

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ROSS LEFFLER SCHOOL OF  
CONSERVATION

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, last month graduation exercises were held for the 13th class to complete study and training at the Ross Leffler School of Conservation near Brockway in Jefferson County, Pa.

The ceremony marked the start of a most difficult but highly satisfying career for 25 young men who, as Pennsylvania game protectors, will become a part of the forces responsible for keeping the Commonwealth the outstanding outdoor recreation area of the East. Having survived the rigid 10-month course, each of the new alumni will, for the next 9 months, work under the direct supervision and guidance of an experienced game protector and a field division supervisor to round out what is considered the Nation's most thorough and effective training program in this rugged profession.

The Punxsutawney Spirit has presented an excellent description of the Ross Leffler School and its requirements. Because this unique institution contributes so substantially to Pennsylvania's established conservation program, I include the article in the RECORD.

My colleagues may want to make this information available to those agencies in their own States which are designed to serve in the same capacity as the Pennsylvania Game Commission.

The article follows:

GAME PROTECTORS GRADUATE SOON: JEFFERSON  
COUNTY HAS STATE'S BIGGEST CAMPUS

What school has the largest campus in Pennsylvania?

The surprising answer to that question is found nestled in the northeastern corner of Jefferson County, approximately seven miles from Brockway.

The Ross Leffler School of Conservation, the training grounds for Pennsylvania's Game Protectors since 1936, has the largest campus of any school in the commonwealth, boasting 45,000 acres in Jefferson and Elk counties.

"We may not have many buildings but we have a heck of a big campus," admitted Donald Miller, supervisor of the school.

The thirteenth class to graduate from the school will receive diplomas this month, following ten months of gruelling training—training that has been called the toughest in the nation for conservation personnel and game protectors.

The members of the class follow a rigorous schedule of classroom and field work, beginning each day at 6 a.m. and going non-stop until 10:15 in the evening.

A typical day at the Ross Leffler School begins with physical exercises (including running a mile) at 6:10 a.m. followed by breakfast at 7. Four 50-minute class periods are scheduled for the morning and, after lunch, three more classes are held. Dinner is served at 5:30 and still another class is held at night. All students live at the school while training.

The 25 men who have been selected from

more than 250 applicants are exposed to many areas of instruction to prepare them as game protectors in the commonwealth. Included in the course of study are: law enforcement, land management, game management, predator control, public relations, public administration, firearms instruction, first aid, water safety and numerous others.

Two resident instructors—Mr. Miller and Charles Laird—handle much of the teaching at the school but specialists are brought in to enrich the training program.

Members of the Game Commission research division lecture the candidates about new developments in the fields of biology, forestry and other areas while state police, fish commission personnel, Federal Bureau of Investigation agents and others add specialized instruction to the game school program.

Classroom instruction is only a part of the education received by the members of the class. Field work, given under actual outdoor conditions, is perhaps the most important segment of instruction for the candidates.

"We may have a member of the class who has done well in the classroom and scored high on all exams," said Mr. Miller. "But it is in the field work that his true potential as a successful game protector comes out."

Each class member spends almost three months in training throughout the state learning how to conduct himself in the field. Each game school member spends two or three weeks with each of four different game protectors to learn the difficulties of the job and the approach taken by different men in the performances of their duties.

Such field training is extremely valuable because every graduate of the game school is assured a job—and a big one. Following graduation each new game protector is given his own territory, often as large as 350 square miles, to enforce the laws, inform the public of Game Commission activities and perform the one hundred and one tasks expected of game protectors—from conducting gun safety clinics to capturing squirrels in attics.

Mr. Miller, who was a member of the second class to graduate from the game school, thinks the extensive training program is highly effective.

"This training is twice as long as most states and is much more thorough. Anyone who graduates from the school has to be dedicated. That's one reason the Game Commission retains 85 percent of all officers who graduate until they retire."

Before the inception of the game school, a game protector was selected by a competitive exam conducted for applicants from the county where the vacancy existed, then given a badge and game law book and expected to enforce the law and carry out public relations.

Although excellent, hard-working game protectors developed through this system, it took many years for the average officer to become familiar with the laws and know his many duties.

The Ross Leffler School has solved that problem. By matriculating a new class every two or three years as the need arises, the Game Commission is assured adequate replacements for retiring game protectors.

When replacements are needed, the Game Commission announces the formation of a new class and usually receives approximately 250 applications for each class.

All applicants must meet certain physical requirements. They must be between 23 and 35 years of age, not less than 5'8" or 140 pounds in weight and must be able to pass a 20/30 vision and color test without corrective lenses and a normal hearing test without the aid of a hearing device.

In addition, the applicants must be residents of Pennsylvania and high school graduates.

All applicants meeting physical and residential requirements are required to take Civil Service tests and the 50 students scoring highest are given oral examinations and interviews to select the final class.

Graduates of the school will look forward to one of the toughest jobs in the commonwealth. Game protectors do not work a fixed schedule and often work 70-or-80-hour weeks. The training at the Ross Leffler School is tailored to get them used to such a schedule and weeds out any students who are not prepared for such a life.

Dedication to duty and love of the job is a tradition in the Game Commission with three members of the present class having relatives in the Commission program, including one who is the third brother to attend the school.

The members of the 13th class who will graduate this month include: D. A. Bernhardt, Schuylkill County; W. A. Bower, Dauphin County; L. L. Everett, Carbon County; J. P. Filkosky, Chester County; E. W. Gallew, Bradford County; G. E. Gibson, Elk County; L. L. Harshbarger, Mifflin County; D. W. Jenkins, Allegheny County; J. M. Kazakavage, Schuylkill County; C. L. Keller, Lebanon County; F. D. King, Centre County; J. A. Lukas, Lawrence County; D. A. McDowell, Cambria County; R. W. Oliver, Butler County; A. N. Pedder, Westmoreland County; P. G. Piechoski, Philadelphia County; J. E. Rankin, Allegheny County; B. K. Ray, Westmoreland County; J. F. Serfass, Carbon County; J. P. Shook, Lycoming County; G. B. Thomas, Venango County; J. K. Weaver, Clinton County; H. D. Wetzel, Bradford County; L. C. Yahner, Cambria County, and G. J. Zeidler, Philadelphia County.

Anyone who would like to visit the game school is welcome—if he can find the school in the middle of the 45,000-acre game land campus.

## A DREAM

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, several days ago the United Cerebral Palsy conducted its annual telethon in Nashville, Tenn.

It has been my privilege during the past 10 years to serve as president of the middle Tennessee affiliate and president of United Cerebral Palsy of Tennessee. The chairman for this year's event was my wife who has also been most active in our community effort to provide care, services, and education to those unfortunate individuals afflicted with cerebral palsy.

Each year the telethon viewers in middle Tennessee, northern Alabama, and southern Kentucky have responded with great generosity—gifts this year exceeded \$210,000. Some of our most active participants are the parents of cerebral palsy children and during the telethon I had the opportunity to recite a poem written by one of these dedicated parents, Mr. Lawrence Halliburton, the father of one of the sweetest young ladies I have had the privilege to meet, Terri Lynn.

Mr. Speaker, I now insert into the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this poem and direct the attention of every Member of the House of Representatives to this. Certainly those that have witnessed friends and loved ones who have, with courage, fought almost overwhelming handicaps will appreciate this message:

A DREAM

(By Mr. Lawrence Halliburton, Terri Lynn's father)

A dream I'll remember forever,  
That opened thoughts this mind can't sever.  
I saw the hands of God displayed,  
I saw my child get down and play.  
A miracle that can't be explained,  
I saw one walk who was born lame.  
I saw her run a child across the floor,  
A view I may never see any more  
I saw her play as others do,  
I saw her bend over to tie her shoe.  
She looks so happy and clever  
I wish that dream could have lasted forever.  
The dream was short but gave me a view.  
Of my little girl whom I never knew.  
A word of thanks to whom guides the mind  
Of this little girl who is mine.

AMARILLO GLOBE-TIMES PAYS  
TRIBUTE TO DR. EVELYN POWERS

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the medical profession in America is looked upon as a difficult profession for which to qualify and a difficult profession in which to practice with its many years of educational requirements, its high code of ethics, and the great good judgment required with human life hanging on instantaneous decisions. For some reason few American women have entered the profession of medicine, while some European countries have more women doctors than men.

That American women are capable of being outstanding doctors, physicians, and surgeons is shown by the record of Dr. Evelyn Powers of Amarillo, Tex., who decided at the age of 3 that she would become a doctor and she made good by graduating from the Baylor College of Medicine in 1925, the only woman in her class. While she has been a very active practitioner of medicine in Amarillo, Tex., Dr. Powers has not forgotten her obligations as a citizen and she mixed with this practice a dedicated work for better government in our time to all levels of government: local, State, and national.

The Amarillo Globe-Times, of March 20, 1969, paid tribute to her learning, her ability, her dedication, her success, and, above all, her service to people, in an article entitled "World of Medicine Wide Open: Longtime Woman Doctor Practices What She Preaches." I ask consent that the tribute, ably written by Anna Catherine Day, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Amarillo (Tex.) Globe-Times, Mar. 20, 1969]

WORLD OF MEDICINE WIDE OPEN: LONGTIME  
WOMAN DOCTOR HERE PREACHES WHAT SHE  
PRACTICED

(By Anna Catherine Day)

America is wasting its woman power. "There is no reason why we can't have as many women doctors as men doctors," said Dr. Evelyn Powers of 3208 S. Hayden.

Dr. Powers is one of six women among the 150 physicians in the Potter-Randall County Medical Society.

The women's association of the American Medical Association says only 6.5 per cent of the nation's physicians are women.

In comparison, 75 per cent of the physicians in Russia are women.

At the age of 3, Dr. Powers decided she would become a doctor.

"My hand was badly cut. Of course, I kicked and screamed like any other child each time it was dressed, but it fascinated me that it would get well."

She graduated from the Baylor College of Medicine in 1925, the only woman in her class.

During her 43 years of medical practice, Dr. Powers encountered only one doctor who resented her because she was woman.

"He said he would quit the case if I were called in for consultation," she said.

The family did not insist, but the patient and many of her relatives later switched to Dr. Powers for treatment.

Dr. Powers retired from medical practice five years ago after 40 years in Amarillo and almost three years in Chillicothe.

"I was the senior partner in our firm," she said. "I received my diploma one minute before my husband."

Dr. Powers, the former Miss Evelyn Gass, and her husband, George Powers, married during their freshman year in medical school. They graduated in the same class, and practiced medicine in the same firm for more than four decades. She specialized in obstetrics and gynecology. He was a general practitioner.

Dr. Powers was born in Tullia, a daughter of Charles L. and Beulah Yearly Gass. Her grandfather, D. L. Gass, was the first merchant in Hereford just before the turn of the century.

"I wasn't very old when I decided I wasn't going to stay around the house and wash dishes. I couldn't see anything so glamorous about that," Dr. Powers said.

She never had any qualms about entering the field of medicine "because the doctor image was male."

"I want to tell you that in my child life the doctor image was female—my mother was our physician except on rare occasions," she said.

Dr. Powers' mother was interested in medicine, and her older brother, a physician, encouraged that interest.

Dr. Powers, the middle child in a family of three children, was usually the accident victim who had occasion to visit the doctor across the street more often than her brother and sister.

"I was more active and was always experimenting with new things," Dr. Powers said.

She remembers that her mother often treated the children's illnesses herself rather than call the family physician who always gave calomel, the most popular drug of that day.

When Dr. Powers entered medical school, the dean called her into his office.

"He told me that they wanted women in the school and that if anything offended me I should come and tell him," Dr. Powers said.

She had only one occasion to visit the dean in regard to those instructions.

"The offender was a lawyer who taught us medical jurisprudence. He had told a very vulgar joke which had nothing to do with medicine. The lawyer was not a member of the faculty the next year," Dr. Powers said.

During her freshman year, one of her male classmates said to Dr. Powers:

"You girls are such fools. You could stay home and play the piano and no one would think anything about it."

He dropped out the first year, Dr. Powers said.

"And I've always hoped he played the piano."

Dr. Powers feels that women are often advised, for one reason or another, not to enter the medical field.

"It is a downright sin that certain occupations have become set aside for men and others for women," she said.

"Once a high school girl told me that she wanted to study medicine but her teacher adviser told her no one had confidence in a woman doctor. I told the girl if any more women had confidence in me they would kill me," she said.

Dr. Powers has delivered two boys and a girl who are now doctors.

"Years ago," she said, "I delivered a girl and a boy to an Amarillo couple. The girl was older. She graduated from Oklahoma University and told me that she was going to become a medical technician."

"Why sell yourself short?" Dr. Powers inquired and advised the girl to study medicine.

She is Dr. Audrey Fern Posey McIntyre of Houston, who graduated from Baylor College of Medicine in 1960. Her brother, Dr. Randall Posey, a graduate of Texas University Medical School, is now in public health work in Philadelphia. They are the children of Mr. and Mrs. R. E. Posey, now of Houston.

Mrs. McIntyre is an anesthesiologist in Houston.

Dr. Hugh Bob Currie of Amarillo was also graduated from Baylor College of Medicine. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Hugh Currie of 2204 S. Lipscomb.

Dr. Powers had been in every kind of home in Amarillo on house calls.

She has delivered many babies at home, and has traveled in below-zero weather to treat the ill.

Back in 1926 in Chillicothe, she and her husband did a tracheotomy by the light of a kerosene lamp with a trunk as the operating table.

The patient, a 5-year-old boy, recovered.

Dr. George Powers delivered a baby in a covered wagon during their early days of practice. The Drs. Powers opened their practice here in the Fisk Building in November, 1928, after almost three years in Chillicothe.

"She built her practice a little faster than I did," said her husband.

Dr. Evelyn's memories of her medical practice are many, but some stand out above the others.

One expectant mother visited Dr. Powers to retain her services.

"And Dr. Powers, I want twins," the expectant mother said.

"I'm sorry, you've come to the wrong doctor. I don't have many twins. My patients are too stingy to have twins," the doctor replied.

"Why, do you charge more for twins?" the patient inquired.

Dr. Powers interned at Baylor Hospital in Dallas, and is a Founding Fellow of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. She is also a fifth generation Texan.

The five other women physicians in the Potter-Randall County Medical Society are Dr. Leta Boswell of Canyon, Dr. Ernestine Smith, Dr. Betty Cooper, Dr. Frances Davis and Dr. Margaret Davis, all of Amarillo.

FOCUS ON FEDERAL CITY COLLEGE—PART III

**HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that the attempt of the students at Federal City College to communicate their views to the community should have been distorted in the newspapers. Headlines such as "Student Leaders Defend Black Studies" are attention-grabbing, but fail to express the real educational goals and aspirations of the students.

In an effort to provide a more complete delineation of student desires, and to clarify a number of questions that have arisen as a result of recent publicity concerning Federal City College, I urge my colleagues to read the following statement by the Student Government Association of the College:

STATEMENT FROM THE STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION OF FEDERAL CITY COLLEGE

One of the principal responsibilities of the Student Government is to take those actions that will result in benefits for the students and that will enable the College and community to act in accordance with the needs and aspiration of the students.

This statement is issued to announce a student position on the state of the College and to respond to the number of questions that have been directed to the Student Government.

There are three basic statements that the Student Government Association wishes to make: (1) the students attend Federal City College to obtain a high quality education; this is our basic and primary purpose, (2) the students accept the need for several different types of educational programs to co-exist as part of the urban higher educational experiment, with the qualification that all such programs must be academically sound in content, philosophy, and instructional method, and (3) the students remain dedicated to the growth and development of the College and consider as irresponsible any discussion of the need to terminate or restrict the growth of the College.

The students have indicated and demonstrated their responsible participation in the affairs of the College. While students on other campuses have been engaged in various types of action projects, some helpful and some destructive, the students at FCC have maintained a focus on those actions which contribute to the success and development of FCC.

We recognize a need for this educational opportunity and for the employment and life opportunities that success in college affords; however, we insist that the education given at FCC be relevant to the needs of the students, their families, their communities and the total District population. An educational program that meets these requirements, urban higher education, does not exist; it must be developed. The students at FCC are part of this developmental project and seek to participate in responsible and effective ways.

There are several alleged issues that deserve comment. Do the students believe in the College and feel that they are receiving a meaningful education? This question assumes that education anywhere in the nation has met some standard that precludes further investigation. At FCC the students admit that we are in the process of finding answers and view participation in this pro-

cess as a meaningful and rewarding form of education.

How are the students affected by the disagreements among and between administration and faculty? In a developing program consensus not disagreement is to be avoided. The disagreement as stated in the press (the outsiders), is vastly different from the disagreements as experienced within the College. There are different programs being advocated by different faculty members; different programs are being supported and enrolled in by various students; some of these differences are related to sharply different premises about what is a relevant education. The debate can be solved by permitting various programs, as long as they are academically sound and within the province of a public institution, to demonstrate their effectiveness. What one student needs to learn is always different from what another student may need. In order to meet individual needs, different types of programs and learning experiences are desirable.

Do the students support a Black Studies Program? The answer to this question depends upon which of the Black Studies Programs is being discussed. The one that is available within the College already has the support of a large number of students; the one that is reflected in the news accounts has little or no support, except from those who wish to use this inaccurate view as a means of causing additional confusion and to achieve some objective other than support of the institutions. A Black Studies Program that meets the needs of students, that is academically sound, and that does not violate Title VI of the Civil Rights Act is an important and necessary part of higher education. This type of Black Studies Program exists and has support at the College. It deserves the total support of the Washington Community.

Do the students want a change in organizational and administrative procedures? Yes, and when those changes are instituted there will be additional changes desired and required. The question is not whether or not change is needed but the reaction to this need and the means by which changes can be obtained quickly and effectively. Students at FCC participate in bringing about these changes. Sometimes we cooperate and sometimes we take actions that intensify the debate; at all times we have the best interest of the College and the students as our principal objective.

Most of the students at FCC work full or part time jobs and attend College because they know the importance of a good education. This objective is number one on their list of priorities. The opportunities provided by FCC are important to the thousands of other District residents who need the opportunities made available by FCC.

