and disturbing the peace on private property and treated accordingly by the law.

The judgment regarding the impeding of normal University operations or the violation of the rights of other members of the community will be made by the Dean of Students. Recourse for certification of this fact for students so accused is to the tri-partite Disciplinary Board established by the Student Life Council. Faculty members have recourse to the procedures outlined in the Faculty Manual. Judgment of the matter will be delivered within five days following the fact, for justice deferred is justice denied to all concerned.

After notification of suspension, or trespass in the case of non-community members, if there is not then within five minutes a movement to cease and desist, students will be notified of expulsion from this community and the law will deal with them as non-students.

Lest there be any possible misunderstanding, it should be noted that law enforcement in this procedure is not directed at students. They receive academic sanctions in the second instance of recalcitrance and, only after three clear opportunities to remain in student status, if they still insist on resisting the will of the community, are they then expelled and become non-students to be treated as other non-students, or outsiders.

There seems to be a current myth that university members are not responsible to the law, and that somehow the law is the enemy, particularly those who society has constituted to uphold and enforce the law. I would like to insist here that all of us are responsible to the duly constituted laws of this University community and to all of the laws of the land. There is no other guarantee of civilization versus the jungle or mob rule, here or elsewhere.

If someone invades your home, do you dialogue with him or call the law? Without the law, the university is a sitting duck for any small group from outside or inside that wishes to destroy it, to incapacitate it, to terrorize it at whim. The argument goes—or has gone—invoke the law and you lose the university community. My only response is that without the law you may well lose the university—and beyond that—the larger society that supports it and that is most deeply wounded when law is no longer respected, bringing an end of everyone's most cherished rights.

I have studied at some length the new politics of confrontation. The rhythm is simple: (1) Find a cause, any cause, silly or not; (2) in the name of the cause, get a few determined people to abuse the rights and privileges of the community so as to force a confrontation at any cost of boorishness or incivility; (3) once this has occurred, justified or not, orderly or not, yell police brutality—if it does not happen, provide it by foul language, physical abuse, whatever, and then count on a larger measure of sympathy from the up-to-now apathetic or passive members of the community. Then call for amnesty, the head of the president on a platter, the complete submission to any and all demands. One beleaguered president has said that these people want to be martyrs thrown to tooth-

less lions. He added, "Who wants to dialogue when they are going for the jugular vein?"

So it has gone, and it is generally well orchestrated. Again, my only question: Must it be so? Must universities be subjected, willfully, to such intimidation and victimization whatever their good will in the matter? Somewhere a stand must be made.

I only ask that when the stand is made necessary by those who would destroy the community and all its basic yearning for great and calm educational opportunity, let them carry the blame and the penalty. No one wants the forces of law on this or any other campus, but if some necessitate it, as a last and dismal alternative to anarchy and mob tyranny, let them shoulder the blame instead of receiving the sympathy of a community they would hold at bay. The only alternative I can imagine is turning the majority of the community loose on them, and then you have two mobs. I know of no one who would opt for this alternative—always lurking in the wings.

We can have a thousand resolutions as to what kind of a society we want, but when lawlessness is afoot, and all authority is flouted, faculty, administration, and student, then we invoke the normal societal forces of law or we allow the university to die beneath our hapless and hopeless gaze. I have no intention of presiding over such a spectacle: Too many people have given too much of themselves and their lives to this University to let this happen here. Without being melodramatic, if this conviction makes this my last will and testament to Notre Dame, so be it. . . .

May I now confess that since last November I have been bombarded mightily by the hawks and the doves—almost equally. I have resisted both and continued to recognize the right to protest—through every legitimate channel—and to resist as well those who would unthinkingly trifle with the survival of the University as one of the few open societies left to mankind today. . . .

#### MAJORITY CONCERN NEEDED

As long as the great majority of this community is concerned and involved in maintaining what it believes deeply to be its identity and commitment, no force within it, however determined or organized, can really destroy it. If any community as a whole does not believe this, or is not committed to it, it does not deserve to survive and it probably will not. I hope we will. . . .

I truly believe that we are about to witness a revulsion on the part of legislatures, state and national, benefactors, parents, alumni, and the general public for much that is happening in higher education today. If I read the signs of the times correctly, this may well lead to a suppression of the liberty and autonomy that are the lifeblood of a university community. It may well lead to a rebirth of fascism, unless we ourselves are ready to take a stand for what is right for us. History is not consoling in this regard. We rule ourselves or others rule us, in a way that destroys the university as we have known and loved it.

Devotedly yours in Notre Dame,  
Rev. THEODORE M. HESBURGH, C.S.C.,  
President.

#### BIAFRA MUST RECEIVE INCREASED HELP

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that vast numbers are dying daily, particularly children, as a result of

the Nigeria-Biafra conflict. If both sides continue to disagree over badly needed air and surface corridors one of the worst famines in modern times appears inevitable.

The complexity of the situation politically and militarily offers little hope of a halt to the starvation. Efforts by the ber I have been bombarded mightily by the political involvement of a number of the member nations.

It is because of this state of facts that I have joined with over 90 of my colleagues in the House of Representatives in sponsoring a resolution—the purpose of which is to see to it that the United States fulfills its humanitarian obligations.

Our resolution calls for significant increases in the "amount of surplus food stocks, relief moneys, noncombat aircraft, and such other vehicles of transportation as may be necessary for relief purposes."

Conscience demands that the United States take those steps proposed by our resolution to relieve the suffering of the Biafrans. We cannot wait any longer.

Our resolution does not question who is right or wrong, but expresses the sense of Congress that our Nation should be doing all it can to arrest the already appalling starvation in Biafra and prevent what is otherwise destined to become the major disaster of our time.

#### FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conduct a Voice of Democracy Contest. This year over 400,000 school students participated in the contest competing for the five scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. The contest theme was "Freedom's Challenge." The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington, D.C., for the final judging as guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Enclosed is a copy of the winning speech from Ohio as delivered by Mr. Robert J. Pondillo, 4565 Woodridge Drive, Youngstown, Ohio, a resident of my district. It is my privilege to insert this in the RECORD:

#### FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Robert Pondillo, Austintown-Fitch High School, District 8, Youngstown, Ohio)

This is the story of many voices, voices that tell of the spirit with which America has always faced its greatest tests, voices that challenge us today as never before, asking for the best in all of us, this is truly Freedom's Challenge.

In great crisis, in the moment of decision or of ultimate truth, there comes to men a calm, a stillness in which they know this is the big moment. Men have lived or have died by such moments, nations have endured or they have vanished.

Let me take you back, back through the vacuum of time, back beyond the endless void we call history, and I will endeavor to

show from where the roots of this great American adventure took sprout.

We hold these truths to be self evident, some men in Philadelphia once wrote, that all men are created equal and there was not a man there who didn't know that this was to be a declaration for the ages, that all other generations would manifest it as the living document, that a new nation must be born even if they must die for it. This was truly an example of that will to forge forward against insurmountable odds, striving for liberty, freedom and justice for everyone.

And then out of the grief and the terrible grandeur of Civil War, the nation whispered why? And on a winters day in 1862, the president replied, "we cannot escape history, the fire trials through which we pass will light us down in honor or in dishonor to the last generation." By giving freedom to the slaves, we assure freedom for the free, we bear that responsibility, we can nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope on earth—for America, for Abraham Lincoln, that was freedom's greatest challenge.

"Ask not," a young voice said, "what your country can do for you," but then the voice grew old, and cold, and stearn and said, "touch not," hands off to those who pointed at our hearts new muscats now charged with cosmic death. Hush the world said, pray, will this be the end; and then suddenly, incredibly that voice grew still, but it had lived to answer freedom's challenge. And truly for these presidents and the great masses of humanity they led, the crisis they faced were the most trying and certainly most challenging of their times, but they fought for their beliefs and delivered freedom from that challenge.

Today it seems many of us are beginning to forget that great heritage of the past is the seed that brings forth the harvest of the future. Oh, we still hear voices, but these voices threaten our government, ridicule our society, condemn our policies—voices—challenging our freedom, voices full of the sound and the fury and signifying—nothing, and perhaps that's the point, the sound is there, the words are heard, but—the significance is gone, the causes become futile, the protests foster disunity and freedom's challenge grows.

However, it is said, some of the brightest thunder bolts flash in the darkest of skies, therefore, we can be confident, that no matter what type of radical or reactionary group evolves in America to challenge our freedom, groups that even now, this moment are spreading hate like rats spread disease, we know we will not let them put cracks in our wall of freedom and solidarity. So you see, this is presented not to revive your shock or your tears, but to remind you of the courage and honor, and hope and pride, and compassion and pity and the sacrifice which have flashed during freedoms darkest moments which have been the glory of the past.

We cannot escape history, our signatures are on the great and the faithful documents and those beloved unforgotten voices challenge us to strength with greatness, to wisdom with compassion. By what we choose to be, we can nobly save or we can meanly lose the last best hope of earth—or perhaps the earth itself.

#### ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, February 24 marked the 51st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Re-

public of Estonia. Free Estonians in the United States and about the world commemorate this event—not with joy but rather in sadness and heartache in lonely exile.

For more than two decades Estonia enjoyed its independence, was accepted into the free world and its citizens knew the rewards of self-determination. Economically, the people prospered. Culturally, the nation flourished. Socially, Estonians were far advanced. Politically, they had demonstrated the ability to conduct their own affairs as an independent nation.

This happy interlude was abruptly cut short by the events of World War II. In 1940 the Red army attacked Estonia and overran it, and it was incorporated into the Soviet Union. Free and independent Estonia ceased to exist, and since then Estonians have not known freedom in their homeland.

I salute these proud people who continue the struggle in heart and mind for individual liberty and the restoration of the national identity that is rightfully theirs. I acknowledge that so long as any peoples are denied their God-given right to individual liberty and self-determination no free people can be truly safe in any land.

#### C. L. DENNIS HELPS CHART LABOR'S COURSE

### HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, there are now several new faces around the conference table during executive council meetings of the AFL-CIO. I would like to take a few moments to highlight the achievements of one of the men recently appointed to this outstanding council—Charles Leslie Dennis.

In the years ahead, Les Dennis will be helping to chart labor's course with the same farsightedness and dedication that he brought to his post as international president of the Brotherhood of Railway and Airline Clerks—BRAC. Under his progressive leadership, this union which he has piloted since 1963 has moved boldly ahead and has lived up to its motto as "A modern union on the move."

As a long-time member of BRAC, I am pleased by his recent appointment to the executive council of the AFL-CIO, but I am not surprised. It is only natural that the leaders of American labor would recognize a man of his wide-ranging ability and deep dedication; it is only natural that they would want his counsel and guidance when tackling today's complex labor issues.

Les Dennis typifies those labor leaders who identify with American society as a whole—he wants for all Americans what he wants for his own membership. Broad social and economic issues as well as labor matters are of deep concern to him.

It was a natural step for young Les Dennis to enter railroading. His father, C. E. Dennis, was with the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy and the Chicago &

North Western for many years. Altogether, 16 members of the Dennis family are or have been in railroad service. A son, L. E. Dennis, is a Washington-based staff member of the union, and two daughters formerly worked for railroads. Five of Les Dennis' sisters are BRAC members and belong to the C. & N.W. Lodge 679 in Chicago.

Born in Beardstown, Ill., on June 21, 1908, Les Dennis began his railroad career as a freight handler for the Chicago & North Western in 1928. He joined BRAC shortly afterward and still holds membership in Chicago's Wood Street Station Lodge 1189. Active in lodge affairs, he held almost every office ranging from financial secretary-treasurer and local chairman to division chairman.

In 1939 he won the union's grand prize for signing up the largest number of employees into membership. Elected general chairman of the C. & N. W. in 1940, he was reelected and continued to serve in that post for 19 years, until elected a vice grand president at the brotherhood's 1959 convention in Los Angeles. First elected to BRAC's top post in 1963 he was reelected without opposition in 1967. He, his wife Harriet, and their son Jeffrey make their home in Cincinnati.

Playing an active role in the Railway Labor Executives' Association, he is chairman of that group's international Affairs Committee and of its Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Insurance Committee. He also serves on the general council of the International Transport Workers' Federation. He is a vice president of the Eugene Debs Foundation and, as a representative of the AFL-CIO, he undertook a mission to Japan in 1963 for the Agency for International Development.

Les Dennis has established a reputation as one of the most progressive and innovative union leaders in the transportation field. As the principal architect and chairman of the Conference of Transportation Trades, he recognizes that labor must create a solid framework upon which to build a unified approach to the problems confronting today's working men and women.

Created to serve as "a clearinghouse on ideas and as a forum for the exchange of views," this relatively new conference has already made its mark on the labor scene. At its recent executive board meeting in Bal Harbour, Fla., the conference mapped out a comprehensive program to deal with key issues and problems affecting the transportation industry and the men and women who are a vital part of it. Les Dennis has been instrumental in formulating conference policy and in focusing public attention on the needs of the industry.

Aware of the challenges facing labor if it remains fragmental into many small unions, Les Dennis has spearheaded the movement toward the merger of unions. On January 1 of this year, BRAC merged with the Railway Patrolmen's International Union, and just recently, BRAC joined with the 40,000-member Transportation Communication Employees Union. Thus, Les Dennis now leads the largest AFL-CIO transportation union with a membership of more than 300,-

000 employees working in all modes of transportation. At the present time, merger talks are going on with the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway, Transport & General Workers' Union and, by the end of this year, BRAC will be headed toward a membership of 400,000.

Recent events have borne out Les Dennis' farsightedness in recognizing and working toward merger as a way to strengthen transportation unions. This trend was recently underscored by the unification of four of our Nation's operating rail unions into the United Transportation Union.

As a colleague of mine, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ANDERSON), noted recently in the RECORD, the creation of this 225,000-member United Transportation Union—the second largest after BRAC—has brought four “frankly less effective railway trade unions” into one organization better able to serve its members and cope with the problems of the future.

Once again, let me say how pleased I am by the AFL-CIO executive council's appointment of Les Dennis—a man who has never forgotten that the foundation of the labor movement lies in its unity of spirit and purpose. I am confident that in the years ahead Les Dennis' influence and guidance as a vice president will be an invaluable asset to the AFL-CIO's executive council and to the entire labor movement.

#### SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION TO PERMIT TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR MOVING EXPENSES

### HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing legislation in an effort to secure more equitable tax treatment of reimbursed moving expenses for those employees who move at the request of employers.

American industry has long followed the practice of transferring employees to new locations for a variety of reasons—promotions, to staff new facilities, to fill needed skills, and others. When these transfers occur the employer has generally reimbursed the employee for the expense caused by the employer in moving the employee, members of his family, and his personal possessions to the new location. The Internal Revenue Service has ruled that the expense of transporting the employee, his family, and household effects to the new work location is actually the employer's expense and this is excludable from the employee's income. This clearly is a correct interpretation. However, the Internal Revenue Service contends that all other expenses created by the move and for which the employee is reimbursed by his employer is income to the employee and subject to income tax. This seems to be an unduly strained interpretation. The tax defeats the purpose of reimbursement which is to keep the employee financially whole.

In addition to those reimbursed ex-

penses now excludable, my bill provides deductions for the following: First, reimbursed expenses for “househunting” expenses incurred by the taxpayer in searching for a residence at his new place of work; second, temporary living expenses at the new business location before the taxpayer has found permanent living quarters; third, expenses of selling the former residence at the old work location; and fourth, miscellaneous expenses, such as attorney fees, and so forth, incident to the purchase of the new residence.

In my judgment no portion of such reimbursement should be considered as “taxable” income to the employee because it represents an unexpected, out of the ordinary expense which would not have been incurred by the employee had he not been requested to relocate in another area. The question of moving expense deductions is one of the phases of out tax laws on the list of items to be reviewed by the Committee on Ways and Means. I hope this means that favorable action will be taken in this session of Congress.

#### GOVERNMENT BY SECRECY AT THE FEDERAL RESERVE

### HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this week, we had another example of the government by secrecy that goes on at the Federal Reserve.

The Federal Reserve—in another of its magnanimous moods—released a summary of the actions taken by the Federal Open Market Committee back on November 26, 1968. We learned from this summary of the secret Open Market Committee meeting that there has been a sharp divergence of opinion on monetary policy within the Federal Reserve.

This fact is obviously of great importance to the Congress, yet we learn of it 3 months after the fact.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, there are an elite few in our economy who did not have to wait 90 days to receive this information. These are the insiders who are represented at each and every one of these Federal Open Market Committee meetings.

In addition to the seven members of the Federal Reserve Board, all 12 presidents of the Federal Reserve Banks also attend these Open Market Committee meetings in which the critical decisions about our economy and the level of interest rates are made.

These 12 presidents report directly to nine-member boards of directors at each district bank. Six of these directors on each board are selected directly from the commercial banking industry and the remaining three are men with “tested banking experience.”

It is reasonable to assume that these 12 Federal Reserve bank presidents reveal in great detail the discussions and the decisions of the secret Open Market Committee meetings which take place in the Federal Reserve building here in

Washington, D.C. Only the most naive would suggest that these bankers who sit on the boards of directors of the Federal Reserve district banks do not use this inside information for the benefit of themselves, their friends, and their banks.

Mr. Speaker, I estimate that at least 2,000 to 3,000 insiders know everything that goes on at these Federal Open Market Committee meetings. Yet the Members of Congress and the President of the United States are denied access to the meetings or to the minutes of these meetings. Only the summaries are released 90 days after the secret sessions.

Mr. Speaker, such a situation violates every rule of good government. Specifically, these secret Federal Open Market Committee meetings are in violation of the Freedom of Information Act passed by the 89th Congress.

This Congress should demand that this “government by secrecy” cease and that these meetings be open in keeping with the law. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of an article which appeared in the American Banker of February 25 concerning the release of the summaries of the Federal Reserve Open Market Committee meetings:

#### FOMC SPLIT ON COURSE AT NOVEMBER 26 MEETING

WASHINGTON.—The Federal Reserve Board Monday issued reports of meetings held by the Open Market Committee on Nov. 26 and Dec. 17, revealing a split in the members' views on the right course for monetary policy.

The earlier meeting ended with an 8-4 split in favor of seeking unchanged monetary conditions. The minority, including Alfred Hayes, president of the New York Fed, said they favored somewhat firmer money market conditions, both in view of inflation and to help maintain the strength of the dollar in foreign exchange markets.

Less than a month later, the Open Market Committee agreed unanimously that greater monetary restraint was required.

The members agreed that the discount rate should be increased, though views on the amount differed, and that one element of the new firmer money policy should be a more restrictive Open Market policy.

There was some support on Dec. 17 for “a moderate increase in member bank reserve requirements,” the report indicated, while some members thought the discount rate should be raised by as much as one-half point.

It was also argued that uncertainties on the foreign exchange markets, and the sensitive state of domestic financial markets militated against also increasing reserve requirements at the time or raising the discount rate by as much as one-half point.

The Federal Reserve Bank of New York was thus told on Dec. 17 to conduct its operations so as to attain firmer conditions in money and short-term credit markets, thus marking the official beginning of the present tight money policies.

#### SUPREME SACRIFICE MEDAL

### HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to introduce today legislation which would establish a “Supreme Sac-

rifice Medal" for survivors of American service men and women killed in the Vietnam war.

The Supreme Sacrifice Medal would be presented to the widow or widower and parents of the men and women who are killed in the Vietnam conflict. Presentation would be retroactive to December of 1961 when American troops became involved in the hostilities.

Since that time more than 31,000 of our finest Americans, including nearly 900 from my State of Indiana, have died in Vietnam fighting. The controversy over this war should not be allowed to overshadow the fact these brave Americans have lost their lives.

Their sacrifice often has gone unnoticed because of the nature of this undeclared war. Awarding of this medal would be one small way we could demonstrate the appreciation of a grateful nation.

Existing awards, including the Purple Heart and Medal of Honor, are presented to the service man or woman or in their name to the next of kin. The Supreme Sacrifice Medal specifically would honor the widow or widower and parents of the deceased.

The Supreme Sacrifice Medal would be designed so that it could be appropriately and prominently displayed in the home or place of business of the survivor to serve as a reminder of the supreme sacrifice made by them.

This medal would not in any way detract from the honors awarded to the deceased service man or woman. Instead, it would serve as an official symbol of the Nation's gratitude to those who have borne the tragic loss of a loved one so that succeeding generations may continue to live in freedom.

This legislation is based on a resolution approved by the Indiana Department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, VFW Post No. 1120 in Indianapolis, Ind., first proposed the resolution which later won unanimous support at the VFW National Convention in Detroit last August.

The following is the exact wording of that resolution:

**RESOLUTION 274—SUPREME SACRIFICIAL MEDAL**

Whereas, thousands of American servicemen have given, and are giving, their lives in active service all over the world; and

Whereas, many of these servicemen make the "Supreme Sacrifice" without benefit of any military honors from their country; and

Whereas, the families and next-of-kin of these servicemen would cherish a token of the official gratitude of our country for such Supreme Sacrifice; now, therefore

Be it resolved, by the 69th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, that we initiate and/or sponsor such legislation in the Congress of the United States to provide to the next-of-kin of any American serviceman killed in military action a "Supreme Sacrifice Medal" of a design suitable for the solemnity of the occasion.

Adopted at the 69th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States held at Detroit, Michigan, August 16 through 23, 1968.

I am honored that numerous Members of the House of Representatives have joined with me in cosponsoring this proposal. We invite our colleagues to support this legislation, as well as individual cit-

izens, other veterans' organizations, and civic groups across this Nation.

**FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE**

**HON. GEORGE H. FALLON**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy Contest. This year over 400,000 school students participated in the contest competing for the five scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. First prize is a \$5,000 scholarship, second prize is \$3,500, third prize is \$2,500, fourth prize is \$1,500 and the fifth prize is \$1,000. The contest theme was "Freedom's Challenge."

The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington, D.C., for the final judging as a guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

It is a pleasure for me to insert in the RECORD a copy of the winning speech, delivered by Mr. Gregory E. Malanowski, who is from the State of Maryland and who resides in my congressional district at 3521 Shannon Drive, Baltimore.

We in Maryland are very proud of Gregory and wish him every success.

The speech follows:

**FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE**

(By Gregory E. Malanowski)

The scene is a road-side diner someplace in southern Mississippi. There are a few people sitting in the diner, for, it was twelve o'clock. A young Negro came through the door and sat at the counter. The waiter looked up from what he was doing. The diner had never served a Negro previously. The people were now watching the waiter as the Negro asked for a menu. The waiter stood there, confused. He could do one of two things. Refuse to serve the Negro and force him out of the diner, and probably keep every white person happy; or, he could serve this young man, acknowledge the dignity and freedom of this individual, and probably lose all his white business.

This was "Freedom's Challenge."

Now, the scene shifts to a city in western Czechoslovakia. A middle-aged man, a noted news broadcaster in the city, had just come down to breakfast. He had a piece of toast and a quick cup of coffee, then he hurried out the door. Preoccupied with the show he was to do in fifteen minutes, backing the liberalized Dubcek government, he did not notice the unusual quiet about the streets. As he turned the corner into the square he stopped, mouth wide open, and just stood there. About a hundred yards in front of him was a tank with a Red Star and Russian soldiers on its turret.

Now, he was faced with a grave challenge—return home without causing any trouble, or, go on the air, support Dubcek, and risk arrest and imprisonment.

Freedom now challenged him.

In these situations, the characters are presented with vital questions which they must answer; fateful decisions which they must make. The examples seem out of context and distant—yet each is the voice of Freedom.

But—What is freedom?

Freedom is a peculiar idea. You can't see it, touch it, or taste it, yet, you can feel its presence, and you know when it is gone. Because it is abstract, people have characterized and symbolized Freedom in many ways.

When creating the Statue of Liberty, its sculptor characterized Freedom as a woman, and, rightfully so, for a woman is always challenging those who love her with little trials and tests. She finds out if her "suitors" really love her.

President Kennedy also symbolized Freedom, its responsibility and challenge, in his Inaugural Address. "The Torch has passed to a new generation of Americans." As a Torch, Freedom serves as a "beacon" of hope for those in darkness or under oppression; a beacon whose flame must never be allowed to die.

But these challenges, these are the things that keep Freedom alive in men's hearts. Without them we would lose our desire; with them we strengthen our hold on our greatest treasure—freedom.

Yet, we must take up Freedom's Challenge when it comes our way. Like the waiter, we should not snuff out the Torch with a blanket of hate, but kindle it in love and respect. Like the news broadcaster we should not embrace a new love—Communism—but extend our loyalty and fidelity to our only love—freedom. We should keep in mind as our guide, a few lines of a contemporary song on Freedom:

"Seems to me, we have to fight to keep people free

Until you and me learn to live together.

Seems to me, we gotta solve it individually

Both you and me must learn to love one another.

"So shout it from mountain on up to the sea  
People everywhere just wanna be free.  
Hard to understand, seems so simple to me  
People everywhere just wanna be free."

**RETIREMENT CREDIT FOR UNUSED SICK LEAVE**

**HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK**

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which if enacted will give retirement credit to those civil service employees who do not use all their accumulated sick leave.

Under the terms of this proposed legislation civil service employees will be allowed to retire 1 day early for each day of unused sick leave. This means that if a person works for 29 years and 2 weeks without ever taking one day of sick leave he could retire with credit for 30 years of continuous employment.

The law at present gives no credit for unused sick leave and when a person retires he loses all the sick leave he has accumulated by not being absent from work for reasons of illness. Thus, the dedicated employee would no longer fall to be paid for his dedication to his work and lack of absenteeism.

**FISH BILL SOUND**

**HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared in the Evening News of Beacon, N.Y., an outstanding newspaper in my

district, an editorial concerning the control of the criminal use of firearms. The editorial is a well reasoned and I believe a very sound argument that legislation that deals with gun control should be aimed at the criminal, not good citizens. I insert the editorial in the RECORD:

#### FISH BILL SOUND

Rep. Hamilton Fish Jr. (R-Dutchess and Ulster) has tried to plug a big hole in national legislation dealing with gun control.

The federal loophole which should be corrected in order to restrict criminal use of weapons, now permits courts to withhold penalties for such acts. The law provides for an additional sentence of from one to 10 years upon conviction for using or carrying a weapon in the commission of a crime. It also provides for a sentence of from 5-25 years for second or subsequent convictions.

However, it is discretionary with the court as to whether such a sentence should be imposed on first offenders. The additional sentence is compulsory in the case of second or subsequent offenses, but in both cases it is still discretionary with the court as to whether the additional sentence is to be served consecutively or concurrently with the sentence imposed for the crime committed with the weapon—robbery, homicide, etc.

Mr. Fish would make the prison sentence mandatory for all offenses, denying the use of probation as a substitute for first offenders. And his amendment would require that sentences for use of a weapon in commission of a crime be served consecutively.

He who uses a gun to commit a crime is prepared to commit murder, and he deserves such a severe sentence as to discourage if not deter such a practice. Concurrent sentences (served simultaneously) offer no deterrent to use of the weapon, nor does the knowledge that it may be possible to escape a prison sentence.

The law passed in 1968 already is being interpreted in a way to make good citizens register their weapons, just as many had feared. To buy ammunition (or a weapon) the citizen must provide identification, dealers report. Not much can be done about this unless sportsmen want to make an issue of it.

It's time those concerned over illegal possession or use of firearms tried to aim their fire at those who need it—not the honest citizens who don't require it.

At the same time our legislators might keep an eye on what goes on at the state level. Legislation dealing with firearms there also should be directed at the criminal—not the good citizens. Assemblyman H. Clark Bell (R-Ulster) has such a bill in the hopper at Albany and it deserves support, just like the proposal of Congressman Fish.

#### THE PROFESSIONAL STATESMANSHIP OF AVERELL HARRIMAN

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, political analysts are fond of describing American politics as government by amateurs. Because of our great reliance upon leaders in nongovernmental professions, they maintain that the Cincinnati figure is traditional in American politics. They often compare our elected representatives to this early Roman who left his comfortable estate in the countryside to serve in the Roman Senate. However, such a view underestimates the contribu-

tion to the American system made by our career statesmen.

In a model way, Averell Harriman reflects both traditions. He has rendered over three decades of service to his country and in fact made a career of it. Yet he had already had a successful career as a Wall Street industrialist. He gave up his wealthy Republican background to join Roosevelt's New Deal liberals in 1933, and since that time has served four Presidents with distinction. The United States is grateful for his participation in the national recovery program. A dedicated public servant, Harriman used his economic and administrative abilities to help rescue America from the misery of depression.

After a number of years in domestic government, Harriman transferred his talents to the international sphere. In 1941 he was appointed Ambassador to England. Shortly thereafter he represented the United States in Moscow. From these experiences stem his deep awareness of the tensions and complexities of East-West relations. As Ambassador to Europe in the postwar years, Harriman contributed to the reconstruction of a devastated Europe. His involvement in the founding of NATO tempered his reputation as a negotiator skilled in the problems of cold war diplomacy. In 1954 he returned to domestic service when he was elected Governor of New York. After a brief respite from the affairs of government, Harriman joined John Kennedy's New Frontier as its senior member. In his characteristically energetic fashion, he immediately put his abilities to work for the new administration. Among other things, he laid the groundwork for the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty of 1962. The following year he analyzed the explosive Sino-Indian border dispute for President Kennedy. President Johnson tapped the New Frontiersman emeritus to handle the Vietnam negotiations in Paris in the spring of 1968. Now, his baggage covered with the decals of many foreign ports, Averell Harriman has come home to his retirement—or so he says.

Men half his age marvel that this seemingly inexhaustible source of energy, and find it hard to think of him in retirement. His colleagues at the Paris peace talks recall being awakened early in the morning by the Harriman, now, having digested all the morning's newspapers, was ready to plan out the day's discussion.

Let us hold Averell Harriman the model statesman for future generations. Let us pay tribute to the man so deserving of our gratitude.

#### STATE, PENTAGON SPLIT ON COMMITMENTS TO SPAIN

### HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I find the press reports to be very disturbing that the military in the Pentagon independently developed an agreement with Spain with

respect to U.S. commitments to defend and protect that country. The New York Times of February 26 and Flora Lewis' column in the Washington Post of February 25 reported that the military had attempted to pressure the State Department into signing an agreement which contains a U.S. pledge to defend Spain as if it were a NATO country in exchange for Spain's extension of the leases for two U.S. airbases and a submarine base which expire on March 26.

These articles raise serious questions about who is actually conducting the foreign policy of the United States, the military or the State Department. The dangers posed by the military playing a predominant role in the exercise of foreign policy are so acute that I believe this entire episode warrants a prompt and thorough investigation.

Foreign policy must be developed within a broad spectrum of discussion and debate. While it may be true that sensitive diplomatic negotiations cannot already be carried on in public, decisions which imply far-reaching commitments for the United States must be considered at all levels of government.

During the past several years the influence of the military on the shaping of U.S. commitments has become more and more evident.

Two years ago we discovered that the CIA also was making foreign policy on its own initiatives. At a time when the extent and propriety of our foreign commitments are being called into serious question by large segments of our population, we cannot allow military usurpation of policymaking prerogatives. I urge the House to give thorough consideration to the question of who really makes U.S. foreign policy.

I include the following article by Flora Lewis from the Washington Post of February 25:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 25, 1969]

#### STATE, PENTAGON SPLIT ON COMMITMENTS TO SPAIN

A secret dispute has developed between the State Department and the Joint Chiefs of Staff over American commitments to Franco Spain. At one point, the military almost made a U.S. pledge to fight for Spain as though it were a NATO country.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which is starting to study how the U.S. gets into military obligation abroad, got wind of the blow-up between the State Department and the Pentagon at its peak. A committee staff member inquired and was told by both sides that there was no disagreement, no trouble. The executive departments are not inviting the Senators into their quarrel.