The Student Government Association, recognizing that there are many differences and that participation in the development of an institution is not an easy task, pledges its support to the following:

1. The continued growth and development of Federal City College as an institution that is academically and philosophically relevant to the needs of an urban community.
2. The use of student resources in responsible, if not always cooperative, ways to achieve improved opportunities for student learning and achievement.
3. The continued participation on committees, commissions, and council of the College to insure that students are effective participants on the decision-making process.
4. The use of this educational opportunity to better prepare themselves for positions of leadership with government, both District and Federal.
5. The use of this educational opportunity to better prepare themselves for effective performance as both employers and employees within the private sector.

6. The use of this educational opportunity to enable the students, now and in the future, to serve as a community resource.

7. The unity of students in support of the College and against those whose interests and activities are not in the best interest of FCC. This includes persons within and outside the College community.

8. The use of student resources to enable other residents of the District, especially poverty families, an opportunity to benefit from our knowledge and the College's capabilities.

The Student Government Association views the present state of affairs at the College as one of challenge, finding new answers to old problems, finding ways to deal with educational and social problems, and finding ways to use individual resources to solve community problems.

The College has difficulties and disagreements and differences—this should be—it is part of the challenge. Our problems are not a cause for despair and our commitment is to solve them on the one hand while educating those who question the integrity of the College on the other.

FCC is our opportunity, our vehicle, our resource. We hold it in the public trust for ourselves and our brothers and will pass on to our fellow students an institution of high standing.

In cooperation with the College administration, faculty, staff, District Government, D.C. residents, and Congress, we intend to insure that a one hundred year late opportunity does in fact have an immediate payoff.

SALUTE TO HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT LEADERS

**HON. HENRY M. JACKSON**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I feel certain that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), my cochairman for the seventh annual Senate youth program, will join me in a salute to the high school student leaders who were recently our guests. There were 102 representing all of the States and the District of Columbia.

These young delegates who visited us in early February exemplified the highest qualities of American youth today.

While here, they visited with their Senators, questioning us on the key issues of the day. Their questions were bright—and direct.

Such were the delegates to the 1969 Senate youth program brought to Washington by the Hearst Foundation. They were winners not only of the week-long trip but also of \$1,000 scholarships. We, of the Senate Advisory Committee, were able to derive great satisfaction from being able to assist them during their stay.

During their stay in Washington, the students were greeted by a number of dignitaries of Government agencies and departments, highlighted by a visit with the President of the United States. He met them at the White House and made a point of shaking every hand. Also welcoming the visitors were Vice President SPIRO AGNEW, Secretary of State WILLIAM ROGERS, Speaker of the House JOHN McCORMACK, Supreme Court Justice BYRON WHITE, Army Chief of Staff WILLIAM WESTMORELAND, and FBI Director J. Edgar

Hoover, as well as numerous distinguished men and women in Government.

Members of the Hearst family personally supervised the stay in Washington. Mr. and Mrs. George Hearst have never missed being on hand for the program since its start in 1961. Mr. Randolph A. Hearst similarly takes a great interest in the overall effort which is under the direction of Ira P. Walsh whose original idea it was to make such an opportunity available to qualified contenders. Others responsible for the overall success of the indoctrination were Lt. Col. Robert E. Keener, of OSA-PA, who supervised the military escort officers, planned the Defense Department briefing and arranged for participation of musical groups from the various services which played at official functions; Mr. Stephen King, briefings officer of the Department of State, who arranged a top-level briefing by high Department officials, followed by a buffet luncheon in the Ben Franklin Room of the State Department, and many more representatives of governmental agencies and departments who lent their talents to the success of the program. We thank them all.

On behalf of the Senate, we are grateful to the Hearst Foundation for their generous contribution to education and encouragement to learning. We deeply appreciate the cooperation of our colleagues in the Senate and their staffs who made the delegates welcome.

I ask unanimous consent that the lists of students who participated, and their escort officers, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

U.S. SENATE YOUTH PROGRAM, 1969—WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST FOUNDATION

- ALABAMA  
Judy Joy Hester, Russellville.  
Stephen Turner Hardin, Helena.
- ALASKA  
Phillip Robert Wyman, Sitka.  
Gerritt James VanKommer, Spenard.
- ARIZONA  
Nicholas John Sakis, Phoenix.  
Barry Becker, Phoenix.
- ARKANSAS  
Robert Mitman Mason, Jr., Little Rock.  
Russell B. Chitwood, Lake Village.
- CALIFORNIA  
Michael P. Woodard, Costa Mesa.  
Esther L. Valadez, Baldwin Park.
- COLORADO  
Pamela Fitting, Denver.  
James T. Burghardt, Littleton.
- CONNECTICUT  
John S. Carusone, Glastonbury.  
Stephen L. Nightingale, Darien.
- DELAWARE  
Angelo J. Accetta, Dover.  
Brenda Lynn Higdon, Townsend.
- DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
Patrica Marian Eanet, Washington.  
William M. McNeil, Washington.
- FLORIDA  
Bernard Cheeseman, Tampa.  
Jose Perez, Miami.
- GEORGIA  
Kenneth Lowell Shigley, Douglasville.  
Melanie Thompson, Atlanta.

- HAWAII  
Bruce Seaman, Alea.  
Yvonne Yarber, Waialanae.
- IDAHO  
John Sage, Naples.  
Claudia Williams, Midvale.
- ILLINOIS  
Shelby Jean Hoover, Hettick.  
Stanley Palder, Chicago.
- INDIANA  
Patricia Jane Purser, Jeffersonville.  
Dean H. Robb, Hobart.
- IOWA  
Steven Dale Adams, Bettendorf.  
Daniel Bookin, Ottumwa.
- KANSAS  
Gwen E. Adams, Osage City.  
Jere LeRoy Totten, Jewell.
- KENTUCKY  
Benjamin Jones, Campbellsville.  
Chris Horvay, Louisville.
- LOUISIANA  
Peter K. Allain, Jeanerette.  
Robert Daigle, Paincourtville.
- MAINE  
Lisbeth E. Shurman, Dexter.  
Estelle R. Beauchesne, Biddeford.
- MARYLAND  
David Hankin, Baltimore.  
Donna Hogans, Rock Hall.
- MASSACHUSETTS  
C. Robert DelTorchio, Magnolia.  
Maureen Curley, Hudson.
- MICHIGAN  
Antonlo Garcia, Farmington.  
Lani June Chichester, Grand Rapids.
- MINNESOTA  
Eugene Richie, Winona.  
William Marsh, Minneapolis.
- MISSISSIPPI  
Gregory Lee Berry, Jackson.  
David Palmer Jaqua, Meridian.
- MISSOURI  
Michael Sundermeyer, Raytown.  
Burlleigh Leonard, St. Louis.
- MONTANA  
Allan Karell, Ballantine.  
Robert Brown, Great Falls.
- NEBRASKA  
William Bystrom, North Platte.  
Tamara Gay Hathaway, Lincoln.
- NEVADA  
Charles Ross, Reno.  
Jackie Hood, Elko.
- NEW HAMPSHIRE  
Bonnie B. Butler, Durham.  
John W. Carr, East Kingston.
- NEW JERSEY  
Roderick G. Dorman, Mendham.  
Kathleen M. Yaskiw, Clifton.
- NEW MEXICO  
Catherine A. Clark, Hobs.  
Fred Raymond Vigil, Los Alamos.
- NEW YORK  
Paul F. Wendelglass, Rochester.  
Susan Szurley, Whitesboro.
- NORTH CAROLINA  
Jeff Wood, Tobaccoville.  
Vicky Gordon, Zebulon.
- NORTH DAKOTA  
Bradley W. Leben, Devils Lake.  
Thomas Dahlstrom, Lisbon.
- OHIO  
Gregory F. Rose, Hamilton.  
Dail Hollopeter, Wooster.

- OKLAHOMA  
Bruce D. Gaither, Tulsa.  
Pamalyn Kay McEver, Oklahoma City.
  - OREGON  
Reitha Jane Simpson, Newberg.  
H. Hadley McCann, Klamath Falls.
  - PENNSYLVANIA  
Joseph Anthony Gent, Franklin.  
Leslie Anne Miller, Mechanicsburg.
  - RHODE ISLAND  
Ann-Marie Harkins, Providence.  
Stephen Paul Erickson, Middletown.
  - SOUTH CAROLINA  
John Spearman, Summerville.  
Jack Griffeth, Greenville.
  - SOUTH DAKOTA  
Mary Patricia Bierle, Yankton.  
Stephen Carl Hunt, Sioux Falls.
  - TENNESSEE  
Keith Lundin, Oak Ridge.  
Wendell L. Hartzog, Memphis.
  - TEXAS  
Marilyn Rueping, Beaumont.  
Charles E. McCloud, Houston.
  - UTAH  
John Harold Steed, Clearfield.  
Karl Christian Rove, Salt Lake City.
  - VERMONT  
Richard F. Pulling, Rutland.  
Janet R. Houghton, Woodstock.
  - VIRGINIA  
Christopher Howard, Richmond.  
Michael S. Wheeler, Blacksburg.
  - WASHINGTON  
Elizabeth D. Lindsay, Spokane.  
Robert A. Caplan, Seattle.
  - WEST VIRGINIA  
James R. Fleenor, Martinsburg.  
Elizabeth Ann High, Fairmont.
  - WISCONSIN  
Judith A. Wenzel, Marshfield.  
Scott G. Swanson, Wausau.
  - WYOMING  
Daniel Lee Wright, Wheatland.  
Kandace Einbeck, Cheyenne.
- ESCORT OFFICERS—1969 SENATE YOUTH PROGRAM  
U.S. NAVY
- Senior escort officers*
- Lieutenant Commander Beverly F. Shepard, USN, Office of the Chief of Information, Navy Department, Washington, D.C.  
Lieutenant Raymond J. Kukulski, USN, Defense Atomic Support Agency, Washington, D.C.
- Escort officers*
- Lieutenant (jg) Gunnar A. Askeland, USN, Bureau of Naval Personnel, Room 2716, Navy Department, Washington, D.C.  
Ensign Donald L. Bach, USN, Bureau of Naval Personnel, Room 2735, Navy Department, Washington, D.C.  
Ensign Nathan K. Harimoto, USN, Bureau of Naval Personnel, Room 1836, Navy Department, Washington, D.C.  
Ensign Wilfred P. Van Loben Sels, USN, Bureau of Naval Personnel, Room 2721, Navy Department, Washington, D.C.  
Ensign Cecilia M. Brown, USNR, Naval Security Station, 3801 Nebraska Avenue, Washington, D.C.  
Ensign Rosemary L. Berner, USNR, Naval Air Systems Command Headquarters, Washington, D.C.
- U.S. MARINE CORPS
- Escort officers*
- First Lieutenant James P. Dusenbury, USMCR, H&S Company, H&S Battalion, TBS, MCB, Quantico, Va.

First Lieutenant Richard J. Muller, USMC, H&S Company, H&S Battalion, TBS, MCB, Quantico, Va.

First Lieutenant Robert W. Riordan, USMCR, H&S Company, H&S Battalion, TBS, MCB, Quantico, Va.

First Lieutenant William B. Zimmerman, USMCR, H&S Company, H&S Battalion, TBS, MCB, Quantico, Va.

First Lieutenant Lorraine M. Garcia, USMCR, Education Center (Language Branch), MCB, Quantico, Va.

Second Lieutenant Sandra Mahoney, USMCR, Marine Corps Exchange, MCB, Quantico, Va.

#### U.S. ARMY

##### Escort officers

First Lieutenant Charles W. Bowens, USA, Executive Officer, D Company, 1st Battalion, 3rd Infantry, Fort Myer, Va.

Second Lieutenant James F. Flint, USA, Assistant S-1, 1st Battalion, 3rd Infantry, Fort Myer, Va.

Second Lieutenant Ronald W. Frost, USA, Community Relations Officer, Headquarters, MDW, IO, Tempo B, 3800 Newark, NW., Washington, D.C.

Second Lieutenant David R. Holdridge, USA, Public Information Office, 1st Battalion, 3rd Infantry, Fort Myer, Va.

First Lieutenant Charlene C. Haas, USA, US Women's Army Corps Detachment, US Army Garrison, Fort George G. Meade, Md.

Second Lieutenant Sybil J. Lawless, USA, Headquarters Company, US Army WAC, Fort Myer, Va.

#### U.S. AIR FORCE

##### Escort officers

First Lieutenant Malkon C. Baboyian, USAF, 1001 Field Maintenance Squadron, Andrews AFB, Md.

Second Lieutenant Berry T. Cox, USAF, 1100 Support Group, Bolling AFB, Washington, D.C.

First Lieutenant Robert J. Hertler, USAF, 1001 Composite Wing, Andrews AFB, Md.

Second Lieutenant Michael F. Nealls, USAF, HQ COMD USAF (ODC), Bolling AFB, Washington, D.C.

First Lieutenant Cyrena M. Gilman, USAF, Malcolm Grow USAF Hospital, Andrews AFB, Md.

First Lieutenant Karen L. Miller, USAF, 1100 AB Wing, Bolling AFB, Washington, D.C.

### THE CAMPUS DISORDERS SHOULD BRING SUSPENSION OF FEDERAL FUNDS

## HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I share the mounting concern of those who see the current force of anarchy and violence on America's campuses as a possible prelude to anarchy and violence in America's streets where, already, there is too much.

I share the mounting concern of those who see the current campus actions in the name of "freedom," "rights," and "progress" as an abuse of "freedom" and "rights" via the crude, rude, violent tactics of the savage.

I share the mounting concern of those who see the campus agitators and revolutionaries leading their minority followers in a massive, grotesque transgression of the "freedom," "rights," and "progress" of the majority.

In recent years, we have heard a lot of high-sounding oratory about how every American has the "right" to a college

education. Personally, I have felt that every American had the right to the opportunity to gain a college education, if he wanted it, if he qualified with the prerequisites, and if he continued to qualify after gaining admission to an institution of higher education.

Ever since the current rash of nationwide campus disruption, violence, anarchy, and revolution began in 1963, I have found increasingly greater cause to ponder whether those whose "major" subject seems to be protest, have not confused their claimed "right" to education with "license" through which education must be achieved.

I have found increasingly greater cause to ponder whether these individuals who hop from claim to claim, charge to charge, cause to cause, complaint to complaint, protest and demonstration to protest and demonstration, disruption and violence to disruption and violence, have not foreclosed upon their claim to certain "rights," whether real or imagined.

Again and again, we see those who cry the loudest for "understanding," "liberality," and "respect" demonstrating little "understanding" of the subject against which they complain, illiberality toward anyone who seeks to rebut their argumentation, and a conduct which strongly suggests little respect for anyone, themselves included.

Again and again, we hear them cry for more and more financial aid from State and Federal Governments, even as they continue to reflect a conduct which suggests loyalty to neither echelon of government.

Again and again, we hear them cry for peace and love and unity even as they deliver warfare and hatred and division.

Again and again, we hear their shouts of abuse and obscenities against law and order and anything and everything representing and reflecting law and order; and, though their cries are raised in the name of a new order, we see within their ranks little semblance of anything but old disarray.

This, I believe, may strike at the heart of the problem which these young people, both malcontent and revolutionary, have foisted upon our society; for order is the essence of national and social establishment, survival, growth, and progress. Without order, there is no freedom, only anarchy. Without order, there is no tranquillity, only confusion. Without order, there is no progress, only retrogression. Yet, in this much proclaimed age of space and era of progress, we have seen, again and again, the components of our educational community delivering their institutions, their community, and this Nation back toward the age of stone and the era of the primitive.

Some students have demonstrated greater interest in delivering their own personally opinionated undergraduate lectures and harangues on socio-political-ideological matters than in attending classes in accordance with their ostensible purpose: gaining an education in the field of their proclaimed choice. Worse, some students have demonstrated greater interest in substituting violence for academic reason in trying to impose their minority views, ultimata, and

threats upon the institution and the majority of their fellow students.

Educational administrators have failed in their responsibility to protect the majority, and to protect law, order, and the academic process. By this failure, such administrators have betrayed the hundreds of thousands of earnest, law-abiding students whose right and desire to exist in the essential atmosphere of peace, and to gain their education, have been frustrated and violated by that rebel minority which has ordered strikes, seized classrooms and buildings, interrupted and closed classes, and intimidated, threatened and attacked those students who have chosen to dissent from their violent version of dissent.

By failing to invoke the most expeditious legitimate and legal remedy required for restoration of order and punishment of the guilty, such academic administrators have, in effect, cooperated in the coercion of serious students by the minority-led mob. In so doing, they have intensified the threat and damage suffered by the majority which, as an innocent third-party victim, has, in fact, been denied their right and means of prompt recourse.

It is time that, if those immediately responsible for infusing some old-fashioned American horse sense into this psychedelic nonsense continue unwilling or unable to do so, the Congress must have little choice but to do so. Congress has the responsibility to protect the Federal interest, represented by the gigantic investment of taxpayers' dollars in programs, grants and moneys which Congress, itself, has poured into such institutions. Congress also has the responsibility to protect the rights of the majority of students who are sincere in their efforts to obtain an education and abide by the lawful established processes within this Nation.

The young rebels make great pretense to demands that spokesmen for what they so derisively call, "the establishment," speak with candor, "tell it like it is."

Well, this is "like it is" as far as this Member of the Congress is concerned; let the young rebels, student and teacher alike, get it straight:

Congress has no responsibility to appropriate Federal funds for even the indirect subsidization of a student nor a teacher who demonstrates disloyalty to this Nation, disobedience to its laws, violation of its order, contempt and animosity to the source of the subsidy, and transgression against the rights of the majority of the students.

In short, Congress has no responsibility to appropriate Federal funds for even the indirect subsidization of a student or a teacher whose conduct, activities, demands, and threats default upon the very rights, freedoms, and opportunities to which they lay claim.

Congress has no responsibility to appropriate Federal funds for academic institutions which permit such conduct and which, in doing so, foreclose upon their claimed objectives and upon their claims to congressional monetary consideration, support, and subsidization. These colleges and universities are chartered and accredited—as academic institutions; not as institutions which function

to tolerate, encourage, and reward revolutionary and/or criminal conduct.