But the trouble has been brewing for months. The issue is now on its way to the National Security Council and will have to be decided by President Nixon. The story is a new case history of how the U.S. can stumble into a foreign war.

The immediate issue is the two air bases and the submarine base which the U.S. has in Spain. Although American officials disagree on their precise value, there is general agreement that none is essential to national security though all are useful.

The base agreement runs out this year. It provides that unless Madrid and Washington agree on renewal terms by March 26, the U.S. must evacuate within one year.

Talks on renewal went on during much of 1968. But last September, the Spaniards broke off negotiations, saying the gap be-

tween their price of \$700 million in new weapons for another five years' use of the bases and the U.S. offer of \$140 million in weapons and services was too big. If it was a bluff, it didn't work.

So in October, Spanish Foreign Minister Fernando Maria Castiella called on then Secretary of State Dean Rusk to launch a new approach. In place of the diplomatic talks, an American military mission was assigned to a three-stage discussion with the Spanish military, who dominate Spain. They were to assess the actual threat facing Spain, the "tasks and missions" the Spaniards must undertake to face it, and then the equipment needed to do the job.

Rusk's idea was that by tackling the subject in terms of needs rather than supplies, Madrid could be brought way down from its exorbitant demands for its three armed services.

Rusk also asked, twice, for a six-month extension of the March 26 deadline to give the new Administration time for this important policy decision. The Spaniards flatly refused.

On Nov. 18-20, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, visited Madrid and opened the talks. He made a general speech about Western strategy and mentioned in passing "the potential problem of political instability in North Africa." And to head the mission he named Maj. Gen. David A. Burchinal, a tall, dapper man who as deputy to NATO supreme commander Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer has the dual role of second in command over all NATO forces in Europe and over all American forces in Europe.

Burchinal started work on Dec. 7. Two days later he signed a joint minute with the Spaniards on the threat they face. It included as a serious element the threat of limited war in North Africa, mentioning such possibilities as Algerian aggression, a "proxy" war in the Spanish colonies backed by the Russians, and other highly unlikely developments. His signature to this vast expansion of Wheeler's remark implied that Spain was justified in seeking far more weapons than the U.S. wants to give.

While he worked, he kept his papers locked in a safe at the U.S. air base at Torrejon, which is under his command. Neither the U.S. Embassy in Madrid nor the regular U.S. military mission there was given any word on conduct of the talks, nor could they possibly get access to the papers that were taken each night from Madrid to Torrejon.

Burchinal sent his copy of the signed minute back to Wheeler. It was not shown to the State Department nor to Pentagon civilians. After two weeks, with the intervention of top Pentagon civilians, the paper was finally produced.

The civilians, at the Pentagon and especially at State, were distressed with it. The extended reference to a threat from North Africa could be used to involve the U.S. in a Spanish colonial war. They wanted the text changed. Burchinal refused on the grounds that it was already signed and that trying to get a redraft would ruin his negotiations.

So State and the Pentagon compromised. They agreed on the text of a "prefatory note" which was sent to Burchinal to be inserted in the next joint minute on "tasks and missions." The note said the talks were a useful exchange of views but that nothing in the first or future minutes could be considered a binding Spanish-American understanding or commitment.

They also agreed on a proposed minute for the second stage and sent it to Burchinal to negotiate. It eliminated the whole passage about North Africa. There was no report from Burchinal for over a month. Then, in early February, he returned the jointly signed minute with a deadline of 48 hours for approval. The Joint Chiefs demanded State's endorsement.

The State Department people exploded. Burchinal had made three crucial changes:

1. The "threat from North Africa" idea was reinserted.

2. A statement was inserted saying the U.S. was obligated to defend Western Europe "of which Spain is an integral part." State Department lawyers pointed out that this could extend the NATO guarantee to include Spain, a vast and probably illegal commitment without Senate ratification.

3. The "prefatory note" was changed. It said that the minutes were "agreed views" of the two military sides and "must constitute" the basis for further talks on arms for Spain, though it still contained the phrase that this was not a commitment.

Furthermore, State was incensed at the impertinence of the 48-hour deadline and refused approval. Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird intervened on the request of Pentagon staff. He got Secretary of State Williams P. Rogers, who was in Florida, to insist on speedy clearance of the paper.

An inter-departmental meeting was called. It was stormy. Reluctantly, State agreed to endorse Burchinal's minute provided two changes were made. The fateful "integral part of Europe" phrase was removed and a sentence was added to the "prefatory note" saying the talks "do not necessarily reflect the views of the two governments."

The whole issue was then sent, as case No. 1, to the new Inter-Departmental Group for Europe set up under the Nixon Administration's machinery for funneling policy decisions to the National Security Council. Assistant Secretary of State John Leddy is chairman of the group. Its report went into the broad dangers of any security commitment to troubled Spain, whether the U.S. really needs the bases and how high a price it should pay for them in terms of both money and future policy risks.

The Spaniards have repeatedly made vague threats that they might turn neutral if there is no new base agreement. Some American officers argue that Madrid might settle for fewer weapons if it could get a mutual security treaty with the U.S. American diplomats are convinced this would be an outrageously false economy.

At the least it would open the U.S. to serious charges from anti-Franco Spaniards that it deliberately supported his dictatorship, as Cuban moderates who initially supported Castro charged about Batista. At the worst, it could impel the U.S. into an unwanted war.

#### CONGRESSMAN HORTON CALLS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF NONLETHAL WEAPONS FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT

### HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, modern police organizations are leaning toward nonviolence and minimum force in crime, arrests, and mob control. In their present form, most law-enforcement weapons developed to date are neither adequately evaluated, properly used, or fully developed.

The development of nonlethal weapons for crowd and riot control is one of the most neglected aspects of the war on crime.

I submitted legislation today which would amend the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1968 by setting aside \$5,000,000 for the research and produc-

tion of effective, but nonlethal crime and riot control weapons.

As the President said when he signed this bill into law, "much more needs to be done."

Our present police weapons are inadequate and lethal. Law enforcement officers are using the same equipment that police used 100 years ago, the stick and the gun.

When criminals and rioters have access to the same weapons, the law-enforcement officer and even the fireman faces the risk of physical injury and death each time he responds to a call for assistance.

The primary emphasis of this bill is on research leading to the development, fabrication, production, and subsequent dispensing to law-enforcement agencies and personnel of weapons and techniques that are basically nonlethal and noninjurious.

Training law-enforcement officers in the use of these weapons and techniques, after they are developed, is also provided for.

This bill strictly limits the disbursement of any weapons or techniques developed solely to law enforcement agencies and personnel. To do less would materially weaken the intent of putting superior nonlethal weapons force in the hands of police alone.

Mr. Speaker, superior equipment and systems developed by science and industry would vastly improve police recruitment, law enforcement procedures, and community relations.

It is surprising to me that today's law-enforcement agencies continue to purchase the total output of police firearms offered by manufacturers.

The service revolver is neither self-loading nor automatic. It has a six-shot capacity and crude open sights. It lacks magazine loading, must be manually operated, and its off-center grip makes the gun recoil.

When you take this weapon and match it with the orders "shoot to maim," what you have is a preposterous situation.

As long as such weapons continue to be in demand, as long as the major firearms manufacturers can sell all the handguns they produce, there is little need from the corporate point of view to develop an improved handgun for "police only."

That is why appropriations expressly for research and development of a superior police weapon, with both offensive and defensive capacity, is so important. Lethal and nonlethal weapon supremacy in the hands of the police would result in fewer challenges of law enforcement. Typical real life shooting confrontations might result in no shootings at all.

We have on the market tear gases, stench chemicals, electric sticks, bright lights, net snares, high-pitched sound and directional horns, smoke bombs, detergent foam, itching powder, water guns, dye markers, and tranquilizing sprays.

I see no reason to believe that the mood of a mob can be changed with bayonets, guns, and billy clubs.

Death and permanent injury are the seeds from which violent disorder grows.

As such, it could trigger a possible epidemic of civil discontent.

Europe surpasses us in this respect. Firehoses are used to confuse, cool off, and hold off mobs. With a high trajectory stream of water a crowd can be moved with minimum injury. When a dye is mixed into the stream, rioters can later be identified.

Law enforcement in the United States has not yet begun to explore the possibilities of utilizing the many chemical agents we already have available as non-lethal crowd control weapons.

My bill makes it possible for the police to look to science and technology for the use, application, and development of weapons and techniques which would greatly reduce the opportunity for crime to be committed easily or successfully.

Fabrication and design is the keystone of effective nonlethal weapons development. Law enforcement officers could dissipate mobs before they get organized, and apprehend fleeing suspects without the use of clubs and bullets.

Not only would would-be rioters be discouraged from rioting in the first place, but police could do their work in relative freedom from charges of brutality and manslaughter. Training in these techniques will enhance the effectiveness of police forces across the country.

Mr. Speaker, if we fail to provide the money allotted in this legislation to invent, perfect, and train law-enforcement personnel in effective and nonlethal weapons and procedures, then conventional firearms and weapons will continue to be used in accordance with the demands, judgment, and risks of the moment.

The use of conventional weapons will only serve to prolong riots and stimulate intervention. Help me to prevent this by supporting this legislation.

#### HUMAN NUTRITION ACT OF 1969

### HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am privileged to have three colleagues—the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREEN)—join me in introducing legislation to define formally the ultimate responsibility of the Federal Government to see that all Americans can be free from hunger and malnutrition.

This legislation would, moreover, clearly focus the responsibility for national food assistance programs within the Department of Agriculture by creating an Assistant Secretary for Human Nutrition.

Finally, our bill would set up an Advisory Council on Human Nutrition, including, in its membership, specialists in the fields of human nutrition, food distribution, and food assistance to advise the Agriculture Secretary, the President, and the Congress. The Advisory Council would submit an annual "state of the Union" message on the nutritional

health of the American people. The Council would do so with an independent staff of its own, free to let the chips fall where they may in making its judgments and recommendations. The Council would be able to maintain a continuous yearly review—through independent consultants as well as its own staff—of Federal, State, local and private food programs throughout the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure Members on both sides of the aisle agree that much needs to be done to refine the effectiveness of the Agriculture Department's food programs. In the last Congress, I had the pleasure of serving with Senator, then Representative, CHARLES E. GOODELL, Republican, of New York, as cochairman of the bipartisan "Coalition To Help Malnourished Americans." We sponsored legislation, which was approved by the House, implying a national commitment to eradicate hunger and malnutrition in the United States.

Subsequently, the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs has rendered valuable service in further developing the dimensions of the hunger problem. Dr. Arnold E. Schaefer, director of the National Nutrition Survey, in recent testimony before the Senate select committee, stated:

Our studies to date clearly indicate that there is malnutrition, and in our opinion it occurs in an *unexpectedly* large proportion of our sample population. One of the major objectives of the National Nutrition Survey is to determine the prevalence of the various population groups that are in a serious health risk status as a result of their nutritional status . . . [Emphasis added.]

Of special concern to us is so-called "hidden hunger" in which the individual may not recognize any particular symptom; however, in essence he has such low nutrient tissue levels, that if he is subjected to a continued inadequate diet and/or additional stress such as hard physical labor, infectious or chronic disease, his physiological functional performance is reduced and eventually the physical manifestations of malnutrition will appear. The preschool child from the time of weaning until approximately six years of age is the most vulnerable to problems of malnutrition. His well being is dependent upon the knowledge and capability of the mother to properly feed him and protect his health, supply clothing and shelter. The problems of malnutrition are definitely associated with other health, education, social and economic problems.

I should like to add that while Federal, State, and local food assistance programs are often underfinanced, require prompt expansion into areas not now served and need more imaginative administration to reach the needy effectively, we cannot hope finally to overcome the hunger problem without the full participation of American business. American food companies have made great strides in developing new fortified food products and have made important improvements in both food-delivery systems and in developing products that are not only nutritious but which can appeal to the taste of the diverse malnourished groups in the United States.

These private firms are giving consideration to many constructive proposals which merit the careful attention of the Congress. It is becoming clear that one of the most efficient ways we can allocate our food-assistance resources is through

vastly expanded school breakfast and lunch programs.

I might add, for my own part, that the contribution private food service companies can make, particularly in low-income school districts, cannot be underestimated. We might well look to the example set by many large private firms in the use of such companies to feed their own employees. Some American food companies have also suggested new approaches in the food stamp program such as special supplementary stamps for expectant mothers to further enrich their diets.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to express my deepest gratification over President Nixon's recent statement to the Agriculture Department employees, emphasizing the capability of the United States to wipe out hunger and malnutrition in this country. The existence of such a capability should be a powerful incentive for a clear commitment and effective action on a national scale.

#### THE 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

### HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, as we have just recently commemorated the 51st anniversary of Lithuanian independence, I feel it would be appropriate to include in the RECORD the following resolution, which was adopted by the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey at their meeting on February 16, 1969. I feel this would be a tribute to those who are still fighting for those freedoms we hold so dear in our own country:

#### RESOLUTION

(Unanimously adopted at a meeting of American-Lithuanians and their friends living in New Jersey, sponsored by the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey, held on Sunday, February 16, 1969 at St. George's Lithuanian Hall, Newark, New Jersey, in commemoration of the 51st anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918.)

Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania by force in June of 1940; and

Whereas the Lithuanian people are strongly opposed to foreign domination and are determined to restore their freedom and sovereignty which they rightly and deservedly enjoyed for more than seven centuries in the past; and

Whereas the Soviets have deported or killed over twenty-five per cent of the Lithuanian population since June 15, 1940; and

Whereas the House of Representatives and the United States Senate (of the 89th Congress) unanimously passed *House Concurrent Resolution 416* urging the President of the United States to direct the attention of the world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, Americans of Lithuanian origin or decent, reaffirm our adhe-

rence to American democratic principles of government and pledge our support to our President and our Congress to achieve lasting peace, freedom and justice in the world; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States carries out the expression of the U.S. Congress contained in *H. Con. Res. 416* by bringing up the Baltic States question in the United Nations and demanding the Soviets to withdraw from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and be it further

Resolved, That the pauperization of the Lithuanian people, conversion of once free farmers into serfs on kolkhozes and sovkhoses, as well as exploitation of workers, persecution of the faithful, restriction of religious practices, and closing of houses of worship, and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded this day to the President of the United States, Secretary of State William Rogers, United States Ambassador to the United Nations Charles Yost, United States Senators from New Jersey, Members of U.S. Congress from New Jersey, and the press.

VALENTINAS MELINIS,  
President.  
ALBIN S. TRECIOKAS,  
Secretary.

G. WARREN NUTTER

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. MARSH, Mr. Speaker, the President's appointment of Mr. G. Warren Nutter, of the University of Virginia, as Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs has generated considerable editorial comment.

I believe that the following editorial, which appeared in the Daily Progress, Charlottesville, Va., on February 24, 1969, will be of interest to Members of the House:

MR. NUTTER AND ISA

So upset is the Washington Post that it devoted its lead editorial yesterday morning to an attack on the appointment of G. Warren Nutter of the University of Virginia as assistant secretary of defense for international security affairs.

The ISA, said the Post, is the foreign policy arm of the Department of Defense and is a lot more sensitive and important position than most people think.

Mr. Nutter, says the Post, is not qualified to hold this position, or at least he should not have been appointed to it, because of "his history as an intellectual zealot of the Right."

Furthermore, said the Post, Mr. Nutter's political judgment must be regarded as questionable in view of his support of Barry Goldwater in the 1964 presidential campaign and his position as a member of the inner circle of Mr. Goldwater's advisers in that campaign.

"To have thought that a man with such eccentric views in the field with which Mr. Nutter will be concerned would have been a good President, is scarcely a mark of the kind of judgment required for this sensitive job," said the Post.

And, although Mr. Nutter is recognized as one of the top international authorities on Russia, the Post takes him to task, adding "nor do the harsh and somewhat simplistic statements he has recurrently made on U.S.-Soviet relations suggest a bent of thought especially suitable to the job at ISA."

In other words, Mr. Nutter just will not do. He is rightist while the Post is leftist. Mr. Nutter is a zigger when he must be a zagger to qualify for the ISA position.

It will be recalled in the 1964 campaign, for which Mr. Nutter was one of Mr. Goldwater's closest advisers, one of the things that buried the Arizona senator was his recommendations for escalation of the war in Vietnam, a position that led the Post and a number of other newspapers and individuals to denounce Mr. Goldwater as something of a madman who would plunge the world into suicidal war.

The Post flayed Mr. Goldwater almost daily for his ideas on what to do in Vietnam, yet fell strangely silent in the months following the election when President Johnson carried out the Goldwater proposals almost lock, stock and barrel and in some instances escalated the war in Vietnam far beyond anything that Mr. Goldwater had dared to suggest.

The only explanation we can see for this is that Mr. Goldwater wore a Conservative label while Mr. Johnson leaned somewhat in line with the Post toward a leftist position, a strange way indeed to judge the capabilities of men and the programs which they recommend and which they carry out.

Mr. Nutter has a long record of service to his University, his state and his nation and if the Nixon Administration had no confidence in him, he would not have been named to head the ISA. At the very least he deserves an opportunity to demonstrate—as he has done often in the past—that he can handle this call to duty. Certainly his qualifications should not be questioned because he does not think as the Washington Post thinks.

PACKAGE OF MODEST REFORMS  
AIMS AT BETTER JOB ON HILL

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks attempts have been renewed to achieve essential reforms in the Congress. As we consider proposals and hopefully take action, I believe it is important to keep in mind the increasing support these measures enjoy among the American people.

This support will be shaped in large part by the manner in which the news media present the case for reform, and a number of commentators have stated very clearly their views of what the proposed legislation would achieve. I include a column written by Roscoe and Geoffrey Drummond which appeared in the Washington Post on February 8, and an editorial from the New York Times of February 11, at this point. Both articles portray the proposed changes as reasonable and essential if the Congress is to function effectively in a responsible manner in the months and years ahead. The articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,  
Feb. 8, 1969]

PACKAGE OF MODEST REFORMS AIMS AT  
BETTER JOB ON HILL

(By Roscoe and Geoffrey Drummond)

It's Them Against Us, and to most people Government is Them.

And unless Government moves more to be

Us, it is encouraging frustration and violence.

Congress in particular has got to do a better job, and the public will have to push them into doing it.

Majority rule must have more power in Congress, and its creaky machinery must be modernized so that it can transact the public business more openly, more efficiently and more responsively.

Fortunately, a package of measures to do this is being put up to the House by a sizable bipartisan group, led by Rep. Donald Rumsfeld (R-Ill.).

They are modest but useful reforms and all headed in the right direction.

Their direction is toward loosening the stifling dominance of powerful committee chairmen and toward making Congress more responsive to its own majority so that it can be more responsive to the majority of the people.

There is momentum behind the Rumsfeld push, but we need to bear in mind that most of the senior, powerful members of Congress like self-reform about the way Winnie the Pooh likes your honey.

This is why strong public support will be needed, and to that end we should know what the reform proposals would do and why they are critical to the Congress and to the country.

Separately, these reforms are not very exciting but, added together, they go to the heart of making democratic Government function more democratically. Here are some of the things they provide:

Senate committees must meet on "written consent of a majority of the committee." Sounds innocent, but without it committee chairmen can single-handedly suffocate legislation by refusing to call a meeting.

Congressional committee meetings shall be public unless the majority rules otherwise.

Roll call votes on bills within committees shall be made public.

A committee chairman must report on the written demand of a committee majority within seven days any measure approved by the committee. This is crucial. Some committee chairmen have pigeonholed approved bills for months.

No more proxy voting.

There shall be a roll call vote in both Houses on all appropriations bills. In the past, billions of dollars have been approved without it being known how anybody voted.

Every bill must contain a committee estimate of the cost of carrying it out.

There shall be a permanent Joint Committee on Congressional Operations to give continual study to congressional functioning and how to improve it.

These are not casual proposals. Most of them were unanimously urged by the Monroney Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization in 1967 and passed by the Senate 75 to 9. Then the House Democratic leadership raised its hands in holy horror and arrogantly proved the need of these reforms by keeping them buried in the dark recesses of outdated rules.

These measures are coming forward again at a moment when they are especially important. Many Americans, who want nothing to do with the destructive militants, feel frustrated and on the outside looking in when it comes to the functioning of their Government.

Unless Congress wants to feed this frustration and fuel the cause of the violence, it must prove that Government by the "consent" of the governed requires that Congress must be responsible to the majority of the governed. It can only be so when its own majority can put its hands on the levers of Congress.

That's what it is all about. That is why the new congressional reorganization bill needs public support—and deserves it.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 11, 1969]

#### REBELS IN THE HOUSE

Twenty-six younger Republicans in the House under the leadership of Representative Rumsfeld of Illinois and Conable of New York have introduced a bill to make the workings of Congress and its committees more open, more orderly and more responsible. A comparable group of younger Democrats is preparing a reform bill along similar lines.

One objective of the reformers is to democratize the internal procedures of the various committees. These vary widely, depending upon the personal strength of each committee chairman and the traditions of each committee. The bill would enable a majority of a committee to overrule a chairman who holds up a bill by refusing to report it to the floor or even to schedule hearings on it.

The minority party would be granted its own staff on each committee, thereby correcting a scandalously unfair condition which now exists in a few committees. Every committee vote would be made public. Proxies would be abolished. As the Joint Committee on Reorganization pointed out in the last Congress, proxies are a convenience for busy members, but the evils of this practice outweigh the advantage. Proxy voting tends to discourage attendance at committee meetings and sometimes makes a farce out of committee deliberations. "You cannot argue with a proxy; a proxy cannot consider an offered amendment; a proxy cannot compromise."

Committees would be empowered to hold hearings during the fall when Congress is not in session in order to prepare bills for Congress to consider in January and February, normally unproductive months. Scheduling of bills would also be altered to break the "Tuesday-to-Thursday" club and get the House on a true five-day work week. In view of the increased salary which members are about to receive, there is no longer any shadow of an excuse for members to rush back Thursday night to their law practices and insurance offices. Unfortunately, the bill does not ban this Congressional "moonlighting."

Other provisions of the bill would improve the effectiveness of the committees in reviewing the work of the Federal agencies under their jurisdiction, abolish Congressional control over appointments to West Point and Annapolis and strengthen the regulation of lobbyists.

These are all modest reforms. It is a measure of the inwardness and complacency of the Democratic committee chairmen and a few of their senior colleagues in both parties that a similar package of reforms was smothered in the House Rules Committee last year. Only by the old-fashioned standards of Capitol Hill would the proponents of these changes be regarded as rebels and disturbers of the peace. But time is on the side of the young men in both parties. Moreover, Representative Ford of Michigan, the minority floor leader, has made Congressional reorganization a party issue. If Speaker McCormack and the rest of the Democratic leadership are wise, they, too, will begin heeding the voices of change.

#### COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the war on poverty has developed a distinct, personal approach in Austin, Tex., largely

through the efforts of a community involvement project. Since the poverty programs administered through the Office of Economic Opportunity will once again be scrutinized by Congress, I would like to explain this innovative program at this time.

The community involvement program is a demonstration through the Human Opportunities Corporation of Austin and Travis County, OEO, and the Hogg Foundation for Mental Health at the University of Texas.

Mrs. Sidney Smith, chairman of the committee, sent a detailed report of the CIP activities and I would like to enter excerpts of her report at this time:

The intent of this proposal is to develop widespread local community support for anti-poverty efforts through the direct involvement of heretofore uninvolved segments of the community in the development, implementation, and evaluation of programs designed to meet the self-articulated needs of the poor.

The present administration has stressed that private enterprise ought to be brought directly into the scope of the poverty program, probably in tax credit incentive programs, and perhaps this can be made to work. It deserves our careful consideration. But even more important than business participation is the direct involvement of individual citizens. When individuals get involved they find a way to help. The community involvement program in Austin has been one of the first, if not the only demonstration program in America, where we have stressed individual participation. Just think, Mr. Speaker, if we could harness the help of individuals in our churches, schools, PTA organizations, civic clubs, fraternal organizations, veterans groups, garden clubs, and the myriad of women's organizations—what a tremendous force to reduce problems of poverty, hunger, and disease. I am proud that this demonstration program was started in Austin, Tex., and I hope that other communities over the Nation will attempt the same direct manner and invite leading citizens to help. I am confident similar programs are underway throughout our land.

Mrs. Smith's report added that—

The use of pre-determined techniques, not previously used in this community action program, in all phases of the program will result in achieving the desired goal. Simultaneously, it is expected that existing unmet needs of the target population will to an appreciable extent be met through a coordinated multi-service approach of existing unused and underutilized local resources.

In an accompanying letter, Mrs. Smith explains some rather unusual aspects of the program that have proven highly successful. Excerpts from the letter include:

This unique project was set up, not primarily as a public relations vehicle to spotlight the poverty program, but fundamentally to see if the poor can articulate their own needs and to discover if hitherto uninvolved segments of our affluent population can be encouraged to become involved.

There is no problem of funding this particular program for another year. As the budget sheet reflects, we have not begun to expend our funds from the initial grant. It was recommended by the regional office that we not request a second year's grant, and we are operating for the next fiscal year on the

residue of money remaining from our first year's budget.

Now we are involved in what we consider perhaps one of the most innovative and exciting efforts yet made in the War on Poverty. It is our hope that our demonstration, small though it is, will be a microcosm of what might be done on a large scale in other efforts.

We are endeavoring, through the efforts of Mr. Osborn, the District Director of Internal Revenue, to enlist the help of the community's largest employers in a training program for under-employed members of the East side. But we are not stopping there. Recognizing that it is not enough to help the head of the house with his job and to neglect the remainder of the family, we are making this a Family Involvement Project. No man will be taken for training unless his whole family agrees to share in the training effort in many areas. We have experts who will work with the young people, both scholastically and in information concerning human relations, home making, and practical skills. We are planning discussion groups for the mothers (and we hope to have indigenous leaders from the neighborhoods as teachers and teacher's aides). These courses will include home and family living, human relations, employment, education, legal aid, gardening, sewing, loan applications, cooking and any other helpful items we think relevant. Each family will have a "monitor family."

All of us involved are excited over this idea. If we can pull it off, we feel as if we will have made a contribution consisting mainly of helping families learn to help themselves through their own strengths and efforts.

Mr. Speaker, at this juncture, I would like to introduce excerpts from the full report:

The Office of Economic Opportunity designs programs to help people help themselves. It is not welfare by any means, but, instead, it helps people to solve their problems. A breakdown in dialogue comes when government brings money into a community and gives it away. The only way to solve this problem is by having people work along side the government. The government is responsible if only the people will let them know what they want.

The welfare approach is not always the best way. It creates a dependency. Human Opportunities Corporation will not do this to people and make them want to linger in their present poverty. People in poverty want to succeed and make better lives for themselves.

We hope that the community will see the needs of these people and respond to them in a way the government cannot. We want to demonstrate to the country that the project can work both for the community and the government.

Essentially, the project was to attack a serious problem which is native to any area where government or private agencies wage their "War on Poverty." This problem revolves around the lack of community support for local and anti-poverty efforts.

The formal presentation of the Community Involvement Project idea included these specific problem areas:

1. Absence of visible relationship of H.O.C. to anti-poverty efforts.
2. Absence of techniques which make possible the participation of sufficient community involvement in all phases of program planning, development, and evaluation of programs.
3. Absence of sufficient opportunity for the poor to articulate their own perceptions of unmet needs.
4. Absence of a vehicle through which heretofore uninvolved or marginally involved community groups can develop projects in direct response to unmet needs as articulated by the poor.

5. Absence of a vehicle through which the above described groups can relate and coordinate their efforts so as to develop a multi-service approach.

6. Absence of paid technical expertise in the above described groups to assist them in development, implementation, and evaluation of self-generated and self-supporting projects.

These outlined problem areas were to be the focal of the C.I.P. Perhaps the key problem and the key solution to the success of this community effort may be found in item (6) above.

The development of social welfare, or more correctly, social programs, has been viewed with many a doubting eye, mainly because of the apparent ineffectual administration of the programs. For many years before the Office of Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the basic philosophy of social programs involved the concept that volunteer efforts could effectively attack the problems of poverty. However, with the coming of the Kennedy administration and later the Johnson administration, this type of thinking gave way to the realization that the hiring of paid professionals, working in conjunction with volunteer efforts, was the only answer to a meaningful "War on Poverty." Too much energy was being expended in too many different directions, with the end result being a much less efficient overall effort.

In the case of Austin, or perhaps any community in the country, interested people belong to groups such as the League of Women Voters, the Chamber of Commerce, the Junior Chamber, the Optimist Club, or any number of other organizations. It seems that belonging to a club or civic organization is part of the American way. For some it is means to become involved while for others a way to make new business contacts. Whatever the reason for belonging, the small local club or organization is a functioning part of all our communities. And, for the most part, the plethora of civic organizations are quite separate entities in themselves. They very seldom participate in joint ventures of any sort, and when they do, the result is often chaos.

Since the intention of most service or civic groups is to try to serve their communities, it would seem that these would be logical vehicles to further the War on Poverty at the local level. The Community Involvement Project is designed to test this concept.

In addition to the above-mentioned test of whether or not established civic groups could, or would, sponsor an effort aimed at promoting community involvement, the O.E.O. project will also explore the following questions:

1. Whether direct (and visible) administration of (the) program will engender more extensive and intensive support for anti-poverty efforts.

2. Whether involvement of community groups in all phases of community action (development, implementation and evaluation) will result in more extensive and more intensive support.

3. Whether heretofore non-involved and marginally involved community groups can develop coordinated, broadly based, joint programs.

4. Whether members of the poverty population functioning as staff participants and beneficiaries can best articulate their own needs and develop community enthusiasm for the program.

5. Whether a structured pre-service and in-service training program for indigenous neighborhood staff can open new career opportunities.

6. Whether planned for on-going and past evaluation will maximize volunteer efforts.

In summary, the Community Involvement Project attempts to make use of vehicles already in existence and functioning toward community benefit. Groups and organiza-

tions which are typically native to white, affluent Austin were asked to send representatives to a central governing and operating unit, the Community Involvement Committee. These representatives act as liaison between the committee, the poor, and their own respective clubs or organizations.

Likewise, the representatives of the poor, economically deprived areas of Austin have been selected from already functioning neighborhood committees. These committees are set up to handle problems which generate from the neighborhood level. One project the Community Involvement program undertook was with the help of the Austin Real Estate Board. This group of men gave many cases of paint to neighborhoods if they would paint up and fix up their homes. This did not cost the government. It was a donation by Austin businessmen. The project was successful, though it was limited in geographical approach.

#### NIXON COMMENDED FOR GERMAN UNITY STAND

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, with the world divided—two Vietnams, two Koreas, two Chinas, two Rhodesias, two Germanys—and with every power play to keep it divided, into Communist and free, it was indeed refreshing to hear President Nixon from the capital of free Germany, a country divided into five occupied zones, state:

One thing that has not changed is our devotion and dedication to the goal that the German people will again be united.

Here in Congress, in my remarks of May 1, 1968, I had recognized the need for a reunification of Germany, and a reuniting of her people with their own common culture so they might attain their position of leadership—a friendly bastion in a world sorely seeking peace and unity.

President Nixon's leadership is in keeping with the objectives of free people the world over in permitting nations to have self-determination, free from outside interference.

Mr. Speaker, I insert a news account of President Nixon's Bonn talks following my comments:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 27, 1969]

#### GERMANS PLEASUED BY NIXON—ALLIANCE UNITY IS DISCUSSED IN BONN TALKS (By Richard Harwood)

BONN, February 26.—President Nixon flew into Germany today for the twelfth time since 1947 and came face to face with many of the problems he had encountered on his first visit 22 years ago.