These colleges and universities are institutions of academic nature, character, interest, and pursuit; not institutions for political and criminal misconduct and asylum. Academic freedom does not extend to license to violate a specific nor implicit contract with the source of Federal funds. Academic freedom does not extend to license to violate and deny the rights of peaceful students or faculty.

Academic freedom does not extend to license to destroy the academy and, therefore, academic freedom.

I, for one, have no desire to infringe upon any freedom, including that seemingly ever-expanding condition known, a bit too loosely, as academic freedom. But I do believe, in light of what this Nation is now reaping from institution after institution into which multibillions of public moneys have been poured that, however reluctantly, the Congress of the United States is compelled to take a long look at what, precisely, its established procedure of "funding but not questioning" has really wrought.

The release of the text of the letter on the campus disorder problem which, on instructions of President Nixon, Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Finch has dispatched to college and university administrators has only punctuated this fact; so has the release of President Nixon's own commentary thereon.

Clearly, the message of the Finch letter and the Nixon commentary is that, between the Government and the school administrators, neither the 1968 law nor the 1969 law which Congress passed in an extremely mild and highly restrictive effort to protect Federal interests has ever been invoked.

The 1968 law—section 504 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968—specifies that if any student is convicted of a crime in a court, or if he has committed what his college or university regards as a "serious" violation of its own regulations, he is to be declared ineligible for 2 years to receive Federal scholarships or loans.

The 1969 law—section 411 of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1969—specifies that any student convicted of a crime related to a campus disorder becomes ineligible to receive Federal loans and scholarships.

The 1968 law puts the burden of enforcement on the colleges and the universities; the initiative for enforcement of the 1969 law is thought to lie with the Federal Government—principally, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

We are told that the Department's failure to enforce this rather simple, basic 1969 law is principally because the Department finds it difficult to know which students receive the funds it doles out for student loans and scholarships. The alibi for this is that, as a rule, these Federal funds for students are distributed to colleges and universities in lump sums, and the colleges and universities take command of the selection of the recipients.

This alibi is either a sorry admission of a woeful inadequacy, ineptitude, in-

dolence, and incompetency on the part of academic administrators and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or it is a monumental insult to the intelligence of the Congress and the people.

It certainly suggests if nothing more, that, even though the Government people may be willing to enforce the law, the academic people are unwilling and, therefore, frustratingly uncooperative. For now, I shall pass the logical question: Why has the Government permitted this? To raise the more basic question: What else should we expect but this apparent unwillingness, if not refusal, of academic administrators to punish students convicted of lawbreaking as set forth in the 1969 law, when they have proved unwillingness, if not refusal, to punish students who break their own regulations as set forth by the 1968 law?

This failure, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and by the academic administrators to invoke these two simple, modest efforts to end, at least for a time, the Federal subsidization of no more than 1 percent of the students actually involved in campus disorders is, in reality, the most revealing and shocking aspect of the Finch letter and the Nixon commentary. It could be made no clearer if it were handed down in a special message to Congress. Certainly, the point is clear: Something even more basic, more simplistic, is required—not just to get the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare moving, but to relieve the academic administrators of what, to them, quite obviously, is the unhappy, perhaps impossible, burden of helping the Federal Government enforce the law. Furthermore, it is now admitted that, even if this pair of mild, bland laws had been enforced, the real problem of campus disorder would not have been ended, for they would have punished all too few of those responsible, and would have done so all too late, even without consideration of the time required for the modern appellate process.

I suggest, therefore, that the Congress give serious consideration to conducting something of an audit of its expenditures in the name of education and of the gains therefrom. There would be no better, more natural, opportunity for such an audit than any condition on any campus wherein the educational process to which the Congress has contributed taxpayers' moneys is disrupted and interrupted by disorder, building seizure, student and faculty strike and, certainly, violence.

As soon as such condition develops, I suggest that, within 5 days, all Federal funds already appropriated for that institution or any program therein be frozen, and remain frozen until that institution's administration restores law and order to that campus, if necessary, with the assistance of the full impact of whatever agency or agents of law and order are required; and, that accomplished, that said funds remain frozen until that administration prosecutes all violations of law, and submits to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare a program which would fully assure that repetition will not occur.

I suggest further that any teacher or instructor or lecturer found guilty of violating any law in connection therewith shall forfeit all Federal subsidy, stipend, or payment of any kind from Federal sources.

Toward that end of establishment of commonsense, propriety and balance in taxpayer-supported educational institutions; toward that end of restoration of law and order; toward the end of protecting the rights of the majority of the students, and toward the end of putting some needed backbone into academic administrations, I will introduce legislation to provide such remedies.

DR. EDWIN MITCHELL, A LEADING RESIDENT OF NASHVILLE, TENN.

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the March issue of the Nashville magazine contains an excellent article about Dr. Edwin Mitchell, a leading resident of the city of Nashville. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

DR. EDWIN MITCHELL: GENTLEMAN FROM THE GHETTO

(By Pat Harris)

On October 12, 1967—just a few weeks after North Nashville erupted into a riot—a slim, bespectacled doctor stood before some 400 people at a Chamber of Commerce breakfast meeting and called them "brave and unthinking men!" Dr. Edwin H. Mitchell, who walked the riot area in an attempt to avert the violence brewing along Jefferson Street and who was struck down by a hurled rock, had been asked by David K. Wilson, then president of the Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce, to address the group.

His talk stunned an audience which included U.S. Rep. Richard Fulton and Metro's Mayor Beverly Briley, both seated at the speaker's table.

"Tall buildings," Dr. Mitchell told them, "which allow you to gaze out upon the green grass of suburbia cannot long shelter you from the desperate frustration and pettiness that continues to build around you."

Then he added:

"There is something wrong with a community that unites its government but divides its people."

Warning of "a giant step backward," he charged that their plans for a "forward Nashville" were a mockery in the midst of poverty that rings the city.

The *Nashville Tennessean* called Dr. Mitchell's talk "a broad indictment of both the private and public sector of local community leadership and thoughtless planning, wholesale job discrimination and inferior segregated housing patterns."

What manner of man stands up for his beliefs where it counts when he could so easily look the other way and enjoy his own personal success in life without becoming involved? In this instance, an almost self-effacing individual who sees nothing at all unusual about himself.

In his small office at Meharry Medical College is a sign:

"Before you ask, the answer is No!"

Actually, Dr. Mitchell finds it difficult to turn anyone down. His home phone, as well

as his office phone, rings with requests from people needing help, which keeps him a thoroughly busy man. In addition to his fulltime job as associate professor of radiology at Meharry, he is president of the Davidson County Independent Political Council and chairman of the Metropolitan Human Relations Commission.

Established by Metro Council in December of 1965, the Commission replaced Mayor Briley's bi-racial advisory committee on human relations launched in the spring of 1963. It was set up under an ordinance introduced by Councilman Z. Alexander Looby to investigate complaints of discrimination, recommend legislation and promote fair treatment of citizens. In 1966, Dr. Mitchell was elected the first chairman of the Commission. Its members are appointed by the mayor subject to council confirmation.

Dr. Mitchell's main interest, however, appears to be the Davidson County Independent Political Council, a group formed in 1962 to advance the rights of the Negro through political means. Within a short time, he was elected president succeeding State Senator Avon Williams.

"We formed the Council," he explains, "because the NAACP could not engage in political activity. A similar group in Shelby County approached us and asked us to become affiliated on a statewide basis with the Tennessee Voters Council. Then we enlarged to include eastern Tennessee."

During the political campaign of 1962, Attorney Looby ran for the State Supreme Court, was endorsed by the Council and polled well over 100,000 votes although he was defeated. "This really got us off the ground, however," says Dr. Mitchell. "And by the way, we don't zero in on race. We're an integrated effort addressing ourselves to the problem of poverty—and the problem of the Negro is inseparable from the poor of any group except that the black man has the additional problem of being black."

Specifically, what does Dr. Mitchell's Council want?

"We want to see minority representation in government at policymaking levels," he responds, "as well as in jobs throughout government. We want to be able to make our case before government and have some reasonable assurance that we're going to get an equitable hearing."

And he adds:

"I think we're making progress. I think people follow us because they trust our board. We ran an appeal to them. I believe that we have kept the faith with them."

Dr. Mitchell's background dictates no particular reason for becoming embroiled in civil rights. He had a middle class upbringing, he has utilized his intelligence to take advantage of opportunities available and, in the parlance of our age, he has "made it."

In short, he had nothing to gain in a material sense and a lot to lose two years ago when he went into the heart of the impending riot and tried to mediate the conflict. He still bears a scar on his back from the rock that struck him.

Born in Norfolk, Virginia, on December 21, 1921, he and his family moved to Yonkers, New York when he was five years old. His father had been working as a laborer at the Norfolk naval base and his mother was a teacher. In Yonkers, his father joined a brother in a small business which went bankrupt during the depression of the 'thirties, and then became a Pullman porter whose main run was to Buffalo and Sarasota. The elder Mitchell died in January of this year. Dr. Mitchell's mother has retired and now lives in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Mitchell grew up in what he describes as a "lower middle class neighborhood," attended public high school there, was a member of the National Honor Society and did a little daydreaming about becoming a doctor.

"I just didn't see how it would be possible

financially for me to study medicine," he says.

Winning a scholarship to Brockport State Normal, Mitchell won his varsity letter in basketball his first year, then transferred to Albany State Teachers College in 1941. Once more he considered studying medicine—this time at the suggestions of both his coach and the school physician. And once more he decided he couldn't swing it financially.

"The draft was pending," he says, "so I went into the Army in August of 1942 in Chemical Warfare Service."

Mitchell was assigned to a replacement training depot at Camp Sibert in Gadsden, Alabama, where he taught illiterates and trained recruits. Rising to the rank of sergeant in 1943, he took exams for the Army Specialized Training Program and was transferred to basic engineering at Prairie View State College in Texas (near Houston) for three months. While there he took the army exams for pre-med training and in December entered Meharry Medical College.

During his sophomore year at Meharry, Dr. Mitchell received his honorable discharge from the Army, and in April of 1947 he was married to Noella Pajaud, a pretty young medical student from New Orleans. She was the only child of parents who had hoped she would continue in a small family business they operated and who were disappointed that she chose medicine instead. She had her choice of entering medical school at Howard University in Washington ("for some reason, my parents opposed the idea of my living in Washington"), Women's Medical School in Chicago ("I hated the idea of an all-woman school"), and Meharry.

Upon graduation in 1948, the couple interned together at Harlem Hospital in New York City where some of the grimmer facts of life among the poverty-stricken confronted them.

"At the time," he says, "we looked on it as real 'scut' work, but one of the most rewarding assignments we had was to ride ambulances. The things we saw were unbelievable. We went into Puerto Rican neighborhoods, for example, where coal bins and basements with no lights were rented to the poor. Bedrooms were partitioned off with sheets. There was hardly breathing space to be found."

In addition, the Mitchells had arrived in New York during one of the city's perennial garbage strikes and "my wife wasn't too impressed with garbage strewn all over."

After his internship, Dr. Mitchell became director of out patient clinics at Sydenham Hospital and his wife joined the pediatrics clinical staff, where the two worked from July of 1949 until February of 1951.

Re-entering the Army (this time as a first lieutenant), Dr. Mitchell was sent to Fort Sam Houston in San Antonio, Texas, for medical officer training. When he was transferred to Fort Jackson in Columbia, South Carolina, his wife joined him along with their two small daughters, Tresa, who was born December 27, 1947, and Cheryl, born December 20, 1950. After six months there, he was sent to Japan. His wife elected to remain in Columbia where she almost casually managed to combine the rigorous duties of motherhood with those of physician.

"One of the doctors went on a three-month fellowship," she says, "and I handled his medical practice. After he returned, I opened my own office. It was great! I enjoyed it!"

Mrs. Mitchell's subsequent retirement from the practice of medicine was not just because of the demands of her growing family.

"There was a sort of personal disillusionment involved," she says. "I have never been impressed with the growing isolation of the doctor from the patient."

After his Army stint, Dr. Mitchell and his wife opened a joint medical practice in Camden, South Carolina, until 1956 when they returned to Nashville where he took specialty training in radiology at Meharry. By that

time, the family numbered two more children—Edwin, Jr., born April 22, 1954 (the only member of the family whose birthday does not fall in December), and Kathryn, born December 7, 1958. Mrs. Mitchell's birthday is December 25.

Upon completion of his course, during which he was a National Institutes of Health trainee, Dr. Mitchell became a Commonwealth Fellow in radiology at Columbia Presbyterian Medical Center in New York in 1959. Returning to Nashville in July of 1960, Dr. Mitchell joined the staff of Meharry as assistant professor of radiology.

He teaches a formal course in radiology, reads X-rays and treats patients. The school has a training program for residents and a school of X-ray technology plus year-round student electives. Add to this the inter-departmental conferences and the obligations of staff membership committees and administrative functions, and Dr. Mitchell has little free time. What he has is often spent reading books and articles on sociology and politics.

He gives the impression of being a thoughtful person who is not only attempting to define the problems of his race but is also seeking practical solutions—without too much hope of success in his lifetime. Expressing his view of "black power," he asks: "Black or white—why does the adjective make it different? I think that it implies the inconvenience of not having all that cheap labor, which is frightening to some people."

He also thinks that black power is "an effort to express the realization that the black man has a heritage of which he can be proud and to try to create out of this a positive force for correcting the inequities which the black man has suffered."

Hardly a week goes by, he says, that he does not get a phone call from somebody with job problems or difficulties relocating because of urban renewal or highway projects. He says he gets frequent calls, also, alleging abuse by the police. Such calls he refers to the Human Relations Commission for follow through.

The Mitchell family is pretty firmly settled down now after all their moving around. Tresa, a senior at Fisk University, is interested in entomology. Cheryl is a freshman there and her interests are divided between psychiatric social work and writing. Edwin is a ninth grader at Father Ryan and Kathryn is in the fifth grade at St. Vincent de Paul.

They live at 2403 Underwood in North Nashville. Mrs. Mitchell, who is as outgoing and impulsive as her husband is quiet, directs an Opportunities Industrialization Center office on Jefferson Street not far from Meharry. Almost every day the Doctors Mitchell meet for lunch at their home.

On one such day, he was forced to interrupt his lunch to confer with a plumber in the front yard investigating a large leak in a water pipe. Several blocks away, the sounds of construction work on Interstate 40 punctuated the air.

"He's generally rather shy," she said while he was gone.

"But one thing about that type—when they do get mad, you really listen!"

Although different in personality, Dr. Mitchell and his wife are much alike in intellect, humor and sensitivity. And they are both firm in their commitment to justice and equality of opportunity for all, no matter what the personal cost. Flight to the more affluent suburbs does not interest them.

They have added two bedrooms to their original three-bedroom house and have acquired a couple of collie dogs. And in Dr. Mitchell's words, "It looks like we've added a swimming pool, too."

Standing in the front yard surveying the gaping hole in which muddy water was bubbling up from the broken pipe, he explained that the plumber had told him the damage was caused by the blasting on Interstate 40. Then he added succinctly:

"Progress!"

As his wife described Dr. Mitchell, he is "a

very quiet and gentle person, and sometimes people mistake his gentleness for no firm conviction... and they couldn't be more wrong."

TRIBUTE TO DOUGLAS ROWE

**HON. ORVAL HANSEN**

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, we recently received the sad news that another of Idaho's finest young men, Douglas Rowe, of Blackfoot, Idaho, has lost his life in Vietnam. This is another grim reminder of the tragedy of the war and of the urgent necessity to give the highest national priority to our efforts to bring the war to an end and to build an enduring world peace.

In an eloquent tribute to Pfc. Douglas Rowe, one of Idaho's most distinguished editors, Mr. Drury Brown, of the Blackfoot News, has raised some questions that are deserving of answers. I include Mr. Brown's editorial as a part of my remarks:

PRIVATE DOUGLAS ROWE DIES

(By Drury Brown)

Word was received by his parents yesterday that on March 9, 1969, Private First Class Douglas Noel Rowe died in battle in Vietnam. The notification did not reveal the place of his death. Neither was it revealed when his body may be returned to Idaho.

Private Rowe was born Nov. 13, 1946 in Rupert, Idaho. He was the son of Mr. and Mrs. Noel F. Rowe, 706 South Fourth Avenue, Pocatello, Idaho. He is survived by his parents; by two brothers; Alvin Rowe, Washington, D.C., and Airman First Class Steven Rowe, now stationed in Thailand, and by a sister, Elaine, Pocatello.

Private Rowe attended school in Blackfoot, graduating from Blackfoot High School with the Class of 1965, and thereafter attended Idaho State University, Pocatello, for two years.

He was a member of The First Baptist Church of Blackfoot. Time of funeral services cannot be established until the family has been notified by the Army when his body will be returned. But it is announced by his parents that the funeral will be held in The First Baptist Church of Pocatello and burial in the Blackfoot City Cemetery.

This is the sort of simple war statistic that has appeared thousands of times in American newspapers since the beginning of our involvement in the undeclared war in Vietnam.

But Doug Rowe is much more than a war statistic. Doug is the little boy grown to man. He is the son and brother who, through his entire lifetime, was a source of extreme pride to his family. He was intelligent and fun-loving yet always unassuming. He was clean-cut and fastidious. He was the thoughtful and dependable boy that carried a newspaper route. In so doing, he won the affection and esteem of the people to whom he delivered the newspaper. He was the young man who for four years worked part time in the office of the Blackfoot News and who was mature and competent enough in his last summer of employment to act as its circulation manager.

He was the talented guitar player who with Nancy Edison, Julie Hutchings and Joe Evans, made up one of the most entertaining and delightful singing groups ever formed in Blackfoot High School.

Doug Rowe became one of the group of young American men who were unable to plan their careers because conscription to military service was hanging over their heads.

Doug thought the war in Vietnam was wrong—that it was a waste of the nation's energy and resources—he believed that most of the people in the little nation of Vietnam wished that we had not come there and that we would leave—that it was immoral for us to be fighting there.

With such thoughts in mind, perhaps it was natural that Doug found it impossible to finish his college work while waiting for the draft to reach him. He dropped out of school and, while waiting, he took a job selling encyclopedias in Torrance, Calif. He reported to his family that he had met with startling success in the field of selling—that such would be the career he would pursue when his service to his country was completed.