As in the past, there was a crisis atmosphere over Berlin, where the President goes Thursday. The old unresolved issue of German reunification was still alive and came up in Mr. Nixon's initial talks with Chancellor Kiesinger. There was concern on Kiesinger's part over the treaty to limit the spread of nuclear arms. There was talk of sharing the costs of the NATO alliance. And there were the perennial questions about the negotiating intentions of the United States and the Soviet Union.

#### PERSONAL TRIUMPH

Nevertheless, the President's first day in Bonn is being described by both politicians and journalists as something of a personal triumph.

He left the West German Parliament laughing and cheering today after a brief speech arranged at Mr. Nixon's initiative. One Social Democratic member said he had made a better impression than any other post-war American President among politicians here, including the late President Kennedy.

A West German Foreign Office official said the public had responded with equal enthusiasm to the President, whose activities have been widely televised today. His references to the German heritage of his children (they had a grandmother who was born in Germany) and his repeated pledges to maintain and strengthen the U.S.-West German alliance met with particular approval.

#### GREETED BY KIESINGER

Chancellor Kiesinger greeted him with a small speech: "I view this (trip) as an expression of your conviction, which I share, that co-operation between the United States and free Europe is an important, if not the most important, precondition for the maintenance and strengthening of world peace."

Mr. Nixon replied: "One thing that has not changed (since his first trip in 1947) is our devotion and dedication to the goal that the German people will again be united."

"One thing that has not changed is our mutual dedication to the principle of independence and freedom for all of the peoples of Western Europe. And one thing that has not changed is that dedication to the great alliance of which we are a part."

From the airport, Kiesinger and the President drove to the Chancellor's office to begin a series of discussions that lasted much of the day.

They took a break after lunch and en route to the president's residence in the American settlement, Mr. Nixon stopped his car four times to get out and shake hands with people along the way. An old woman in the crowd gave him a gray pigeon, the symbolic bird of peace. Mr. Nixon stroked the bird, put it on his arm and smiled as it flew away. The crowd cheered.

#### TALKS WITH PEOPLE

Later he met with a group of private citizens—as he did in London yesterday—for a give-and-take conversation on the problems of life in the 20th century. His visitors included businessmen, academicians, journalists, bankers, youth leaders, and politicians.

Following the morning conversations between the President and the Chancellor, official spokesmen for the two governments reported that the discussion had ranged over the major diplomatic problems of the world.

#### AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS MUST BE AIDED

### HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as today's air passenger relaxes in the comfort of his seat onboard a giant transcontinental jet, he thinks of his safety and security being the primary responsibility of one man—the pilot. Yet, there are many who are involved in the complex task of keeping the Nation's aircraft flying safely to their destinations and have an almost equal rank with the pilots in this respect. This group of men functions un-

seen and unknown to the average passenger.

I refer to the air traffic controllers, those anonymous but highly vital Government employees who are responsible for guiding and directing our aircraft to prevent midair collisions or other mishaps which could result in tragic loss of life and property. A pilot is in charge of one airplane and its passengers, but the air traffic controller is responsible for many planes and many passengers at any moment of time.

Today, a controller's function is absolutely demanding and vital. Some 400 people can be killed and \$20 million worth of airplanes can be wrecked if a single controller says the wrong word or hesitates for a few seconds too long. The demands of the job are enormous, and the stakes are far too high, to permit anything less than the most capable and experienced of men to have these strategic positions.

In the past, the Government has played all too loosely with the lives of our airplane passengers by failing to enforce an adequate program for the selection, training, and compensation of controllers. To remedy this situation the controllers themselves have formed an organization, the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization, to secure the proper Government support for safety in the sky. With the lanes of air traffic becoming constantly more congested, and with larger passenger airplanes on the drawing boards, the outlook is for increasing danger in air transportation unless we act now to do what needs to be done.

The Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization has drafted legislation embodying the reforms needed to insure air safety now and in the future, and I am pleased to join many of my colleagues in sponsoring this program. The bill I have introduced is designed to raise the qualifications and standards of all air traffic control personnel, thereby providing the Nation with a safer and more efficient air traffic control system.

Air traffic controllers use sophisticated electronic equipment, including radar systems, to keep track of the location of commercial airplanes. It is their duty to control the landing and takeoff of aircraft at the Nation's airports, and assign air routes between cities to prevent collisions. The responsibility of maintaining numerous aircraft in holding patterns during periods of high density traffic, and assigning landings on a frequent basis, demands intense concentration and the ability to make split-second decisions after analyzing many sources of continuously changing information.

This is a job for young men, yet men with the experience to know exactly what they are doing. This legislation is intended to place the right men in these extremely important positions.

Under the bill, the qualifications for entrance into the field of air traffic control would be elevated. No person would be allowed to begin a career in this field after the age of 33. Strict physical and proficiency requirements would be adopted, with a guarantee of annual physical examinations.

To attract qualified personnel, salaries would be adjusted to a range that is commensurate with the responsibility. A formula for retirement is included, along with provision that controllers would not have to work continuously past the time when their physical and psychological condition would have been too greatly strained.

These safety measures are needed now if we are to provide our citizens with the air travel safety they need. The public has recently become more conscious of the vital role of the air traffic controller and is looking to us to upgrade the professional competence of controllers.

By enacting this legislation, we can end the stopgap and crisis-to-crisis decisionmaking which has marked Government actions in this field in the past. This bill will provide us with a logical, effective program for the future, and I hope that the Congress will act favorably on it in the current session.

---

RACHEL TURNER: ARIZONA'S VOICE  
OF DEMOCRACY WINNER

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that a young lady from my congressional district was chosen as Arizona's candidate for the annual Voice of Democracy Contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. She is Miss Rachel S. Turner, of Tucson.

In her speech Miss Turner makes a strong appeal for continued freedom of dissent consistent with the preservation of society itself.

Without objection, I will insert the text of Miss Turner's speech at this point in the RECORD:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Rachel Turner)

There has been much public and governmental concern over riots that occurred in our large population centers. Some have argued that the rioters are young militants who purposely try to disrupt our country. Others have argued that the rights of the individual are being infringed upon as far as right for assembly is concerned. It is this differentiation of views that I want to discuss. Freedom's challenge is how we as a Nation can preserve individual rights without jeopardizing society's rights.

In discussing this problem, I'm first going to point out how riots arise from primarily peaceful gatherings. Then I want to point out the way in which we must resolve this situation.

Let's take a look at a sample riot. First of all, a certain goal must be achieved. Secondly, there must be a set mode for achieving this goal. Finally, somewhere along the line one of these steps becomes either obtuse or obscure. It is then that the people panic and police are called to the scene to try to calm the crowd. The logic of the crowd points to infringement of rights when police officers arrive to preserve the peace.

Charges of police brutality have frequently arisen from situations such as these when the police must resort to force to calm the crowd. But there is something to be said for these charges when the officers raided a

building simply because they were "bombed by empty bottles." Four ambulances were needed to carry the seriously injured away.

On the other hand, I can understand the frustration of police when they are hampered in their effectiveness by masses of enraged, incoherent youths, fistfuls of human waste thrown in their faces, and everywhere the cries of "Police brutality" when they so much as touch one of the rioters.

Those who support the individual's battle for freedom call upon historic events that happened in our past and ask where we would be today if the Boston Massacre and Tea Party had not occurred. These were obviously riots, but they achieved their purpose of lighting the mighty cannon of the American Independence movement.

Certainly, though, we cannot claim any justification for civil disorders when thousands of dollars of store merchandise were destroyed in Detroit last year, not to mention again those dead and wounded. The effects of that civil disorder are still evident; store owners in the southeast part of Detroit have an extremely difficult time obtaining insurance rates they can afford, and nearly everyone would refuse to walk the streets after dark even if there were no curfew. This is another example of carrying the individual's rights too far because they endanger the rights of society.

John Locke's philosophy, upon which much of our government is based, was that "... every man, by consenting with others to make one body politic ... puts himself under an obligation to every one of that society to submit to the determination of the majority ...". From this and from what our constitution says, I think we can assume that the individual's rights must be preserved at all costs except when he is a member of society and threatens to endanger that society.

Let the people gather to express their views. Let the halls of Congress ring with the voice of common man. But when this same common man turns and attacks the very society that he has worked to set up; when this same man threatens to destroy the very life of which he is a part, then he is no longer the individual whose precious rights must be guarded, but he becomes the individual whose rights must be bounded by society for her own preservation.

The United States is the example of democracy for the world. If we fall because of internal disorder, there can be no hope for weaker nations who seek the democratic way of life.

Freedom's challenge in our great democracy is to determine at what point the individual's rights end and society's rights begin.

---

CONGRESSMAN HORTON URGES  
ADOPTION OF "911" AS NATION-  
WIDE EMERGENCY TELEPHONE  
NUMBER

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a resolution today under which Congress would support adoption of "911" as the nationwide police, fire, and general emergency number.

This proposal's advantages are numerous. Call "911" for help has been vigorously endorsed by public leaders and civil organizations of all types.

Among leaders supporting "911" as

the uniform national emergency telephone number are the President's Commission on Crime and Civil Disorder and the Federal Communications Commission.

Even the American Telephone and Telegraph Co. has announced it is ready to make this service available to any community or city requesting it.

It is unfortunate and often tragic that the American public must contend with a multitude of emergency service numbers in each city and town.

In my District of Monroe and Wayne Counties, New York, for example, 500,000 persons have to contend with more than 75 separate numbers for fire, police, and ambulance services. Each city and town in the United States is faced with this same problem.

The advantages of a central "911" number are numerous. It would slash the time needed to place a call for emergency help. It would greatly eliminate the possibility of reaching busy numbers.

The confusion of different numbers for different services would be eliminated, panic would be lessened, and a person would be sure of getting emergency help no matter where he was, or when.

The new central emergency system would have enough operators manned around the clock to coordinate all mutual emergency aid and activity services. The whole process would be simplified, shortened, and strengthened.

By routing all emergency calls to a central switchboard, calls could be re-directed quickly and accurately to the correct service or agency. This increased efficiency, in addition to lessening confusion, would save precious life-saving seconds and minutes.

Frankly, the logic and merit of such a system is so apparent that it is amazing a nation as technologically advanced as ours has not instituted this concept long ago. Great Britain has been using an emergency "999" number since 1937.

This is really a matter of life or death. The time for action is now. Let us promptly adopt this resolution establishing one uniform national police, fire and emergency telephone number.

#### COUNTY-RAILROAD COMMUNICATIONS

**HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a privilege to have this opportunity to call the Members' attention to the excellent statement prepared by Mr. Peter Perrecone, supervisor of the town of Rockford, Winnebago County, Rockford, Ill., on behalf of the National Association of Counties. The subject of Mr. Perrecone's remarks is County-Railroad Communications.

I was most impressed by his presentation. His commentary on our future opportunities as well as our obligations in this area are well taken. Therefore, I feel

certain that other Members will find his statement both interesting and helpful. The statement follows:

#### COUNTY-RAILROAD COMMUNICATIONS

(By Peter Perrecone)

Mr. Manion has announced the subject of our panel as Communication Between Private and Public Agencies as it relates to safety at highway-railroad grade crossings.

I was asked to participate in this meeting as a Director of the National Association of County Officials.

As an elected Illinois official for the past three decades, I feel that the panel topic might be more direct if it had been announced as "the complete lack of communication" between public agencies and the railroads.

Our moderator has referred to the more effective relationship developed by the AAR and highway officials since the Act of 1956—the Federal Aid Highway Act.

As an official who has worked tirelessly on the county, state and national levels, I must confess this comes as a complete surprise to me. Never in my public life—and I am Supervisor for Rockford Township which embraces the second largest city in Illinois—have I ever had a communication from the AAR, or any branch of railway operation, dealing with this subject.

At the start—do not misunderstand me. I merely want to stress that there must be a great need of communication between officials on the levels which I serve and those interested in our nation's vital rail systems.

My first reaction on being invited to participate on communications was that the railroads have done a fine job except where a crossing might get bumpy or when warning lights were needed.

At the same time it occurred to me that there has been no liaison or communication between the counties and the railroads, and because of this lack of communication, the railroads have suffered.

I am interested to know that there have been so many higher-echelon meetings between Highway and AAR officials—and started to find that not a word of this has trickled down to the county level.

If any one in the State of Illinois has been in a position to be advised of such a program, I believe I am. As President of the Illinois Association of County Officials I am kept constantly aware of comparable problems—but the railroads and their representatives have not communicated.

However, we are all aware of the problems of rail-highway crossings, and have constantly sought to act in any way that would improve them. For instance, the first 1969 Highway death in our Winnebago county involved a collision between a Northwestern railway train and an automobile.

There was no reason for this accident—it was on a county grade crossing with good visibility—both the auto and the locomotive proceeded slowly. This is one of the inexplicable accidents we will always have as long as there are automobiles and grade crossings.

Granting that we will always have grade crossings and motorists, I wish also to record that I know the problem of the men who operate locomotives. The crews live in constant fear that some motorist will kill himself by ignoring the most basic of safety standards. The situation will never be eliminated, but it can be improved I am sure.

Today I also bring a message which should have a high degree of interest for all participating here. It is from Herbert D. Brown who today is assuming office of Illinois Director of Public Safety under appointment from Governor Richard Ogilvie.

Mr. Brown, a life-long law enforcement official dedicated to public safety, assures all interested in the work of this panel that he

will give his complete cooperation in any move made to improve highway crossing safety in the State of Illinois.

He plans to study all proposed legislation on this point, and in discussion with me, has expressed interest in the use of reflector panels on railway cars. Director Brown says that in many situations, particularly in unlighted and un-signalled areas, reflectors on rail cars might alert a motorist that a train is using a crossing.

I know this law has been proposed before and has not been adopted. Knowing that many rail accidents have occurred because motorists have not been alerted to presence of a train, I feel that it is one that should be explored.

While the rail crossing problem is a vital one, I feel that it will become ever more important. Even though passenger hauling has dwindled on the national rail system, I believe that a new era is approaching.

The urbanization of the United States is not closing in on us.

It is here!

We are near the point where upwards of 25 regional areas will comprise the heart of the future America.

It is obvious, therefore, that all levels of government must cooperate to achieve a transportation system that will move people swiftly and economically.

The American railroads can be the answer to this particular problem.

To be sure, the transportation system of this country of ours must be co-related to highways, aviation and waterways. I suggest that, in all our deliberations at all levels of government, we keep in mind that all modes of transportation depend on each other—and are not set apart from each other.

I feel that the American railroads are the answer to this particular problem.

This statement is made with complete realization that railroads have abandoned passenger service wherever possible. While Rockford is the second largest city in Illinois, served by three major rail lines, its passenger service is virtually non-existent.

At the same time these rail lines are maintaining commodious and valuable right-of-way into the heart of the community. They are virtually unused.

While rail right-of-way use is at a minimum—and I am fully aware of the value of rail freight service—adjacent highways are jammed and the downtown core of the city is suffering from too many automobiles and too little parking space.

Just for example. A North Western spur line parallels a large portion of US Route 51 on Rockford's northeast side. This line is vital to the freight business and the development of the area's industry. At the same time it is used by one or two switch engine trains daily—while the adjacent highway carries 40,000 vehicles every day and millions are being spent to improve the roadway in this immediate area.

The same situation exists on the west side of the city. Rail right-of-way, used by a couple of freights each day, parallels a highway which links the Rockford area to the Wisconsin state line. Millions of dollars are being spent to improve this highway—state route 2. Nothing is being done to improve and increase the use of the adjacent railway.

I'm sure you see the course of my thinking.

Many vital transportation problems would be solved in our community if there was a high speed passenger service.

This is no impossible dream. I know that it has been developed in the booming Toronto, Ontario metropolitan area with the cooperation of the Canadian National railway. Commuters leave their cars in mammoth parking lots and are whisked to the heart of the city from 40 miles away.

I know that Toronto is a much larger city—but the money being spent in our commu-

nity, paralleling rail facilities, exceeds the amount which was required to put the Canadian commuter plan into operation—including special trains, stations and parking lots.

If federal, state and rail funds were used to eliminate grade crossings—with high speed passenger service the ultimate goal—certainly one of the great problems of every major center in America could be solved. Rail men will say at once that such service cannot be financially profitable. This may be true, but it is no more absurd to subsidize commuter service and save our central cities than it is to subsidize airports, air lines and transcontinental expressways.

The problem of swift, safe and convenient transportation for human beings grows each day. Air service is becoming congested to the point where it is ridiculous. Passengers spend more time stacked above major airports than they do in actual flight—as long waiting for their baggage as the journey required—and as much time getting from airports to their destinations as the air trip consumed.

In other words air and highway facilities are being used to the limit. Passenger service on railroads is vanishing. It's a problem we all will face in the future.

These remarks on high speed rail service of the future are not a digression from the topic of this panel. Realistically, high speed service in crowded communities will require elimination of grade crossings to the greatest extent possible—even the use of subway-type construction in many areas.

Railways cannot be expected to assume the cost of high-speed lines alone. They can be expected to cooperate in making such high speed lines available by use of the invaluable right-of-way facilities they now own.

Certainly our railways should be as forward-thinking as the Canadian National railway which functions as a government owned facility in competition with the privately-owned Canadian Pacific system. I interject this comment to add that I favor the consolidation of our own major rail lines. In fact, my only experience with a railway and public relations came when rail officials were in our community to drum up sentiment for such a merger.

And getting back to "communications" which I originally believed was the topic for this panel. It has been my sad experience in dealing with railroad people to become entangled in a maze of red tape and endless correspondence.

When I was in private business as a fuel wholesaler, I happened to become the owner of 99 feet of American railroad. What appeared to me to be a simple matter of expanding a siding for \$125.00 became a \$2,000.00 project with no action in sight a year later. I recruited an expert section gang and installed the siding myself. The railway finally accepted it, but the encounter with railroad red tape convinced me that I would never become involved in a similar debacle.

These criticisms, if you want to call them such, are merely constructive. I happen to believe that American railroads are beginning a new era of national usefulness.

You cannot, for a moment, visualize the United States without its railroad transportation systems. We, the American people, cannot long endure without the American railroads.

I believe it is up to us in public office—on local, state and national levels—to make sure that the avenues of communication are opened so that we can work together. There is nothing more frustrating than attempting to pierce the maze of vice presidents which every rail system apparently uses as insulation to keep itself from public reaction.

The National Association of Counties firmly believes that the railway systems can be modernized and expanded in a way to fill the void in our present transportation facilities.

Industry and commerce cannot live in our nation without services of the railroad in moving raw materials and finished products. A further contribution should be made by adding new facilities where they are required to accommodate the daily transportation needs of the 200 million residents of our nation.

In county government particularly, we are dedicated to solution of urban problems. The National Association of Counties currently urges that all counties move at once to assert vigorous leadership in the area of mass transportation problems.

Our National Association is also supporting adequate enabling state legislation which will permit local governments to move ahead in supporting area-wide transportation systems.

While this is moving far from the problem of grade crossings alone, I am certain that we here are all interested in another program supported by the National Association of Counties.

The organization approves the provision of the Housing Act of 1961 which provides grants for comprehensive transportation planning and demonstration programs for the improvement of mass transportation facilities.

Basically, we are talking today of communications between the railways and representatives of the public on a plane necessarily more broad than grade crossings.

Personally, I advocate efforts on the part of the AAR to seek a change of image—achieving a status more personal and accessible than the tremendous proportions which have developed through the years.

Through the years personal communication has been lost between our invaluable railways and local officials.

May I suggest that railway personnel offices—in cooperation with their important association—dig into this problem and try to bring the railroads back to a person to person basis achieved by other lines of transportation. Even General Motors, the world's largest corporation, seems closer to the average American than the railways which are so vital to his existence.

In my community—as in virtually all others in the country—we argue over rights-of-way, elevations and grade crossings year after year. Today we are no nearer to solutions than we ever have been. There seems just to be no area of communication. Let us find one.

Personally, I want to do something really important to lift the railroads out of the past and into the image of the last third of the 20th century. Hopefully, by the year 2000, the railroads will once again be what I think they ought to be today. The rail lines—and local governments—must think in terms of a population of 400,000,000 by that time.

#### NATIONAL ECONOMIC CONVERSION COMMISSION

### HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on Monday next I will join with Congressman BINGHAM of New York and Congressman MORSE of Massachusetts, and some 40 other Members of the House, in sponsoring legislation to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission.

This legislation will provide the administrative apparatus needed at the Federal level to insure the smoothest

possible economic transition during a period of shifting and declining defense demand.

In his 1969 Economic Report to the Congress, President Johnson included the final report of the Cabinet Coordinating Committee on the Economic Planning for the End of Vietnam Hostilities which had been established by the President in the spring of 1967. In this report the Cabinet committee concluded:

Prosperity has not depended on the defense buildup and will not need high military spending to support it in peacetime. On the contrary, peace will provide the nation with welcome opportunities to channel into civilian use manpower and material resources now being devoted to war.

As far as the national economy is concerned, these are indeed encouraging words. However, I think that we would agree that outlook is not so promising for many localities throughout the Nation which find themselves heavily impacted by defense spending. This is particularly true in the case of those localities which have been affected by sharp increases in Vietnam spending occurring since the middle of 1965.

I think that we can agree that if adequate provision is not made for proper advance planning and close coordination between local, State, and Federal authorities, many of these communities will experience serious economic reversals resulting from either a leveling out of defense spending or a marked and sudden decline in such spending.

The Cabinet committee in its report acknowledged this fact and in turn recommended the early establishment of a full-time committee in the executive branch which would, first, assume responsibility for detailed planning for Federal readjustment assistance for affected localities and defense-related industries; second, work with State and local authorities responsible for demobilization planning; and, third, coordinate Federal readjustment programs during demobilization.

I applaud this recommendation of the Cabinet committee; the Congress must now come to realize that it is time to act on this matter. The question of economic conversion is of mutual concern to all of us in the Congress, and it is my view that the bill which we are introducing today will provide the administrative means and the direction needed to insure the least painful economic adjustment to either a gradual or a marked shift in the pattern of defense demand.

Mr. Speaker, considerable study both in and out of Government has been devoted to the conversion question in the past several years. What is clearly needed today is not more study but the immediate establishment of an appropriate administrative apparatus capable of implementing and directing an effective program of economic conversion at the community level. In the case of many localities the problem is already here. Defense spending in recent months has reached a plateau; many defense orders are being cut back or canceled; and most indicators at our disposal today show little prospect for renewed growth in de-

fense spending, barring, of course, any serious deterioration in the world political setting. Moreover, if in the near future we should experience either a continuing and gradual deescalation of hostilities or hopefully a peaceful accord in Vietnam, either development would obviously have a profound impact on the pattern of defense spending.

Thus given these considerations, I urge the Congress, Mr. Speaker, to give immediate and active consideration to our legislative proposal calling for the establishment of a National Economic Commission.

THE LATE CHARLES ELLSWORTH  
RUSSELL

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and distressed last week when I learned of the passing of a legendary musician who, over a 45-year period, entertained thousands of my constituents during his frequent engagements in Queens; hundreds of thousands in the Metropolitan New York area, literally millions throughout the Nation and the world. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to Charles Ellsworth Russell. This name may not sound familiar, but the name "Pee Wee" Russell is legendary in the history of jazz.

Just a few weeks ago many of us had the delight of seeing Mr. Russell for the last time here in Washington when he performed during inaugural festivities, and it is with deep sadness that we mourn his passing.

An eloquent tribute to "Pee Wee" appeared recently in the Washington Star, written by that newspaper's special writer, Allen Scott.

The text of Mr. Scott's column follows:

Jazz writer George Frazier, in once defining what jazz is, wrote "Pee Wee Russell's clarinet."

Another critic said Pee Wee's process sound was half B-flat and half saliva. Of the man himself, his late wife called him "a normal, healthy, maladjusted American male."

This was Charles Ellsworth (Pee Wee) Russell, who died yesterday in Alexandria Hospital at the age of 62.

A great many jazz fans will be surprised to learn his christened names. He was always Pee Wee from the start of his professional career with somebody named Herbert Berger in St. Louis at the age of 15. That was in 1921.

In the ensuing 48 years he became a jazz legend in his own time, in part because he played with so many other legends—clarinetist Leon Rappolo, pianist Peck Kelly and cornetist Bix Beiderbecke, among others.

His first record was "Feeling No Pain" with Red Nichols in August 1927.

Small combos were his forte, and in the 30's and 40's he was a fixture on the New York scene at the Famous Door, Nick's and Eddie Condon's, where he played with groups led by trumpeters Bobby Hackett, Max Kaminsky, and Wild Bill Davison; trombonists Miff Mole and Georg Brunis; singer Red McKenzie, and always Condon.

Condon reported the lives and good times of those days in his autobiography, "We Called It Music," including the group's sure-

fire hangover cure, "the juice from two quarts of booze."

Although always classified as a Dixieland player, discerning critics pointed out that he always played in his own way. Pee Wee stunned his fans in the 1950's by teaming up with avant garde clarinetist Jimmy Giuffre for a masterful set of duets, meshing perfectly with Giuffre's modern style. Still later, he surprised them again by recording compositions by such modernists as Thelonius Monk and John Coltrane.

In the 1960's he formed a successful quartet featuring trombonist Marshall Brown. One of its albums, "Ask Me Now," gained Down Beat's highest five-star rating.

In 1965, at his wife's suggestion he took up oil painting. Within six months Pee Wee proudly reported he had made two "legitimate sales" to respected collectors. He did not count the ones his jazz friends bought. But Pee Wee firmly maintained he was a jazz player, not a painter.

In recent years he had played on several occasions at Blues Alley in Georgetown.

Tommy Gwaltney, a Washington musician, said Russell had joined him and trumpeter Buck Clayton a week ago at Blues Alley.

Russell often played on such occasions, Gwaltney said, but this time refused, complaining of not feeling well. He entered the hospital last Sunday.

Of his playing, someone once wrote: "He is no virtuoso and his tone is breathy and squeaky but you forget this when you hear the bliss and the sadness and the compassion and the humility that are there."

HOW TO CHOOSE A PRESIDENT

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in my testimony before the House Judiciary Committee, I suggested that the abolition of the electoral college would only be a first step in bringing about the electoral reform which this country needs today. On February 24, the Christian Science Monitor ran an editorial which pointed out some weaknesses in the present convention system and offered justification for instituting a national presidential primary election. Under unanimous consent I place this editorial in the Extensions of Remarks:

HOW TO CHOOSE A PRESIDENT

One of the loudest cries raised at and after the 1968 Democratic convention at Chicago was: "Reform the nominating process!" To date, moves have been made toward staffing a special committee which is to assure the democratic statewide selection of convention delegates. But whether the party is moving in time, and whether this is all the reform that's needed, and whether the follow through on good intentions will be sufficient, remains to be seen.

Actually, some 800 of the 2,622 delegates at Chicago were chosen by undemocratic processes. And it is estimated now that perhaps 20 of the state Democratic parties have not complied, as yet, with the reform resolution adopted by roll-call vote at Chicago aiming at a more equitable process of selecting delegates.

If by the time 1972 rolls around improved machinery has not been set up, in all the states, the Credentials Committee of the Democratic Convention of that year will pretty certainly have a rugged row on its hands. The time to act is now.

How much reform is enough reform? Should the convention delegates all be selected, say, by state primaries? Or—a farther-reaching proposal—should the presidential candidates be chosen in a national primary—or by a national "advisory" primary, to be followed by conventions? The Democrats should be thinking about this. So should the public. So should the Republicans, who may of course be simply renominating Richard Nixon in 1972, but will need alert procedures then and in the ensuing convention years.

In defense of the convention process, unamended, it is pointed out that in virtually every instance the convention has chosen for the presidency the man actually preferred by the party majority (though perhaps not the man preferred by party activists and convention-hall demonstrators). But it is also a fact that conventions have been put together by very slipshod procedures—by enforcement of the unanimity-demanding "unit rule," by the choosing of delegates a full year and more before the convention date, and by selection of delegates by inner-party elite cabals.

The year 1972 may hear strident demands in the Democratic Party for a revamping, if not abolition of the convention process. Now is the time for Senator Harris, party chairman, and the party leaders to see that the essential reforms will have been accomplished.

FREEDOM DAY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the Honorable JOHN H. BUCHANAN, of Alabama, was the principal speaker at a mass rally which was held January 23 in Taipei, Taiwan, to observe the 15th anniversary of Freedom Day. In addition to the material in yesterday's RECORD, I insert the following:

First. Declaration of the rally;  
Second. Cable message to the United Nations;  
Third. Cable message to President Richard M. Nixon, of the United States of America;  
Fourth. Cable message to President Park Chung Hee, of the Republic of Korea;  
Fifth. Cable message to President Nguyen Van Thieu, of the Republic of Vietnam;

Sixth. Cable message to the United States, Australian, New Zealand, Korean, Philippine, and Thailand officers and soldiers now fighting in Vietnam; and

Seventh. Address by U.S. Congressman JOHN HALL BUCHANAN at the Taipei city hall on January 24, 1969.

The material follows:

DECLARATION OF THE 15TH FREEDOM DAY  
RALLY

As the sixties in the 20th century will soon come to an end and mankind is prepared to welcome the arrival of the more glorious seventies, the hope of landing on the moon and the control of the space, all reflect the wonderful progress in human society. Immediately following the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes and the lessening of natural pressure, freedom and well-being of mankind have been greatly elevated. A brilliant and colorful century of freedom will soon emerge.

However, in the age of progress which moves in leaps and bounds, there exists in our globe a vicious Communist force which has as its unalterable objective the conquest of the world and the enslavement of mankind. Today, nearly one third of the entire population of the world has fallen into its sinister hands—deprived of freedom, shed of human rights and threatened of human survival. As the 15th Freedom Day Anniversary is approaching, while we are ashamed and conscious of the absence of freedom to shine over mankind and the continued growth of the terror of enslavement, we are gratified to see the growing trend of the struggle for freedom and against slavery. This is particularly true in view of the resolution passed at the Second World Anti-Communist League (WACL) Conference held in Saigon last December, which called for the expansion of the Freedom Day into the World Freedom Day. Thus, this great freedom movement will become the World's main stream of justice.

We are certain that the march of mankind toward the objective of freedom is irresistible, and that all the obstacles in front of it will be eliminated. Though checked by brutal force for the time being, the liberalization movement of the people in Eastern Europe will generate still greater surges due to the thrust of mankind. Despite a rugged future lying ahead, Vietnam's struggle for freedom and independence will prevail and achieve victory in the end. The anti-Communist and anti-Mao struggles on the China Mainland will penetrate any suppressive measures that Mao and his cohorts may take, and will enter into a new phase in its overall development. The undercurrent of appeasement and the dark shadows of compromise will vanish in the midst of mankind's awareness of rationality and the uplift of moral courage. A brand new situation calling for joint actions by mankind for the defense of freedom and the elimination of slavery will rise.

Looking over the horizon, we can clearly see the sharp domestic division in the bloc which is out to enslave people, their bitter conflicts and serious crisis of disintegration. We are fully conscious of Pres. Chiang's words that "The past situation was one of a unified Communist bloc attacking a divided and scattered Free World. What we need to exert our efforts on is a unified Free World defeating a divided and contradictory Communist bloc." This then is the overall objective in our struggle for the freedom of mankind and marks the bright road on which freedom will prevail over slavery. As the delegates representing all walks of life in the Republic of China meeting here to commemorate the 15th Anniversary of Freedom Day, we call upon all peoples of the World:

(1) To establish the firm conviction that freedom will triumph and that enslavement will fail. People who enjoy freedom must have the courage to shatter the status quo of "half freedom and half enslavement". Those people whose freedom is already at stake will protect freedom and fight with indomitable spirit. Those people who have lost their freedom and have been enslaved will resist and fight in order to regain their freedom and maintain their survival.

(2) To unite all forces guarding freedom into an entity. The most pressing things are to formulate a worldwide unified struggle objective giving equal emphasis to the East and the West and to establish a regional collective security organization in order to repel the challenge of the Communist force of enslavement and check its rampage.

(3) To step up all movement to seek freedom and all struggles against communism and tyranny behind the Iron Curtain—East or West. Destroy totalitarian and dictatorial tyranny, crush vicious slavery system, break the chains on one billion enslaved peoples, restore their freedom and human dignity, and protect their survival and well-being.

These are the directions of efforts for all freedom-loving peoples throughout the world. We the Chinese people will stand on the frontlines of this struggle. Domestically, we shall speed up the development of the "Anti-Mao and Anti-Communist movement." Internationally, we shall increase the joint actions against Mao and Communism. With our maximum efforts, we shall make out maximum contributions to the solemn missions of our time in order to achieve ultimate and everlasting victory for the freedom of mankind.

**DRAFT MESSAGE TO THE UNITED NATIONS  
Secretary-General and all Delegations to the  
United Nations:**

Fifteen years ago, the United Nations continued its insistence on the voluntary repatriation of prisoners-of-war in the Korean War that enabled 22,000 Korean and Chinese anti-Communists to regain their freedom on January 23, 1954. That was one of the most important achievements of the United Nations in its task of safeguarding human rights and dignity. Since then, the January 23 Freedom Day has been of great spiritual encouragement to the people both in the free world and behind the Iron Curtain in their struggle against Communism. It has also laid down a major example of the unviolability of the spirit of the United Nations Charter. Last year, the General Assembly set an unprecedented record in defeating an intrigue to seat Communist China in the United Nations, and the spirit of United Nations Charter was again exalted.

Late last year, resolutions were passed by the World Anti-Communist League at its Second Conference in Saigon to uphold the spirit of the United Nations Charter. The proclamation of January 23 as World Freedom Day by the Conference was an example of a concrete action the League has taken to fulfill the United Nations principle of defending human rights and freedom.

We people from all walks of life in the Republic of China meeting in Taipei to observe the 15th Anniversary of Freedom Day, are convinced that the achievements of the United Nations, under Your Excellency's great leadership, will be even more glorious. We are hereby sending this special message to Your Excellency to express our admiration and respect in the hope that Your Excellency will make further efforts in the United Nations for safeguarding human freedom and world peace.

With high regards,

KU CHENG-KANG,  
Chairman.

**DRAFT MESSAGE TO HIS EXCELLENCY PRESIDENT  
RICHARD M. NIXON OF THE UNITED STATES  
OF AMERICA**

*Your Excellency:*

Fifteen years ago, some 22,000 anti-Communist prisoners of war of the United Nations allied forces in the Korean War turned back on the Communists to begin a new life of freedom. They had outwitted brainwashing in prison camps masterminded by the Chinese Communists and their fellow travelers. However, their struggle against the Communist conspiracy would not have been a success without the support given them by former U.S. President Dwight D. Eisenhower and by Your Excellency.

At a time when the government and people of the Republic of China are commemorating the 15th Anniversary of that Freedom Day and celebrating the adoption of World Freedom Day beginning in 1969 by members and observers of the World Anti-Communist League, it is heartening and inspiring that Your Excellency has taken up office as the 37th President of the United States of America. Your Excellency's victory has given encouragement and inspiration to freedom-loving people and freedom-fighters throughout the world.

As Your Excellency knows, the Peiping regime is the root of all evils in the world. It has instigated armed revolts and subversive activities in Southeast Asian countries. It has infiltrated Africa and Latin America. It has also, openly taken part in inciting racial violence in the United States. It has also entered into rivalry with Soviet Russia for International Communist leadership, and shouted out anti-U.S. slogans to achieve its dream of world conquest. Because of its militancy and bellicosity, it has become Enemy No. One of the entire free world.

Taking advantage of the inconsistency and hesitation unfortunately now existing in the free world, the Peiping regime is intensifying its internal struggles, brainwashing the masses with Mao-thought and practically carrying out nuclear tests. It is thus of paramount importance to the free world that it devise a global unified anti-Communist strategy that will cover West as well as East before Peiping's evil schemes and ambitions reach maturity.

Your Excellency's proposal to nations in Asia and Pacific area that they form a regional mutual security organization is of enormous significance in the formation of a brighter outlook in this part of the world. We sincerely hope that Your Excellency will give continued support to make it a reality at an early date. We are confident that Your Excellency will lead the free world in its struggle against Communism and fulfill the historic responsibility that is entrusted to Your Excellency.

With our highest regards,

KU CHENG-KANG,  
Chairman.

**DRAFT MESSAGE TO HIS EXCELLENCY PRESIDENT  
PARK CHUNG HEE OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA  
Your Excellency:**

Fifteen years ago, more than 22,000 Korean and Chinese prisoners-of-war during the Korean War, under the insistence on the principle of voluntary repatriation of our two nations and peoples, were determined to choose freedom and regain happy lives in this side of the world. Since then, the bell of liberty has pealed outside and within the Iron Curtain. Those who have lost freedom find their hope for freedom rekindled; and those who are defending freedom are strengthened in their conviction that freedom will triumph and slavery will fall.

In the past year, as a result of the joint efforts of our two nations, the World Anti-Communist League was founded and has developed under the arm of freedom for all mankind. Moreover, the 23rd of January every year was proclaimed World Freedom Day at the Second World Anti-Communist League Conference in Saigon last December. In view of these encouraging signs, the Republic of Korea and this nation will bear an even heavier burden from now on.

Presently, we, people from all walks of life in the Republic of China are meeting in Taipei to observe the 15th Anniversary of Freedom Day and to promote the United Movement against Mao. We are heartened when we recall what we have accomplished together in our struggles shoulder to shoulder, and when we see that the trend of anti-Communism is stronger than ever.

Your country, under the great leadership of Your Excellency, has made tremendous progress in every field these years, and has been displayed vigilance in defending Northeast Asia against our common enemy. The despatch of armed forces to Vietnam by your Government demonstrated to the world how fond Korea is of justice! Recently, the Communists of North Korea sent infiltrators to the South and are engaged in undermining activities in your country. We are confident that the intrigue of the Communists will surely be in vain because of the firm anti-Communist determination of your people, military as well as civilian. At this

juncture, we particularly hope that our two nations will draw even closer in our cooperation so as to establish a collective security organization in Asia and the Pacific area, and further to recover our lost land. We are hereby sending this special message to Your Excellency to express our admiration and respect in the hope that concerted action will be taken by our two nations to safeguard Asian security, world peace, and human rights and freedom.

With highest regards,  
Yours respectfully,

KU CHENG-KANG,  
Chairman.

DRAFT MESSAGE TO HIS EXCELLENCY PRESIDENT NGUYEN VAN THIEU OF THE REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

To His Excellency President Nguyen Van Thieu and to patriotic anti-Communist civilians and military personnel of the Republic of Vietnam:

At a time when the government and people of the Republic of China are celebrating the 15th Anniversary of the Freedom Day and the extensive propagation of the United Movement against Mao, it is particularly heartening and inspiring to witness the unswerving stand, the national unity and the determination of the democratic government of Vietnam to defeat the enemy both in the battlefield and at the conference table. The gallantry and fearlessness demonstrated by the Vietnamese civilians and military personnel will surely defeat the scheme of international Communism to sow dissension and unmask the conspiracy over the peace talks. At the same time, they will make it clear to the free world that peace and justice in Vietnam can never be achieved by any unilateral attempt at appeasement volunteered by any misguidedly enthusiastic party.

The meeting of the Second WACL Conference and the 14th APACL Conference in Saigon late last year unequivocally showed the whole-hearted support of freedom-fighters of the world to Vietnam's anti-Communist stand. It also demonstrated the unity of the world's anti-Communist strength. We are sure that ultimate victory will come to Vietnam in its struggle to safeguard her independence and territorial integrity. We sincerely hope that Your Excellency will give continued support to the establishing of a regional mutual security organization in Asia and Pacific area and to the early formulation of a united world anti-Communist strategy so as to lay a solid foundation for Asian security and world peace.

KU CHENG-KANG,  
Chairman.

DRAFT MESSAGE TO GEN. CREIGHTON W. ABRAMS, COMMANDER OF U.S. FORCES IN VIETNAM AND ALL THE UNITED STATES, AUSTRALIAN, NEW ZEALAND, KOREAN, PHILIPPINE, AND THAILAND OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN FIGHTING IN VIETNAM

Dear General Abrams, and all United States, Australian, New Zealand, Korean, Philippine, and Thailand officers and enlisted men fighting in Vietnam:

At this time when the government and people of the Republic of China are observing the 15th Anniversary of Freedom Day, it is particularly heartening and inspiring that the forces of the United States of America and troops from Australia, New Zealand, Korea, Thailand and the the Philippines have dealt fatal blows to the Viet Cong offensives and harassments which were launched under cover of the smoke screen created by the Paris peace talks. The victories of the allied forces under your command, together with the high morale of the Vietnamese national forces, have made an enormous contribution to the final victory and independence of the Republic of Vietnam.

The government and people of the Re-

public of China pledge their whole-hearted support to the anti-Communist war being fought by the allied forces in Vietnam. We are confident that you will lead them to one victory after another, until the Hanoi regime is obliterated.

We sincerely hope that you will give continued support to the establishing of a unified world anti-Communist strategy that will embrace West as well as East. We are sure any help from a man with such profound knowledge of the dangers of International Communism as you have will be of incalculable value to our cause.

With high regards,

KU CHENG-KANG,  
Chairman.

U.S. CONGRESSMAN JOHN H. BUCHANAN'S ADDRESS AT THE TAIPEI CITY HALL ON JANUARY 24, 1969

Chairman Ku, Members of the Parliament and Ladies and Gentlemen: It is a privilege to stand before you this day to participate in the Freedom Day activities this week in Taiwan. I salute you as leaders of a great republic and long with you towards the day when you will once again lead all of China.

As you may know, our new American President, Richard M. Nixon, is a member of the Quaker faith and the Quakers traditionally do not believe in violence. I trust in our new President and believe that in his foreign policy, he will be as I shall be in the speech I make this morning. I believe that you and I shall substantially agree on much of what I have to say, but if you find yourself in violent disagreement, then I shall be like the Quaker farmer who awoke one night to find that a burglar was crawling into his window. He picked up his shotgun, pointed it at the burglar and said: "Friend, I would not hurt thee, nor harm thee for the world and all that's in it, but thou art standing where I am about to shoot."

We are confronted as a part of the world's forces of freedom with a great challenge in our time and I would address you this morning before answering your questions on the Communist challenge and the American response to that challenge. I do not need to persuade the people in this audience of the strength and of the nature of the world Communist movement, but that you may know that there are a great many Americans in positions of leadership and the Parliament and our Congress and in the Executive Branch as well to recognize the nature and scope of this challenge, I will review it briefly this morning. We look out upon a world today in which 25 percent of the earth's surface and more than a billion of the world's people are controlled by some form of Communist government. We are confronted with a very powerful Communist nation at the forefront of that Communist movement is the Soviet Union, a nation of great economic, industrial and military strength, second only to the United States in its power. We look out upon a Communist movement which stretches across the globe at Cuba led by Fidel Castro with an effort to subvert the western hemisphere. We see Europe with the Eastern European captive nations under the heel of the Soviet Union. We witness Communist activity in Africa and in the Middle East. I do not need to persuade you of the dangerous government upon the mainland of China, and of its nature and its intent towards its neighbor as a great potential aggressor and as a tyrannical government, and so around the world we see this great Communist challenge with which the forces of freedom are confronted in our time.

There are those voices in Europe and some in the United States as well which would say there is less danger in our time in the 1960s from the World Communist Movement because in the first place the Soviet has melted and there is, or there is a chance for,

a detente between the United States and the Soviet Union. Such voices would say further that there is a deep schism within the Communist world and a fragmentation which means that it is no longer united and hence no longer the threat it once was to the forces of freedom in the world.

Let us examine these propositions to determine their reality and validity. It is true that the Soviet Union over the last fifty years has made great industrial and economic and military progress. Soviet foreign policy is dictated not only by the Marxist desire for conquest and their belief that inevitably they must sooner or later replace every free government with a Communist government, but also by Russian national interest, and such Russian national interest would dictate at a time when they are a relatively prosperous nation that they would have a good deal to lose from a nuclear war with the United States. Hence, I do believe that Russian foreign policy is apt to place high priority on avoiding a nuclear warfare with the United States or that which might lead to it. This does not mean that there is any end to their desire for world conquest, both as a nation and as a leader of the Communist movement. There is within the Kremlin a conflict between the Neo-Stalinists, those who would impose a harsh and more rigid policies of Stalin at home and this same outlook abroad and those who would modify and relax this harsh regime. There is some indication in recent months that the Stalinists are again gaining more influence in the Kremlin and may exercise more on Soviet policy, foreign and domestic.

However great may be the Soviet determination to avoid war with the United States, her national policies still aim toward increasing Communist domination of the world. We need only look at the fact that she is supplying the aggressors in Vietnam to the amount of more than one billion dollars per year, but in my own hemisphere she supplies Castro one million dollars a day to continue his subversion, at a great expense amounting to several million dollars. The Soviet Union has armed and rearmed Egypt and certain other Arab nations to foment discord in the Middle East and to extend her influence there. We can look at the brutal suppression of Czechoslovakia when it took a slight turn towards freedom, not the replacement of the Communist government, but a movement simply to permit more personal freedom, such as freedom of the press to the Czechoslovakian people, brutally suppressed by the Soviet Union and her satellite states which surround Czechoslovakia to see the true nature of the Soviet Union, the true designs of that government for world conquest, whatever strategy that government might use to achieve this aim.

If and when the Soviet Union sees fit to use its offices to bring about the tearing down of the Berlin Wall or the holding of free elections in Hungary, if and when it ceases to finance subversion in the Western Hemisphere as in Asia and all around the world, then there may be a better chance for real detente between the United States and the Soviet Union.

I do not need to describe for you the nature of the government upon the mainland of China, but I will say that certainly there is schism between the Soviet Union and the Red Chinese, and I am glad that this is the case. I am very much afraid, however, the real debate between Mao and Moscow is over when they shall bury us, how they shall bury us, and who the chief undertaker shall be.

The leopard has not changed his spots, and Communism is still Communism in our time and I do not need to tell you that this is the case. It has been my privilege to stand before the ugly monument to the failure of Communism that is the Berlin Wall, which separates the thriving city of West Berlin from the bleak police state that is East Berlin. It has been my privilege to hear the testimony

of Miss Juanita Castro as she told a subcommittee of which I was a part with deep emotion how her brother Fidel Castro had betrayed his country, how he had betrayed himself as the George Washington of Cuba, and how he had instead imposed upon that people a brutal totalitarian regime. It has been my privilege to walk among our troops in Vietnam and to see through their eyes the enemy which they help the Vietnamese people to fight—the enemy which rules by force and fear and terrorism wherever he holds power. An opportunity has also arisen much less than yours, however, to look upon the conduct of the Communist government upon the mainland of China and from all of this to know that Communism is still Communism, is still evil, and is still dangerous in our time.

I will only say further in this connection that no country, no system which is really good for people has to build an Iron Curtain of a Berlin Wall around itself to retain its people. How many people have thought to escape from Taiwan to the mainland, and how many seek to escape from the United States or Western Europe behind the Iron Curtain of the Soviet Union or its puppet nations.

In light of this great challenge to human freedom, to human dignity, and to those of us who seek to conserve these precious things, what will the Nixon foreign and domestic policy be in the United States? I can speak only with the authority of one who knows and has faith in this man's record and in his thinking in the years that have passed. Obviously, he has not had time to set forth detailed foreign policy for the present and future, but I believe we can find in this man's experience and background and in the statements he had already made certain elements of what his basic foreign policy will be. He has indicated in his Inaugural Address that high on his list of priorities will be his pursuit of an honorable peace. And yet you will note the very important phrase in that Inaugural Address "A peace which recognizes the right of self-determination for the peoples of the world." I believe that he will give himself in Paris and elsewhere to the pursuit of an honorable peace.

Let us look first at his policy as I believe it will be in Vietnam and in the conduct of the Paris negotiations, the Paris peace talks. As we all know, the Communists do not go to the bargaining table because they have not decided that they want peace and justice in the world. They fight first on the battlefield, and then they go to the Conference table to try to win there what they have failed to win on the battlefield. Their policy remains "Fight, fight, talk, talk, fight, fight, talk, talk."

Then the Paris negotiations represent a battlefield on which the Communists will seek to gain further advantages which they have not won. Now, the United States is, and this would apply beyond Vietnam to all our Asian Policy, irrevocably and inescapably both a world power and specifically an Asian power. We are a Pacific power, and our future is bound up with what happens in Asia. Our President knows that if the Communists are permitted to succeed in Vietnam, then they may well move forward with new adventures in Asia. Our President well knows there has been a dramatic turn in Indonesia to throw off the Communists as there has been the growth of the strong and courageous Republic of Korea following the Communist attempt to destroy that land and control it, as there has been the strong stand of your great Republic against the menace on the mainland. So we must not permit the Communist aggressor in Vietnam to succeed lest he continue to move elsewhere against the free and independent nations of Asia.

We need to look together to the great thing which has been achieved in this difficult

struggle in Vietnam. Out of the midst of war and conflict there has been born constitutional republic created by the people of Vietnam and not by my government. There has been elected a government and a representative parliament which is composed of men of the highest caliber. That government is committed to the sustenance of a strong and viable non-Communist state in Vietnam. It has great public support in this high goal and I am confident that if we do not surrender unnecessary ground at the conference table, and I believe we shall not, this goal will be achieved in Vietnam.

Richard Nixon is a man of great experience and knowledge in foreign policy and a man who has through the years been a firm, knowledgeable anti-Communist. Henry Cabot Lodge, who has before stood firm against the Communists. Ellsworth Bunker, our Ambassador, is a tough and experienced diplomat, and I do not believe these men will permit other than an honorable peace which does not constitute surrender to tyranny or bowing to the aggressor.

I would remind you further that the United States like the Republic of Vietnam has made a great investment in this struggle, not only in terms of billions of dollars but in something more precious than this, 30,000 American lives. We will not fail to keep faith with these men who have made the supreme sacrifice that the people of Vietnam might be free and that the freedom and peace and stability of Asia and of the world shall be protected by their sacrifice.

The same set of principles will apply to our China policy and our policy in all of Asia. We are a partner in Asia's future by the very geography and nature of our nation. We are a Pacific power. We must have an interest in what happens in Asia. Our interest does not lay in the direction of Communist expansion, but in assisting the peoples of Asia to stand independent and free, to join hands with you in regional security and regional programs of economic advancement, to join hands in a continuing way with this great Republic as you have sought to aid in the economic development of Asia and Africa and to work with you and others toward the creation of a stable, non-Communist Asia where men can live in genuine peace and freedom and security. This shall be the direction of our policy and you may rest assured there will be therefore no change in our China policy.

As the thrust of the new administration shall be toward honorable and just and lasting peace for all mankind, as a necessary prerequisite to the chance for such a peace our policy shall not only be the pursuit for peace, but shall be one of strength and preparedness. Our new President has said we will remain as strong as we need to be for as long as we need to be. And this means a continuing investment in military and space programs and technology. This will mean that we will remain strong that we may use that strength to protect and preserve the world's chance for stability and peace.

It is not enough to have a balance of power, what Mr. McNamara used to call a balance of terror between the forces of tyranny and the forces of freedom. In my judgment, the new administration will rather pursue the course of continuing a definite American lead in American military strength and space technology, toward creating that necessary imbalance of power in favor of those nations who seek peace and freedom and who do not seek to control the rest of mankind. I believe that he will seek to guarantee an imbalance of power in favor of the forces of freedom for the sake of the world's peace and security.

I believe the policies of this new administration in this area shall follow the advice of former American President Theodore Roosevelt, who stated that his policy was to speak softly and carry a big stick.

A policy which pursues an honorable peace,

but which maintains strength on the side of freedom, and on the side of our own country's military and space establishment. A policy I believe of patience and perseverance. A policy which will have patience enough to stand firm until there can be honorable peace and I pray that shall be soon.

Needless to say, and I have indicated, we will continue our firm partnership with our allies in Europe and Asia in mutual defense and toward economic development.

In his domestic policy, because a nation must be internally strong if it is to endure the storms of our time, I believe that our new President will have emphasis upon fiscal responsibility, on the part of the American government. For too many years, we have sown the seeds of fiscal instability within our own country. I believe that our new President shall seek to operate within our needs, and to pursue those policies which will protect the soundness of the American dollar and the American economy.

The new President has promised to bring a restoration of law and order with justice in the United States. As the world well knows, our country has had an alarming crime rate. Our country has been racked by riots and civil disturbances in a number of our cities. This has been caused in part by legitimate grievances on the part of groups of our people. It has also been caused in part by criminal elements in our population, and it has been caused in part by subversive groups, and their activities.

The overwhelming majority of the American people, of every race and ethnic group, are law-abiding citizens who love their country and respect its duly constituted authority. For the sake of the rights and liberties of all Americans, whose rights can only be protected within the firm framework of the law, I believe our new President shall insist on law enforcement and respect for duly constituted authority, and that in this he shall have the enthusiastic support of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

In the area of social legislation, I do not need to tell you of the tremendous wealth of our country, or that the standard of living of the average American family is very high compared to the standard of living of the average family of the world. There are, however, pockets of poverty within our country, although our poor are not poor by the world's standards. Be this as it may, I believe that the President will seek to meet the needs which do exist to eliminate what pockets of poverty we do have and to solve the problems that are there in our country. But I believe that he will rely increasingly on the partnership with private enterprise, which in our country as in yours has proven to be a key to great prosperity for all our people and has helped to create the great middle class and to eliminate most of the poverty in our land. I believe also that he shall enter into a voluntary agreement between government and the independent sector, the churches and the charity organizations which fill our land, that we together as private citizens, with our government, and through private enterprise and private charity, might continue to refine our goals and to protect the way of life which all our people can live in the United States, that we shall move forward, but with greater reliance upon private action and personal action and a partnership between government and people.

It is my belief that the new administration will be marked by realism, not making claims which cannot be delivered or making promises which cannot be fulfilled, marked by realism in word and action, one which listens to the voice and heartbeat of the American people. My country is one of vast resources, but our greatest resource is free men. As the whole is equal to the sum of its parts, a nation is equal to the sum of its people. And it is true for the

Republic of China or my Republic that its strength lies in its people. I believe that the American people will be challenged to stand on their own feet, and to live such lives of courage, and dedication, and patriotism, and usefulness, that our own country shall be made more internally strong, and that we shall be even more completely a part of the world's strength.

It is our privilege as free men to live at a time of challenge and of opportunity. As we look out upon a world that is threatened by the Communist terror, may I point out that the people of Latin America have said a firm no to Castro, that the people of Africa have in a number of instances literally run out the Red Chinese who would seek to subvert them. And Africa is saying no to Communism. May I point out that the people of Eastern Europe are restive and longing for freedom because it's man's nature to be free. But even within the Soviet Union itself among the younger people there is restiveness and a great desire for greater freedom which will some day bear fruit. I do not need to tell you of the disillusionment on the mainland of China, of Indonesia's dramatic turn for freedom, of the courageous stand for freedom in Vietnam, and Korea and here, of which I've spoken before, so I believe the time of the deep tides of history run with and not against the forces of freedom. I believe we shall succeed in our great quest for the preservation of human freedom. I believe that if we keep faith with freedom itself, and if we seek each to play his full part as a citizen of a country dedicated to the cause of freedom, we shall succeed and meet and overcome this great challenge of our times.

Chairman Ku, and leaders of free China, for your decisive role in this great struggle for human freedom, I salute you, and pledge to you the continuing and abiding friendship not just of this one American, but of my country.

Thank you.

THE SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF  
1969

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am joining today in the introduction of the 1969 Selective Service Act—a measure that would carry out major reforms in this Nation's system of military conscription.

The need for such legislation is clear and pressing. Cumbersome, antiquated, patently unfair, the draft has evoked protests from just about every segment of American society. Selective service standards for induction, for example, often appear capricious and vary widely from community to community. Some young men are summarily taken out of the classroom and put onto the drillfield; others are allowed to continue studies virtually ad infinitum. Current draft policies threaten to plunder our graduate schools while leaving veritably intact the student bodies of our undergraduate schools. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the Congress must act to reform the draft.

The Congress, unfortunately, has lagged behind popular sentiment for draft reforms. In passing the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, Congress refused, for example, to establish a random selection system and national stand-

ards for the operation and administration of the Selective Service System. But Congress has not been alone in its oversights. Thus, after the passage of the 1967 law the President refrained from drafting the youngest first, which was legally possible, despite his earlier support of this change and widespread belief in both the civilian and the military sectors of national life that this would be a wise step.

Unfortunately, to the imperfections and omissions in the 1967 law, some of which have become obvious or clearer after almost 2 years' experience in operating under it, must be added new problems, such as the reclassification of protesters, that have sprung up or intensified since its enactment. In a word, the time has come, clearly, for the Congress to rework, in fundamental ways, our national policy and legislation pertaining to the procurement of military manpower. Toward this goal, the Selective Service Act of 1969 has been drafted and submitted for congressional consideration.

In the aggregate, the major provisions of the Selective Service Act of 1969 can be divided into five categories. These deal generally with induction, deferment, national standards, administrative-legal matters and problems, and studies of issues related to military manpower procurement.

First. The Selective Service Act of 1969 requires that the youngest registrants be drafted first by a random selection system, which will come into effect over a 3-year transitional period. In two other areas bearing closely on induction and induction requirements, it brings policy toward the drafting of aliens into conformity with our treaty obligations, and it encourages the employment of civilians in nonmilitary jobs through the defense establishment.

Second. It permits only those occupational deferments that are ordered by the President; permits students to postpone—but only to postpone—their exposure to induction, a permission that is discontinued if casualties in military combat rise to 10 percent of the number of men drafted in any month during hostilities; and permits the conferring of conscientious objector status on atheists and agnostics who are bona fide pacifists, thus placing these men on a par with those whose pacifism is based on religious training and belief.

Third. It requires the adoption and uniform application of national standards and criteria in the administration of selective service law.

Fourth. It restricts the definition of draft delinquency to acts relevant to a registrant's individual status; allows the judicial review of questions of law pertaining to classification, and the use of habeas corpus proceedings by those who comply with induction orders; reestablishes the responsibilities of the Department of Justice in the review of conscientious objector litigation; permits registrants to appear in draft board proceedings involving them, and to be represented by counsel; limits to 6 years the term of office of the Director of the Selective Service System; and prohibits discrimination of any type in the composi-

tion of selective service panels that act on the draft status of registrants.

Fifth. It calls for thorough public study of a National Service Corps through which the obligation of service to the United States might be met by nonmilitary activities; of a volunteer army; of programs to give educational and physical assistance to those who desire to volunteer for military duty but cannot meet induction standards; and of the granting of amnesty to men who have chosen to leave the country rather than to submit themselves to the draft.

This is highly significant legislation, and I urge its support by my colleagues of both parties.

YOU'RE A MAN NOW, SON

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it is most gratifying to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House, a moving and inspirational open letter published in the Pittsburgh Press, Friday, February 21.

It is obvious that a wonderful rapport has been established between father and son, as Major Collins so beautifully expressed his emotions upon his son's entrance into the U.S. Air Force.

In order that all my colleagues may have the opportunity to share with me the sense of true patriotic spirit, I submit for the RECORD the article at this time:

AN OPEN LETTER: YOU'RE A MAN NOW, SON

(NOTE.—As a major in the U.S. Air Force Reserve, The Press' night news editor, Lee W. Collins Jr., yesterday swore his son into the Air Force.

(Lee W. (Wes) III now at Lackland AFB, Tex., where he will receive basic training. Wes is a graduate of Taylor Allerdice High School.

(Mr. Collins, who has spent 26 years in the service, nine on active duty, lives with his family at 5712 Hobart St. Mr. Collins' open letter to his son follows:)

DEAR WES: You're a man now, son. Maybe not in the strictest legal sense. After all, you're still only 18. But when you raised your right hand yesterday and I swore you into the U.S. Air Force, you became a man in nearly every sense of the word.

You're old enough to serve your country and to fight and die for it.

When I administered the Air Force oath to you, it was one of the proudest moments of my life and one that comes to few fathers.

LOTS OF MEMORIES FLASH BACK

A lot of things flashed through my mind as you repeated those words after me. And, if you saw an unusual glistening in my eyes, it wasn't the reflection of the light and it wasn't the first time in your life it has happened.

Yes, yesterday brought back many memories. Such as the first time I saw you, a few hours old, lying in an Army hospital nursery in Texas. My eyes shone the same way that day. Then a few days later I held you for the first time. You were a big baby but you seemed very small to your Air Force sergeant father.

And, so it went through the years. Your christening. Your first steps. First birthday.

Your first day in school. First Holy Communion. First Little League game. Your graduation from eighth grade and finally, last year, your high school graduation.

So many days. Some happy, some sad, some so-so, but really all pointing to this day when you were to leave home for the first time.

#### IT HASTENS THE PROCESS

I consider it a privilege that I was allowed to swear you in. It's a duty, an obligation to be sure, but more than that, it's a privilege to serve this great country.

There are those who say that military service makes a man out of a youth. Others say it makes him a bum. I disagree with both ideas.

I think the service merely hastens the process, whichever it may be. I have no qualms about you on this point, son. Just be your usual level-headed self; listen, learn and follow orders and you will come out okay.

I wish you well in the days to come and I hope you learn to be as proud of and love the Air Force as much as I do. There will be rough days but there will be good ones, too.

#### BIG FOOTSTEPS TO FOLLOW

Wherever you go and whatever you do, you'll be following in the footsteps of those who went before you. Men like Eddie Rickenbacker, Frank Luke, Charles Lindbergh, Billy Mitchell, Jimmie Doolittle, Hap Arnold and the thousands of others, many unsung, who helped build the proud tradition of the U.S. Air Force.

It is your tradition, now, too.

Also, I want you to remember that you will never really be alone. The thoughts and prayers of your family will go with you.

YOUR LOVING DAD.

#### LEVI ESHKOL, ISRAEL STATESMAN

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the world was saddened on February 26, 1969, when the announcement came from Israel that Prime Minister Levi Eshkol had died of a heart attack. It is a loss for the world, for Levi Eshkol was a peacemaker in an area too often torn by war and too seldom quieted by peace. In a time fraught with polarization and extreme positions, Prime Minister Eshkol was the rare individual who sought compromise and moderation, the man who led a nation that wanted the tranquility that comes from reason, and not the chaos that is bred by invective and hate. Throughout his life, Levi Eshkol was dedicated to finding acceptable solutions to apparently insoluble problems.

Eshkol was an immigrant in a land of immigrants. He had suffered the tortures of the pogroms in his native Russia, and had witnessed the persecutions of the Nazis. His public life was devoted to finding homes and a new life for others of his faith who had been the victims of inhuman prejudice. Perhaps the Kibbutz that he loved and helped found is a fitting tribute to his life, for it was on the barren lands of Israel that he built the communities that accepted the lost and rejected Jews of the world. He left the land of Israel a better place than he found it some 50 years ago.

He was vitally interested in the labor movement and was a confirmed Zionist, having taken an active role in both of these fields and having become a recognized leader in both. He served with the British in World War I, and contributed to the Allied victory in that conflict. The military training of those early years served him in 1947 and 1948 when he was active in the war for Israeli independence. Levi Eshkol was also recognized as an authority on collective agricultural settlements and on economic planning for development. He was, in an age of specialists, a well rounded and well versed man, expert in many fields.

The people of Israel have lost a valued leader and statesman, the United States has lost an ally, and the free world has lost a champion of liberty.