He received his draft call in August, 1968.

In one of the last letters received by his family from Doug in Vietnam, he wrote that he had just returned from a 10-day military operation in the jungle. During that period there had been no time to bathe, shave nor change clothing.

Doug's family had every reason to be proud of him in life. They may find little solace in the assurance of military authorities that their son and brother died in Vietnam as a hero, nor in the flying of the flag over Blackfoot High School at halfmast the day that he will be buried. We can grieve with them as we remember there was every reason to think he could have made a very real contribution to his world.

There are many of us who knew Doug Rowe who believe, as he did, that the war in Vietnam is a tragic mistake into which the nation was dragged by an ill-conceived foreign policy.

Perhaps the greatest tribute such of us could pay to his memory is to demand without ceasing that the old men who make wars in which young men fight and die shall cease dragging their feet in the pursuit of the peace to which they say they are committed, and that saving the lives of both American and Asian boys has a much higher priority than saving the faces of political and military leaders.

THE DRUG PROBLEM

**HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, the shocking testimony before the Senate District Committee concerning the use of narcotics in Washington, D.C., should be thoroughly examined for the variety of implications to be found within the contentions of the witnesses. The growth of dope traffic and addiction in the Nation's Capital is one example of an escalating trend across the United States. If the pattern in Washington is an indication of what is happening in other areas of the country, our young people are the foremost victims of the fast spread of drug abuse.

Of particular importance, I think, is the identification of the ultimate source of the narcotics traffic in Washington. Supplies are shipped into the metropolitan area by organized crime wholesalers in New York. We know that past evidence shows that organized crime is trafficking drugs into all other sections of the country. The crime syndicates take substantial profit from the narcotics trade that conservative estimates indicate amounts to more than \$350 million annually.

While the thought of vast sums of illicit money going into the pockets of racketeers as a result of dope distribution, is disturbing the effects on society wrought by criminal promotion of addiction are appalling. The Washington situation points out that ghetto youths are becoming addicts in junior high school. These children are being pushed into a habit that ranges in cost from \$50 to \$200 a day. Since they come from the most economically deprived families imaginable, it is obvious that they must turn to crime for the money to support their use of drugs.

Dope pushing, prostitution, armed robbery, shoplifting and any other criminal means of obtaining dollars for drugs are resorted to by young people who have fallen into the narcotics habit. They therefore become pawns for racketeers who use young addicts to service many aspects of big crime operations.

While we must not ignore the tragedy of the drug problem among middle- and upper-class youths and must resolve to combat the narcotics traffic on all fronts, the indications that great numbers of ghetto youths are turning to drugs should be particularly alarming to the Congress. We have established as a national priority aid to disadvantaged people within our inner cities. Yet, no financial help we could possibly afford to appropriate could meet the needs of a generation hooked on hard drugs. Perhaps, our priority has been aimed in the wrong direction. The Washington example convinces me that we have not done nearly enough to stem the ravages of criminal activity which prey daily on our citizens in the ghetto.

INQUIRY WELCOMED

**HON. JOHN R. DELLENBACK**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, at a time when Congress is looking into the rising costs of lumber and plywood and the effect of high prices on the Nation's housing program, it is gratifying to see a newspaper give its wholehearted support to this important investigation. The Eugene, Oreg., Register-Guard recently outlined some of the problems and suggested possible solutions which might be considered by the Congress.

I commend this responsible editorial to my colleagues as a fair and definitive explanation of the problems of the forest products industry:

INQUIRY WELCOMED

Leaders in most industries cringe and complain when the government launches investigations to determine why product prices are going up. But lumber and plywood industry manufacturers are responding most enthusiastically to the inquiry President Nixon has ordered to identify reasons their prices are zooming.

This is no put-on. Lumber and plywood mill operators are delighted to have this chance to prove long-ignored contentions that government actions have caused imbalance between their raw material supplies and their market opportunities. They want the nation, and especially the Congress, to know why plywood prices have skyrocketed 92 per

cent in the past year and why Douglas fir lumber items have been marked up some 30 per cent.

These manufacturers are anxious to have President Nixon's Cabinet Committee on Economic Policy prying into their cost-price affairs. They hope a committee task force will recommend that executive and legislative branches of the federal government act to: 1. facilitate harvesting of more ripe timber from federally owned forests, thus dampening mills' raw material costs, and; 2. promote more even year-to-year building construction rates, thus reducing wild fluctuations in demand for lumber and plywood and permitting more efficient operation of their mills.

Forest product industry leaders see possibilities of profit opportunities that, in the long run, will be better than they've enjoyed in alternating periods of light and heavy demand for their products. They are quite aware that high prices on lumber and plywood will induce the construction industry to use less expensive substitute materials wherever possible.

So there's really no mystery about the lumber and plywood manufacturers' response to the investigation being made of their prices. They figure this can only lead to full disclosure of log supply cost problems and of the effects of feast-or-famine demand cycles in marketing their finished wares. As they see it, Uncle Sam should understand that he can promote lower lumber and plywood prices by permitting more realistic utilization of the tremendous tree farms he controls and by fostering greater steadiness in national building rates.

#### FIFTY YEARS FOR GOD AND COUNTRY

#### REMARKS

OF

**HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, this year, 1969, will be marked nationwide by observances of the golden anniversary of the American Legion.

In my home county of Suffolk in New York State the golden anniversary will be celebrated by a series of events.

Outstanding Legionnaires of our county, led by Committee Chairman James Heneghan and county Commander Joseph J. Stinsman, will organize the golden anniversary celebrations.

A convention parade will be held in Patchogue, N.Y., on June 13-14, with gaily decorated floats depicting all phases of American Legion programs and activities.

The golden anniversary observances will culminate in a memorial presentation to Suffolk County on Veterans Day—November 11, 1969.

The memorial will consist of 10 trees to be planted on the site of the county seat. Each tree will be in tribute to the memory of those citizens of our 10 towns who have given their lives for our great country in her military service.

The Legionnaires of Suffolk are to be complimented for their observance of the golden anniversary in this memorable manner, and they are to be congratulated and honored for their great and lasting contributions to our community, State, and Nation.

#### AMERICAN MARITIME INDUSTRY: NEW HOPE

**HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, Mr. Edward M. Hood, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America, spoke before the annual meeting of the Western Shipbuilding Association in San Francisco. On that occasion, Mr. Hood took particular note of the change in the administration, and based upon earlier statements of the President concerning the deterioration in our maritime posture—a factor well known and appreciated by most Members of Congress—he expressed an optimism or new hope for the future of the American maritime industry.

I join with Mr. Hood in looking to the future somewhat optimistically with the view that we in the Congress may be able to act in greater consonance with the current administration than has been the case in the past. I would only point out, however, that the monumental task of bringing about a resurgence in our maritime posture cannot be accomplished by the Government alone.

On October 11, 1968, I addressed the 42d annual convention of the Propeller Club in St. Louis, Mo. Like Mr. Hood, I, too, referred to the statements concerning our maritime posture made by now President Nixon, and specifically the following comment that "the time has come for new departures, new solutions, and a new vitality for American ships and American crews on the high seas of the world."

A similar note was struck by the President in the issuance of his recently executed proclamation setting aside May 22d as National Maritime Day 1969, when he observed the following:

Through the cooperation of business, labor and Government, and with prudent use of advancing technology, the American Merchant Marine must become capable of providing modern, productive service to the Nation's commerce as an integral part of transportation.

It is in this spirit of recognition of necessary action to restore the preeminence of the United States upon the high seas that I insert the following remarks made by Mr. Hood on January 31 for the benefit of my colleagues:

SPEECH BY EDWIN M. HOOD, PRESIDENT,  
SHIPBUILDERS COUNCIL OF AMERICA

Let me begin by expressing again the appreciation of the Shipbuilders Council of America for the endeavors of the Western Shipbuilding Association, in 1968 and earlier years, to improve the environment for shipbuilding and ship repairing not only on the Pacific Coast but in other sections of the country. On problems and issues of common interest a special spirit of harmony has developed between us, and I look forward to a continuance of this cooperation as a new era in American history unfolds.

As a change in political administration takes place in Washington, D.C., there is inevitably much conjecture as to the tone of government that will evolve. There is considerable speculation as to the direction Federal policies and programs will from

henceforth take. The establishment of priorities, the extent to which emphasis is applied to areas of critical need, and the structure of the policy-making processes will thus be followed with more than casual interest by most citizens, including those of us in this audience and elsewhere who derive their livelihoods, either directly or indirectly, from shipyard activities.

Few Presidents of the United States have entered The White House with a detailed exposition of their thinking with regard to shipbuilding already contained on the public record. But President Nixon has! His positions on maritime and naval affairs were rather extensively defined in statements released during the 1968 campaign on September 24 and October 25 respectively.

In these appeals to the American people, President Nixon pledged his efforts to these two important objectives, among others: the constant availability of a United States Navy second to none and the prompt restoration of the United States as a first-rate maritime power.

He also called for: a higher level of coordination between naval and merchant shipbuilding to create a climate in which shipyards can attract investment capital and retain stable labor forces . . . better use of credit facilities, amortization procedures and long-term government cargo commitments to stimulate U.S. shipbuilding . . . and tax incentives and cargo assistance for domestic shipping operations. In addition, he promised support for a domestic shipbuilding program to produce a fleet of American-flag merchant ships capable of carrying 30 percent of the nation's trade and commerce instead of the present 5 percent. And, he urged vigorous research and development programs to harness the latest technology to the needs of the maritime fleet.

Throughout history, unusual circumstances have often frustrated good intentions, but more frequently lofty aspirations have been fruitful. If our new President can achieve the goals I have just summarized, he will have succeeded in an area where his immediate predecessors have been eminently unsuccessful. Though there is much optimism favoring full achievement, even partial accomplishment will result in a greater magnitude of naval and merchant shipbuilding than has been the case during the past eight years.

The optimism to which I have referred is not the hand-rubbing, gleeful variety; it stems from the solemn hope that the priorities and policies of the new Administration will, at long last, take into account a very grave condition. The ships in our naval fleet . . . the ships in our oceangoing merchant fleet have grown older and older; our fishing fleet, our Great Lakes fleet and our domestic shipping fleet are plagued with antiquity; in short, our shipbuilding effort has not been equal to overcoming the reality of galloping obsolescence.

While successive national Administrations, over the last decade, have dealt with this obsolescence problem only minimally, it is generally believed that the point of further expediency has long since passed and that further procrastination in the reconstruction of U.S. sea power resources could endanger the national security. Many pages of Congressional testimony and several authoritative reports put this danger in the context of the Soviet Union's growing strength on the oceans and sound the alarm "loud and clear."

The emergence of communist sea power has graphically defined—and demonstrated—the role and importance of ships as functions of domestic and international policy. Since the end of World War II, however, the Soviet Union and the United States have viewed the role and importance in spectacularly different ways. A national purpose of fixed determination to move ahead has pre-

valled in Russia. Conversely, to this point, the United States has had schizophrenia as to what our overall posture on the oceans should be.

In the last decade, the Russians have advanced to a position of sea power strength from which the interests of the United States and the entire Free World can now very definitely be challenged. As Russia has moved ahead, the United States has dropped from first to fifth position as a maritime power; as a shipbuilding power we have dropped from first to ninth position; and the Soviet Navy is presently second only to that of the United States. In the vacuum created by American lethargy and the retreat of the British Navy on all fronts, the Kremlin obviously hopes to use the oceans for exploitation of Soviet geopolitical objectives.

The Russians have been building many more merchant ships than we have. At mid-1968, they were constructing 448 ships compared to our 58. There are other startling statistics; for the past several years new ship deliveries to the Russian merchant fleet have outpaced U.S. deliveries by a ratio of nearly 8 to 1 . . . about 80 percent of the Soviet shipping fleet today is less than 10 years of age, while approximately 80 percent of the American merchant marine is 20 years of age or older . . . in the past 20 years, more than 1,000 ships have been added to the Russian merchant marine, while in the same period our shipping fleet has contracted by about 1,000 vessels . . . 58 percent of the ships in the U.S. Navy are at least 20 years of age and less than one percent of the Soviet Navy's surface combatant ships and submarines are 20 years old or older.

While the Russians have been putting together a formidable merchant marine and naval force, which in the words of the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, represents a "threat to the United States' supremacy at sea," those responsible for our maritime policy have seemingly been oblivious to all that has been taking place.

There have, in the past four years, been those in high Government posts who have regularly downgraded the aggressive, steadily expanding, buildup of Russian strength on the oceans. There have been those, in high places, who have invoked the hallucination that the United States—and the Free World—have nothing to fear from the Russians on the high seas. They have derided the supposition that the Soviets have any ulterior motives of using sea power to enhance foreign policy objectives or to support psychological, political and economic warfare.

Last September, here on the West Coast, in Seattle, President Nixon deplored, in his words, this "shocking de-emphasis on our national maritime efforts" and added "if we permit this decay to continue we will find that we have abdicated our maritime position to none other than the Soviet Union." In that same statement, he also had this to say:

"To overcome the present maritime crises, I recognize that we have an opportunity and an obligation to reverse the gross deficiencies that have marked the present (Johnson) administration's performance in this field.

" . . . the leadership for national policy can and will come from a new Administration."

Compared with the litany of the Johnson years, these are refreshing words. They would seem to constitute a more favorable prospect for a more constructive and comprehensive approach to the nation's maritime and naval shipbuilding needs than has heretofore prevailed.

These needs, I have emphasized from the standpoint of programs coming within the purview of the Nixon Administration. But, there are other non-government requirements for ships which could quickly multiply. For example, the discovery of oil on the

North Slope of Alaska will require a means of waterborne transportation not only to move equipment and supplies to Alaska but to haul crude oil from Alaska to West Coast or East Coast refineries. This could involve barges as well as tankers. Estimates range to as many as 50 large size oceangoing tankers to service this new oil field. Some of these could no doubt be built on the West Coast, and many, once in operation, would surely be repaired and overhauled by shipyards represented in the membership of the Western Shipbuilding Association. And, this activity could portend a revival of many coastal and intercoastal trades and a restructuring of traditional patterns in the movement of oil.

By any scale of measurement, the prospective work volume from governmental as well as commercial sources could well place U.S. shipbuilding on the brink of unprecedented growth. Translation of President Nixon's objectives into action programs could result in the greatest peacetime shipbuilding effort under Federal auspices the nation has ever seen, presenting vast new challenges for our shipyards. It could shape an entirely new environment for the procurement of ships in which manpower, facilities and productivity will be crucial in the cost equation.

Fortunately, every major shipyard in the United States is "gearing up" for this prospect. Through management skills, capital improvements, new techniques and cost reductions, a significant renaissance in U.S. shipbuilding is taking place. It holds great promise for the future in terms of work stability, employment for craftsmen and shipyard profits, and more dramatically, as an expression of declared national intention that the aspirations of free men and women everywhere will not be subjugated de facto through Soviet expansionism on the seas.

THE ABOLITION OF SLAVERY IN PUERTO RICO

HON. JORGE L. CORDOVA

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. CORDOVA. Mr. Speaker, the 22d day of March 1873, was one of jubilant celebration in Puerto Rico, then a colony of Spain. On that day—after decades of tireless efforts on the part of Puerto Rican patriots such as Dr. Ramón Emeterio Betances, lawyer Segundo Ruiz Belvis, and newspaperman Julio Vizcarrondo Coronado, who had the valuable cooperation of his American wife Harriet Brewster—the abolition of slavery was proclaimed, and some 29,000 human beings were freed from their pitiful condition of servitude. In San Juan, the capital city, and other island towns, people rejoiced in parks, streets, market places, and churches, with since demonstrations that lasted well into the evening.

There was good reason to be happy. The institution of slavery, which dated back to July 22, 1513, when it was made legal by royal decree of King Ferdinand, was only adopted as an urgent measure to provide a working force in a rapidly sinking economy, but along the years it had become truly repugnant to the Puerto Ricans.

By the middle of the 19th century there was already a general feeling against the inhuman practice which

made some men the property of others, and a secret abolitionist society was organized to buy and liberate the newly born children of slaves at \$25 each. This was followed by proposals submitted to the Spanish Cortes for the elimination of slavery, with or without any indemnity.

In a rapidly changing society, Puerto Rico was anxious to follow the liberal currents born of the French Revolution a few decades before; but what really triggered some positive action was the Emancipation Proclamation, signed January 1, 1863, by the martyred President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln.

Puerto Rican leaders met in Madrid and talked to ministers, legislators, newspapermen, lectured in literary clubs, moved public opinion in every possible way to no avail. They were praised for their efforts, but officialdom was slow to move.

It took the military coup which de-throned Queen Isabella in 1869, and the proclamation of the Spanish Republic in February 11, 1873, to change apathy into action, and turn indifference into sympathy. The new National Assembly of Spain finally passed, by an almost unanimous vote, the Abolition Act of which all Puerto Ricans are justly proud.

On March 30, 1873, a solemn high Mass was held at the San Juan Cathedral, and in a balcony speech delivered to the crowd in front of the Fortaleza—Governor's mansion—Governor Martinez Plowes said:

This date will be engraved on our hearts with love and gratitude . . . to celebrate the moment when . . . Puerto Rico entered fully into Christian civilization.

BIG SKY VISTA REFLECTS "CAVEAT EMPTOR"

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker—

We must make sure that every family in America lives in a home of dignity and a neighborhood of pride and a community of opportunity and a city of promise and hope.

These words of President Johnson should instill hope, should foster confidence, and should encourage determination in the people across this land seeking to own or at least rent suitable and adequate living quarters. But there is a small community in my State of Montana where hope, confidence, and determination have all but dwindled. These people have run headlong into the quicksand of bureaucratic ineptness. It is time that their story is told so that others may not follow this bleak trail. Especially must it be told to my colleagues so that when I ask your help, you will be aware of the magnitude of this tragedy.

Some six families purchased homes in a subdivision called Big Sky Vista near Vaughn, Mont., in the spring of 1965. This was subsequent to the great Sun River floods of 1964, when this area was

inundated. Because of the emergency prevailing then they were eligible for Small Business Administration loans. The Federal Housing Administration inspected the houses. The FHA reported that the houses and the "life-systems" of the homes were adequate. Subsequently, the sewers, foundations, and the house structures have deteriorated to such an extent that it is questionable whether the occupants should remain in the development.

Where do these people go for help? First they approached the FHA and the SBA people. Both agencies absolved themselves of responsibility and extended their regrets. For the past several months, I have worked with Senators MANSFIELD and METCALF in an attempt to help these people. We, too, have been rebuffed by a bureaucratic brick wall. But we are determined to achieve justice, and I do not admit defeat in presenting this expose, as I mentioned previously this story must be told so that others will not walk into the same pitfalls.

Unless one of these two agencies—the Federal Housing Administration or the Small Business Administration—assumes responsibility, it is my intention to direct these homeowners to legal recourse. The demon of "Caveat Emptor"—"Buyer Beware" does not belong in this day. It cannot be tolerated, particularly not in a transaction involving a citizen and his government. The commercial codes of most States have placed the burden on the seller who is more knowledgeable about his product. The seller's "puffing" cannot be the buyer's deflation. I sincerely hope that the FHA, especially, will exercise more discretion in the future when evaluating housing projects, and that it will accept its responsibility when tragedies like Big Sky Vista happen.

#### A POLITICAL ERA DIES

### HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, last week in New Orleans a political era died. Judge Leander H. Perez, Sr., long recognized as one of the most brilliant political leaders in this Nation, passed to his eternal rewards. At the time of his death I issued the following statement:

#### STATEMENT BY HÉBERT

U.S. Representative F. Edw. Hébert, who is recuperating from eye surgery at Hotel Dieu, issued the following statement upon learning of the death of Judge Leander Perez: "Another great American now belongs to the ages. For over 30 years Judge Perez has been my political and personal friend. It has been an association of which I have been proud and never hesitated to boast. He was a man in whom there was unlimited determination and a fiery tenacity for the things in which he believed. He asked no quarter and gave no quarter. Even those who did not understand him were compelled to respect him. I was one of those privileged to have known his many sides and facets. No matter by what name he was called or how he was described by either enemy or friend,

he loved the people who loved him and they did love him. He brought into a community a loyalty and a devotion, a duty and a service that is seldom found anywhere.

He leaves many monuments and he leaves a memory of a man who contributed to his community and built it up into a great family. He hands the torch to two sons in whom he was justly proud. The memory of Judge Perez must be a fuel that keeps that torch lighted and I am sure his people will renew their determination to continue his work which he outlined for them and to carry out his plans which he had for Plaquemines Parish.

He was the most model family man I have ever known, a devoted husband, a tender father and an enthusiastic grandfather. There is no doubt that the death of Mrs. Perez left a void in his life which has never and could never be filled.

There were those who did not agree with him but there were none who denied his capacity and ability. There were those who fought him but there were none who did not respect the valor of his shield. There were those who attempted to thwart him in what he believed to be right but there were none to whom he ever surrendered.

I consider his loss indeed a most personal loss for I have lost one of the dearest and best friends I ever had.

Not only I, but everyone, friend and foe, will miss him. As I so often said in his lifetime and again say on his death, he was the "noblest Roman of them all."

For a more graphic and vivid description of Judge Perez and his eventful life, I urge you to read the following article written by Clarence Doucet, one of the New Orleans Times-Picayune's promising young writers who, in this piece, has done a serviceable job and has captured the tone of the moment:

LEANDER PEREZ RETURNS TO WIFE'S SIDE AT IDLEWILD: CASKET BROUGHT TO FINAL RESTING PLACE

(By Clarence Doucet)

Leander H. Perez Sr. returned to Idlewild Friday to the side of his wife.

There, amid surroundings reminiscent of the gracious plantation life of the Old South, his rose-covered casket was brought to its final resting place in the family mausoleum.

Several hundred friends and associates lined the 150-foot stone walk leading from the Perez home to the mausoleum as the final prayers for the dead were recited by a Catholic priest, and as holy water and incense were sprinkled on the casket.

A fiery advocate of segregation and states rights and the political chieftain of Plaquemines Parish for nearly half a century, the 77-year-old Perez died of a heart attack Wednesday night, a few days after having been released from a hospital after suffering another heart attack earlier this year.

#### RELIGIOUS RITES

The services at Idlewild, the Perez family ranch located about three miles below Belle Chasse, were preceded by religious services in the Holy Name of Jesus Church on the Loyola University campus.

Although he was excommunicated from the Catholic Church in the early 1960s because of his vocal opposition to the integration of Catholic schools, it was disclosed Thursday that some 18 months ago Mr. Perez had reached a reconciliation with the church and that he had been receiving the sacraments since that reconciliation.

Holy Name of Jesus Church, with a seating capacity of nearly 1,000, was packed to overflowing with family, friends, political dignitaries, and a handful of curious.

Among the dignitaries paying their last respects were former Gov. George C. Wallace of Alabama; Gov. John Bell Williams of Missis-

sippi; Gov. John J. McKeithen of Louisiana, U.S. Sen. James O. Eastland, D-Miss.; Louisiana Lt. Gov. C. C. "Taddy" Aycock; Associate Justice Tom Brady of the Mississippi Supreme Court; Louisiana Appeals Court Judge Louis Yarrut; former Louisiana adjutant general Raymond F. Huff; scores of state representatives and senators and virtually every public official from both Plaquemines and St. Bernard parishes.

Gov. McKeithen was not at the funeral home, the House of Bultman, or at the church, but he did attend the services at Idlewild.

#### OTHERS PRESENT

But it was not dignitaries alone who filled the church. College students, many carrying books, could be seen among the hundreds of persons paying their last respects, and one taxicab driver, after dropping off his fare (who was attending the funeral Mass) said that he, too, was going to church. He locked the doors of the taxicab and made his way inside.

The funeral procession from the House of Bultman to the church was composed of more than 200 automobiles that followed the black hearse which carried the silver casket along St. Charles Ave.

At the funeral home, a group of children from the Prytanía Private School entered in procession carrying a heart-shaped flower display of red and white carnations.

A short set of prayers was recited there before the casket was closed and the covering of roses placed over it.

St. Bernard Parish motorcycles led the police escort from the House of Bultman to the church. They were followed by motorcycles from the city and state police.

The casket was rolled to the steps of the church, and there the grandchildren of Mr. Perez took their places on each side to serve as pallbearers.

#### WALKING BEHIND CASKET

Walking directly behind the casket were Mr. Perez' two sons, Leander H. Perez Jr., the district attorney of Plaquemines and St. Bernard parishes, and Chalin O. Perez, who took over as president of the Plaquemines Commission Council when his father stepped down, and his two daughters, Mrs. J. Douglas Eustis and Mrs. Richard J. Carrere.

Former Gov. Wallace, for whom Mr. Perez had campaigned in his race for the presidency last year, followed them into church with a contingent of other Alabamians.

Celebrant of the Mass was the Rev. Peter Boerding of St. Thomas Church in Pointe à la Hache. He was assisted by the Rev. Stanley Goote of Our Lady of Perpetual Help Church in Belle Chasse. Both priests also officiated at the services at Idlewild.

The casket was carried to the front of the church with three lighted candles on each side and a crucifix on a stand behind it.

"We humbly pray," said Father Boerding as the services began, "You . . . do not hand him over to the powers of evil but command his soul to be taken up by the Holy Angels."

Preceding the Mass Father Boerding recited the traditional prayers before the casket.

#### READS FROM JOHN

During the Gospel, he read from John who tells of Martha's conversation with Jesus, whom Jesus told: "He who believes in Me, even if he die, will come to Me."

Frequently during the Mass, Father Boerding intoned: "Hear us, Oh Lord . . . answer our prayers for Leander," and "O, Lord, listen to our prayers for Leander."

At the Offertory, he asked God to "deliver the souls of the departed from the pains of hell," and later added, "O Lord, be merciful and grant them eternal rest."

The funeral Mass was concluded at approximately 11 a.m., and by 11:05 a.m. the church bells were rung, signifying that the body was leaving the church.

The procession arrived at Idlewild shortly before 11:30 a.m., and again the casket was removed from the hearse and carried to the brick mausoleum.

**VIRTUAL SILENCE**

Except for the rustle of leaves, caused as the hundreds of friends followed the procession to the mausoleum, walking alongside the stone path, there was virtual silence.

Father Boerding, sprinkling the casket with holy water, said of Mr. Perez: "God has taken him to Himself from the trials of this world," and he again prayed that God would not punish the deceased for his deeds, but, rather, "make him a companion of Your saints," and "grant to him everlasting rest and happiness."

He then led the mourners in the Lord's Prayer and the Hail Mary for Mr. Perez, and these prayers were then recited again for those persons who will die in the future.

The simple ceremony concluded, the casket was then moved into the brick mausoleum and placed in the open crypt alongside the crypt in which rests the body of Mrs. Perez.

**BUILT MAUSOLEUM**

Mr. Perez built the mausoleum only a few months after the death of his wife in 1967. He confided to friends that her burial place was "too far away from home."

It sits amid a grove of giant live oak trees draped with Spanish moss. Two magnolias grace the front of the mausoleum, and four white columns adorn the facility built in an architectural style that complements the rambling red brick Perez home.

A close friend of the late Mr. Perez said a day seldom passed after the body of Mrs. Perez was placed in the mausoleum that "The Judge," as he was known to his many associates, did not visit the serene resting place of his wife, and upon leaving show visible signs of his bereavement.

Near the mausoleum is the white frame building in which Mr. and Mrs. Perez spent their weekends over several years prior to the construction of the Greater New Orleans Mississippi River Bridge. It was after the bridge was constructed that Mr. Perez built the impressive home he called Idlewild.

His close friend said the serenity of the spacious Perez ranch was a great joy to both Mr. Perez and his wife.

And it is there, in the land they both loved so well, that they are again by each other's side.

In life Mr. Perez had many admirers and many detractors, but in death, as the priest reminded, it is God alone who passes judgment on man regarding his eternal life.

**"OF MINING, AND RUGGED INDIVIDUALS"**

**HON. WALTER S. BARING**

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, being the Representative from Nevada, my colleagues quickly can associate with the Nevada names of Reno, Las Vegas, and Lake Tahoe and a few other cities where citizens of our country have visited to vacation, hunt, gamble, ski, or soak up some good old Western sunshine.

But there are other names in Nevada that are not known perhaps as well to Americans and those are the old cattle and mining towns that formed the basis for the State of Nevada and first put her on the Union map.

The names of those towns are included, for the most part, in a book that a very good friend of mine sent me a few days ago. My friend, Don Emigh, of St. Louis, Mo., must have known how much I would enjoy the book, "Mining Camp Days," by Emil W. Billeb, who lived and participated in our Western life as it was known back in the mining days of Nevada and parts of eastern California. One very real reason I have enjoyed the book is that I am from one of the mining camps that Mr. Billeb writes about, Goldfield, Nev., where I was born and lived until I was 5.

Mr. Billeb's yarns and collection of photos perfectly portray life and the ruggedness required by the men and women of those days to exist and succeed.

Mr. Billeb narrates the book and stories he lived and heard. One such story depicts that our early days miners had time for a bit of "horseplay" too. Mr. Billeb writes "An Unhappy 'Corpse'":

There was one old character who had developed a great liking for hard liquor and in his later years was under the weather quite a bit of the time. Once after a spree he was found lying in the sagebrush and some of the town's gentlemen decided to try to teach him a lesson and perhaps get him on the water wagon.

From a dry goods store they obtained a large packing box and took it over to the drunk's resting place. As the box was too short to cover him, they knocked out one end and placed it over him with his feet sticking out.

When he started to move and mumble in the box, the group gathered around and conducted a funeral service. Some commented how sad they were at the passing of the deceased. They all ignored the fact that by now the victim was pounding on the box and shouting, I ain't dead! I ain't dead! The services concluded with dropping earth on the box and intoning, Ashes to ashes, dust to dust. . . . Then the mourners departed and adjourned to a nearby store.

It was some time before the deceased came sufficiently to life to crawl out of the open end of the box. Excited and sobered, he came to the store wanting to know who was responsible. He was referred to a paper posted in the store window announcing his demise and the sale of his possessions at public auction the following day. He assured everyone that he was very much alive and that there would be no sale of his belongings. He remained on the water wagon for some time after this experience.

**SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS FOR MINERS AFFLICTED WITH BLACK LUNG DISEASE**

**HON. JAMES KEE**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, during recent weeks, considerable publicity has been given to an occupational disease of coal miners which has become a substantially increasing problem, resulting from the development of new and more efficient mining machinery. This dread disease, which is known technically as pneumoconiosis, or more popularly known as black

lung disease, is afflicting more and more coal miners as more powerful and efficient mechanized equipment is being used in the operation of the Nation's coal mines. The fact is that this new and improved type of equipment, in addition to producing more coal per man-hour, also produces coal dust for our coal miners to breathe. This coal dust is inhaled by our underground coal miners and develops within their bodies a lifelong and fatal affliction.

Many of our patriotic underground coal miners who have come down with black lung disease have been determined to be disabled under the social security disability insurance program. The cash benefits that they receive help them to some extent in meeting their living expenses. However, these cash benefits are entirely inadequate for those afflicted to meet their medical care needs which, in so many cases, include the use of a continuing supply of oxygen at costs ranging up to \$200 or more per afflicted individual each month.

The legislature of my home State of West Virginia recently enacted an amendment to its Workmen's Compensation Act, providing for compensation for persons afflicted with this disease for the first time. This legislation, so I understand, does not apply to the many hundreds of coal miners who have come down with this disease in the past years and have been no longer able to work and obtain coverage under the State workmen's compensation system. To me, I strongly believe that the most logical place to turn to provide these coal miners with the medical care they so urgently and desperately need is the presently existing medicare program. I am in the process of drafting a logical and workable bill which would extend the existing medicare program to persons, regardless of age, who are eligible for a disability insurance benefit under present law. The purpose of this proposed legislation is to extend medicare benefits to most of the disabled miners who are presently afflicted with black lung disease who are ineligible for any type of medical care under present law and would also supplement the medical care received by miners who will be found qualified under the recently enacted amendments to the West Virginia Workmen's Compensation Act.

In addition to providing medicare benefits to those who qualify for social security disability benefits, another purpose of my proposed bill would also make it easier for persons who are afflicted with black lung disease to receive a social security disability cash benefit regardless of age.

It is proposed to do this by having the provision written into the Social Security Act which will extend the same treatment to victims, regardless of age, of pneumoconiosis, as blind persons now receive under the law. Under this amendment, these persons would benefit in two ways in receiving a disability determination, just as the blind are now eligible under present law.

First, the physical tests of disability would be met without the need for any additional medical evidence once a per-

son is determined to have pneumoconiosis, which would be defined in the legislation.

Second, my legislative proposal would provide that any person, age 55 and over, afflicted with pneumoconiosis, shall be entitled to a disability insurance benefit if he is unable to engage in his usual occupation—that is, if he is unable to work as a coal miner—regardless of his ability to engage in some other occupation.

It is my firm belief that these amendments, as a whole, will be a tremendous help in providing more of our coal miners who are afflicted with this dreaded black lung disease with financial and medical assistance that they so rightfully and desperately deserve and are not now receiving. These amendments will not take care of all of the problems facing these miners and their families and because of this fact, I am in the process of drafting additional legislation to complement these social security amendments.

With favorable approval by the Congress, these proposed amendments will provide significant and substantial support which is so richly deserved by our coal miners who are now denied these justly due benefits.

As a nation, we have an obligation to these dedicated workers and, as such, we can do no less than to provide these essential benefits.

In conclusion, I would like to point out that much of the philosophy behind my proposed legislation emanates from W. A. Boyle, president of the United Mine Workers of America, who has long urged that legislative action be taken to aid these forgotten and neglected victims of black lung disease.

#### AMENDING RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

**HON. RICHARD FULTON**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, major steps are being taken by the Congress and the administration to help curb inflation.

Last year a 10-percent surcharge on personal and corporate income taxes was made in an effort to halt inflation. The Congress has now been asked to extend that surcharge.

Vital programs are being held to a minimum in funds—again in an effort to fight inflation.

While we are seeking ways to curb inflation, we must also be concerned about those who must live on fixed salaries or fixed retirement incomes.

They have watched their dollars shrink in purchasing power.

For those who are retired, their earning years are all but over.

One group of retired persons who have been consistently overlooked are those receiving benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act, and particularly the widows of retired railroad workers.

Under present law a widow receives

approximately 80 percent of her husband's annuity and loses her spouse's benefits. This amount is but a few dollars more than one-half of the joint amount they received prior to his death. This amount fails to meet the needs of the widow.

The loss of one person does not cut living expenses in half. Many overhead costs, such as property taxes, remain the same regardless of the number of persons.

It has been my feeling that the man and wife were partners and jointly earned the family income, and jointly contributed to the family retirement plan.

In far too many cases the widow, trying to survive on the reduced railroad retirement benefits must seek public welfare assistance to have the bare necessities of life.

In 1967 a 7-percent increase was granted to those under the Railroad Retirement Act. This was the first increase since 1959. Some of the widows received this increase a year ago under the social security increase, and as a result in some States, the public welfare was reduced by the same amount. As a result, they received no increase in benefits at all. Others, who tried to supplement their income by working under social security, likewise had their benefits reduced.

Because of this inequity, I have introduced legislation which would change the Railroad Retirement Act. Under this legislation, provisions would be made so that the surviving spouse of a deceased principal beneficiary under the Railroad Retirement Act would receive the same amount of basic retirement benefits that he or she would draw at the time of the spouse's death, but in no case less than \$104 a month. In addition, the surviving spouse would also be granted any increase in benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act which may be made effective at any time following the death of the principal beneficiary.

My concern is not only for retired railroad employees, but also for those who are currently employed on our Nation's railroads.

I have reintroduced legislation designed to promote employee and traveler safety on our railroads.

This legislation is designed to promote railway safety through the reduction of consecutive hours which certain operating employees may remain on duty. That maximum is now 16 hours and this legislation would make the maximum 12 hours.