#### TAX FREE PROMOTION OF SOCIALISM

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the revelation that a tax-free foundation had subsidized political free loaders was revolting enough to taxpaying citizens—but for the recipients to try to defend the tax-free gifts makes a mockery of the tax system.

Perhaps the public need demand more than ethics in public life. Ethics, like any self-discipline, applies only to the honest and the decent, but is treated contemptuously by the crafty and amoral, who refuse to accept the equal rights and equal responsibilities of a free society.

Some feel they are immune to ethics and above responsibility because they believe themselves to be part of an intellectual aristocracy—a nonlaboring class entitled to special privileges.

Mr. Speaker, I include several news clippings on the Ford Foundation, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 26, 1969]

FOUNDATION CONTROVERSY: FIVE R. F. K. AIDES DEFEND GRANTS  
(By Bruce Galphin)

For Rep. Wright Patman (D-Tex.), it was further evidence in his long case against tax-exempt foundations.

Rep. John W. Byrnes (R-Wis.), referred to it acidly as "severance pay."

McGeorge Bundy, president of the giant Ford Foundation, defended it on educational and humanitarian grounds.

Whoever is right, it is clear that the case of Ford grants to eight aides of the late Sen. Robert F. Kennedy had dramatized some central issues of the foundation controversy.

By approving almost simultaneous grants for eight men all so closely identified with one man's politics, had the Ford Foundation clouded its nonpartisan stance? Had it demonstrated the danger that big foundations can unduly influence the Nation's political thought?

Or to the contrary, had the case shown the benevolent potential of foundations, investing in talent, putting the men's findings as it were into a sort of idea bank, so that the

material's true worth could be judged—as Bundy put it—only "several years from now?"

Bundy told the House Ways and Means Committee that he initiated the eight grants. And he readily conceded that there was an emotional motive: After the second major assassination within a few weeks, he said, he asked himself, "What can we do to help?"

In the case of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s death, Ford gave \$85,000 to the Atlanta university complex to establish a King archive.

Kennedy, Bundy said, had assembled an unusually talented group of idea men, and it seemed appropriate to fund studies in which their expertise could be put to work.

The eight grants totaled \$131,879, including travel. Ford makes approximately 2000 grants a year to individuals, Bundy testified.

Beyond the philosophical questions in this case is a concrete one: What did the Kennedy octet do with the Ford money?

The Washington Post was able to reach five of the eight. Each contended that he had put the funds to good use, and that his study produced worthwhile data.

Their reactions ranged from resentment over the accusations leveled at the grants to a belief that people mistakenly thought the grants were used for politicking.

Peter B. Edelman, whose specialty on Sen. Kennedy's staff was domestic affairs, made a round-the-world trip under his Ford grant.

He said he studied social insurance in Denmark and Sweden, political and economic decentralization in Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, preschool programs in the Soviet Union, agricultural cooperatives in Israel, rural development in Kenya, Tanzania, and India and agricultural methods in Southeast Asia. In Japan, he said, "I tried to get to the roots of what's happening to the students. I think it is very relevant to American youth."

The whole trip, he contended, "broadened me in ways that are immeasurable" and was highly "relevant to poverty and other social problems in this country."

Edelman said he resents the suggestion that he did not carry out the requirements of his \$19,901, five-month grant.

He has written about 125 of an estimated 150 pages of his study, which he hopes to complete within the next two weeks.

Edelman presently is working for the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Foundation here.

The new job is with the Vera Institute of Justice, which deals with research and demonstration projects in the field of criminal justice.

Adam Walinsky was Sen. Kennedy's ear to the New Left. A special interest then was the problem of alienation and self-determination, and his six-month, \$22,220 grant allowed him to continue research in that field.

Alienation is not solely a ghetto phenomenon, he said. It is a problem among farmers, factory workers, the rich—"much of the western world."

#### NO REQUIREMENTS

Walinsky said there are no firm requirements whether his research will be used for written reports or for advice to the Foundation. He looks upon himself as something of a continuing consultant, even though the grant has run its course and the funds are terminated.

For instance, he expects his research findings to be relevant to pending and future legislation. He already has spent some time advising the Robert Kennedy Memorial Foundation, which he said will be "active in these very fields" (of his interest).

"I think that what bothered some people was a belief that we were running around doing politics," Walinsky said of the controversy the eight grants have raised. He said he spent "maybe three weekends and seven or eight weekdays on politics. That was on my own time, and it was less than any number of privately employed men spent."

## SCANS CAMPAIGNING

Gerald J. (Jerry) Bruno has been investigating the proposition that because of the threat of assassination, existing airport-motorcade-shopping center campaign techniques should be abandoned in favor of an all-media approach.

Bruno, who was Kennedy's top advance man, says he is comparing cities the Senator visited during his 1968 campaign with a control group Kennedy didn't visit. Bruno says he has compiled research in "about 16 states."

Funds for Bruno's seven-month, \$19,450 Ford grant continue until March 5. He is doubtful that he will have a written report by then, but said he has no specific deadline for it.

Bruno opposes the all-media idea. "My belief is that it would hurt our political system . . . that it would tend to make the candidate not responsive to the issues," he said.

The three other Kennedy aides who received Ford grants after the Senator's death are:

Frank Mankiewicz, now abroad, \$15,692 to study the effectiveness of Peace Corps programs in Latin America.

Earl G. Graves, \$19,500 for a six-month study of opportunities for black citizens in small business.

Thomas Johnston, \$10,000 to study the feasibility of transmitting newspapers electronically.

Joseph F. Dolan, now a practicing attorney in Denver, Colo., has completed his Ford project.

The six-month, \$18,556 study concerned the way law schools teach students about the law-making process.

Dolan said he visited "22 or 23" law schools in the New York and Washington areas, in Michigan, Washington State and the Rocky Mountain states.

He completed his report early in January, submitted it to Ford, offered it to a law journal, and circulated it among a number of law deans and professors for criticism.

"The thing that mystifies me is the sudden interest in this grant," he declared.

Dolan worked with Kennedy in the Justice Department from 1961 to 1965, then joined his senatorial staff. He once was listed as Kennedy's best paid aide.

Dall Forsythe had the smallest of the Ford grants to the Kennedy octet: \$6,390. And, he reported, "I gave them back about \$700 that I didn't spend."

His four-month grant authorized him to study presidential political trends, especially in the nominating process.

He did research in the Columbia University library, attended the Democratic National Convention and the meeting of the New Democratic Coalition in Minneapolis, and conducted research in California, Oregon, Colorado and Iowa.

Thus far he has completed only a "six- or seven-page" outline for Ford, but Forsythe said he has no specific deadline for his final report.

"I've got about a foot and a half of research data," he said. "I wish I had finished it, but I have a new baby and a new job."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 26, 1969]

## JOURNALISM GRANT GIVEN FOR NEGROS

The Afro-American Newspapers, Inc., and the Virginia Council on Human Relations will sponsor a year-long project, financed by a \$123,000 Ford Foundation grant, to train 15 young Negro newspapermen and women.

Details of the Frederick Douglass Fellowship program were announced yesterday in Richmond by Raymond H. Boone, editor of the Richmond Afro-American, and Carl E. Auvil of Falls Church, Virginia Council president.

They said the project is aimed at:

Training Negro newspapermen for careers in a profession usually closed to them.

Strengthening the Negro press by adding to the skilled manpower available.

Challenging and confronting racism in American newspapers, especially in the South.

Applicants for the Douglass Fellowships will be sought from colleges, prisons, ghettos, military services, Job Corps training centers, VISTA volunteers and Peace Corps returnees, according to Boone and Auvil.

The participants each will receive a stipend of \$4200.

Headquartered in Richmond, the project also will have newsrooms in Washington and Baltimore.

The program, according to Boone and Auvil, will emphasize learning by doing. The fellows will cover news events, report on them and, if their accounts merit publication, will see them published in one or several of the Afro-American's editions.

## THE SENTINEL ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM

## HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 26, 1969

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, many Americans are deeply concerned about the proposals to construct the Sentinel anti-ballistic-missile system in the coming years, a system which is argued on the one hand as essential to the defense of the United States, and on the other, is criticized as a needless expenditure of American resources for a doubtful gain, at a time when the country should concentrate on its social needs, and its urban deficit, among other urgent requirements which have been recognized.

The Hartford Times has recently done a serious and thoughtful study of the arguments against this matter, and I believe that its presentation deserves to be placed in the RECORD and made available to Members of the House and Senate:

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times, Feb. 23, 1969]

## WHY SENTINEL COULD BE A CATAclysmic MISTAKE

The debate about whether to go ahead with the Sentinel anti-ballistic missile system is a deliberation of very large and long range importance. It may be a far bigger decision than it seems to be.

It isn't just a debate over whether we should go ahead with a missile defense system that has been challenged both as technique and as strategy.

We are debating, there is reason to suspect, a national commitment to the ways of defense and the ways of life that lie beyond the Sentinel. The subject is explored in the leading article on the first Perspective page in today's Sunday Times.

This is a crossroads. If we elect to go the way of the Sentinel system, it is quite possible that there will be no turning back. We may find we have condemned ourselves to live under a permanent national preoccupation with Doomsday.

This is not a decision to be made in the Pentagon or in a closed session of a congressional committee. Because of the implications of the decision on the Sentinel, it needs to be the subject of full public understanding and discussion. And the Washington Post's discovery of an elaborate and quite clandestine military plan of public relations

on behalf of the Sentinel is not very reassuring.

When the United States decides on a route as important as this one seems to be, the decision should be an open one. When the United States decides to deploy an anti-ballistic-missile system, the relative security of the nuclear power stand-off between the United States and the Soviet Union will come to an end. To end that stand-off involves a commitment of awesome proportions.

The United States, in order to be effective in world affairs and in order to work creatively for world peace, must be able to bargain from strength. And many of the backers of the Sentinel, as men of good will and honesty, see this plan as one which simply gives us a little more strength to use for decent purposes.

But such experts as William C. Foster, for eight years the director of the U.S. Arms control and Disarmament Agency, point out that the issue is not that simple. The rules of the game will change dramatically if we make this choice.

There is at the moment, the best opportunity in many years to get together with the Soviet Union and to call a halt to the nuclear arms race. There is an opportunity now to halt the proliferation of nuclear weaponry around the world.

It is clear, moreover, that President Nixon recognizes the psychological importance of this moment and wants to make the most of it.

But even a president, especially in the first months of organization and policy-making, can be caught up in the sweep of earnest but misguided pleadings to find that bad judgment has closed the doors we wish were still standing open.

Today's chances for nuclear negotiation are perishable opportunities. It has taken decades to create them. They could be destroyed in a few hours of short-sighted decision-making.

It is the view of this newspaper that to lose these opportunities would be one of the great historic tragedies of modern times.

To plunge ahead, slam bang, with the Sentinel system is to commit ourselves to immeasurably more elaborate systems which would have to follow. That could kill off any opportunities for ending the perpetual spiral of nuclear weaponry.

When President Johnson and Defense Secretary McNamara gave their hesitant approval to the initial work on the Sentinel system 18 months ago, it was rationalized as a "thin" system to protect us against the relatively primitive nuclear weapons Red China will have a few years from now.

But Red China's weapons are not going to remain "primitive" for very long. There is good reason to doubt that the Sentinel system would give us effective protection against the Chinese by the time we got it installed.

Thus, if we undertake an anti-ballistic-missile defense at all, we will have to install something far more sophisticated than Sentinel.

At this point the Soviet Union is hardly going to believe us when we say we are worried only about Red China—even if we mean it. The Russians will feel compelled to counter our newest system with a newer one of their own. And we, in turn, will feel the necessity to top the Kremlin's effort.

The rules of this game of unlimited nuclear one-upmanship could bring the United States to a program in which we ring each city with all the hardware of nuclear war and huddle away our lives in fallout shelters.

The preliminary cost estimates of this "thick" defense ran to more than \$40 billion—and there is probably no way of estimating what the real cost would be. The program is now being discussed at a \$100 billion plan.

Real costs, in this kind of defense system, might be almost irrelevant, anyway. Would not our whole national existence be given over so soon to the nightmare preparations for a war of total nuclear annihilation?

We would have to prepare—if "prepare" is a word with any meaning here—for an enemy strategy which might at some point decide to catch us with a first strike before we could develop the next stage of nuclear capacity. For the odds again would favor the first-strike strategy.

This country's obsession with the terror-laden business of nuclear defense in an all-out arms race would surely threaten to demoralize the non-military aspects of our civic existence. It is hard to imagine, in any event, a situation which would dehumanize the United States any faster—or which would gobble up any resources available to the human side of our national existence.

President Johnson and Secretary McNamara saw all this clearly enough. They warned that this could be the result of their tentative approval of the Sentinel program. But they were not quite far-visioned enough or independent enough to reject the Sentinel when they should have.

It is not too late to do so now. But the time has almost run out.

A new administration, inheriting a plan ready for execution and all of that plan's self-generative expertise, may be too timid to cancel commitments which should be cancelled.

That was the course of events that led to the Bay of Pigs. And it has already been suggested that the Sentinel may be the Nixon Administration's Bay of Pigs. But let us make sure this doesn't happen.

If the people had really known what was going on, there would not have been a Cuban fiasco for Kennedy. If the people are permitted to get in on the facts and the decisions, there need be no nuclear fiasco for Nixon.

#### AID FOR BIAFRA

### HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply troubled and concerned, as I know most of our colleagues and the majority of the American people are, over the situation which has existed in Nigeria for the past several months. Daily we receive reports of countless numbers of men, women, and children dying from starvation, disease, and malnutrition. The plight of the Biafrans, young and old, who have been victimized by this civil war cannot help but touch all of us, in and out of government.

The tragedy of Nigeria, like so many other human tragedies, is that what seems clearly moral and clearly imperative to most of us is not what seems either clear, moral, or imperative to the people who have it in their power to end the conflict. The basic difficulty appears to be that the humanitarian aspects of the problem are hopelessly tied to its political aspects and, so far, ancient rivalries and suspicions have prevented those responsible from being convinced that innocent persons should not be made victims of power plays and political maneuvering. A clear and definitive distinction must be made between the political and military aspects of the situa-

tion, on one hand, and the humanitarian aspects on the other.

Although our Government has made major contributions to alleviate the suffering in Biafra and has donated more than \$22 million in cash and surplus food plus eight cargo aircraft, I believe the response of the United States to this situation was neither prompt nor broad enough. At present, only 200 tons a day are reaching a people whose minimum relief needs are estimated at 2,000 tons a day. It is obvious that much more must be done. Without becoming embroiled in the political factors, the United States should be doing everything it can to prevent the already appalling starvation in Biafra from becoming one of this century's major world disasters.

I was pleased to join with over 100 of our colleagues last month in sponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 98, which calls for a significant increase in U.S. relief efforts and international cooperation in this humanitarian endeavor. Such a large number of sponsors clearly indicates the strong bipartisan support in the Congress for expanding American relief efforts to this beleaguered and war-torn area of Africa and I urge that prompt and favorable action be taken on this resolution, and that the United States take all necessary steps to increase its relief activities in Nigeria-Biafra.

#### DAVID LEO UELMEN STRESSES LABOR'S STAKE IN THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION

### HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, David Leo Uelmen, a well-known labor lawyer, gave an excellent speech in Milwaukee on January 11, 1969, in which he summarized eloquently the role the Supreme Court has played both in safeguarding the rights of the workingman and in assuring a decent and civilized society for all of us. He also sounded a timely warning against ill-considered attempts to overturn Supreme Court decisions by amending the Constitution.

The speech, entitled "Labor's Stake in the American Constitution," is well worth reading and I commend it to my colleagues:

#### LABOR'S STAKE IN THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION

(Address By David Leo Uelmen)

I bring you greetings from Dave Previant who is not able to be with us tonight. It was nine years ago that he warned us all that no union would escape the restrictive provisions of the Landrum-Griffin Act, and we certainly have found that to be true. All unions have had to adjust to those provisions and none have escaped.

We also know that in 1968 strikes have become more difficult to settle, and perhaps there are numerous reasons for this fact. Some of these reasons bear stating:

(A) The historic right of union members to obtain assistance from their brothers on the picket line has been seriously curtailed by the law.

(B) The contracts that we desire to negotiate with the employer are now regulated from paragraph to comma by the National Labor Act. No settlement is possible, even where the parties are in agreement, without overcoming serious legal burdens.

(C) In addition to fighting the boss, we are occasionally obliged to fight some of our own members. All of these factors have contributed to the legal difficulties in 1968.

The simple fact is that law has virtually removed the power of the majority of the members to control or discipline the minority, including those few fifth column artists who consciously try to undermine the union and its work. In Detroit, Mich., three officers are facing indictment tonight for having assisted the chairman in removing, in a peaceful way, two members who insisted on attending a meeting at which they had no legal right to be.

In addition to legal impediments, the responsible officers of the unions have to face political problems at regular intervals. Much can be accomplished by dedicated union officers for the members and society, but disappointments and frustrations are also present. The year of 1968 had its fair share of those, and I'm not satisfied that enough is being done on the top policy levels inside the International Unions and the Central Bodies to assist the local unions in solving these problems.

1968 was a year of dissent and a year in which dissent was expressed in numerous ways and in strange places. We saw dissent expressed in our colleges and universities, in our labor unions, in our corporations, in our military services, in our sports activities and in almost every state of the union. In my opinion no organization as responsive to the economic and political life of the country as labor unions are can ignore this dissent. Nor will this dissent be still—nor can it be stilled.

Frequently, we are too eager to read evil into dissent. Each dissenting opinion becomes suspect, too quickly. Each dissenter is labeled "rebel" too soon. It reminds me of the story of the girl who joined a convent at which only two words could be spoken every ten years. After ten years this girl said "Food's bad." After twenty years she said "Bed's hard." After ten more years she said "I quit." The Mother Superior replied: "Well, I'm not surprised. You've done nothing but complain for the past thirty years."

No one person can tell the labor movement how it will react to its dissenting voices. All must listen to the voices and all must participate in the decision as to how labor should react. Are there procedures which must be changed or adopted? Are there policies which must be changed? What additional structures should be established or abolished? Who will be the leaders to meet these challenges?

In about one week a new U.S. President elected by the conservative groups of the country will be sworn in. He will be given every opportunity to help solve the nation's problems, but I am reminded what Adlai Stevenson said about Richard M. Nixon: "He is the type of a politician who will cut down a redwood tree and then mount the stump to give a speech in favor of conservation." Perhaps he has changed since then.

During the last campaign no institution of our country was safe from attack or was spared criticism. When the winds of dissent blow as strongly as they blew in 1968 no one can be sure what type of dust and sand will be blown about into the eyes and ears of the American public. One of the institutions which received the brunt of the attack was the Supreme Court of the United States. Part of the reason for the attack is because it is unable to publicly defend itself. The Presidency and the Congress are elected at regular intervals and great publicity follow these campaigns. The Court, which is the balance wheel established by the Constitution

to secure the Constitution against erosion by legislative acts, is composed of members appointed for life. No public funds and no private funds are available or are budgeted for the Court to defend itself or its decisions.

Nor can the Court duck the issues presented. It can't reject a case as "too controversial"; a case must be controversial before the Court will consider it.

It can't consider "what will the voters think." It must consider only "what does the constitution say."

It can't say, as Congress said to labor in 1959 when it adopted the Landrum-Griffin Act over labor's objections—"You should have seen the mail."

The Court must face the controversial issues of the times, and it is frequently called upon so to do. We have seen, in the past fifteen years, that there is more guts in those nine men than Congress has shown with its 500.

Lost in the politics of the day was a recognition of the fact that the Supreme Court is one of three independent branches of government established by the Constitution of the United States. The Presidency, the Congress and the Supreme Court each have their specific roles to play; each are created by the Constitution and each have their powers defined by the Constitution. The genius of the American Constitution is that it created these three independent branches of government each to act as a check and balance on the other. Does Russia, France, Germany, Italy, Egypt, Cuba or other South American countries have a tradition of a free and independent judiciary? You all know the answer to that question.

The so-called system of checks and balances is the cornerstone of our Constitution, our government and our liberty as individuals. And it is the unique contribution which American history has made to the world. The attacks on the Supreme Court—the proposals to change the Court—the proposals to remove life tenure from the justices—the proposals to hold Constitutional conventions—to repeal the Bill of Rights and other provisions of the Constitution—should give us all cause for alarm.

True, decisions of the Court in important matters are controversial. Two sides argue, but only one can win. But the American labor movement should know that it has been saved again and again by that same Supreme Court, and management and the conservatives didn't like it one little bit. Just a few examples:

1. When the State of Wisconsin issued an injunction against the strike of the bus drivers in Milwaukee on the ground that it was illegal for them to strike under the state law as a public utility, the Supreme Court of the United States reversed, and told Wisconsin that since federal law gives these men the right to strike, the state can't take it away.

2. When the Supreme Courts of Mississippi, Georgia, Wisconsin and Texas and a number of other states held that a state court could enjoin peaceful picketing in industries that affect interstate commerce, the Supreme Court of the United States said—you're wrong. The National Labor Act gives unions the right to picket and no state can take it away.

3. When the National Labor Board held that a hiring hall was illegal, and the Building Trades and Teamsters Unions were to pay back thousands of dollars of dues collected pursuant to their hiring hall contract provisions, the Supreme Court of the United States reversed.

4. When the Kentucky Court of Appeals held that a decision of the joint labor-management grievance committee was just advisory, and that the decisions of these grievance boards could not be enforced in court, the Supreme Court of the United States reversed, and the Court backed up the collective bargaining agreement negotiated by the

union. [Incidentally, for you newcomers, Dave Previat argued these cases in the Supreme Court.]

5. When Kansas argued that the regulation of rates for natural gas at the wellhead was a matter for exclusive state jurisdiction and that Congress would not regulate the price of natural gas, the Supreme Court of the United States said to Kansas—"you're wrong". We're not going to let Kansas, Texas and Oklahoma oil people hold up the people living in Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois and Minnesota in the price of their natural gas.

6. When the old Liberty League argued that the National Labor Relations Act, which gave employees the right to join a union without being fired, was unconstitutional, the Supreme Court upheld the statute. Congress does have the constitutional power to protect employees who join labor unions from discrimination and discharge.

7. When the State of Ohio permitted its police force to push in the door of a private home simply because they suspected that there was some illegal conduct going on in that building, Ohio argued that the Bill of Rights to the Constitution doesn't apply to the States; and that it is a limitation only on the federal government. The Supreme Court of the United States said to Ohio—"forget it". The provisions against unreasonable search and seizure of the Constitution protect a man in his home and it would permit no distinction between whether a door is being kicked down by an FBI man, a state policeman or a local city patrolman. It is the Constitution that governs and protects.

8. When the District Attorney in New York went into a local union office and seized the file cabinets and physically carried them out without a search warrant, and used these files to convict a business agent of a crime based upon the records they found in his own file cabinets, the Supreme Court of the United States reversed. The Constitution protects a citizen in his home and in his office from illegal searches and seizures.

9. When the State of Florida tried and convicted a citizen on the charge of burglary and denied him the right to be represented by an attorney, Florida argued he wasn't entitled to an attorney unless he could afford to pay. The Supreme Court of the United States said "no", the Constitution guarantees a man a lawyer and Florida cannot deprive him of that right simply because the man is poor.

10. When the State of Mississippi argued that it could hold persons accused of crime without bail or, in the alternative, could set bail at hundreds of thousands of dollars in order to keep a man in jail, the Supreme Court of the United States said, "no", the Constitution gives a man the right to be released on bail and Mississippi cannot deprive him of those Constitutional rights.

11. When the State of Illinois said, all right, we'll give the man his right to a lawyer, but it will be at the time of trial, and in the meantime we'll hold him in the police station for a few weeks for questioning before we let him see the lawyer, the Supreme Court of the United States said "no", this man is entitled to a lawyer after his arrest. A state may not take a citizen accused of crime down to the jailhouse for a little pushing around in order to get a confession from him, and then after it has obtained the confession, give the citizen his day in court.

12. When Allis-Chalmers argued that the union could not fine its members who acted as strike-breakers by working during a strike, in violation of the Union constitution, the Supreme Court of the United States supported the union and its constitution.

13. When Nebraska held that the union shop amendments to the Railway Labor Act were unconstitutional, the Supreme Court reversed. It held that a citizen may be compelled to pay his fair share of the cost of

collective bargaining under which he benefits.

14. When the Supreme Court of the United States held that a child could not be required to say certain prayers prescribed by the school board, there were certain kinds of "nuts" going around the country saying that the court had "thrown God out of the school room." [As though any human could throw God out of anywhere he desires to be.] We don't send our children to school for the purpose of praying, and who wants school boards whose membership undergoes change from Protestant to Catholic to Jewish from time to time, adopting a series of their own personal prayers and imposing them upon all children as uniform standard prayers.

I am also amused by those that say that the prescribed prayer was just a "harmless" prayer—whatever that is.

15. When the various states of the United States had ignored reapportionment of the legislatures for many years to the point that the cities were virtually unrepresented, and the state legislatures were organized on the basis of geography instead of on the basis of population, the Supreme Court of the United States ordered the legislatures reapportioned. Our Constitutional system requires each man to have one vote, and no state can count the sticks and stumps in the north or the swamp rats in the south as voters. One man—one vote. It was the Supreme Court of the United States that had the courage, the willingness and the intestinal fortitude to support the Constitution and interpret and apply the Constitution when the state legislators could not bring themselves to fulfill their duty.

We are told by Senator Dirksen that the Constitution must be changed so that legislative reapportionment may be based on an area as well as population. We are told by Governor Dewey that the Fifth Amendment should be dropped. We are told by George Wallace that the Supreme Court justices should be recalled and that their authority under the Constitution should be abolished.

No one will assert that the Constitution of the United States is a perfect document, but we do know that it is the one product of our revolution which makes this country different from the rest of the world. No other revolution has produced a document or government that has lasted as has this government—not the French revolution, not the Russian revolution, not the Cuban revolution, not the Egyptian revolution.

Our document is different and its differences have been the source of our strength. Those who will change it are cutting at the heart of the Constitution and at the heart of our liberty.

We are told that a new Constitutional convention should be called.

Who does Senator Dirksen have in mind to be Chairman of this convention? Do you know who the last Chairman was?—George Washington. And who do we have on the scene today that will take the place of Alexander Hamilton, Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, James Madison, and the others?

No doubt these people seeking a new Convention envision one held in a plush carpeted building with cocktails before dinner and brandy afterward, and after the important provisions of our Constitution have been gutted, all Americans would sit down quietly and shake hands and "let bygones be bygones."

Well, there was no carpeting at Valley Forge; and there were no cocktails served before Washington crossed the Delaware; and when the British captured Nathan Hale they did not shake his hand and say let's "let bygones be bygones."

Our founding fathers knew sacrifice and experienced the risks to establish a document which gives the citizens of the United

States freedom unequalled and unheard of in the history of the world. The right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures; the right to be free from arrest in the absence of reasonable cause; the right of the accused to be taken to a magistrate for the setting of bail; the right to be represented by legal counsel. These rights were obtained after much sacrifice and cannot and should not and will not be negotiated away by any current generation of Americans. These rights are too precious to be tampered with on a day to day or year to year basis. These are rights which cannot be taken away by any police patrolman, police chief, or police judge—not while the Supreme Court of the United States sits.

Some have said that since the Constitution of the United States has been amended twenty-five times, what's wrong with having a few more amendments. However, the number 25 is a very misleading number. The first ten, the Bill of Rights, are the ones that we have been talking about here tonight. Seven others are primarily "housekeeping" amendments. Election of senators, succession of presidents, women's suffrage, incompetence of the president and the income tax amendments.

Two amendments cancel each other—that silly business about prohibition.

The others are the Civil War amendments which state in substance that all persons born or naturalized in the U.S.A. are citizens of the United States and of the state in which they live. No state can deprive a citizen of life, liberty or property without due process of law or deny any citizen equal protection of law.

These additional protections from state action were won after the great Civil War. The phrase "Civil War" is not just a historical phrase to be read in your son's history book. The very term should send a chill down the spine of every living American. We lost one million American men dead in the Civil War. Based upon the percentage of population and the new "technology" if that war were to occur today, we could lose twenty million dead. By way of contrast, we lost 407,000 in World War II.

These tragic figures show that Americans value their Constitution and their freedom, and amendments to the Constitution affecting our basic rights are not going to be pushed through based on popularity contests or in plush carpeted halls. Our Constitution was born in revolution and can be amended only through the type of sacrifice mentioned above.

You all heard George Wallace campaign in this state last year with the phrase "Stand Up For America." "Love Her or Leave Her." You all saw those signs. Well the words are right, but the music and the singers are wrong.

Do we stand up for America when we run down her Court, tear down her institutions, and wrench out of her Constitution the important principles of checks and balances? Forbid it, Almighty God.

We stand up for America when we support her Court and when we support her Constitution.

We stand up for America when we stand up for the principles for which she had always stood—liberty, equality and justice for all her citizens regardless of race, color or creed.

All living Americans are the beneficiaries of the liberty protected by our Constitution. We are also, at the same time its trustees. As beneficiaries, we are free to enjoy this liberty, use it, live under it and benefit by it. As trustees we are obligated to protect it and to pass it on to those that come after us. No generation of Americans has failed in this trust and it is our obligation to see to it that this generation fulfills its obligations and duties under this trust.

There is no doubt but that the labor movement will be called upon to "stand up for America," and to support her Constitution, and when we are called upon, let us not answer unprepared.

## VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENTS AND RESCUE SQUADS

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I believe there is substantial interest in this House with respect to the operations of volunteer fire departments and rescue squads.

Many Members represent districts in which these voluntary organizations perform outstanding community service.

While I have no pride of authorship in the language of the bill, I want to note at this time that I have introduced H.R. 1210, which would provide preferential treatment for these organizations in the disposition of surplus Federal property, similar to the preference the Congress has given a number of other organizations. Additionally, I have introduced H.R. 491, which would give these organizations the postal rates available to nonprofit organizations, assuming that, in each case, the nonprofit qualification could be met.

It is needless for me to point out at this time, Mr. Speaker, that volunteer fire departments and volunteer rescue squads perform a needed service without charge on the taxpayer in most situations. The enthusiasm and competence of the members of these organizations are well known, and I believe the Congress should encourage their efforts in any appropriate way.

Representative of the service given by these volunteer organizations is the following statistical report of the Winchester, Va., Rescue Squad:

Winchester Rescue Squad, annual report, 1968

Total calls.....	2,279
Total mileage.....	46,746
Unit No. 1.....	3,988
Unit No. 2.....	4,168
Unit No. 3.....	15,977
Unit No. 4.....	2,842
Average calls per day.....	6 1/4
Total man-hours.....	28,800
Man-hours per call.....	12.6
Average hours per call.....	2.1
Total expenses, 1968.....	\$26,067
Average cost per call.....	\$11.43
First aid and instructors.....	20
Persons instructed.....	144

## AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am joining in the introduction of legislation to raise the qualifications and standards of air traffic control personnel. In the interest of a safe national transportation system, it is of critical importance that this Congress move to insure the development of an effective air traffic controller force.

With the passage in 1958 of the Federal Aviation Act, Congress established the Federal Aviation Administration and made it responsible for development of

an efficient and safe air traffic control system. FAA recruited its controllers primarily from the military, and for a time this was sufficient, but air transportation growth in the last 4 years and forecasts for the future indicate that air traffic will increase at a greater rate than the present or programed traffic control system can handle. An increasing number of terminal areas are already experiencing unusually long delays in receiving and dispatching aircraft. Nevertheless, in recent years only nominal changes in personnel policy have been brought about, while air traffic control has become much more complex, and during recent months various stopgap measures have been designed to alleviate the current air crisis in which many controllers have logged as many as 86 hours in less than 7 days.