Essentially this legislation would lower the hours of continuous service which certain operating railway personnel would be permitted or required to undertake.

It makes it unlawful for any common carrier, its agents, or officers subject to the act to require or permit an employee to continue on duty or go on duty when he has not had at least 8 consecutive hours off duty during the preceding 24 hours.

Other provisions of the bill deal with computation of rest periods, intrastate crews working on interstate carrier tracks, crews of wreck and/or relief trains and for violations.

#### COMMUNICATION ON CAMPUS DISORDERS

**HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received from a constituent, who has a daughter attending the Pennsylvania State University, a letter that President Eric A. Walker sent to all parents concerning the "almost" disorders at the university. The letter is a good example of a university meeting its responsibilities to the public, the parents, and the students, in this age when irresponsibility seems to be on the upswing. We have heard a good deal about the "lack of communication"; I think President Walker's approach is the kind of communication all college presidents should be engaged in.

President Walker's letter establishes the proper response to those who would attempt to disrupt the education of students at Pennsylvania State. The president was not bullied, nor did he panic, when a so-called "reform group" attempted to tell the university how to run an educational institution. Instead, he responded with dignity, firmness, fairness, and with dispatch, and a potentially explosive situation was averted.

President Walker obtained an injunction against an illegal use of the university. That action, followed up with the establishment of a "special judiciary board to hear staff charges and evidence against students who destroy university property, unreasonably disturb or interfere with the orderly conduct of the university, or advocate active disruption or violence," put those who would tamper with the educational processes at Pennsylvania State University on notice that such tampering would not be tolerated.

President Walker, in writing to the parents, included the text of the statement made by the Honorable A. H. Lipez, judge of the Centre County court, upon the issuance of the injunction. The judge's remarks bear close reading and I would like to have both President Walker's letter and Judge Lipez' statements appear in the RECORD following my comments:

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY,  
University Park, Pa., March 14, 1969.

To Parents of Penn State Undergraduate Students: I am sure you, as parents of a Penn State student, are concerned over reports of potentially disruptive activities at the University Park campus of the University. I share your concern, and through this letter I would like to comment on the situation.

Since the beginning of Winter Term, the University Park campus has been faced with many difficult problems in relating with and communicating with some of the students. I will not detail each situation, but will state simply that the problems have been related to three occurrences—a list of demands presented to me by the black Frederick Douglass Association; the publication of an "underground" newspaper, known as the *Water Tunnel*; and a list of nine "non-negotiable" demands presented to me by a non-chartered group calling itself the "Steer-

ing Committee to Reform the University." It was over these latter nine demands that a sit-in resulted in Old Main on February 24, 1969.

On February 17, a letter containing the aforementioned list of nine demands was delivered to my secretary while I was out of the office. The letter stated that the demands were "non-negotiable" and that I had until Monday, February 24 to respond. Since the letter did not contain student names, and since the Steering Committee to Reform the University is not a chartered student organization with known officers, I responded to the demands by a general press release. That release was printed in the *Centre Daily Times* on Saturday, February 22, 1969. The *Daily Collegian* reports my statement was read at a Students for a Democratic Society rally in the Student Union, Saturday, February 22. I stated that to respond to demands which were termed "non-negotiable" would be in direct conflict with the very spirit of the academic community.

At approximately 3 p.m. Monday, February 24, a group of several hundred students entered the main lobby and balcony area of Old Main and determined they would remain there after the normal closing hours for the building and until such time that police came to request them to leave. Members of the administrative staff read the press release described above, and told the students that the building closed at 5:15 p.m. They were advised to leave the building by 5:15 p.m. and that if they did not, legal action would be taken. None of these warnings were heeded and the University sought a court injunction prohibiting occupation of the building.

At approximately 9:45 p.m. a temporary injunction from the Centre County Court was served by the County Sheriff. However, before the injunction was served, a larger group of students, estimated in excess of 1,000, gathered outside Old Main threatening to remove those inside. Concerned student leaders, staff members, and faculty talked to and calmed both groups and physical injury and violence was avoided, except that one student reporter was struck by a thrown object and injured on the cheek. The students inside Old Main left the building peacefully by 10 p.m. after the injunction was served and the students outside opened a path for them to leave.

I am most concerned that a situation similar to this, which has the potential for severe disruption and violence, does not again occur on this campus. To help assure this, the University obtained a continuance of the injunction at a hearing held on Friday, February 28, in Centre County Court. I think you should be aware of the continuance, and I am including a copy of the remarks of Judge A. H. Lipez, when he announced the decision of the Court.

I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of our students and you, their parents, support the University administration in its determination that no class shall be interrupted, nor action tolerated that threatens others, or interferes with the educational programs of the University. I can assure you, too, that a majority of the University faculty feels a similar obligation. This is reflected in the action of the University Faculty Senate which adopted the following temporary resolution at its meeting March 3, 1969:

"Recognizing that some changes in university procedures and policies are necessary, the senate endorses the constructive resolution of problems through free discussion among all groups in the academic community, and rejects the ideas of ultimata or arbitrary action as a solution to campus problems.

"The senate supports maintenance of the

CXV—506—Part 6

inviolability of the educational process and the right of students to continue their access to class and to academic instruction uninterrupted.

"Further, the senate supports the exercise of legal action to prevent personal injury or the destruction of private or public property by any groups or individuals."

Many others have expressed their support for our efforts. Letters from parents, faculty, alumni, and others carry similar messages.

I am confident that The Pennsylvania State University, through the joint efforts of responsible students, faculty, administrators, parents, and other interested and concerned parties, will continue to meet its educational responsibilities to your sons and daughters. However, we must face the real possibility that there are some within the University who would disrupt its normal functions. To assure that we are able to continue to fulfill our responsibilities, I have established a Special Judiciary Board to hear staff charges and evidence against students who destroy University property, unreasonably disturb or interfere with the orderly conduct of the University, or advocate active disruption or violence. This is a temporary Board which will make disciplinary recommendations to me regarding individuals found guilty or responsible for such acts. Disruptive activity is regarded as a serious matter which can result in dismissal of a student.

I hope that all parents accept this letter in the spirit in which it was written—a communication to parents to keep them informed.

Sincerely yours,

ERIC A. WALKER,  
President.

STATEMENT OF JUDGE A. H. LIPEZ IN CENTRE COUNTY COURT, FEBRUARY 28, 1969

The evidence here indicates that more than 250 students entered Old Main on the afternoon of February 24 and refused all requests to leave until after the service of the injunction around 10:00 p.m. The requests were met with jeers, obscenity, as well as threats. It is apparent also that had not the injunction been issued, the defendants would have continued to occupy this administration building which would have materially interfered with the proper administration of this large University having some 7,000 employees and approximately 25,000 resident students.

We have no doubt that some of you, at least, in so occupying Old Main, were carried away by the belief in your cause. Some of you may even have believed you had the right to take possession of Old Main in this manner and in effect hold it as hostage to enforce your demands. Let me tell you at the outset that no matter how pure your motives, or laudable your objectives, your actions were unlawful and the law does not countenance illegal acts.

Perhaps what was done here was inspired by similar actions at other universities and colleges, and perhaps some of these institutions felt compelled to make some accommodation notwithstanding the coercive methods used. The plaintiff here, The Pennsylvania State University, properly under the evidence, decided not to submit to what amounted to a seizure of its property and hence brought this action before us.

The law is clear. No one—students or others—has the right, forcibly or otherwise, to take possession of the property of an educational institution and thereby interfere—actually or potentially—with its right to carry on its activities. Anyone doing so is subject to the injunctive process of the equity court.

You—the defendants—have rights. You have the right to meet peaceably in mass

meetings on the campus in proper places—you have the right to organized demonstrations and protest meetings—you have the right to petition the University officials to redress your grievances. All these are recognized under the First Amendment of the Constitution and there is nothing to indicate that the University sought to deny these to you. But the University—its officials—and all the other students—have rights too, and you cannot act in a manner as to interfere with their rights. The moment large numbers of you went into Old Main for the purpose of remaining there until your demands were met, and certainly after you were requested to leave—from that moment, you were trampling on the rights of the University—your actions then became illegal.

We have long prided ourselves on having a government under a rule of law—a system that has made possible human achievement unmatched by any other nation. Implicit therein is the belief and the understanding that there is a duty to obey the law. Only by doing so are we able to have an ordered society and a government which protects the rights of all of us. Where we believe government is wrong, our Bill of Rights allows dissent and disagreement, but in peaceable and orderly ways. Experience has shown that lawless protests breed lawless counter protests as in fact happened here. The power of a mob today for noble and constructive ends may tomorrow be for ignoble and destructive purposes. No government can submit to mob rule and survive. Nor can any educational institution.

EARTHQUAKES

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago today a catastrophic earthquake shattered southcentral Alaska.

As the earth twisted and rolled, huge landslides sheared away. Tidal waves, generated by undersea slides, sent walls of water smashing into coastal communities, carrying away people, boats, and buildings.

What later came to be known as Alaska's "Good Friday Earthquake" registered 8.5 on the Richter scale.

One hundred and fourteen persons lost their lives, \$300 million in property was destroyed, and the State's economy suffered a crippling blow.

Hundreds of homes and other buildings were shattered. Water mains and sewerlines burst. Great cracks in the earth slashed across highways and railroad lines and bridges collapsed. Airfields, so important in Alaska with its limited system of roads, were temporarily rendered useless. Telephone and powerlines snapped as the earth rocked.

Considering the massive destruction, it was surprising that the death toll was not higher. This was due to a number of fortuitous circumstances. Southcentral Alaska is relatively sparsely populated. The earthquake took place in the early evening of a holiday when schools and most offices were empty. The weather was mild for that time of year and the sea was at low tide.

Geologists tell us that should an earthquake of such magnitude and duration as the 1964 Alaskan earthquake take place in a densely populated region, it might easily cause thousands of deaths and billions of dollars in damage.

Help was not long in coming to Alaska. While the earth still rocked, the military—itsself badly hurt—moved magnificently to aid the stunned civilian population. The President speedily declared southcentral Alaska a disaster area opening the door to massive Federal assistance. Messages of encouragement and offers of aid came to us from across the Nation.

In Alaska, the people rose to the crisis with indomitable spirit and fighting courage. They showed a considerable unity of purpose in facing the major problems and a willingness to assist others and a determination to overcome crushing misfortune to start over again.

Although economic patterns have changed in southcentral Alaska because of the earthquake, we have almost recovered from the blow of 5 years ago. Almost. At least one community—the city of Seward—was so badly hurt that it still is fighting for its life. Valdez, which was entirely relocated, looks forward to a bright economic future. In Whittier, Anchorage, Kodiak, Cordova, Seldovia the scars still show but their edges are becoming blurred.

Alaska's earthquake and following tidal waves spurred a series of coordinated Federal-State plans to cope with such hazards in the future.

Tidal wave warning systems have been improved. Possible geological hazards to building and settlement are assuming increasing importance in planning. Earthquakes and crustal movements are being monitored and a variety of techniques are being used to probe deep into the earth to learn its structure and the forces that effect it.

With increased knowledge, techniques may be developed that will prove the basis for an earthquake prediction system that could benefit all earthquake-prone areas of the country, geologists tell us.

#### TIMBER SUPPLY CAN BE INCREASED IMMEDIATELY

**HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, public concern about the impact of lumber and plywood prices on the availability of new homes is being reflected in the Congress. The Banking and Currency Committee is reviewing this vital issue this week. There is reason to believe that this review can lead to immediate improvement in the situation.

The key problem appears to be the supply of standing timber that is available for processing in our western mills. Most of that timber is on the national forests under the careful stewardship of the Forest Service.

The chief of the Forest Service has

testified that "in all forest regions supplies of timber could be substantially increased by such measures as planting, thinning, stand improvement, increased protection against destructive agents, and access road construction."

I am hopeful that the Congress will soon provide the Forest Service with the funds and personnel necessary to accomplish this intensification of management. We should. Besides helping to meet our housing needs, such an investment will result in substantial returns to the Treasury in the form of timber-sale receipts.

While very important, these practices are not the most promising possibility that has come to our attention for increasing availability of Federal timber for home construction. Among other things, the University of California at Berkeley is noted for its outstanding school of forestry and conservation. John A. Zivnuska, the dean of that school, told the Senate last week that there can be an immediate increase in the cut on the Federal forests. This can come with recognition of present wood utilization practices, the use of appropriate units of measurement and the recognition of the increases in timber growth that are achieved under improved forest management.

This increase in the availability of timber would come because of what is technically known as a shortening in rotations—a reduction in the planned time needed to grow a new crop of timber. Dean Zivnuska explained this opportunity in his testimony last week to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. A copy of his explanation is offered herewith for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I bring this matter to the attention of this body at this time because Dean Zivnuska is scheduled to appear before our Committee on Banking and Currency tomorrow, Friday, March 28. Dean Zivnuska's well-qualified technical answers to our timber shortage deserves our careful attention. They offer a real hope for meeting this Nation's needs for construction materials and homes at reasonable prices.

The above-mentioned material follows:

#### PRESENTATION TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, MARCH 21, 1969

My name is John A. Zivnuska. I am Dean of the School of Forestry and Conservation, University of California, Berkeley, but I do not speak for the University in this matter. I appear simply as an individual citizen with 25 years of experience in teaching and research in the economics of forestry. Much of my work has been devoted to the interactions between forest conditions and the forest products industries.

The very sharp rise in lumber and plywood prices which has occurred in the last year is in many respects simply a repetition in accentuated form of an event which has taken place frequently in the past. Essentially this price rise reflects the inability of the lumber and plywood industries to achieve large increases in output over a short period of time in response to sharp increases in demand. This in turn is related to the availability of timber for the mills. Since the industries are highly competitive among both buyers and sellers, the demand increase combined with the inelastic supply response results in a

rapid rise in prices with very little increase in the quantity supplied.

#### HISTORICAL ORIGINS OF THE PRESENT PROBLEM

This kind of relationship can be traced back for more than a century. From 1860 to 1947, the wholesale price index for lumber increased nearly threefold relative to wholesale prices generally. This price increase did not occur as a steady upward trend. Instead, it took place through a series of sharp rises over short periods, typically followed by longer periods of stable or declining prices.

A very pronounced instance of such a period of sharply rising prices with only limited increase in volume supplied took place after the removal of price controls following World War II. The pattern was of serious concern at the time, which was also a period of high demand for housing. In an analysis of supply and demand trends in the lumber industry from 1921 through 1953 which was published in 1955 (John A. Zivnuska, "Supply, Demand and the Lumber Market," *Journal of Forestry* 53 (8): 547-553), I pointed out that lumber production shows "an inelastic response to price in expansion at high levels of prosperity" and that over the years "the supply schedule is becoming more inelastic." The current price experience reflects this pattern.

The bottleneck explaining the persistent pattern of inelastic supply response to high demand levels does not rest in the mills, which typically have had capacity well in excess of actual production. Instead, the limiting factor is the availability of timber adapted to processing under established technology within the operating radius of the established mills.

Historically the production of lumber and plywood has been based on the availability of old-growth timber. Even today, these industries are predominantly based on old-growth, although the utilization of the young-growth stands which have followed the initial cutting has increased rapidly. For three centuries the lumber industry of North America was a migratory industry, following a retreating frontier of virgin forests. Exhaustion of timber in current operating areas led to higher prices, which in turn enabled shifting to new production areas, typically more distant from the main consuming centers.

By World War II, this historical process had largely run its course. In recent years, the forest products industries have been settling down and becoming permanent. Production has been greatly diversified, with lumber and plywood production being increasingly integrated with pulp and paper, wood chemicals, and other products. Some major segments of the forest products industries such as pulp and paper are now based dominantly on young-growth forests, with the geographic center of such production being in the South rather than the West. Lumber and plywood, however, continue in their traditional dependence on old-growth. Thus, as the nation now moves into the final stage of its use of old-growth forests, such production faces major difficulties.

A comparison of the periods just before and shortly after World War II is illustrative of the nature of the problem. In 1940-42, U.S. lumber production averaged 34.6 billion board feet annually. In 1949-51, the index of wholesale lumber prices in constant dollar terms was 53 percent higher than in the earlier period, yet production averaged only 35.8 billion board feet—an increase of only 4 percent in quantity. Even more striking, with the exception of the six southwestern counties of Oregon and the three northwestern counties of California, lumber production in the balance of the nation actually declined by nearly 10 percent in the face of this 53 percent price increase. It was only the very rapid increase of production in this nine county area that enabled the nation to maintain and slightly increase the quantity of

lumber production under conditions of rapidly increasing lumber prices. These nine counties represented the last major block of old-growth timber remaining in private ownership in small- and medium-sized holdings.

#### IMMEDIATE CAUSES OF THE PROBLEM

The current situation of sharply rising prices in lumber and plywood must be interpreted in the light of this historical perspective.

Following the post-World War II building boom and the pronounced rise in prices, lumber prices moved into a prolonged period of relative stability, while plywood prices showed a remarkable downward trend. From 1951 to 1967 the wholesale price index of lumber in constant dollar terms showed a slight decline, averaging 5 or 6 percent lower in the later years than in the earlier years of the period. Softwood plywood prices were cut nearly in half over this period, with the softwood plywood price index in constant dollar terms (1957-59=100) dropping from 134 in 1951 to a low of 75 in June, 1967. Lumber production fluctuated modestly over this period, with a very minor downward trend. In contrast, softwood plywood production in 1967 was three times as high as in 1951. Through the combined effect of these two patterns, the total volume of logs consumed for lumber and plywood consumption was about 8 percent higher in 1967 than in 1951.

By 1967 signs of pressure on the available timber were beginning to appear. This was most evident in the Pacific Northwest, with the immediate cause being the rapidly growing Japanese demand for export logs. This upward trend in the export demand on U.S. timber became evident in 1963, when the volume of log exports to Japan doubled from the level of the preceding years. By 1967 the export volume from the three Pacific Coast states had reached 1.5 billion board feet. While this represents only about 4 percent of the log volume used in lumber production in the same year, two-thirds of the export logs came from the State of Washington, with most of the balance coming from Oregon. Within these heavily affected regions, there was increasingly general concern about the impact of this new source of demand on the price of stumpage and on the availability of logs for some domestic mills.

The log export demand continued its rapid rise in 1968, with a down-turn emerging toward the end of the year. In April, 1968, the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior issued orders restricting the sale of federal timber to the export market from Western Washington and Western Oregon to approximately the 1966 level of exports of logs from federal lands. Last October the Congress acted to make this limitation effective for 1969, 1970, and 1971, extending the area covered by the restriction to the federal lands of the entire Western forest region.

With demand already pressing hard on the upper limits of the range of elastic supply response in lumber and plywood production, 1968 also brought an increase in demand for housing construction. There was also growing recognition that the nation was moving into a new period of high housing demand with promise of greatly expanded levels of home construction—a recognition which was given additional substance by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.

Thus the nation once again moved into a period in which a sharp rise in demand could only bring forth an inelastic supply response in lumber and plywood production, with rapid rises in price and only small increases in quantity of production being the result.

#### REASONS FOR THE INTENSITY OF THE PRICE REACTION

During the seventeen or eighteen years since the last such experience, a number of changes had taken place in the nation's

timber situation, particularly in old-growth timber, most of which have acted to intensify this problem of inelasticity of supply.

The most obvious of these changes in the effect of the additional years of cutting in further reducing the remaining reserves of old-growth timber. By 1963 old-growth sawtimber stands occupied 43 million acres, or approximately 8 percent of the nation's commercial sawtimber area. Two-thirds of this area and a larger proportion of the old-growth volume was concentrated in the Pacific Coast states.

Further, the impact of this cutting has not been uniformly distributed among the various forms of ownership. The cutting was heavily concentrated on small and medium sized private ownerships as long as appreciable volumes of such timber were available. For example, in 1953, approximately 70 percent of the total cut in California came from small and medium private holdings, which represented less than 30 percent of the state's forest area. Such concentrated cutting has largely depleted old-growth in these ownerships, from which the quantity of timber supplied has traditionally been highly responsive to market demand.

Today the federal government is the primary holder of the nation's old-growth timber, with most of the balance being in large industrial ownerships. Such ownerships are characterized by a commitment to sustained-yield forest management. Here it must be recognized that such forest management greatly intensifies the short-run inelasticity of timber supplies. Current cutting decisions are restricted by the need to maintain or develop a distribution of volumes and age-classes of timber such that harvesting can be carried on continuously in the future. "Allowable cut" limits are established on the basis of technical considerations including the nature of the present timber inventory, the length of rotation over which it is planned to grow future crops of timber, the growth potential of the sites, and the intensity of management and degree of reliance on thinnings and other intermediate cuttings considered to be feasible.

With such constraints being established on allowable cutting levels through technical considerations, the responsiveness of current cutting levels to market demands is severely limited. This is particularly the case on the federal forest lands from which the level of cut is determined almost entirely by tightly-enforced allowable cutting limits and the level of appropriations for timber operations. The response in volume of sales offerings to market demand is highly inelastic.

However, the impact of this extreme inelasticity of federal timber supplies has not been felt in full until recent years. Twenty-five years ago, the demand for public timber was relatively limited, since private timber could commonly be obtained under more advantageous conditions. Thus actual cutting levels on the federal forests were far below the allowable cutting limits. As a result, for a number of years following World War II the level of cut from federal lands could be increased in response to rising demands. Today such federal timber sales provide the primary basis for open-market timber operations in the West.

Within recent years, however, the actual cut has reached the allowable cut limits on most operating areas in federal ownership. In short, the situation is now one in which short-run expansion of lumber and plywood production is heavily dependent on federal timber, while established allowable cut standards and operating policies make the short-run supply of such timber almost wholly inelastic. Under such conditions, a price spiral is the inevitable result of any sharp increase in demand. When the quantity

offered is essentially fixed, the full response to the demand increase will be in price.

#### ADDITIONAL FACTORS

Some other aspects of the situation might be noted. In the past small sawmills operating on timber from small holdings have played a significant, though limited, role in the adjustment of production to cyclical shifts in demand. Periods of rising prices have been marked by a rapid increase in the number of such mills, while declining prices have brought an equally rapid closure of such operations. In this regard, the present experience differs from the past. The small mill segment of the industry has not responded to the degree typical in the past. This appears to reflect several factors, including:

(a) Changes in the timber supply, particularly in the availability of timber from small holdings.

(b) Changes in utilization practices in lumber manufacture, with returns from the utilization of mill residues and bark being increasingly essential for profitable operation. Thus the low investment small mill which manufactures only rough-cut lumber is at an increasing disadvantage.

(c) Shortages of low cost labor, which has been basic to such operations in the past. This reflects both good alternate employment opportunities and the effects of minimum wage legislation.

While inelasticity of short-run timber supplies appears to be the primary cause of the inelastic supply response in lumber and plywood which has led to sharply rising prices, there are some short-term factors which intensify the situation. In a basically unstable situation such as the present balance of supply and demand in lumber and plywood, any interruptions or inefficiencies in operations can be expected to have unusually pronounced effects. The repeated problem of freight car shortages which has plagued relationships between the producers and the railroads for many years is one such example. Logging closures because of the severity of the 1967 fire season is another. Severe winter weather has also been adverse to production in some areas, while the timing of full expansion of operations this spring is still to be determined. The recent dock strike has also disrupted supplies at the retail level. However, although such factors can aggravate the situation, they do not appear to be fundamental causes of the problem.

#### THE ROLE OF FEDERAL TIMBER IN MEETING THE PROBLEM

To the extent that this analysis of the causes of the sudden increases in lumber and plywood prices has been correct, any actions taken to improve the situation must be responsive to the forces which have been reviewed. Thus the balance of my presentation will be devoted to a consideration of actions which might be taken to increase lumber and plywood supplies and thus reduce the pressure on prices.

As the preceding analysis has shown, the basic cause rests in the inelastic supply of timber of suitable characteristics to the lumber and plywood mills in the face of a marked rise in demand. Inevitably, attention must be focused on the supply of sawtimber and veneer logs. The small and medium sized private owners who have provided a major element in the flexibility of timber supplies in the past no longer have significant volumes of old-growth timber. The large private owners have already moved in most instances toward the intensification of their forest management programs and appropriate increases in cutting levels. The main opportunity for increases in timber supplies today clearly rests in the federal forest lands, and primarily in the lands administered by the U.S. Forest Service. These lands are the dominant supply source for open-market timber operations to support lumber and

plywood production and they are the only forest lands which can currently sustain major increases in cut without sacrifice of future yields of timber.

Some excerpts from the statement of Mr. E. P. Cliff, Chief of the U.S. Forest Service, before the Subcommittee on Retelling, Distribution, and Marketing Practices of the Select Committee on Small Business, United States Senate, on November 26, 1968, are highly pertinent here:

"On National Forest lands in the Douglas-fir region, for example, preliminary results of a study now underway indicate that the annual allowable cut could be substantially increased gradually over the years. This might be done through an annual program of investing funds to intensify management practices such as commercial thinning, pre-logging, salvage, reforestation, and timber stand improvement. Much of this would depend on an access road system. . . .

"Allowable cuts could be increased by shortening rotations. However, much of such increase from shorter rotations would be derived merely from faster liquidation of the residual old-growth timber accompanied by falloff in levels of annual cut at the end of the rotations. . . .

"The study to date clearly indicates that there are some measures which are essential to support increases in allowable cut. These include better utilization, more thinning, cultural treatments of young growth, reforestation of nonstocked land, better protection, and more complete salvage. The allowable cut on the national forests should be increased, we feel, *only when we earn the right to do so by performing these forest management activities.* (Italic added.)

"... Other studies have been made of investment opportunities on national forests throughout the country. They show that allowable cuts could—in time—be increased by about two-thirds by intensifying timber culture on the more productive portions of national forest commercial timberlands. . . ."

The U.S. Forest Service has long held the position of leadership in forestry in the United States and it continues to be marked by a high level of professional competence. With its responsibilities for managing forest lands for many purposes in addition to timber and for providing timber for future generations as well as for the present, it is naturally and appropriately conservative in its management philosophies.

In the present instance, however, there is a clear opportunity to increase greatly the contribution of the federal forests to meeting the nation's housing needs over the next few years without any sacrifice of future benefits from these lands. Rather than waiting until intensified management practices have "earned the right" to increase allowable cutting levels, there is an opportunity and need to increase the allowable cut in the immediate future with a *simultaneous* intensification of forest management practices. Indeed, the nature of forest management is such that certain of the intensified management practices can be put into effect only through the medium of expanded timber cutting.

Expanded thinnings, salvage cuttings, and pre-harvest cuttings are examples of this, with any substantial progress in this direction being dependent on expanded support for timber sales administration and with full realization of this potential also being dependent on further development of access roads. There is substantial agreement both within and external to the Forest Service as to the desirability of such a program. It is a logical first step toward expansion of the cut of federal timber and should be implemented immediately. However, it must be recognized that this is essentially the "easy" increase in cut which can be achieved—an increase

which involves no re-evaluation of established Forest Service policy and which is more a matter of taking advantage of high prices to cut previously sub-marginal timber than it is a positive program of expanded cutting to meet the nation's critical housing need.

#### THE POLICY ISSUE OF LENGTH OF ROTATION

The really central question is that of the current policy in establishing rotations—the period of years planned for the establishment and growth to merchantable size of new stands of timber on the lands now being brought under management. These rotations serve as a primary constraint on timber management and allowable cut planning. Any decision involving shortening of the rotations would enable immediate increases in the allowable cut from the predominantly old-growth forests managed by the Forest Service. This immediate increase would be derived from a shortening of the period for liquidation of the remaining old-growth timber, as Mr. Cliff has pointed out. However, even if this were the full story, such a policy decision would deserve careful consideration since such a change would in itself help to meet the current housing need and to protect future markets for building materials based on renewable forest resources from inroads by alternate materials which typically come from nonrenewable resources.

However, this is by no means the full story. Current rotations used in setting allowable cutting limits on federal forests are based on utilization practices of the past. They do not reflect current utilization standards, to say nothing of reflecting the utilization standards which must be expected to prevail at the time several decades in the future when these new stands will be utilized. As a consequence, they involve larger future crop trees, lower growth rates, and substantially longer periods than they should to meet the requirements of the future. Neither present markets nor future markets are well served by the present planning standards.

The extent of the falldown in cut which would occur at the end of this first rotation tends to be greatly exaggerated by the reliance on obsolete units of measurement in making the management calculations and by failure to consider the potential of intensified management practices within the context of shortened rotations. The conventional practice of federal agencies is to base such calculations on board foot volumes above some minimum diameter limit such as eleven inches which the trees must reach before being included in the management calculations. Thus these calculations totally ignore the volume in trees less than this minimum diameter limit; additionally ignore all the wood volume in trees above the diameter limit which is in shapes and sizes not adapted to the manufacture of conventional lumber sizes; and do not even recognize that actual sawmill recovery of lumber typically runs higher than the log scale estimate by an appreciable margin, with this percentage overrun tending to be greater for small trees than for large trees. Thus the system is one of partial and biased measurement which wholly fails to reflect current practices and trends in forest utilization. One result of this is to lead to the establishment of rotations substantially longer than those appropriate to maximize the growth of total wood material. A second result is to show a falldown in future cutting levels from shortened rotations which in fact does not apply to the total wood volume available, but only to a limited and peculiarly-measured portion of it. A third and particularly significant result is to hold current cutting levels below those now feasible and appropriate.

If forest volumes were measured in terms of cubic foot volumes of all trees four inches and above in diameter instead of board foot log scale volumes of trees eleven inches and larger in diameter, the calculations would

commonly show little or no falldown in wood availability in the second rotation, and in some instances an actual increase would be shown.

Further, estimates of the cutting level in the second rotation are also dependent on the estimates used of the growth to be achieved by the new stands. Current management planning is commonly based on results actually achieved under the extensive management practices of the past. If allowance is made for the increases in growth which can be achieved by intensified management, shortened rotations would often show little or no falldown in cut even when expressed in the archaic standards of measurement now in use.

While these points may seem excessively technical in nature, they actually reflect broad and fundamental issues in the concepts used in forest management planning. They deserve the most careful analysis and full explanation. The present assumptions, reflecting past practice, clearly constitute the primary block to expanded rates of cutting of federal timber of the sizes and characteristics required for the immediate construction needs of the nation.

#### A POLICY PROPOSAL

Thus the appropriate responses to the current problems of high prices related to shortage of lumber and plywood as well as to the needs of the nation for such materials for the housing program of the next decade appears to be as follows: The Secretary of Agriculture should be requested to submit promptly an analysis of the possibilities for several alternate levels of increase in the allowable cut from the national forests, ranging from increases possible simply through expanded thinnings and salvage cuttings to increases requiring re-examination and reduction of present rotation requirements. Each level of possible increase should be supported by documentation of the increases in funds and personnel required to achieve this level of cut. The analysis should be presented not only in terms of board foot volumes log scale to reflect past practices but also in terms of cubic foot volumes to reflect future utilization potentials.

Immediate increases in cut through intensified thinning and salvage sales obviously need not await this full analysis. With careful study and review of such an analysis, however, appropriate policies could be developed expeditiously so that the federal forests could make their full contribution to the needs of the nation.

Any expansion in the rate of cutting of federal timber will require an increase in funding of Forest Service programs in timber management and timber sales administration. However, the increase in timber sale revenues will more than offset these cost increases. On balance, such a program can represent a contribution to, rather than a net drain on, the Treasury.

In this regard, consideration might well be given to the possibility of funding such an intensification of federal timber management by earmarking a portion of the timber sale receipts for re-appropriation back to the management program. Such a tying of the financing of intensification of the program to the level of sales should increase the responsiveness of the federal timber management program to national needs.

#### OTHER POSSIBLE ACTIONS

(a) Another possible area for action to relieve the domestic demand situation might be through control of log exports. The action taken by the Congress last fall in the foreign aid bill placed exports limits solely on logs cut from federal lands. Further, it tended to freeze the level of such exports for 1969, 1970, and 1971 at established levels rather than to impose a major reduction in such exports. While there are provisions in this legislation

to prevent substitution of logs from federal forests for logs exported from private lands, there is no direct control on exports from private lands or on the total volume of exports. Clearly, any such restriction imposed only on federal timber must be expected to concentrate further increases in export demands on the private timber and thus to be only partially effective.

Only the establishment of an overall quota or flat embargo on export of logs, whether from public or private forests, would be effective in reducing or eliminating this source of pressure on timber supplies. However, neither the effectiveness of such restriction in increasing the quantity of timber supplied at lower prices in the domestic market nor the general economic and political desirability of such restrictions is clear.

The initial expansion into this export market was largely in species and sizes of logs for which no domestic market then existed. Rising Japanese prices brought out additional quantities and a wider range of species and sizes. In the current strong domestic market, the major part of the present export volume would probably be marketable in the U.S., although only at lower prices than in the export market. When U.S. demand justifies a price equal to the export demand, there is no problem in diverting the flow to domestic use. The real question is the extent to which the present export volume would be available at reduced prices.

Furthermore, export trade also contributes to national goals through a favorable influence on the balance of payments problem, while arbitrary disruption of such trade must be expected to lead to reprisals in other areas of trade relationships. Any progress toward meeting an internal problem through such a policy of trade restriction would involve an offsetting adverse effect on external relationships of the nation.

Thus any such intensified restrictions on the log export trade would be at best a negative and inherently undesirable approach to the problem, justifiable only under conditions of extreme economic hardship.

(b) Another approach which might be considered is the expansion of wood imports. Such imports are already of substantial importance in the U.S. market. In 1962, for example, net imports of wood products into the U.S. represented about 14 percent of the nation's total forest products consumption. In fact, the U.S. is today the world's largest importer of forest products. In addition, it ranks fourth among the nations as an exporter of forest products. The imports run heavily to softwood lumber and newsprint paper, with wood pulp, pulpwood, and hardwood plywood and veneer providing most of the remainder. Exports are somewhat more diversified, including softwood lumber, softwood logs, wood pulp, and paper and paperboard products.

A highly significant aspect of the imports is that the softwood lumber, newsprint, and other products with the exception of hardwood plywood and veneer come almost entirely from Canada. The other forest regions of the world have little potential for supplying our construction materials needs in forest products, again with the exception of hardwood plywood and veneer.

Canadian exports of softwood lumber to the U.S. are directly responsive to price levels in the U.S. as compared to price levels in other export markets served by Canada. Rises in U.S. demand are typically met by increases in shipments from Canada. Tariffs on softwood lumber shipments from Canada to the U.S. are low and do not appear to be a significant barrier to such trade flow. Thus there is little opportunity here for federal policies to reduce barriers to such imports.

In the case of softwood plywood, there is a mutual 20 percent tariff between the two nations. Little Canadian plywood comes to the U.S., and U.S. plywood shipments to

Canada have also been limited. The effect of a mutual reduction in this tariff level on the volume and direction of trade flow is difficult to estimate, since in the past Canadian plywood prices have often been higher than U.S. prices. Canadian plywood capacity is limited and any large flow of Canadian plywood to the U.S. would be dependent upon an increase in Canadian capacity as a result of tariff changes.

(c) As noted in the first half of this presentation, various short term problems such as freight car shortages and interruptions of logging by weather conditions have intensified the price effects resulting from the inelasticity of the timber supply for the sawmills and plywood mills. Action has already been taken to increase the availability of freight cars to the producing regions. Similar actions to improve efficiency in other problem areas involving interruptions in production can be helpful. However, while such actions may help to temper price extremes, they cannot be expected to solve the basic problem since they are not responsive to the basic cause.

#### CONCLUSION

To summarize, I believe we must recognize that the current problem of sharp increases in lumber and plywood prices is not a new phenomenon. Instead, it is repetition in particularly intense form of an experience which has been repeated a number of times over the last one hundred years. The basic cause in each such instance has been the inelasticity of the supply of timber of characteristics appropriate to the technology of the period within operating radius of established mill capacity. Changes in the nature of the national timber inventory and the concentration of the remaining old-growth timber in federal ownership largely explains the increasing intensity of the price responses to periods of sharp increases in demand.