FAA forecasts sharply rising demands for airspace by air carriers and general aviation through 1977. Total aircraft operations at airports with FAA traffic control service will rise from 41 million in fiscal year 1966 to 139 million in fiscal year 1977, an increase of 337 percent. This increased air traffic volume with a greater proportion of larger high performance aircraft will clearly require new approaches to air traffic control.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed legislation would establish educational and training qualifications, age limitations, and physical and proficiency requirements for air traffic controllers. Finally, in order to attract qualified candidates, the bill establishes a salary and retirement program that is commensurate with the responsibility. Air traffic control must be considered a profession and dealt with accordingly.

## NATIONAL FFA WEEK

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, one day last week 81 students of a high school in my district participated in a very worthwhile project. Their activities did not attract sensational news coverage. They came to school that morning each dressed in white shirt, tie, and jacket. Their group presented every teacher with a rose. The organization's officers volunteered to make the morning room announcements. That afternoon they presented an assembly program for the student body. The previous Sunday they attended a local church as a group. They also developed an exhibit of their leadership accomplishments for showing all week in the school's display case.

What was the week and which organization was trying to show what is right with American youth? It was National FFA Week and the members of Fairfield Union FFA chapter in eastern Fairfield County were doing their part to help set the record straight on behalf of the vast majority of their generation. Operating under the theme "FFA, an opportunity for youth" these ambitious members were doing what they could to show that the

FFA provides opportunities for young people in agriculture to learn, to do, to earn, and to serve. The FFA does not produce instant success, however. Rather, it gives members the opportunity to work, to grow, to excel, and thus become outstanding youth leaders for agriculture in America.

This outstanding chapter is just one of many in my district that are doing much to motivate our rural youth. Their success has been recognized at both the State and National levels of FFA. I salute them on the celebration of their week this month.

President Richard M. Nixon spoke of "the tremendous importance of a healthy, strong agriculture for the United States of America" when he addressed the National FFA Convention on the occasion of their 40th anniversary last fall in Kansas City. He went on to say:

If there is one area in which the American achievement is most remarkable and which too often we do not pay attention to as much as we should, it's in the area of agriculture.

Even as our President is now abroad in pursuit of peace, we can recall his charge to—

never forget that the production of American agriculture is the major source of America's strength in maintaining our industrial capability, in maintaining our military strength, and in maintaining our position of leadership in the world.

Looking to America's future, he concluded that there is no group—

that has in its hands more the strength, the power, not only to feed America and clothe America, but to lead America than the Future Farmers of America.

I am proud to represent a portion of our country's great agricultural community, to serve on the Agricultural Committee of the House, and to bring to your attention the efforts of an organization that, while not capturing the headlines of the national journal is making a significant contribution to a better America.

#### YOUTH FARES

### HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, student writers throughout the Nation continue to express their opposition to Civil Aeronautics Board Examiner Arthur S. Present's decision against continuation of youth fares on our airlines.

I include the following articles in the RECORD at this time:

[From the Harvard Crimson]

#### YOUTH FARE WELL

There is so little room for life in this world. Even the Civil Aeronautics Board should cherish it, but it doesn't. The CAB is threatening to end the Youth Fare privileges for travellers from ages 12 to 21. The System is trying to squeeze the life from air travel so the great silver birds can fly in peace.

Ending Youth Fare will be first and foremost a blow to mothers and lovers. It will banish caprice from air travel. There will be

no more impulsive flights to mothers' cooking or the arms of sweethearts. The airlines will be surrendered to fat executives and government officials with clenched teeth.

The end of Youth Fare will diminish the humanity of airports. Scenes of haggard youths cradling green bills in their hands will forever disappear. At night, the fluorescent light will shine on empty seats.

If the CAB ends Youth Fare, we will all know why it did.

[From Yale University Daily News]

#### YALE BACKS YOUTH FARE; DEMONSTRATION SCHEDULED

(By Wayne Liebman)

A petition asking the Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) to retain airline Youth Fares gained more than 2,000 signatures in the Yale dining halls last night.

A group of undergraduates drew up the petition and intends to send it to John Crooker, chairman of the CAB.

The student group has also organized a demonstration to show support for the continuation of Youth Fare. The demonstration will be held in front of the Trailways Bus Terminal on Grove and Whitney Avenue this afternoon at 4:30.

"Youth Fare is absolutely essential for some students at Yale," a spokesman for the group said. "The Trailways suit is designed to make money for Trailways. Trailways is apparently unconcerned about students who are on scholarship or who travel great distances to school.

"These students depend on the half fares. Many of them will be in real financial trouble if this thing goes through," the spokesman said.

Trailways has recently initiated the suit which would abolish half fare plane rides for passengers under 22, claiming such reduced fares are discriminatory.

The student petition says if Youth Fare is discriminatory, then so are all reduced fares for special groups, such as reduced fares for military men, which both the airlines and the bus companies themselves offer.

A form letter, which will be sent either to the CAB or to congressmen, accompanies the petition to students who request it.

#### AIR FAIR

The Trailways Bus Company suit to abolish airline Youth Fares is an attempt by the bus industry to recoup alleged profit losses at the expense of the country's youth.

Most hard hit will be college students who must travel great distances to school and who can least afford the prohibitive cost of air travel.

Youth Fare's discontinuation might well prevent some from applying to colleges outside their own states. At the very least the abolition of Youth Fare would limit the mobility of a large segment of the nation's population.

The logic of the suit itself is questionable. If Youth Fare is "discriminatory," then likewise are all reduced fares, such as the airlines' family plans.

Concerned undergraduates should protest the move to abolish Youth Fare by writing to members of Congress, to airlines featuring the plan, and to John Crooker, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, 1825 Connecticut Ave., Northwest, Washington, D.C.

#### YOUTH FARE AND YOU

(By Wayne Liebman)

About a week ago, a story appeared in the NEWS with the heading "Examiner's Report Imperils Air Fares." If you saw it, perhaps you thought this might be affecting you. A sketch of Youth Fares history and the recent actions of Trailways Bus Company might make the effect more clear.

In 1965, American Airlines initiated the Youth Fare plan, whereby anyone under 22

could fly stand-by anywhere in the U.S. for half price. Other major airlines followed suit.

The plan proved extraordinarily successful, and while increasing airline profits, it also gave students the mobility to travel practically anywhere in the country to college. Many and this probably includes you, have come to depend on Youth Fare as the least expensive, most convenient way to commute to school and back home for vacation.

#### CLAIMS DISCRIMINATION

Recently Trailways Bus Company filed a petition with the Civil Aeronautics Board which claimed Youth Fare was unnecessarily discriminatory (that is, there was no reason for giving people under 22 plane rides for half price). Trailway's action was prompted by a loss in profits attributed to the Youth Fare program.

A CAB examiner reviewed the situation and recommended to the Board that Youth Fare be discontinued. Had not American petitioned the decision, Youth Fare would have ceased then. Presently, the CAB has one month to rule on whether or not Youth Fare will be allowed to continue.

If you commute to school by air, the stopping of Youth Fare will double your transportation costs, starting perhaps as soon as spring vacation. For those students who live at distances of 1,000 miles or more, and who return home for Christmas and spring vacation, increases in fares will come to several hundreds of dollars a year.

There are few students at Yale who will not be affected by the abolition of Youth Fare. Those who are on scholarship will find it especially hard to meet the increased costs.

#### REQUIRES PROTEST

The CAB has sole jurisdiction with regard to air fares. There is no way to influence its decision other than by direct protest. The Board can be influenced by public opinion, if protest comes in large enough numbers.

We can do something to influence the CAB decision in our favor if enough of us will take a few minutes to write a letter to any of the following urging the continuation of Youth Fare:

1. All major airlines who feature the plan. All of them have national offices in New York and addresses can be found by calling information.

2. Your own congressman, or any other high level government official who might be concerned, eg. Sen. Ted Kennedy.

3. Mr. John Crooker, Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, 1825 Connecticut Ave. Northwest, Washington, D.C.

If you are concerned, please write now. The CAB will probably act one way or the other before spring vacation.

[From the University of Minnesota Daily]

#### UNFRIENDLY SKIES

Arthur S. Present's request on Tuesday that youth stand-by air fares be eliminated on the grounds of discrimination is unreasonable. Present, a Civil Aeronautics Board hearing examiner, is apparently concerned either that existence of youth fares discriminates in favor of some airlines, or that the practice discriminates only on the basis of age, and is in some sense unfair to other passengers.

Those airlines which do not presently offer youth stand-by would not be helped substantially if other airlines were required to eliminate it.

The mobs at the stand-by counter of Chicago's O'Hare airport are more than sufficient evidence that young people want to fly; eliminating stand-by service would probably mean they would not travel at all, since trains and buses usually demand so much time that students, at least would find them impractical no matter how low their fares.

Nearly all methods of public transportation offer special fares, depending on a traveler's age, destination, or time before return.

To do away with youth stand-by air fare would severely handicap young people who want—and sometimes need—to travel quickly and inexpensively; present fare schedules seem adequate, and elimination of stand-by would not make it easier for anyone else to travel. Present admitted that stand-by fares are neither unjust nor unreasonable. We wonder why he bothered to suggest their elimination at all.

#### YOUTH FARE MAY END UNLESS PETITION FILED

Youth stand-by and young adult airline fares offered by 24 airlines may be eliminated on the grounds of discrimination by the Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB), if airline officials don't petition for a review of the decision.

Under youth fare persons between 12 and 22 can fly for half fare if seats are available. Young adult fare allows seats to be reserved at one-third the regular price.

Military standbys would not be affected.

"On Jan. 21 I issued a decision which held that youth fares and young adult fares are discriminatory . . . but not unjust or unreasonable," Arthur S. Present, CAB hearing examiner, said yesterday in a phone interview from Washington, D.C.

Present said, however, that the parties involved, including airlines, bus systems, travel agents, and even the economic board of the CAB, have 25 days from Jan. 21 to file a petition for review of the decision. Also, the CAB can act within 30 days and either pass, overrule, or decide to review the decision, Present said. If no action is taken, the youth fares will be cancelled.

"My own opinion is that someone (other than the CAB) will file a petition," he added. "But I can't speak for the board."

Representatives of several airlines in the Twin Cities were also contacted yesterday. Some of them had not heard of the CAB's action.

Gordon Hudson, district manager at Western Air Lines, said, "I haven't heard any reports other than what I read in the paper. I don't know what the outcome will be, but I don't think the airlines want the elimination of youth fares."

"I'm positive that some of the larger carriers will petition for review," Dave Moran, vice president of traffic sales at North Central Airlines, stated.

Moran explained that a hearing was begun on the issue of discriminatory youth and young adult fares Aug. 23. The entire issue was prompted by bus companies, who are affected by increased air travel, and consequently decreased use of buses.

"There will be a decision," Moran said, "but it will probably be months before anything is certain."

[From Duke University Chronicle]

#### FLY NOW

The Civil Aeronautics Board Examiner Arthur S. Present has asked the board to eliminate youth fares on air lines because the practice to him seems to be discriminatory to adult passengers.

Although this decision in no way is as important as the events happening on campus, students should now try to exert some type of unified reaction as a pressure group with practical interests of its own.

No one can be happy about such a decision, least of all the airlines who for the past couple of years have been "hooking" students into the habit of flying from place to place. And we wonder how many adults have actually complained to Mr. Present about this practice.

Of course students have no right to these benefits, but the situation until now seemed to be satisfactory to all concerned. Maybe they are just doing this to punish us for making so much noise on all these campuses?

[From New Mexico University Lobo]

#### YOUTH FARES

Unless the Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) decides to review a proposal concerning the abolition of airline youth fares, the proposal will become effective in less than 30 days.

The proponents of the anti-youth fare case, and National Trailways Bus System and Transcontinental Bus System Inc., describe the present fares as "unjustly discriminating" against over-21 passengers.

Any opinions on the revision of the student discounts can be aired by writing to the Civil Aeronautics Board, 1825 Connecticut Ave., NW., Washington, D.C., 20009.

#### HALF-FARE TRAVEL IS IN TROUBLE

Travel at half-fare for students has become so commonplace that for many it is now taken for granted. It is about to be taken away.

Civil Aeronautics Board Examiner Arthur S. Present has released a decision calling for elimination of airline youth fare, calling it "discriminatory to adult, full-fare passengers." If the full, five-member board upholds the ruling, youth fares will be abolished within 30 days.

Youth fares have been a source of cheap—if not always easy or convenient—transport for college students since their inception three years ago. Present charges that the measure discriminates against passengers over 22 years of age. The people who filed the complaint with the CAB, however, are not adult air passengers who feel discriminated against. The plaintiff to whom Present is responding is a representative of the nation's bus companies, whose fares in many cases exceed half-price plane fares to many points.

Not many adult passengers are willing to put up with the discrimination against half-fare passengers—there is no guarantee of a seat or of transportation, and interminable delays await the youth-fare traveler. Additionally, half-fare rates provide transportation services to military men, in many cases enabling trips home over long distances that would not otherwise be possible because of the long hours required for bus travel.

Of course the youth fares discriminate in a way against adult travelers. However, discrimination for cause of age is neither against the law nor uncommon in the United States. Those under 21 in most states cannot vote, and those under 62 cannot receive Social Security retirement benefits. One must be 25 to serve in the House of Representatives, 30 to be a Senator, and 35 to be President of the United States.

The important role of the bus companies in the CAB's decision (they filed a suit to force the CAB to hear their complaint) makes it all the more important to ask the question, how can filling otherwise empty seats with young persons at a reduced rate discriminate against adult passengers unduly? It is only the bus companies that are discriminated against.

Students are not without recourse in this affair. Both the CAB and this district's New Mexico Congressman, Manuel Lujan, should be informed by letter or telegram of student opposition to elimination of half-fare rates.

But time may be running out. Write to them before you have to spend your next vacation on a bus.

[From Northern Illinois University Northern Star]

#### STUDENTS WON'T FARE IF YOUTH FARE GOES

Start burning your youth fare cards, gang. You student airline passengers probably have heard the bad news that the Civil Aeronautics Board Examiner Arthur S. Pres-

ent has issued a decision calling for elimination of the airline youth fare because he judges it discriminatory to adult, full-fare passengers.

How does a young person flying half fare on a seat that would otherwise go empty discriminate against regular passengers? He doesn't. And if that's discriminatory, then so would be those discounts that allow parents to drag the little ones on your flight.

One of the airlines that doesn't think too much of students is United Air Lines who testified before the CAB against the retention of youth fares. A United PR man, Mr. Northrup, tried to explain this warped view over the phone the other day.

"Well, you see, youth fares are hard to administer," he stated weakly. "Besides, these students will fly in any event."

Oh yeh? Try telling a student with a limited budget who receives his money from a part-time job that he'll still fly to New York for 60 more dollars.

"Well, if you get right down to it, if they have to fly, they'll pay our fare."

Maybe, but I'll bet it won't be the United way.

United's arch rival American Airlines—who were the first to initiate the "youth fare"—is "vigorously pursuing" retention of the fare which has catered to 5.8 million students.

American's spokesman, A. W. Jackson said by phone that his carrier will "maintain the youth fare as long as possible."

"Our people are trying to convince the CAB how wrong the ruling is. I cannot see how they can say this is discriminatory. We make no bones about it. We're going to fight this thing."

But time is running out. If the CAB does not review this case by Feb. 21, the new rule will go into effect. So here's what we as students can do to help:

Contact the Civil Aeronautics Board, 1825 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20009 and voice your protest against this unfair decision. If you don't have enough time to write your opinion, call Western Union and send a wire. For 90 cents you can send an opinion telegram of 15 words anywhere in the U.S. to your congressman (in this case, Charlotte Reid).

There are legislators like Rep. Arnold Olsen (D-Mont.) who are fighting for our cause. The elimination of youth fares, he said, "would encourage thousands of young people to resume the illegal and dangerous practice of hitchhiking or to attempt long, exhausting automobile trips, frequently in unsafe vehicles."

By the way, do you know who started all this trouble? It was those damn bus companies.

#### ESTONIA STILL A CAPTIVE NATION

#### HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that Estonia and its brave people are still a captive nation behind the Iron Curtain, we take full cognizance that more than a half century ago the people of that great country threw off the aggression of czarist Russia and proclaimed themselves as an independent nation. We also remember and shall never forget that in 1939, Stalin and Hitler signed an agreement to the effect that the U.S.S.R. was to annex the three Baltic nations of

Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and forcibly incorporate them into the Soviet Union.

As a result of that agreement between the Nazi and the Communists, Soviet troops on June 17, 1940, invaded Estonia and destroyed that unfortunate land's freedom with utter disregard for human life, mass deportations, murders, rapes, beatings, and every type of vicious indignities followed. To these people who loved freedom, the ruthless acts of the Soviets and Nazis brought death and terror.

Although the Estonian nation was able to enjoy the fruits of its independence for only a very short time, the memory of such freedom is precious to them and their fellow countrymen and descendants everywhere. It is to the glory and credit of Estonia that both national and religious minorities were accorded every opportunity to develop their own respective national cultures and religious heritage unhampered by the majority during the entire period of Estonian independence.

The duplicity of the Soviet Government is apparent from the fact that at one time the Reds had actually signed treaties of nonaggression with Estonia and other Baltic nations and then had the temerity to invade the very countries whose integrity the U.S.S.R. had solemnly promised to respect.

By taking note of the day that the independence of the Republic of Estonia was proclaimed we call attention to the world of the willingness and the determination of the U.S. Congress to give our moral support to the rightful aspirations of the brave people of Estonia. May she be free in the not too distant future.

JOSEPH V. FERRINO ELECTED NATIONAL COMMANDER OF AMVETS

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the American Veterans of World War II have recently elected an outstanding man to be their national commander. Joseph V. Ferrino is an attorney from Boston and a very active citizen of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. A man with a warm heart and a social conscience, Commander Ferrino will lead the AMVETS in this time of extreme urgency in the placing of veterans from the Vietnamese war in jobs, homes, and communities. Commander Ferrino has been active in the AMVETS for many years, and I am confident that he will lead that excellent organization into a new era of social participation and concern as the brave soldiers from Vietnam come home.

Mr. Speaker, I think that all my colleagues in the House will be interested in these two articles I have submitted from the American Veterans of World War II newspaper, AMVETS, of November 1968:

COMMANDER FERRINO OFFERS CHALLENGE TO AMVET MEMBERS

"AMVETS must assume their share of the responsibility in the reestablishment in their communities of the returning Vietnam veteran, the enforcement of law and order, the fight against poverty, and above all, the safeguarding and continuance of our American ideals. I mandate each of you delegates, first as an American, and secondly as an AMVET, to accept the challenge of these problems in this Year of 1968-69."

With these words, Joseph V. Ferrino, a Boston attorney, became the 23rd National Commander of AMVETS at its National Convention in New Orleans. Commander Ferrino was elected by acclamation, and he assumed the leadership on October 1, following a week of briefings with Commander Caserta and National Executive Director Ralph Hall, and prior to meetings on October 4 and 5 of the National Finance Committee and the National Service Foundation.

Commander Ferrino has long been involved in veteran and community affairs, including membership on the executive board of the Boston Council of the Boy Scouts of America.

In 1967, he was awarded the Italian government's highest award to a non-Italian citizen, the Star of Solidarity.

Ferrino has served the AMVETS on department and national levels for 20 years and in 1962 was elected Commander of the Department of Massachusetts. In 1963 he served one year as National First District Commander and as National Judge Advocate in 1964. During 1968 he was appointed to the National Commander's Advisory Council, the Foreign Relations Committee and a delegate to the World Veterans Federation.

A graduate of Boston English High School in 1944, Ferrino served in the U.S. Maritime Service and U.S. Navy during World War II.

He was graduated from the University of Alabama in 1950 and received his law degree from Boston University in 1953. He presently maintains a law firm in Boston under the name of LaMonica & Ferrino.

"1944-1969"—25 YEARS

(By Joseph V. Ferrino, National Commander)

The year 1969 will be a landmark in the history of our great organization. It marks the 25th Anniversary of its founding. It must also be a year of reassessment.

The past is behind us, the future is our challenge. We now have the opportunity to surge forward in 1969 by doing the following:

- (a) Early renewal returns.
- (b) Follow-up invitations by personal contact to our new Vietnam members.
- (c) Participation in the newly established membership incentive programs.
- (d) Participation in all National and State programs, i.e., "D.E.", Americanism, hospital work, etc.
- (e) Project the AMVETS organization into areas where we presently do not have Posts, by assisting in their establishment.
- (f) Concentrate on the idea that every member should bring in a new member as a bare minimum requirement in membership activity.

The challenge of the future is great, we are living in a critical period in the history of our country.

We, as AMVETS, along with other veteran groups must lead the fight because we know and appreciate the heritage of our nation. To protect this heritage, the erosion of our Constitution must stop.

We must reinstate law and justice for all.

Our institutions and legislation must reflect and be responsive to the will and voice of the majority.

We must rebuild national pride in our

Flag, our National Anthem, and our nation.

We must restore the family concept of respect for parental authority, as well as to teachers, clergymen, policemen and other public officials.

We must improve our image abroad by stamping out permissive anarchy and restore personal and political morality.

A strong AMVETS organization can help defend the nation against the destruction of the basic principles on which our country was founded.

The Constitution must be preserved against the rabble of sedition and the flames of anarchy that are threatening our communities and country. Your active participation in our programs and the strengthening of our membership is your insurance that AMVETS is doing its part to assure us that our way of life will be preserved and nurtured.

NEW YORK SEEKS TO COUNTER RACIAL TENSION

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, New York City has a great many problems. While most of them are not unique to the city, many find their most extreme expression in the complex context of New York life. One such problem is racial tension. In the last year, this has manifested itself in New York in an uneasiness between the black and Jewish citizens, born of changing conditions and a lack of full understanding and communications.

Recently, a group of 20 religious and civil rights organizations led by Arthur J. Goldberg, former Supreme Court Justice and United Nations Ambassador and now in private law practice in New York, announced a five-point program aimed at deescalating racial tension in the city and preventing future racial crises.

Participating groups include the American Jewish Committee of which Mr. Goldberg is president, the Urban League, the American Jewish Congress, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Archdiocese of New York and a number of other local religious agencies.

The program includes: First, the establishment of a "hot line" between the sponsoring agencies, eventually including the city administration, to insure quick communication and to squash false rumors; second, requesting both government and private foundations to end grants to any organization proved to be involved in promulgating bigotry; third, urging the press to balance reports of extremist statements with comments by people of "more influence and standing"; fourth, calling on city agencies, including the board of education to establish guidelines penalizing employees found to be fomenting racial bigotry; and, fifth, urging "publicly funded" institutions to check with any of the participating agencies before publishing materials which

"in innocence or because of insensitivity" can have "disastrous effects."

No doubt, this kind of undertaking will, by itself, not be able to solve this problem. But, as one of hopefully many undertakings by public officials, civic organizations and common citizens, it can have significant impact.

The problem of race tension is a problem of people, and once people begin to face up to the problem they have the capacity to solve it. While I do not agree with all the recommendations made, I think it is a commendable program.

Under unanimous consent, I include two newspaper articles on this program as well as an analysis of the underlying causes of the problem of racial tension between blacks and Jews in New York City:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 11, 1969]

NEW YORK GROUPS ACT TO EASE RACIAL TENSION

(By Leroy F. Aarons)

NEW YORK, February 10.—A group of 20 religious and civil rights organizations proposed a five-point program today aimed at de-escalating racial tension in the city and preventing similar crises in the future.

Announced at a press conference by Arthur J. Goldberg, former Supreme Court Justice and United Nations Ambassador, and by a representative of Roy Wilkins, executive director of the NAACP, the campaign was clearly an effort to bring moderate voices to bear against the almost runaway hysteria here over black anti-Semitism and racial bias.

In addition to the NAACP, the participating groups included the American Jewish Committee of which Goldberg is president, the Urban League, the American Jewish Congress, the Archdiocese of New York, and a number of other local religious agencies. They proposed:

Establishing a "hot line" between the sponsoring agencies, eventually including the city administration, to insure quick communication and to quash false rumors.

Requesting both government and private foundations to end grants to any organization proved to be involved in promulgating bigotry.

Urging the press to balance reports of extremist statements with comments by people of "more influence and standing."

Urging "publicly funded" institutions to check with any of the participating agencies before publishing materials which "in innocence or because of insensitivity" can have "disastrous effects." This refers to the now-celebrated catalogue of the "Harlem on My Mind" exhibit at the Metropolitan Museum of Art that included a school girl's essay generally considered defamatory toward Jews and other ethnic groups.

In addition, the group asked that a special panel be established by the Mayor to head off racially tinged disputes before they escalate out of all proportion.

"The problem of race hatred is not a white problem, a black problem, a Jewish problem or a Christian problem," said Goldberg. "It is an American problem . . . being an American problem it requires an American solution. We must not allow extremists to capture the scene. Americans of good will must gather together in a sober, responsible way . . . This appeal is an appeal for moderation."

Asked about the free speech issue, Goldberg said "a teacher cannot be a teacher who teaches racial hatred. To preach hatred is a form of engaging in the worst type of fight-

ing words. This is not at all protected by the Constitution . . . Too many fighting words are being uttered by nations and people these days."

[From the New York Times, Feb. 11, 1969]

"HOT LINE" TO LINK ANTIBIAS GROUPS—AGENCIES HOPE TO THWART TENSION BY FAST ACTION

(By Irving Spiegel)

A "hot-line" telephone network will be established here linking several human relations agencies to assure "prompt communication and joint action on community problems," particularly between the Negro and Jewish communities, it was announced yesterday.

The project was described at a news conference at the headquarters of the American Jewish Committee, 165 East 56th Street, by Arthur J. Goldberg, president of the agency, and John Morsell, executive assistant director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Roy Wilkins, executive director of the N.A.A.C.P., was scheduled to appear but was unable to because of the weather.

Mr. Goldberg and Mr. Morsell announced that a campaign to end "escalating bigotry in New York City and the nation" had been urged by 20 Negro, Jewish, Protestant and Roman Catholic leaders active in the human rights field.

EXPLAINS "HOT LINE"

A statement signed by the leaders sharply criticized those who "seek to set black and white, Christian and Jew, against each other in order to divide our nation."

In explaining the "hot line," Mr. Goldberg said telephones would be established soon to be utilized at a moment's notice to thwart any rising racial tensions.

Mr. Goldberg said that ultimately the phone line would involve the Mayor's office, the City Commission on Human Rights and any "other pertinent city offices" dealing with racial tensions.

The leaders' statement said:

"We who are black reaffirm our commitment to the attainment of full and equal rights through the democratic process for America's 22 million Negroes."

It also pledged the efforts of Jews "in the struggle for democracy and opportunity" and declared that "we repudiate the ill-conceived views of those who would use the rantings of a few black bigots as an excuse for Jewish withdrawal from that struggle."

"We who are white Catholics and Protestants," the statement said, "condemn both white racism and anti-Semitism as an affront to the Creator who fashioned men in His image. We will oppose any efforts to substitute punishment and repression for the quality education, full employment and decent housing that every American has a right to expect."

SIGNERS OF STATEMENT

Signers of the statement, in addition to Mr. Wilkins and Mr. Goldberg, are the following:

The Rev. J. Edward Carothers, associate general secretary, Board of Missions of the United Methodist Church.

The Rev. Edward Flannery, executive secretary, American Bishops Secretariat for Catholic-Jewish Relations, Seton Hall University.

Rabbi Gilbert Klapperman, president of the New York Board of Rabbis.

Arthur J. Levine, president of the Jewish Community Relations Council of New York.

The Right Rev. Richard B. Martin, Suffragan Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Long Island.

Dr. Lewis Maddocks, executive director of

the Council for Christian Social Action of the United Church of Christ.

Will Maslow, executive director of the American Jewish Congress.

The Right Rev. Gregory L. Mooney, apostolate of human relations of the Catholic Archdiocese of New York.

Msgr. John Oesterreicher, director of the Institute of Judaean-Christian Studies at Seton Hall University.

Bayard Rustin, executive director of the A. Philip Randolph Institute.

Dore Schary, national chairman of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

Rabbi Henry Siegman, executive vice president of the Synagogue Council of America.

Albert Vorspan, director of the Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Mrs. Leonard Wiener, president of the National Council of Jewish Women.

Arthur Wright, executive director of the Catholic Interracial Council.

Charles S. Zimmerman, president of the Jewish Labor Committee.

Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League.

[From the JTA Community News Reporter, Feb. 7, 1969]

"UNREALISTIC EXPECTATIONS" CITED AS FACTOR IN NEGRO-JEWISH CONFLICT

NEW YORK.—The "exceedingly high and unrealistic expectations" which Jews and Negroes have toward each other, stemming from their "common minority group status," have been cited by a Jewish expert on community relations as a significant factor in the growing conflict between the two groups.

Accordingly, in the view of Jerry Hochbaum, community consultant to the National Community Relations Advisory Council, efforts to reduce the level of rapidly expanding Jewish-Negro tensions must include progress aimed at diminishing such expectations by making it clear what each group may and may not reasonably expect from one another. Mr. Hochbaum outlined his views in a recent issue of Jewish Life, the publication of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.

The analyst, in tracing the background of Negro-Jewish relations in this country, noted that Negro anti-Semitism had roots both in Christian theology and in the frustrations of deprived and oppressed ghetto dwellers for which the white man is considered responsible and with the Jew as a handy target for generalized anti-white hatred. One reason, historically, has been the presence of the Jewish merchant and landlord in the inner city slums.

But, he added, there are "uniquely Jewish and Negro components which sharpen and exacerbate these tensions," particularly the expectations each group has toward the other. He pointed out that Jews are often prone, as are other ethnic groups, "to demand that the Negro pull himself up by his bootstraps, as they did," ignoring the fact that the Jewish experience in America and the Jewish historical and socio-cultural experience has been vastly different from that of the Negro. In the same way, he added, the Negro expects "and demands greater morality" from the Jew, because the Jew also is a member of a minority group and was also once "a slave unto Pharaoh in Egypt." This expectation, the consultant added, failed to understand the fact that the Jew "has achieved a middle-class standing in American society." In that status, the Jew "incorporates for better or worse many of the traits of American middle-class mentality. Even Jewish attempts to call Jewish con-

science and morality to bear on the racial crisis have largely foundered because of the elementary sociological fact that commitment to a group's moral norms become attenuated as a result of that group's socioeconomic position, interests and experience."

**EACH GROUP HOLDS OTHER RESPONSIBLE FOR BEHAVIOR OF MEMBERS**

One paradoxical consequence, he added, was that Negroes and Jews, victims as minority group members, "utilize the same cultural devices applied to them by the dominant groups in our society—making demands of each other that we do not make of the rest of the population and holding the group responsible for the behavior of its individual members."

Thus Negroes hold Jews to a higher standard of behavior because they are Jews, and when the anticipated response from Jews fails to materialize, the Negroes are angry and disillusioned. "Even when reasonable responses are forthcoming, they are unlikely to satisfy Negro demands entirely because emotionally saturated and unrealistically high expectations are generically not capable of fulfillment." Moreover, the Negro, who has long been a victim of stereotyping by the white community, "resorts to similar types of generalizations about Jews."

In parallel fashion, Jews are prone to hold all Negroes responsible for the "anti-Semitism and demagoguery of a small minority of Negro extremists." In the light of the Jew's long commitment and staunch support for the Negro's struggle for equality, Jews also expect more from the Negro "than a kick in the teeth." In summary, the differences in the status of Negroes and Jews as minority groups, "and the unrealistic expectations and ambivalence this generates, adds new fuel to the already dangerous conflagration."

He suggested that short-range Jewish communal efforts should include help to Jewish owners of small enterprises in the black ghettos to leave if they want to leave but also resistance to efforts by black militants to force them to leave, as well as aid in creation of programs involving Jewish slum landlords and merchants. Such programs should be aimed at minimizing the presumed abuses by such Jews of Negroes and at helping them to "relate to the ghetto community" through projects to improve the quality of ghetto life. The long range solution—"if there is any"—is to enlarge and expand Negro access to equal opportunity and achievement and thus eliminate the basic conditions which lead to "violence, upheaval and social dislocation."

**WHITE BACKLASH HELD MINIMAL AMONG U.S. JEWS—AID POTENTIAL LARGE**

Despite his view that American Jews have acquired many middle-class disabilities, the community relations expert said that the white backlash was minimal among Jews as an element of the dominant white society. He asserted that the Jewish community "continues to have a substantial and impressive potential, even if it is presently somewhat torpid, to respond to the racial and urban crisis." As one step, he said, Jewish communal leadership must educate American Jews on the desperate plight of the ghetto dweller and on the need for their support for massive action to provide full equality for the dispossessed.

But it is equally important, he emphasized, that Negro and Jewish groups act by all available means to de-escalate "their exceedingly high and unrealistic expectations toward each other. Negro and Jewish groups must learn to truly become cognizant of what each are, as minority groups and in relation to one another, what they have in common as well as their relevant differ-

ences." He added a warning that programs directed to such specific Negro and Jewish elements in the tensions between the two groups, "while less global in scope" than what is required of Jews as part of the dominant white group to meet the needs of the poor, "may be as difficult to achieve as some of the broader social engineering" needed to bring about true equality for the downtrodden.

**THE MEDICAL ASSISTANT**

**HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, American medicine at its best is the finest in the world; at the average, which is where most of us met it, American medicine leaves much to be desired; at its worse, we do quite badly in providing for those in our society too poor or too remote or otherwise unable to learn the intricacies of our "every-man-for-himself" medical delivery system.

We can learn from other countries in medical care as much as we can teach them. One area where we are seriously deficient is in the use of physician assistants to make our too few doctors more productive. Other countries know more about how to train and use these sub-doctorate professionals.

Dr. Edwin F. Rosinski, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of HEW and an expert on medical education, reviewed the use of such assistants in a speech in Lima, Peru, entitled "The Medical Assistant." His talk follows:

**THE MEDICAL ASSISTANT**

(By Dr. Edwin F. Rosinski, Ed.D., professor and head, Department of Health Education Research, University of Connecticut Health Center)

In recent years every published health manpower report, in almost every country, unequivocally states that there is a health manpower shortage and that the shortage will increase. Cries of desperation are heard from every quarter, but in reality few innovative efforts are being undertaken to remedy the situation.

The reasons for a less active and constructive approach are complicated and interwoven with a host of personal, political, social, economic, and professional factors. It is far easier to verbalize on what needs to be done than it is to exert the energy to make innovative health manpower programs a reality.

While disagreement as to possible solutions exists, there is a consensus as to the strategy that must be taken so that the health manpower problem is addressed critically and answered effectively. That strategy embodies the following:

(1) The system, or systems of health care must first be defined.

(2) As the system (systems) is defined, the health personnel who can best deliver all or part of the health care within the system must be identified. If personnel are required, but not yet in existence, then they will have to be created.

(3) The health personnel identified must be educated in an effective and efficient manner; educated as a team so that the health team concept of patient care can become a reality.

(4) The effectiveness of these health personnel in the delivery of health care must be assessed continuously.

There is almost universal agreement to this strategy and under ideal conditions, it would be a logical, sound, and productive approach. It is the course that every country must eventually follow, for only in such a systematic and comprehensive approach can the health manpower crisis be effectively, and ultimately permanently, remedied.

But while such a comprehensive attack is being made the health manpower crisis continues and worsens. Consequently, varied answers must be sought; answers with immediacy and relevance; answers that can provide for the health needs of society.

In the past three or four years one such possible approach has received wide attention—the development and creation of a new type of health worker, who in the health manpower pyramid, is below the university graduated physician, but above the registered nurse. The creation of this new type of health worker is based on the now documented assumption that many of a physician's duties can be more effectively and efficiently assumed by a lesser trained health worker. The argument follows that if a physician could be relieved of some of his less-demanding tasks he could provide better health care to a larger segment of the population. Furthermore, in combination, the M.D. and the newly created "assistant" could provide even greater and more effective care to a larger segment of society.

While the "assistant" concept has received considerable attention in recent years, six or seven years ago it was still an alien notion in the United States. However, within the United States Agency for International Development the health leadership group was aware that a number of countries were using "assistants" to aid in the delivery of health care. These "assistants" received little public attention for their use was controversial, and any kind of publicity that implied endorsement of their use generated an emotional response from the medical profession.

A.I.D. was aware that physician assistants might have merit but approached the matter with understandable caution. A.I.D. decided first to undertake an objective study of the education and use of these "assistants." If the study gave evidence that such "assistants" could be used effectively, and if leaders in the health professions were willing to test further the use of "assistants," then the A.I.D. study could serve as a model in the development of programs to train and use "assistants." It was obvious to A.I.D. that such a model would also have implications for the United States where at that time the health manpower shortage was reaching a crisis stage.

The entire A.I.D. study is reported in a book published by the University of North Carolina Press, titled *The Assistant Medical Officer: The Training of the Medical Auxiliary in Developing Countries*. The countries visited, the type of "assistant" studied, the reasons for studying that particular type, the design of the study, results, and a host of other data are reported.

That study was followed by an additional critical examination of countries that once used such "assistants" but phased them out of their medical service. Combining the data from the two studies resulted in the submission to A.I.D. of a final report of summary observations and conclusions on the use of "assistants."

The following observations are the gist of the report submitted to A.I.D. The phrase "physician assistant" is used here, for it appears the least innocuous of the many controversial titles used throughout the world. The following observations appear to have particular relevance to the theme of this

conference, and as we discuss and consider the use of physician assistants they should always be in the forefront of our discussions.

While the function of the physician assistant remains indefinite and flexible, opposition to him as a sub-quality medical practitioner has diminished recently. This can be attributed to the problem of physician maldistribution that still exists in almost all countries. Regardless of the increase in physician-population ratio, qualified M.D.'s are reluctant to serve in rural areas. Therefore, medical services must be provided through other sources. The physician assistant, or a near equivalent, working with, or under the supervision of an M.D., appears a suitable answer.

However, some opposition to the assistant will persist at the local, national, and international levels. Several trends emerge in the reasoning behind the opposition. The trends are significant and must be considered as the continued use and evolution of the assistant depends on the merit of the opposition.

(1) The reason most often heard is that the assistant is a "second-class" doctor. ("Cheap," "watered-down," and "poor" are other adjectives used to describe him.) This second-class status is justified by the condensed medical curriculum, compacted by a faculty who frequently teach medical students, that is often received by the assistants. The education of the physician assistant then is regarded by the faculty as an added burden to an already heavy teaching and patient load.

(2) Another argument is that the assistant assumes the responsibilities of a physician once he is in "practice." This argument especially is damning when it can be supported that the assistant is trained only to offer a patient minimal clinical assistance.

(3) Because the assistant must be supervised by a qualified M.D. to insure he does not assume the responsibility of an M.D. and that his performance as an assistant is acceptable, additional qualified M.D.'s are needed. Furthermore, adequate supervision would require the services of M.D.'s who otherwise could be used more effectively in providing direct patient care.

(4) As the distinction between the assistant and the qualified M.D. becomes less evident to the public, medical standards deteriorate. This argument is based on the belief that the assistant—lacking supervision, and assuming more of the responsibilities of a physician, and without the commensurate education of the M.D.—offers second-class patient care. While the assistant might be able to make judgements on symptoms, often he does not know what he is prescribing nor the theory of the disease and its treatment. The "poor" quality of medicine offered by the assistant is regarded as the norm offered by the medical profession.

(5) By continuing the training of assistants, a community or country will content itself with existing medical services and not exert effort to improve the quality or quantity of medical education. As soon as assistants are considered to be "doctors" by the public, the public will be content with the services supplied by the assistants, and no grass-roots moves will be made to improve medical services. It is argued that the public will become complacent.

(6) All past efforts have failed to insure that assistants focus on what many consider their major contributing role—public health. If the assistant is to be a contributing member of a health team, it is thought he should devote his attention to public health, a problem an individual with his training could handle adequately. But as soon as the assistant is placed in a rural area, where he is little supervised, he quickly turns from preventive to curative medicine. As soon as he practices curative medicine he begins to justify all of the arguments already cited.

(7) Many assistants are not content with their status. As they assume more of a physician's responsibilities, they want commensurate status. Obviously this cannot be granted as it would lower the prestige of the qualified M.D.'s.

(8) As the assistants become discontented, many want to be upgraded either by edict or additional education. Opposition to upgrading is vehement in some circles as it equates a university "educated" physician (M.D.) with a "trained" technician (assistant). Upgrading by additional schooling creates problems, for where it is now permitted usually the assistant enters a medical school curriculum during its clinical years without undergoing study of the basic medical sciences or having satisfied the rigorous entrance requirements demanded of medical students.

These are some of the reasons for opposing the creation continuance of physician assistants. In spite of these arguments, there is agreement that the assistant does fill the need of front-line medical care. Furthermore, until countries develop an adequate number of physicians to serve all the health needs of all segments of society, a level of health worker such as a physician assistant will be necessary.

Most of the arguments can be countered and corrected with a well-planned program for the training and utilization of the auxiliary. The following is a possible solution to the problems just posed.

First and foremost the duties of the physician assistant must be clearly defined. If he is to be a pediatric assistant, then those responsibilities which can be safely delegated to him by the pediatrician must be spelled out. If he or she is to be an assistant in maternal and child health, again appropriate functions must be described. If he is to be a "generalist" then obviously the task of delineating responsibilities will be more difficult, but even more essential. Admittedly the task of job analysis and job assignment is difficult, but then it must be accomplished so that the educational program can be designed and specific and appropriate educational experiences be formulated.

The need for job analysis and job assignment is of crucial importance. The problems that have arisen through the use of assistants can be attributed to the lack of defined roles. Responsibilities and tasks were assigned to the assistant—by default or design—to the point where through cumulative assignments it often became difficult to distinguish between a physician and his assistant. Because job descriptions have been practically non-existent, well-defined educational programs for training assistants have similarly been lacking. It is futile to talk about the development of educational programs for physician assistants without first determining what it is the assistant can or should do, or better still, determining what functions of the physician can safely be delegated.

Once the role is decided, next the objectives of the educational program for the auxiliary must be defined precisely. These objectives must be distinctly different from those of a university-educated M.D.

Conflicts on the use of the assistant often arise because of the similarity between the educational programs of the M.D. and the assistant. If the educational objectives are explicitly stated then it can be seen whether the assistant's educational program is different from that of the M.D., and faculty teaching plans can be supervised to see if they are distinctly different from those used to educate M.D.'s.

The lack of well-defined objectives appears to cause much of the opposition to the physician assistant. Were educational objectives spelled out, (1) the limits of the educational

program would be established, (2) the faculty would have to confine their teaching within those limits, and (3) school administrators and health officials could determine whether the program has been limited to the objectives. This should result in an assistant whose education has fitted him for a limited responsibility. It is when objectives are not cited that faculty, especially those teaching clinical subjects, become reluctant to develop teaching plans for their daily program. What compounds the problem is that they often assume that a general clinical education will suffice, and that general clinical education invariably resembles a condensed version of their own university medical education.

While establishing objectives seems an obvious first step, it is their absence that causes the difficulties arising from having an auxiliary such as the physician assistant. It is obvious that the objectives of an assistant's education must be markedly dissimilar to those for the education of an M.D.

It is also true that limiting the educational activities will give further assurance that upon graduation the assistant will have been exposed only to those experiences essential to carrying out his assigned duties.

Limiting the program should have the further desirable effect of appreciably shortening the time spent in school. The student can graduate sooner and become a practitioner. It is foolish to design an educational program of even nearly similar duration to that of an M.D. If this occurs it defeats the value of having physician assistants, health workers who can be trained in the shortest possible time to perform a prescribed role safely. In addition, by narrowly defining the program greater emphasis can be placed on some of the new techniques of pedagogy such as programmed texts, self-study films, and audiotapes. The use of these devices should free the faculty from didactic teaching to work with students individually.

In summary, arguments against the use of a physician assistant can be combated if (1) the role of the assistant is determined first, (2) the objectives of the training program are clearly delineated, (3) the objectives are obviously dissimilar to those for an M.D. program, (4) the faculty outlines its teaching program to conform to those objectives, and (5) all the learning experiences are confined to the achievement of the stated objectives.

Adhering to those five points is no guarantee that the practicing physician assistant will not exceed his professional competence. There will be those who by default (no one else around to provide medical care) will assume greater and greater responsibility for patient care. Activity of assistants cannot be strictly limited by these five points. As limitations are placed in the educational program, so must consideration be given to other roles the assistant may come to play.

There are several ways in which the role of the assistant may be altered.

1. Physician assistants now in service might be upgraded and, with further education, become physicians.

2. The role of the assistant may be downgraded and occupy a subsidiary position in the delivery of health care.

3. The assistant may continue as a limited practitioner, but salaried by the government and working under the close supervision of government employed physicians.

4. The assistant may become a member of a health care team headed by a physician.

5. The assistant may act as an independent practitioner, licensed by the government, and perform his duties as a physician without direct government supervision while receiving his income from any source he chooses.

All these possibilities, except the fifth, are in actual practice, today. There are inherent disadvantages in all of them, but prob-

ably the best use of the assistant and the most beneficial effect for society can be achieved through utilizing the assistant in a health team approach to patient care.

The "health team approach" to medical care is preached in most parts of the world and practiced in few. There are indications that many countries are accepting the idea of team medicine. In some, this has become a reality. In Chile, for instance, a team is used to promote health and other services according to population districts. The Chilean team consists of medical personnel as well as representatives of other departments, e.g., agriculture and education.

It is in this context that the future role of the physician assistant is most realistic. Each country will be able to design its program as an entity with the assistant providing a particular service in the team. This will enable the country to determine the type of individual needed and his training. In some instances, it may be that a general purpose "low-grade assistant" is indicated for disease control, such as for malaria spraying and smallpox vaccination. In other countries, an assistant of more education and initiative may be required, to participate as a prominent member of a health team that indulges in routine health activities, including clinical duties, health education, and administration of health services. The achievement of this, again, is based on clearly stated and soundly developed professional roles and educational objectives.

The future of the assistant is apparent. The question is not whether an individual of the physician assistant-type should be a member of a health team, but, rather, what position he should fill in the team. It appears inevitable that the pattern of modern health care will resolve into the physician delegating more and more duties to members of the team having less education and training. This phenomenon is true, not only in the "developing countries," but also in the United States as exemplified by the creation of the "Home Health Aide" in the Medicare program which functions in this fashion. There are indications that even those countries which supposedly have abolished physician assistants are reconsidering his position in their health service.

As an example, in India the training of health workers of an assistant-type is found in the Ford Foundation program. Thus, the assistant will provide a real and valuable function for society, a society increasingly sophisticated in medical matters and demanding more health services. These services cannot be met by the present number of physicians in the world, and it will be impossible to graduate immediately, if ever, the requisite number of physicians for each country. It is evident that even the United States, which has one of the lowest physician-population ratios in the world, provides incomplete health services to its people. It is equally evident, therefore, that the physician assistant will be a vital member of the health team.

The health manpower crisis is upon us and it will worsen. The use of physician assistants appears as an appropriate response to the crises. The use of a physician assistant does not imply a substitute to the university educated physician. The use of a physician assistant does not indicate that quality care is substituted for quantity care. Physician assistants, properly educated, with clearly defined roles, on the contrary can be a way to improve the quality and quantity of health care to all segments of society. Their use must be critically examined and not offhandedly discarded. It is time to find ways in which they can be used, and it is time to stop offering arguments why they will never succeed. Arguments against their use may be stimulating to the intellect but offer no concrete solutions to the health needs of society. The physician assistant appears as

a means to meet more effectively the health needs of society.

Acknowledgement: The A.I.D. study was conducted under A.I.D. contract csd/312-#3433 to the Medical College of Virginia, Richmond, Virginia, U.S.A. Participating in the study were Professor F. J. Spencer of the Medical College of Virginia; Professor Howard K. Holand, at that time with the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia; and, Dr. Robert Jessee of the Virginia State Department of Health.

#### PERSPECTIVE ON VIETNAM AND FOREIGN POLICY GENERALLY

### HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, perspective is a quality too infrequently brought to bear on issues of public policy, especially in the area of foreign policy. It was particularly welcome, therefore, to find in the February 27 issue of the Wall Street Journal two examples of political analysis in which the benefits of perspective are clearly apparent.

I refer to the Journal's lead editorial, entitled "The Impotence of Power," and Editor Vermont Royster's "Thinking Things Over" column.

Though the editorial focuses on Vietnam and the column reflects on "summit" meetings between heads of state, the two have at least these fundamental considerations in common: first, a distrust of the emotional approach to foreign policy, whether the "messianic" character which the Journal sees as the root of our Vietnamese problems or the excessive reliance on personal diplomacy; and, second, a respect for the realities of national power.

Both are especially timely, what with the resumption of heavy fighting—and casualties—in Vietnam and with the absence of exciting developments during President Nixon's visit to Europe, so under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am pleased to bring them to the attention of our colleagues.

The editorial and the column follow:

#### THE IMPOTENCE OF POWER

A rather surprising measure of agreement is emerging about the shape of America's post-Vietnam foreign policy. On this vital question, for example, these columns can be found in the unexpected company of former Presidential adviser Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.

Perhaps it isn't really so surprising; the Vietnam war, in all its demoralizing aspects, has shaken people's thinking to the very foundations and created a kind of consensus among observers who ordinarily see most things quite differently. As Mr. Schlesinger writes in an article in the current Harper's, "The tragedy of Vietnam is the tragedy of the catastrophic overextension and misapplication of valid principles"—chiefly the principle of collective security.

What was wrong about Vietnam, he explains, was not this country's initial involvement there; that is, the attempt to save some millions of human beings from being overrun by communism and at the same time thwart Red China's ambitions of territorial aggrandizement.

The trouble, instead, was the messianic

approach, which led the Government to lose the sense of the relation between means and ends. "The wreckage we wrought in Vietnam had no rational relationship to a serious assessment of our national interest or to the demonstrated involvement of our national security."

A big part of the cause of that misjudgment, Mr. Schlesinger believes, was a failure to perceive the changes in world power contexts since World War II. Specifically, Vietnam is further evidence that the age of the Superpowers is at or near its end. No longer can the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. achieve their objectives simply by virtue of their might.

Here is the U.S., the greatest military power in the world and in history, unable to bring a military conclusion in Vietnam; the Vietnamese Communists, with more than substantial military aid from Russia, can't either. The same paradoxical impotence can be seen elsewhere.

America cannot influence its European allies as it could in the immediate post-World War II years. The Soviets, even with their brutal invasion of Czechoslovakia, cannot bring the Czechs or the rest of Eastern Europe back into line. Also, despite enormous effort, the Soviets have been unable to pick up reliable satellites in Africa or most of Asia. Even in the Arab states the Soviet sway is not absolute.

We would insert a caution at this point: None of the foregoing is intended to imply an equating of U.S. and Soviet motives. The basic Soviet motive has ever been conquest, direct or indirect. U.S. policy has ever been well intentioned, designed to make or keep people free, albeit with untoward results such as Vietnam. But Mr. Schlesinger's central thesis seems correct; strictly in terms of power politics, the rampant rise of nationalism in the world limits the effectiveness of both U.S. and Soviet policy.

Another cause of the U.S. trouble in Vietnam, the author suggests, is the development since World War II—and atypically for this country—of a powerful warrior class. Mr. Schlesinger is not at all denouncing our military leaders as evil men; in effect he is echoing President Eisenhower's valedictory warning against the possible dangers emanating from the "military-industrial complex."

The basic danger, we would guess, is the faith put in military solutions, even when, as Vietnam shows, they can be unavailing. Mr. Schlesinger quotes the economist Joseph Schumpeter, writing of the military establishment in ancient Egypt: "Created by wars that required it, the machine now created the wars it required." That is of course extreme as far as contemporary America is concerned; it nonetheless points up the danger.

The mistakes of Vietnam indicate the outlines of a more appropriate foreign policy for the future. Much as this newspaper has been writing in recent years, Mr. Schlesinger includes the following criteria in his list:

Everything in the world is not of equal importance to us (the effort in Vietnam has been disproportionate to its intrinsic importance and any gain to us). We cannot do everything in the world. We cannot be the permanent guarantor of stability in a world of turbulence. All the problems in the world are not military problems, and military force is not always the most effective form of national power. Accordingly, the basis for our international influence in the coming period will lie less in the power of our arms than in the power of our example.

It should be noted, finally, that many of us who are advocating change are not advocating a new isolationism in the literal sense. In a world in which Communists do continue to commit aggression, it would be unwise—and all but inconceivable practically—for the U.S. to withdraw to its own shores.

What is being advocated is a far more discriminating, and a less militarily oriented, foreign policy. We have to stand up to the Communists, but let us choose the stand. We should eschew military involvement unless our interests are unmistakably and directly involved.

Granted, stating the generalities is a lot easier than applying the specifics. Still, the generalities must precede the specifics. And the fact that so many, including men in the Nixon Administration, are thinking along new lines may prove to be one of the extremely few rewards of the Vietnam war.

**THINKING THINGS OVER: SUMMITS AND SUCH**  
(By Vermont Royster)

Well, one thing you can say is that there's never been a trip quite like it. Ordinarily when a President of the United States goes abroad you can expect exciting things, as with Roosevelt at Yalta, Truman at Potsdam or Kennedy at Vienna and Paris. But not, so it seems, with President Nixon.

By the time he gets home this Sunday night he will have lunched with the king of Belgium and the queen of England, chatted with the presidents of West Germany, France and Italy, visited with the mayor of Berlin and spent an hour with Pope Paul. All this has made good copy for the travel reporters, but thus far it's left the diplomatic correspondents little exciting to write about.

The general tone of their comments is that Mr. Nixon has set a low-key tone for his trip, a summation made by some with approval, by some with disapproval and by all with frustration. It's not easy to file profound dispatches daily when nothing much happens.

Yet sometimes in this world the unexciting is more important than happenings surrounded with alarms and excursions. College students who go to classes and don't bother anybody may have more effect on tomorrow's world than those who tear up the dean's office, and it's possible—or at least conceivable—that President Nixon's quiet visits will be more useful than all those clamorous summit meetings.

Anyway, the world has suffered a good bit from those past clamorous summits, going all the way back to the time when Napoleon and Czar Alexander made peace on a raft and then rather promptly started shooting at each other.

Certainly Yalta and Potsdam, as you'll recall, were disasters. It was at Yalta that President Roosevelt, under the illusion that he could "handle" Stalin, set in train the events that left Eastern Europe under the Soviet yoke, dismembered Germany and made the cold war inevitable.

Potsdam completed that debacle, insuring us today the ulcer of Berlin. In fairness to President Truman, he shouldn't be blamed too much, since he was only carrying on his predecessor's work, but that doesn't lessen the anguish of the results.

These, of course, are the classic examples of modern summitry, and the horrendous ones. But the record of subsequent attempts by heads of state to decide momentous matters on the basis of personal acquaintance is no less cheerless.

The great 1955 summit meeting in Geneva, at which President Eisenhower was present, could hardly be called disastrous because nothing much was accomplished; yet it did nothing to add to the prestige of Mr. Eisenhower or the United States. You could hardly argue either that Mr. Khrushchev's great visit to the United States in 1959, for all the courtesies he received, mellowed Russia's attitude toward this country.

And remember what happened when President Kennedy decided that personal diplomacy was the way to smooth things over. His visit to General de Gaulle was a flop in terms of smoothing Franco-American relations, and his confrontation with Mr.

Khrushchev in Vienna was so acrimonious that it made matters worse. It was after this that the Russians installed their missiles in Cuba, and all the evidence suggests that President Kennedy's deepening commitment in Vietnam was a reaction to Vienna.

This sorry record of summitry can't be blamed on just a want of negotiating skill; too many statesmen have tried it too many times. The fault lies rather in supposing that the issues which divide nations are resolvable by person-to-person chats, like a neighbor's dispute over a hedgerow.

While it is true that a strong leader may put a personal stamp on his nation's foreign policy (witness de Gaulle's mark on France today), it is at most a passing thing. The rivalry of nations, or the friendship of nations, stems from more fundamental things of geography, economics and national need, and tends to persist regardless of the personality of the leader of the moment.

Russian foreign policy, for example, has been expansionist, particularly in seeking bulwarks in Eastern Europe, since the days of the Czars; its fears and rivalries with China are equally old. With the advent of communism an ideological aspect was added, and that aspect is little altered whether the leader is Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev or somebody else.

American foreign policy may seem to twist and turn, but it is almost as consistent. President Kennedy was carrying out President Monroe's foreign policy when he confronted Russia over Cuba. Since World War I, when we first became a major power, the center of our policy has been to restrain, or at least contain, aggressive outbreaks from any other major power, be it Kaiserean or Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy or Communistic Russia and China.

Moreover, it has been primarily European-oriented in spite of all those wars in the Orient. Partly this is sentimental; but in greater part it is because the area from the Pyrenees to the Palestinian plains remains the heartland of modern economic civilization and, concurrently, the greatest source of danger to our national survival.

A China in control of Asia is a danger, but not so dangerous as a single power in control from the Hebrides to the Red Sea.

An understanding of all this, or anyway let us hope so, is subsumed in President Nixon's overseas journey. It is low-key because he is not bemused with the idea that an hour's visit with President de Gaulle is going to charm him into a different foreign policy, or that moving rhetoric in Belgium is going to move the nations of Europe to forget national interests and rivalries.

Yet there is something to be accomplished, perhaps the better for being more modest. His journey is a quiet way of reminding Europe that though we are fighting a war in Asia we are still deeply concerned with what happens on the old continent, abandoning neither our resolution against troublemakers nor our support of those who would live in peace.

If that is a modest hope, it leads to a more prayerful hope that President Nixon will keep the low-key tone when later he sits down with the Russians. Maybe he will be content then too with modest progress and spare us another dangerous gambit of summitry.

LESTER J. CAPPLEMAN

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed that Lester J. Cappleman,

State director, Farmers Home Administration, Temple, Tex., will retire effective February 28. As many Members of this body have, I have always found Mr. Cappleman to be that unique combination of dignity and efficiency. I count him as a close friend.

His fellow employees are honoring him with an appreciation banquet. I would like to insert in the RECORD the message which I have sent to the assistant State director, the Honorable John Barnes. It is as follows:

Mr. JOHN O. BARNES,  
Temple, Tex.:

I have just now learned of the party honoring our beloved friend "Cap". I am keenly disappointed that I cannot be with you. Cap Cappleman has been one of the great public servants for our state. He and your organization in general are too often unsung heroes. I could attest that Cap and the FHA has done more to restore confidence and extend hope and opportunity to our rural communities than perhaps any other governmental agency.

On scores of occasions I have called on Cap and he has responded magnificently. Please tell Cap that the Congressmen here know what he has done and we love him for it.

Many of us in the years to come will always watch for the opportunity to tell the leaders of our smaller communities, their children and their children's children that Cap Cappleman and the FHA made life better for them.

Sincerely yours,  
Congressman J. J. (JAKE) PICKLE.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay my respects to Mr. Cappleman. I know I speak for all my colleagues who say "Thank you, Cap" for a life of service to your fellow man.

**THE SYMPATHETIC ATTITUDE OF  
AN URBAN DIOCESE TO RURAL  
PROBLEMS**

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, despite the recent emphasis on acute urban problems, I am deeply concerned with the less dramatic, but nonetheless grave and pervasive problems of rural areas where 37 percent of the Nation's poor reside. The problems of city slums and rural areas are, of course, interrelated. For many years, rapid technological progress in farming, coupled with seasonality of employment and low wages in the rural economy, have induced massive rural-to-urban migration—so much so that already 70 percent of America's population reside on only 1 percent of the land. As we all know, many displaced or dissatisfied rural workers are ill prepared to compete and thrive in the complex urban environment. In this light, I feel that we are obligated to extend the benefits of the National Labor Relations Act, the Federal minimum wage law and a national employment insurance program to farmworkers—to relieve local poverty and to stem the migration that aggravates problems in the cities. In this connection, I include in the RECORD at the end of my state-

ment a recent letter from the Reverend Joseph M. Sullivan, executive director of Catholic Charities, diocese of Brooklyn, concerning the extension of these laws to farmworkers because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject.

Consideration of agriculture as one of our Nation's major industries, coupled with its critical effect on all our lives, further evidences the need for maintaining equitable and stable employer-employee relationships. Thus if only for the aforementioned reasons, the benefits of the collective bargaining rights and procedures of the National Labor Relations Act should be extended to our citizens employed in agriculture. Consideration should be given to the desirability of new concepts which may be more suitable to a mobile, seasonal agricultural labor force than those afforded by the present Federal labor laws. For example, jurisdiction standards for the National Labor Relations Board, if revised, could meet the special problems of agriculture. Furthermore, a thorough review of this subject may demonstrate the need for an accelerated election procedure.

Just as there are few Federal laws regulating collective bargaining between farmworkers and employers, there are also few Federal and State minimum wage laws covering farmworkers. Only Hawaii and Puerto Rico provide a minimum wage applicable to farmworkers generally. The farmworker's substandard income, the lack of adequate minimum wage laws, and the competition across State lines among farmers producing the same crops while paying wages which vary from \$0.65 to \$1.46 per hour point up the need for a uniform Federal minimum wage law. It is up to us to see that employees in this sector of our economy are treated fairly. It is time we took action to rectify our wage laws.

Finally, we must consider legislation that would provide compulsory unemployment compensation coverage for our Nation's farmworkers. Farm employment provides the average farmworker with less than 150 days of work during the year. The lack of unemployment compensation coverage in practically all States for these workers denies to those who are most in need of its benefits the prime purpose of such insurance—to provide an orderly method of offsetting the effects of unemployment by allowing nondeferable living expenses to be met without having to rely on meager savings. Despite this urgent need, agricultural workers at the present time are eligible for unemployment compensation only in Hawaii, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

Unemployment insurance should be made available to all farmworkers. The near failure of solution of these problems at the State level gives rise to a responsibility on the Federal Government to assist the State in achieving these objectives. We, as representatives for the Federal Government, should hesitate no longer to rectify the injustices contained in our present labor laws. More compre-

hensive and higher Federal standards are needed.

The Reverend Sullivan's letter follows:

JANUARY 2, 1969.

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALPERN: Catholic Charities, Diocese of Brooklyn, though acclaimed as the only totally urban diocese, strongly endorses the efforts of the National Conference of Catholic Charities and the New York State Catholic Committee in their effort to extend the benefits of the National Labor Relations Act, the National Minimum Wage Law and the National Employment insurance program to farm workers.

Sympathetic with the adversities faced by minority groups, we urge alleviation of the burdens of low wage scales, mounting health problems, inadequate educational opportunities, substandard housing and a lack of employment. Farm workers, regardless of the temporary nature of their relationship to the United States, are entitled to security, dignity and reasonable comfort.

We seek your cooperation in our efforts to see that the benefits of social legislation are extended universally to all those who are disadvantaged—particularly, in this instance, to farm workers.

Sincerely yours,

Rev. JOSEPH M. SULLIVAN,  
Executive Director.

#### STUDENTS: SIGNS OF MODERATION?

### HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the wave of disruptions occurring on campuses all across the Nation have confronted universities and public officials with the need to seek viable solutions to potentially disastrous situations. In the months ahead the Congress will be asked to reassess the effectiveness of current procedures for granting funds to universities and students.

As we approach these deliberations, I think it vitally important that we maintain a proper perspective of what is transpiring on a number of campuses. In recent weeks numerous universities have successfully resisted the doctrines of revolutionary violence advocated by a few students while avoiding the suppression of academic freedom. They have followed principles of reason and moderation—making clear their determination to oppose violence in any form while responding to responsible requests for evolutionary change. The February 28 issue of Time magazine presents an excellent assessment of these developments and, with unanimous consent, I include it as a reminder to my colleagues that amid the highly publicized violence, there are signs of moderation; that our universities contain vast numbers of citizens who are willing to renounce violence and work for educational reform within the framework of academic freedom:

STUDENTS: SIGNS OF MODERATION?

In scenes reminiscent of labor wars in the 1930s, the nation's campuses erupted in more

violence last week. At Roosevelt University in Chicago, rebels invaded the president's office and ripped out telephones in a demonstration seeking amnesty for fellow rebels. Deputy sheriffs prevented seizure of the administration building at Eastern Michigan University by 200 students, cut chains off the doors and arrested twelve demonstrators. At Berkeley, 100 policemen clashed with thousands of demonstrators supporting a month-long strike for Third World Liberation Front demands. Pelted with rocks, bottles and fire bombs, the cops fought back with Chemical Mace, clubbed four strikers and arrested 24. While the University of California's regents met at the explosive Berkeley campus, Governor Ronald Reagan alerted National Guard units to stand by in nearby Alameda.

How long can the violence continue? According to the Educational Testing Service, a mere 2% of all students are wreckers who aim to "radicalize" the campuses even if some universities are destroyed in the process. Harvard's Dean Franklin Ford describes the varying degrees of militancy as a series of concentric circles; most students are mainly onlookers. Unfortunately, the torrent of spring-term disorders has clearly put dozens of campuses in double jeopardy. Repressive state legislators are on the war path; so are vigilante-minded conservative students. Unless moderates intervene, campus freedom and evolutionary reform may well be sacrificed to left and right extremists.

#### PATIENCE AND RESTRAINT

Fortunately, amid all the highly publicized violence, signs of moderation are appearing. Last week the dangerous eleven-day strike at the University of Wisconsin, which pitted bayonet-wielding National Guard troops against students, was called off while faculty members considered various reforms. Toward the end, as few as 300 students continued the strike, compared with 7,000 strikers during the Guard's initial invasion. At Howard University in Washington, black law students quietly heeded a federal judge's order to end their lock-in, called to obtain more voice in administrative decisions. The student lawyers planned to go on boycotting classes, but not to flout the law they study.

Elsewhere, student bodies have already taken a second look at good-faith faculty efforts to make archaic universities more democratic, relevant and effective. On some campuses, skilled administrators have warded off outside interference by firmly dealing with radicals while simultaneously "co-opting" their saner demands. On other campuses, students in the middle have simply wearied of disruptions that constantly interrupt their costly education. Items:

Brandeis University's President Morris B. Abram applied patience and restraint during the eleven days that 65 black students occupied the school's communications center in January. Abram waited out the occupiers, meeting with them when they requested but refusing to yield on a crucial demand that they control selection of the black studies department chairman. Because Abram shunned force, moderate students were never radicalized by police action and a strike supporting the occupation drew less than 10% of Brandeis' 2,600 students. "There was sympathy for the blacks," said Student Council President Eric Yoffie, "but there was also a commitment to maintain the university, not destroy it by physical force."

University of Chicago President Edward Levi, in office only five months, adopted a similar policy of passive resistance when radical students occupied the administration building, protesting the school's refusal to rehire a sociology teacher because she was unproductive. Like Abram, Levi eschewed police help, simply continued university business outside the occupied building. As a result, less than a thousand of Chicago's

9,000 students supported the protest; after 16 days, the sit-in died. The administration then quietly suspended 80 students, summoned 50 more to appear before the university's disciplinary committee. Jeffrey Blum, a sit-in leader, freely admitted that Levi had won the day. "We lost because there just wasn't enough faculty and student support for us," he said. "Perhaps our movement was too radical for the campus at this time."

Wilberforce University in Ohio pioneered a new approach to student demands by hiring an outside arbitrator to cope with a nine-day class boycott. After 13 days of negotiating with university and student representatives, Cornell Labor Law Professor Frederic Frellicher hammered out an agreement on 40 points. Frellicher noted that the students "crisis of confidence" dissipated as administration positions were patiently explained at the table. As he sees it, the Wilberforce way of professional mediation and arbitration "could set a precedent for setting similar situations in schools across the country."

Columbia University, scene of wild disorders last spring, will vote next month on an overdue plan to democratize the administration by joining students and long-alooft professors in running the campus. The plan, designed by a faculty committee chaired by Law Professor Michael I. Sovern, would place 20 elected students in a 100-member senate that would govern the university. Implicitly aimed at mobilizing moderates, the plan will bar any senate member if less than 40% of his constituents voted in the election. "Unless the students participate," warns Sovern, "their role will atrophy." If the plan is approved, representative government—not violence—will become the legitimate way to influence Columbia.

Notre Dame's president, the Rev. Theodore Hesburgh, took a slightly different tack last week, stressing the need for responsible behavior, and decreeing immediate suspension and possible expulsion for recalcitrant rebels. Without stiff rules, he said, "the university is a sitting duck for any small group from the outside or inside that wishes to destroy it, to incapacitate it, to terrorize it at whim." No one wants the police on campus, Hesburgh added, "but if some necessitate it, as a last and dismal alternative to anarchy and mob tyranny, let them shoulder the blame instead of receiving the sympathy of a community they would hold at bay."

#### RATIONAL REVOLT

Harsh words—but they obviously appeal to those who yearn for what Philosopher Sidney Hook calls "militant moderation." Hook himself is touring the country, organizing faculty cells for "a revolt of the rationally committed." Toward that end, some moderate students have acquired a hero in S. I. Hayakawa, the doughty acting president of tumultuous San Francisco State College. At the University of North Carolina, Student Grainger R. Barrett has, in fact, started a group called the Hayakawa Society. Says he: "We think change on this campus should be brought about through established and legitimate processes."

The danger in all this antiradicalism, of course, is the boost it may give to a militant right. Zealous conservatives at Queens College in New York City, for instance, recently sacked the office of a newspaper that has consistently supported the position of disruptive Negro and Puerto Rican students. Similar mindless violence seems imminent elsewhere. Worse, at least twelve states are now considering laws cutting off state aid to campus demonstrators who cause physical or property damage. The result might well threaten free speech, to say nothing of penalizing the poor without touching the rich, who may be equally guilty.

Such laws can only stimulate more radicalism followed by more reaction. Instead, the best solution is a lively coalition of liberals

who shun revolution and conservatives who shun repression to provide firm leadership, promote sound reforms and purge the campus wreckers. Though it may take time, the odds are that just such a coalition will ultimately emerge.

#### CONGRESSMAN TALCOTT COMMENDS THE EXTRAORDINARY OSUGI FAMILY OF SALINAS: 12 CHILDREN, AVERAGE GRADE-POINT AVERAGE 3.7

### HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. and Mrs. Kumataro Osugi of Salinas, Calif., had 12 exceptional children. One hardly knows where to begin in describing the accomplishments of this very special family.

This is a Japanese-American family, each of whom is justifiably proud of both his Japanese ancestry and his American citizenship.

Every one of the children attended Salinas High School in Salinas. Except for two children, born in Poston, Ariz., during the Japanese internment during World War II, all are native Californians.

The last of the Osugis will graduate from high school in June 1969. The average grade-point average of all children is an average 3.7—A minus. I suggest that this is an American record not likely to be exceeded.

All have gone on to higher education where they have earned five baccalaureate degrees, two masters degrees, and three associate of arts degrees; three are still enrolled in college—one will receive his baccalaureate degree in June—and the youngest will enter college next September. Accomplishments other than those purely academic are equally impressive.

At a time when campus protest and destruction in the name of minority groups hold the limelight, it is particularly appropriate and rewarding to give attention to the positive side of constructive involvement and academic achievement in the campus picture.

This splendid family of 12 has made a major contribution to our community, our educational system, our State, and our Nation. They have always excelled; they have always been contributors; they have always been constructive. They have always epitomized good citizenship. They can be enormously proud; but our community is more proud and appreciative of them.

On March 6, the faculty of Salinas High School will honor this family. The faculty will be joined by the parent-teacher organization, which will name Mrs. Osugi recipient of an honorary life membership; by our mayor who will represent the community; and by a representative who will speak for the Japanese-American community.

This family deserves many special commendations. Their accomplishments and achievements were in spite of what

others would rightly consider discrimination and poverty.

Nowhere do I know a family more entitled to the accolades of their neighbors and community.

Other families, other children can profitably emulate the extraordinary Osugis of Salinas. Mrs. Talcott and I join in honoring Mrs. Osugi and her children. We wish each of them and their families continued success and great personal satisfaction in all of their future endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include some personal data which is revealing but noteworthy. I am confident my colleagues will share my pride in the accomplishments of this family and would want to know these unusual facts:

#### THE 12 OSUGI SIBLINGS

##### SALINAS HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES

##### Date of graduation

1951—May	1961—Nobuko
1953—Frank	1963—Roy
1954—John	1965—Jim
1956—Fred	1967—Carol
1958—George	1968—Donna
1959—Victor	1969—Mike

##### HIGH SCHOOL HONORS, AWARDS, AND ACTIVITIES

##### Honors

Average of the grade point averages of the twelve: 3.70 (A—).

California Scholarship Federation Seal-bearers: 10.

Valedictorians: 2.

Student Body Meritorious Awards: 2.

Student Body Distinguished Service Awards: 2.

Student Body Life Pass Awards: 2.

##### Scholarships

Sears, P.T.A., University of Southern California, CSF Seymour, Elks (2), Rotary (4), California Savings and Loan League, BPW, Gertrude Waterman Scholarship.

##### Representative awards and activities

Bank of America Achievement Awards Trophy for Math and Science, and for Business.

First Place Cal Poly Math Contest.

Honor Orchestra.

El Gab Copy Editor.

Perfect Attendance Award.

All-League Honorable Mention, Basketball.

Most Valuable Player Award, Basketball.

Girls' Athletic Association Block S.

National Honor Society.

California Scholarship Federation.

American Field Service.

Wrestling.

Student Body Secretary.

Student Body Treasurer.

Class Secretary-Treasurer.

Class Treasurer.

California Scholarship Federation President.

##### Family

*Father*—Kumataro Osugi (deceased 1966): Born and reared in Japan. At age of about 16 he came to the United States, attended a mechanics' training school and worked for a few years. While still in his 20's Mr. Osugi returned to Japan, where he married his wife, Mitsuko. In the early 1930's Mr. and Mrs. Osugi came to the United States and settled in Salinas. Mr. Osugi worked as a mechanic, and eventually went into business for himself—he owned and operated the K. Osugi Garage for over thirty years.

*Mother*—Mitsuko Fujikawa Osugi: Born in Sacramento, California. Her parents had come from Japan to work in California. As a very young child Mitsuko returned with her parents to Japan, where she was reared and lived until she returned to California with her husband.

*Family Home*: 187 Coleridge, Salinas, California.

SIBLINGS

	Higher education	Present occupation
1. Mrs. Yasuo Fujino (May), 1133 Dover Way, Monterey Park, Calif. (married; 2 children).	Hartnell College (2 years)	Housewife and mother; prior to marriage, legal secretary in Salinas.
2. Frank Massache Osugi, 223 North 1st St., Salinas, Calif. (married; 2 boys).	do	Auto mechanic working at Sears, Salinas.
3. John Hiroshi Osugi, 1433 Stonewall Ave., Monterey Park, Calif. (married; 3 children).	University of Southern California (baccalaureate and masters degrees in engineering).	Engineer with space technology laboratory at Redondo Beach, Calif.
4. Fred Saburo Osugi, 18222 Milmore Ave., Gardena, Calif. (married; 2 children).	Hartnell College (2 years); University of California, Berkeley (baccalaureate degree); University of Southern California (masters degree in engineering).	Engineer with space technology laboratory at Redondo Beach (same as John).
5. George Shiro Osugi, 1433 South Saltair Ave. No. 9, West Los Angeles, Calif. (married).	Hartnell College (2 years); University of California, Berkeley (baccalaureate degree).	Electrical engineer with Rocketdyne, Los Angeles.
6. Victor Masaru Osugi, 970 South Menlo Ave. No. 8, Los Angeles, Calif. (married).	Hartnell College (2 years); San Jose State College (baccalaureate degree).	Civil engineer working for Los Angeles City.
7. Mrs. Doug Nakamura (Nobuko), 841 4th St., Gilroy, Calif. (married; 1 child).	Hartnell College (2 years)	Housewife and mother; husband is engineer.
8. Roy Minoru Osugi, Fort Lewis, Wash.	Hartnell College (2 years); University of California, Berkeley, and San Jose State (baccalaureate degree).	U.S. Armed Forces (drafted Jan. 23, 1969); prior to draft worked as meteorologist for Los Angeles Weather Station.
9. Jim Tadashi Osugi, 529 South 10th St. No. 7, San Jose, Calif.	Hartnell College (2 years); San Jose State College (will receive degree in engineering in June).	Senior in college.
10. Carol Emiko Osugi, 187 Coleridge, Salinas, Calif.	Hartnell College	Sophomore in college; plans transfer either to Los Angeles State or San Jose State to work for degree in medical technology.
11. Donna Haruko Osugi, 187 Coleridge, Salinas, Calif.	do	Freshman in college; plans transfer to Fresno State for degree in social welfare.
12. Mike Daisuke Osugi, 187 Coleridge, Salinas, Calif.	Plans to enter Hartnell College in September; possible major, engineering.	Student in senior year at Salinas High School.

CONGRESSMAN FRANK HORTON INTRODUCES CHILD PROTECTION ACT TO HELP ELIMINATE HAZARDOUS TOYS

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I submitted legislation designed to protect children from toys and other products intended for their use which might constitute an electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazard.

Based on the recommendations outlined in the interim report of the National Commission on Product Safety, this bill amends the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to add "electrical," "thermal," and "mechanical" to the categories under the supervision and regulation of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Under present law, toys or other products intended for use by children may be banned under this act only if the category of hazard involved is essentially that of a harmful chemical nature or is otherwise hazardous because it is flammable, pressurized, or radiational.

While the toy manufacturers of America make efforts to correct hazards in toys, most of this safety work is concentrated on making playthings safe when they are used as intended.

In summing up the most urgent needs in toy accident prevention, Dr. Allan B. Coleman, chairman of the committee on accident prevention of the American Academy of Pediatrics, at the National Commission on Product Safety hearings in New York stated:

The biggest need is probably engineering for safety, built-in safety, fail-safe products, and fail-safe design.

Presently the Federal Hazardous Substances Act excludes physical hazards from the list of hazardous substances. That means electrical shock, burn, cut, and puncture are not presently covered.

By adding electrical, mechanical, and thermal to the act, the Federal Hazardous Substances Act would be expanded to attack a number of hazards including, but not limited to, sharp or protruding

edges, fragmentation, explosion, strangulation, suffocation, asphyxiation, electrical shock and electrocution, heated surfaces, and nonextinguishable flames.

There is no question that our children need to be provided with greater protection from potentially hazardous toys.

Of the nearly 56 million children under 15 years of age in the United States, more than 15,000 die each year from accidents. Over 50 percent of these fatalities are preschool children.

The frequency and type of deaths and injuries resulting from hazardous toys designed for children is shocking.

Mr. Speaker, at present the National Safety Council does not act as a clearing house for toys on the interstate market. No systematic review of new toys is carried out by the Council of Toys before they are placed on the market.

This legislation I have offered would stimulate industry to bring about safe design in toys when they are manufactured for children. It would also prompt the toy industry to consider the potentially harmful use of these toys by children before they are released on the market.

Passage of the Child Protection Act would greatly help eliminate family tragedies that are caused when children are maimed, killed, or otherwise injured by defective or hazardous toys.

A TRIBUTE TO JAMES DEWEY CUNNINGHAM

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, there are perhaps too few occasions when we stop to pay tribute to the many competent and conscientious public servants we find in our Federal, State, and local governments. But it would be entirely inappropriate not to pause to say a word of thanks and praise to one of the nearly anonymous public servants who tomorrow, after more than 38 years of dedicated service to the U.S. Government, takes leave of his position as chief hear-

ings examiner of the Federal Communications Commission and enters upon what all of his many friends trust will be a most rewarding and satisfying retirement. I am glad to join those who are on this occasion honoring James Dewey Cunningham.

The business world was made well aware of Mr. Cunningham's towering presence—he stands at 6 feet 3 inches and is reported to weigh 235 pounds—by virtue of his role presiding over the hearings of the proposed merger of the International Telephone & Telegraph Co. and the American Broadcasting Co., Inc. He was also responsible for placing the record of those hearings before the FCC for their decision. Other noteworthy hearings presided over by Mr. Cunningham in recent years concerned the payola investigation and the pot party case involving a Chicago TV station. In important respects the record of the FCC and that of James Cunningham are synonymous. Mr. Cunningham has been with the FCC since its inception, joining it in 1934 as one of the original group of hearings examiners. In 1954 he became the chief hearing examiner of the FCC.

Prominence came to Mr. Cunningham at an early age. Born in Northampton, Mass., on September 26, 1899, to an immigrant Irish working class couple, his exploits as a catcher and a .350 hitter in the Holyoke parochial schools won him a scholarship to Georgetown University. After winning another scholarship and graduating from law school, he married Genevieve Griffin and went into private practice. After some rough sailing at the onset of the depression, Mr. Cunningham was appointed to the Civil Service Commission as a lawyer in 1930. His service with the FCC since 1934 has been continuous except for a World War II tour of duty with the Judge Advocate General's Corps.

James Dewey Cunningham's complete devotion to duty has been reflected in the manner in which he has presided over hearings. He has become known for his brisk and efficient approach to business and the way he has been able to terminate debate promptly, never raising his voice nor losing control of his temper, but known to pound a loud gavel and exhibit occasional signs of agitation. His zeal for rapid expedition of cases has made a deep

impress throughout the FCC and the industries it regulates.

James Cunningham's career of public service serves as a model for others; it is one for which this Nation owes a deep debt of gratitude.

PRESIDENT HOWARD R. BOWEN OF  
THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

### HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 27, 1969

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, the president of the University of Iowa for the past 5 years, Howard R. Bowen, has recently announced his intention to retire from that position. Howard Bowen has spent a total of 21 years as an educator and leader in the great State of Iowa, and all Iowans are immensely proud of the work which he has accomplished. Of particular importance is the steady hand with which he has guided the university through the past turbulent 5 years in which he has served as president. The university has experienced a tremendous increase in student population, in faculty, in staff, and in capital facilities. All of the resultant and inter-related problems have been handled in a most exemplary manner by President Bowen. President Bowen is to be commended for his outstanding contributions to Iowa and to the university. We hate to see him go, but extend to him our very best wishes for his new endeavor. In connection with his departure, President Bowen recently had occasion to address a letter to the people of Iowa, in the University of Iowa Alumni Association's publication, the *Spectator*. His letter deals with the problem of student unrest and academic freedom. The University of Iowa, like so many of our universities, has experienced its share of student disorders, which in turn have caused serious concern on the part of State legislators. President Bowen does an excellent job of putting this perplexing problem in perspective and I include the letter, and an editorial from the *Des Moines Register* of February 23, 1969, commenting on the letter:

[From the *Spectator*, Feb. 1969]

BOWEN'S SPECIAL REPORT TO IOWANS

To the People of Iowa:

I have submitted my resignation as president of The University of Iowa. When it is effective in September, I shall have spent 21 years as an educator in Iowa, 12 at The University of Iowa and nine at Grinnell College. I want to thank the people of this state for the privilege of serving them. They have been helpful and friendly to me and I am grateful.

I should like to thank the people of Iowa particularly for their constructive attitude and deep commitment toward higher education. It is evidenced by the many splendid institutions in this state—public and private—of which The University of Iowa is the largest, one of the oldest, and one of the most distinguished.

The people of Iowa have made great efforts in providing financial support. But even more important they have understood that colleges and universities must be free—free from political control and free in thought and speech.

#### GOVERNOR'S PLEDGE

This idea was expressed recently and eloquently by Governor Robert Ray in his inaugural address when he said: "I shall use every resource at my command to protect the universities from any infringement of their ancient freedoms which academic communities must have if they are to fulfill their promise to mankind."

The University of Iowa has enjoyed unusual independence from political and bureaucratic intervention and other outside pressures.

The vitality of this institution is a direct result.

The University has not been plagued by the witch hunts, the loyalty oaths, the outside interference, or the oppressive legislation found in some states. It has been trusted to conduct its affairs, under the guidance of the State Board of Regents, toward the advancement of learning and enlightenment of promising young men and women.

In the opinion of the educational world and of the vast majority of the people of Iowa, the University has kept faith with this trust.

Recently, higher education—not only in Iowa but throughout the nation—has been in a turbulent period.

Some of the stresses in our society—those associated with racial injustice, poverty, the war in Vietnam, the overemphasis on material values, and the oppressiveness of large organizations—have been reflected on the campus.

In addition, young people of the ages of 18 to 25, whether in college or not, have been striving for adult status and adult freedoms.

#### CAUGHT IN CROSSFIRE

The outcome of these two sets of forces has been varying degrees of unrest on the campus. The universities have been trying to meet these new conditions and pressures.

As yet they have satisfied neither the more militant students who want faster change nor many members of the public who want to continue restraints on the young and who are fearful of open discussion of unorthodox ideas.

The universities in recent years have been caught in the middle and have been subject to criticism, and sometimes abuse, from two directions.

The colleges and universities at this time need special understanding and moral support from the public and from political leaders.

There are many persons today who would threaten the precious freedom and autonomy of the universities by imposing loyalty oaths, restrictions on freedom of thought and speech, control over what is taught and what is studied, supervision over the selection of faculty and students, and detailed control over internal budgets.

There are also some—both private donors and public legislators—who would withdraw financial support as a kind of punitive measure.

#### HERITAGE OF FREEDOM

Fortunately in Iowa the overwhelming majority of people do not subscribe to these views. Yet even in Iowa, with its long heritage of academic freedom and quality education, there are growing threats to higher education.

To those who would intervene with outside controls or who would "punish" higher education by withdrawing support, I would offer some views on the present state of higher education—views which I believe should be considered by every responsible person.

First, the impression of higher education presented in the mass media emphasizes disorders and conflicts.

Disorders have indeed been disastrous at three or four institutions in California and New York, and have been mildly troublesome at many. However, the plain fact is that disorderly conduct is rare and that the over-

whelming majority of students and faculty, 99 percent at least, at most institutions including The University of Iowa, are performing creditably by any reasonable standard.

Indeed, some of the disorder is fomented by persons who are not students at all, but hangers-on. The students, with few exceptions, are orderly, hard working, morally upright, idealistic, committed to learning, and dedicated to the advancement of American society.

#### SUPERIOR GENERATION

No younger generation has ever seen eye to eye with its elders, and this generation is no exception. But in morality, idealism, honesty, and hard work they are superior to any previous college generation and superior to any other major segment of our society. They are far ahead of my own college generation.

They are not perfect; some of them make mistakes; some of them are rude and unkempt; sometimes they do and say stupid things. But who doesn't? To indict the whole present generation of students and young faculty—as some are inclined to do—is grossly unfair and irresponsible.

To those adults who criticize the college generation I would say: Remember that these young people are your sons and daughters and mine, not some abstract collection of people the universities have gathered together.

These young people are the way they are not because of what the colleges and universities have done, but because of what their families, their communities, and American society have done. But in fact the current crop of college students is in no sense degenerate. They are on the whole admirable young men and women.

Second, the leading universities, including The University of Iowa, are outstandingly successful in carrying out their mission of education, research, and public service.

They have never been more creative, or more stimulating, or more effective in serving society. American higher education is the envy of the entire world.

By any criterion—ability of faculty, standards, teaching effectiveness, research and scholarly accomplishment—American colleges and universities are vastly superior to the institutions of ten, twenty, or fifty years ago.

Third, the universities of America, again including The University of Iowa, are today woven more closely into the fabric of our society than ever before.

Our economy, our government, our military strength, our churches, our schools, our health, and our cultural life are all utterly dependent upon our institutions of higher education. We simply could not operate our society—it would soon break down—without the educated and trained people the universities produce and without the basic research they perform.

Our young people are complaining that the universities are too intimately involved with what is sometimes called the "military-industrial complex." They may be right. But what they mean is that the universities are over-emphasizing vocational and professional training and under-emphasizing the broad, liberal education intended to enlarge the human spirit and to give understanding of social issues and world problems.

#### DEAD WRONG

However, if they believe that an advanced technological society like ours could function without sophisticated technical training and research, they are dead wrong.

To slow down the progress of higher education would be the surest way to weaken our society economically, culturally, and morally.

If I were a foreign power wishing to destroy the United States, I would not bother with bridges, utility installations, military secrets, and congested cities. I would strike at the

heart of America—at the center of its know-how—which is in its universities.

*Fourth, the restless questioning that is found on American campuses today is a reflection of the problems and temper of our society and not of some perversity of the university.*

As a society we are in the midst of great searchings as to our national role in world affairs, our system of values and goals, and our conception of human rights and human dignity. Our young people are deeply stirred by these issues, and their idealism leads them to try for improvements in our social order.

#### IRRATIONAL FEAR

It is inevitable and desirable that the campuses should become the centers of debate, discussion, and action on these matters.

It is utterly irrational to fear universities or to penalize them because ideas are discussed there, because new concepts originate there, because people there care about human rights and human equality, or because a true concern exists there for peace and human brotherhood.

As a nation, we should thank God that there is at least one place in our society where people can speak their minds, where they can debate issues, where they can be concerned about the meaning of human life, where they can explore the greatest of all questions: "How should a life be lived?"

It is perhaps fitting to quote a passage from the minutes of the Wisconsin Board of Regents written in 1894 at a time when academic freedom was in jeopardy:

"Whatever may be the limitations which trammel inquiry elsewhere, we believe that the great State University of Wisconsin should ever encourage that continual and fearless sifting and winnowing by which alone the truth can be found."

We should never forget that "continual and fearless sifting and winnowing" is sometimes a noisy and contentious process. But only when fearless sifting and winnowing are taking place is the University doing its job.

#### AVOID EXTERNAL CONTROLS

And so I say to the people of Iowa, cherish your university. It is a worthy institution.

Try to understand it, even when it is a bit difficult to understand. Give it adequate financial support. Don't give in to the temptation to starve the University at a time when it has never served you more effectively and when its services were never more needed.

And keep it from external controls so that it may continue to be an influential center of fresh ideas and so that it may seek the truth without restriction imposed by interest groups and public prejudices.

But if universities throughout the country are to merit the public support and the freedom I am advocating, they, too, have obligations to society which must be faithfully discharged.

*First, universities must be genuine centers for the pursuit of truth.*

They must foster rational discourse, objectivity, and willingness of members of the community to listen as well as to speak.

#### GUARD AGAINST BIGOTRY

They must guard against bigotry which sometimes takes the form of noisy intolerance, intimidation, and violence.

These forms of behavior are wholly alien to a center of learning. Bigotry of the "left" is in no way superior to bigotry of the "right."

*Second, universities must maintain reasonable order and avoid disruption of their legitimate activities.*

A community of scholars which cannot maintain order cannot function effectively as a center of learning, and it cannot long maintain its freedom from outside control. Society will not tolerate disruption and disorder, and will not allow a community where it exists to be self-governing.

*Third, universities must not lose touch with their students either through the impersonality that grows out of large numbers or through neglect resulting from preoccupation with research.*

The primary task of a university, around which everything else centers, is the education of young men and women. Universities are not primarily research institutes nor centers for social service. They are teaching institutions with primary responsibility to their students. The research and service activities, important as they are, are byproducts of the main business, which is education.

*Fourth, universities must be concerned about the efficiency of their operations and seek to hold down costs.*

The education of young men and women is inevitably a personal activity. It requires large amounts of personal service. It does not readily lend itself to the assembly line methods of automobile manufacturing or meat-packing. Therefore, because wages and salaries in our economy are constantly rising, higher education requires an ever-increasing percentage of the national income. For this reason it is a responsibility of those in higher education to be especially mindful of those economies that can be achieved without diluting the human factor in education.

The task of carrying out these responsibilities falls heavily upon the faculty, but it is shared by administrators and students as well. If universities—especially faculties—fall in meeting these obligations, society will step in and the freedom of the university will be curtailed.

In my judgment The University of Iowa has succeeded as well as any institution in the United States in meeting these responsibilities.

#### INSTANCES OF DISORDER

The University of Iowa is a place of genuine freedom of thought and speech and of tolerance and orderly discussion. The instances of disorder have been few and mild, and the essential operations of the University have been maintained without any interruption whatsoever.

The atmosphere of this university is personal and informal. Doubtless, teaching could be improved. But most faculty members are conscientiously concerned with teaching and with their students. Relationships between faculty and students are good and the morale of both is high.

Finally, the University is operated very efficiently—perhaps because it has had no choice. There has never been enough money for the University to achieve its aspirations comfortably. And so the job has been done with inadequate staff and inadequate building space.

#### ABC'S OF EFFICIENCY

To describe the degree of efficiency it is only necessary to point out:

(a) *There are 18 students for each full-time faculty member, when a ratio of 10 or 12 to 1 would be a reasonable standard for a leading university.*

(b) *There is only 172 square feet of academic building space per student when 200 is considered by authorities to be a minimal standard.*

(c) *Supporting staff, equipment, and plant maintenance have never been up to standard.*

The University of Iowa cannot be justly criticized for inefficiency or waste. Nevertheless, there may be ways of achieving significant improvements in efficiency, here and there, and these should be exploited.

To conclude my report to the people of Iowa: The University of Iowa is serving you well. It needs and deserves your continued understanding and financial support.

It also needs and deserves the kind of freedom and independence that has been traditional for higher education in this state.

HOWARD R. BOWEN.

#### BOWEN ON HIGHER EDUCATION

We reprint on this page a special report to the people of Iowa from Howard R. Bowen, who is retiring next September as president of the University of Iowa to join the faculty of the Claremont Graduate School in California. This statement is in the nature of a valedictory from a scholar and educational administrator with long experience and deep understanding of the Iowa system of higher education.

President Bowen's comments were written in connection with the announcement of his resignation, Jan. 29, before the controversy arose over radical speakers and dirty words following the student power symposium held at Iowa City, Feb. 5-6. But the article is especially timely now while the Legislature is considering appropriations for the state institutions and is debating issues of education policy. We commend Bowen's thoughtful observations to our readers for the perspective they provide on university affairs.

Iowans take justifiable pride in the fact that their universities are places of freedom of thought and speech, of tolerance—and of orderly academic processes. Disorders and disruptions, which plague many universities, have been small on Iowa campuses. They have been contained by sensible administrative policies and actions of Howard Bowen and the other university presidents. There has been no significant interruption of the teaching and learning functions in Iowa universities.

The people of Iowa should recognize that their state universities have been well and efficiently run under the Board of Regents and the university administrations. Iowa's universities deserve the full understanding and support which they have received from Iowa people.

## SENATE—Friday, February 28, 1969

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who dost condescend to dwell with men, come to us this day with an

CXV—305—Part 4

overwhelming sense of Thy presence. Come into this Chamber and in this moment make it a holy of holies. Come into our hearts and make them shrines of the spirit. Come into our homes and make them sanctuaries of love. Come into our offices, our shops, our courts, our forums, and our common life that wherever we

are and whatever we do we may know Thy nearness. And if we should forsake Thee or are overcome by the duties of the day, help us to hear across the centuries Thy promise, "I will never leave you nor forsake you. Lo, I am with you always, even to the end."

In the Redeemer's name, Amen.