While various actions can be and are being taken to reduce the extremes of the current price situation, the only far-reaching opportunity appears to be through intensified management and rapidly expanded cutting levels on the federal forests. While the immediate concern is with the price rises which have been experienced since last summer, the problem and its solution must be viewed in broader terms. Realization of the national goals in housing will require a very rapid increase in home construction over the next two or three years, rising to an average rate much greater than that in prospect for the current year. The real issue is that of providing an adequate supply of building materials to meet this need. The policy appropriate to the federal forests must be reviewed and changed in response to this need.

#### IS THE FCC PUFFING OR BLUFFING?

**HON. ROY A. TAYLOR**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues the editorials from the Asheville Citizen and the Asheville Times concerning the threatened ban of radio and television cigarette advertising:

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Citizen, Feb. 8, 1969]

#### IS THE FCC PUFFING OR BLUFFING?

In threatening a complete ban on radio-television advertising of cigarettes, the Federal Communications Commission is seemingly attempting to usurp a prerogative it

doesn't have—certainly not without the concurrence of Congress.

Harmful or not (and the point has never been established to the satisfaction of many research scientists) cigarettes are a lawful product, sanctioned for sale on the open market. If they "May Be Hazardous To Health" as the wrappers must now proclaim, it is possible they are no more hazardous than automobiles, motorcycles, chain saws, certain types of toothpastes, extra-strength detergents, and various other commercial items that are widely promoted on the air. As long as cigarettes are accepted as safe enough to sell, the advertising of competitive brands, within the limits of truth and decency, should not be restricted.

Congress isn't likely to permit the FCC to carry out its threat, which would amount to bureaucratic suppression. Perhaps the agency realizes that; but the fact that such an edict is contemplated seems to reflect the distorted self-image of power this federal commission has assumed and apparently seeks to exercise.

Not that we advocate the smoking of cigarettes; they MAY well be, as the labels maintain, a potential menace. But so, in this instance, is the FCC.

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Times, Feb. 10, 1969]

#### BANNING CIGARETTE ADS

The Federal Communications Commission, by moving for the prohibition of cigarette advertising on television and radio, is getting into a chancy area. Regulation of the personal habits of the nation by executive decree has little to recommend it and much to look askance at.

In its regulations to date, the FCC has been anything but consistent. There is no advertising of hard liquor on the airwaves, but beer and wine have a free hand and bring in their millions to the networks and the advertising agencies. All are intoxicating, and there is little logic in excluding one form of intoxicant and permitting others.

Further, some medical experts still dispute the claim that cigarettes are a direct cause of lung cancer. Until all controversy has been settled, the FCC is infringing on private rights in seeking to forbid the advertising of cigarettes on the air.

#### FOCUS ON FEDERAL CITY COLLEGE—PART IV

**HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the board of higher education is charged by the Congress with the ultimate responsibility to establish requirements governing programs for Federal City College. The criteria which the board expects the college administration to use, and which the board will apply in determining whether a proposed program of study shall be adopted, are outlined in the following statement by the board of higher education:

STATEMENT BY THE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

On February 4, 1969 the Board of Higher Education gave its tentative approval to a statement entitled "The Purpose of Federal City College," which had been recommended to it by the Interim College Commission, which is composed of elected representatives from College administration, faculty, staff, and students. That statement sought to make

it clear that it has been, and will be, the policy of the Board of Higher Education and the College administration to create and operate a college of excellence in a manner consistent with the hopes of the community and those in Congress who worked to establish in the District of Columbia a publicly supported institution of higher education.

That statement of purpose, it now appears, has not been adequately understood by persons within the College and within the community. This further statement, it is hoped, will correct misunderstandings, and elaborate some of the policies heretofore stated only in more general terms.

1. At the outset the Board wishes to make clear that the Federal City College is already an institution in which the District of Columbia and the Congress can take justifiable pride. Many hundreds of students who would otherwise have had no opportunity to attend college are receiving from many highly competent teachers the higher education to which they are entitled. Several thousand additional students who will graduate from high school next year, or who have already graduated, have applied for admission next September. The College continues to attract faculty candidates of high quality. The funds made available for community programs through the status of the College as a Land Grant institution are already providing needed and welcome community educational programs. That there should have been a lack of understanding of some of the policies of the College and of its proper procedures is unfortunate, but this should not obscure the solid achievements which have occurred, nor the potential of the College for a much greater contribution to the community as it continues to grow. The goal of the Board, and of the College community as a whole, is to direct the College toward becoming the "institution of excellence" to which its students and the communities which it serves are entitled.

The Board is aware that this excellence must in the last analysis depend on the quality of the College's faculty and professional and other staff. The Board is also aware, as set out in its statement of purpose, that the College will constantly be seeking innovative improvements and that there will and should be diversity of opinion within the College community on academic and other issues. The Board's duty under the law to make all appointments thus imposes on it a heavy responsibility. It therefore proposes, on the recommendation of its Personnel Committee, to establish by resolution a procedure that will enable the Board to make decisions on appointments and reappointments with the fullest consideration and the greatest care to see that it acts fairly and with full information at its disposal.

2. The Board of Higher Education is charged by the Congress with the ultimate responsibility "to establish policies, standards, and requirements governing . . . programs, graduation (including the award of degrees) . . . of the Federal City College." This responsibility the Board has up to now, exercised only to the extent of an approval of the general program for the freshman year. As programs for second and later years, and for degrees are recommended by the Administration, the Board will review each of them with such assistance from the College community and other sources as it may need and find appropriate, to ensure that the programs are consistent with the overall policies of the College.

Among the criteria which the Board expects the Administration to use, and which the Board will apply in determining whether a proposed program of study shall be adopted, are the following:

(a) The program must be academically sound, and based on relevant academic standards appropriate to college work.

(b) The program must be designed to meet the needs of a student body that will be largely composed of residents of the District of Columbia.

(c) The program must, of course, be consistent with legal requirements, both those contained in the law creating the College and those required by the Constitution and other laws of the United States.

(d) The program must have a proper relationship to the remaining programs in the College.

The allocation of faculty among the several programs of the College will be determined, of course, as the programs themselves are approved by the Board and by the extent of student interest and value to the community in the several programs and courses involved.

Because Black Studies at the College has apparently been the subject of much of the misunderstanding as to the purpose and policies of the College, a further word on that matter is appropriate.

First, the Board believes it highly appropriate that in Federal City College there be courses of sufficient academic depth and diversity to warrant designation of Black Studies as an appropriate major field of academic credit. While the whole matter of Black Studies is a relatively new and evolving one, the goal of the Board will be to have the best program of Black Studies that is offered anywhere.

Second, no program for a course of study in this field has been presented to the Board and no program has been approved by the Board, tentatively or otherwise.

Third, the Board will apply to the course of study in this field the criteria already stated above. *The Board will not approve a program which is designed to encourage separation between the black and white races, or which would increase rather than seek to eliminate racial antagonism and conflict, or which would encourage or condone violence as a means of resolving issues.*

*Fourth, the course of study leading to a degree with a major in Black Studies will be a program of the College, and neither in form nor in substance a separate school, and will be related to and integrated with the other programs of the College.*

Fifth, the allocation of faculty to the program will, as in all other programs of study, be based on the nature of the program and the extent to which there is student interest and value to the community in the particular courses to be offered.

3. Many colleges and universities with long-standing reputations of academic and administrative excellence are finding new patterns of governance. *Federal City College, as a new institution, has sought also to find patterns of administration and governance that are relevant to the present time.* In general, and with the full approval of the Board, the decision-making procedures have followed the tradition of democratic participation that is desirable in an academic institution which seeks to meet the new challenges of the present.

The Board recognizes, however, that due to misunderstandings, to the state of flux in which a newly-organized institution must operate, to a lack of clearly defined processes of decision or recommendation, and in some instances to a disregard of established procedures, the administrative structure of the College has not always functioned either in accordance with normal processes or effectively and properly.

The Board, consequently, directs that the President, with the advice of the College community, prepare and present to the Board a clear statement of the procedures which are to be established to arrive at recommendations or decisions on all matters of College policy. The Board expects the presentation to be made to the Board no later than April 30, 1969.

4. The Board is aware of the charges recently made that some members of the faculty and staff have not accepted their assigned work load, have failed, without good cause, to meet their classes, or have not performed their work in a manner consistent with professional standards and their assigned responsibilities. The Board believes that to the extent this has occurred, it has been confined to a very small number of persons. Nevertheless, no unprofessional conduct can be condoned.

The Board has instructed the President to make an immediate and thorough investigation of these charges, and to include in his report to the Board not later than April 30, 1969, the procedures which are to be established to ensure that unprofessional conduct on the part of any member of the College community will be promptly and effectively eliminated. *The Board will not approve for reappointment faculty or staff who are unable or unwilling to conduct themselves in a professional manner.*

HAWAII BUILDER E. E. BLACK, "A BULLDOZER WITH A HEART," CELEBRATES HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY

### HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the saga of Hawaii's Everett Earl Black is one of humility and hard work, and has its beginnings in a log cabin in Vigo County, Ind. It is the saga steeped in the American tradition of the crusty fist-wheeling builder who carved an empire out of the wilderness. To many old-time islanders, E. E. Black has become the symbol of the hard-driving force which slashed a wide swath through the rugged terrain of a half century of Hawaiian history, and with a business empire which today encompasses Guam, the Philippines and the trust territories. In a recent interview with the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, just prior to his 80th birthday last week, Mr. Black noted one of his favorite bits of advice to youngsters:

Remember, nobody attains success on a 40-hour week.

It is this driving, almost classic, Eric Hoffer philosophy which has governed Mr. Black's life and business. From the founding in 1930 of the construction company which bears his name to the day he surrendered its presidency to his son in 1962, Mr. Black has always been the first man on the job at 5:30 a.m. and the last to quit.

But his beliefs in community service go far beyond just being a good boss and a good friend. It is best expressed in his "my debt to the community" philosophy:

This community (Honolulu) made possible what I am and what I have today. The only way I know how to pay back my debt is through community service.

His days and energies are now directed in serving as the chairman of the Honolulu Gas Co.'s board of directors, as a director of the First Hawaiian Bank, Health Facilities Planning Council of Hawaii, and the Junior Achievement, and

as the chairman of the Queen's Medical Center's board of trustees. With the latter Mr. Black served as its president for 20 consecutive years, and was responsible for pulling the hospital out of the red.

Mr. Black, who has five grandchildren, was honored last year as Honolulu's "old fashioned" Father of the Year.

This, then, is the saga of Everett Earl Black, one of the leading builders in the Pacific. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii views with pride the many accomplishments of the dean of its construction industry. In order that others may know of the remarkable story of E. E. Black's success, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the informative article by reporter Tomi Knaefer which appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of March 15, 1969:

#### BUILDER E. E. BLACK'S 80 YEARS

(By Tomi Knaefer)

I thought he was a tough old so-and-so. But he isn't. Not a bit.

He is E. E. Black, one of the leading builders in the Pacific, whose very name became a kamaaina symbol of tough-talking, hard-driving success as he slashed a wide swath through the rugged terrain of a half century of Hawaiian history.

The Simon Legree image of Black crumpled—as will any image ill-founded on prejudice—under the weight of truth that revealed itself in an interview with him shortly before his 80th birthday next Friday.

What happened, you might say, was simply a matter of one human being getting to know another human being.

Or, as a long-time associate of Black's put it:

"From a distance, E. E. Black is a bulldozer. See him up close, he's a bulldozer with heart."

#### ORIGIN OF A NICKNAME

Heart, or is it soul, or is it humility that never goes out of style? Whatever it be, it came through during the interview as the essence of Everett Earl Black, known to his friends as "Johnny."

The nickname goes back to the first date he had with Ruth Allene Emens, his wife of 56 years who had promptly dubbed him Johnny Jones.

The cigar-smoking (dozen a day) contractor has been called many more colorful names over the years, but they've left no visible scars.

This is, perhaps, because Black has that rare quality of humor that laughs best at himself.

An oldtimer at the Queen's Medical Center, which Black serves as president for the 20th consecutive year, illustrated that quality often obscured from public view:

"He's tough. He gives in hard, but he does give in if it's for the good of the organization, regardless of how strongly he personally feels about an idea.

"When he makes a mistake, he's the first one to admit it and he'll laugh at himself as loudly as the guy next to him."

#### WIT, COMPASSION, CANDIDNESS

The first hint of the Black humor was in his laugh-splashed response to this reporter's request for a pre-birthday interview.

"You people must be in pretty bad shape to want a story about an old battered-down engineer."

He provoked another round of laughter with a recitation of that old saying: "Fools' names are like their faces; always seen in public places."

Along with his wit, within the essence of Black is a depth of compassion and remarkable candidness.

The crusty contractor, who was born in a log cabin in Vigo County, Ind., formed the company that bears his name in 1930. He served as its president until 1962 when he turned the job over to his son, Robert Emens Black, and has since served as chairman of the board.

At first, Black said, the switch in title didn't keep him from bounding about where the action was, just as always. A classic inner-directed man, he had worked hard since childhood and took pride in the fact that he expected no more of others than he did of himself.

#### GOOD BOSS AND GOOD FRIEND

One worker who was with Black from the start and has since retired recalled how his boss pitched in whatever the job—from lugging cement, picking and shoveling to operating a crane.

Furthermore, said the worker, Black—"a good boss and a good friend"—was always the first man on the job at 5:30 a.m. and the last to quit.

Black said: "It wasn't easy to step aside from active involvement. It was a hard thing to quit from something that took all that work to build up.

"But I knew it was time for me to stay away that day I stopped at one of the projects and asked the men 'what's going on?'"

"They were doing the job completely contrary to our accepted practice.

"The superintendent shook his head. He said that my son Bob, the new president, wanted it done that way.

"This superintendent, who had worked with me for a long time, said: 'I told Bob that if your father ever saw this, I'd be fired.'"

#### DIFFERENT MEN, DIFFERENT IDEAS

Black blew out a huge puff of cigar smoke before continuing:

"I knew right then that I had to quit coming around. People have different ideas. I have mine. Bob has his. And it was his turn to be in charge, without any meddling from me.

"But it wasn't easy to stay away," Black said.

As he paused, the reporter recalled the E. E. Black, Ltd., signs seen over the years at countless building and construction sites and, too, the Wilson Tunnel site, where five workers were killed in the last of three cave-ins in 1954.

The tragedy, which occurred during the construction of the first of the two Wilson tunnels, is a "closed subject" for Black.

"I don't want to belittle anyone," he said, noting as he has in the past that the design of the tunnel was blueprinted by the City.

He said, "On the second tunnel, they let us do what we had wanted to do and everything went OK."

While he has apparently steeled himself regarding that remembrance, edges of pain seem still to be there.

#### TAKES PRIDE IN CHILDREN

His expression picked up again as he spoke about his son's progress with loads of fatherly pride:

"Bob's done exceptionally well. The jobs are bigger today. With the value of the dollar down the way it is, he has to work harder.

"The company's grown and expanded to the forward areas—Guam, the Philippines and now the Trust Territories. That credit belongs to my son.

"I'm very proud of him."

It was also with pride and respect that he spoke of his second son, Everett Emens, and his daughter, Jane Anna, both of whom are also in business for themselves; the former in Honolulu and the latter in San Francisco.

Black, who was chosen as Honolulu's ("old-fashioned") Father of the Year last year,

"always tried to spend as much time as I could with my family."

His inward appreciation of his family showed in the facial lines that crept and then creased into the gentlest of smiles.

"Jane," he said, "still calls me every Sunday morning—just about 10 minutes to 8—even when she's traveling," which she does extensively for her epoxy resin formulating business.

#### SUNDAY CALL MEANS A LOT

The Sunday call "means a good deal to her father," Black said, particularly since his wife has been succumbing gradually to the toll of aging.

Mrs. Black was formerly active in "just about every woman's activity in town." She was a member of the University of Hawaii's Board of Regents.

"It means a good deal to me," he said, "to have a good relationship with my children.

"It's marvelous that Jane does call. Her business is a big responsibility. She needs someone to confide in. So do I."

For his 80th birthday, Jane, who was born on the same day, will return here to host a luau fit for "a very magnificent man" and some 175 friends who "have had a deep influence on his life."

The luau will be held at 6 pm. Friday at the Willows. Among the guests will be a number of his original crew, old-timers he worked in previous jobs as a "cub engineer" and business and civic leaders with whom he has tussled on numerous boards.

At another luau a few years back, Black was honored for his role in founding the General Contractors Association of Hawaii. The dean of the local construction industry rose to the occasion in expected form:

"It's wonderful to get flowers while you can still smell 'em."

Black cherishes that tribute from his colleagues. Another among other honors that tickled him was receiving an honorary doctor of engineering degree from his alma mater, the Rose Polytechnic Institute in Terre Haute, Ind.

#### WORK IN COMMUNITY CAUSES

Black has probably donated to more causes than there are causes. Right now, his energies are directed to the following:

Chairman of the Honolulu Gas Co.'s board of directors, director of the First Hawaiian Bank, Health Facilities Planning Council of Hawaii and the Junior Achievement and the chairmanship of the Queen's Medical Center's board of trustees.

The last two are his special pets. For JA, which helps youngsters to learn business principles by doing, Black persuaded an impressive group—architects to labor union officials—to put up a new \$100,000 building for nothing.

Black's pitch to them as to himself: "We all owe it to our community to help as much as we can."

He has often expressed "my debt to the community. I came here as a young man of 24 on June 10, 1913, with my new bride and \$250 in borrowed money. This community made possible what I am and what I have today. The only way I know to pay back my debt is through community service."

Black, who has five grandchildren, strongly supports the Junior Achievement because he believes in the gospel of hard work. He feels youngsters are happier when they know the satisfaction of work well done.

He thinks parents hurt youngsters today by trying to make it too easy by doing "too much" for them.

#### VALUES OF WORK

He believes higher education would be more meaningful if a youngster had to work for it and if a youngster took advantage of in-service work offered in cooperative education.

That, he notes, would help youngsters find their niche earlier and prevent them from getting stuck with ill-suited careers.

One of his favorite bits of advice to youngsters is: "Remember, nobody attains success on a 40-hour week."

His service to Queen's dates back to a severe heart attack 21 years ago. While confined, he was appalled to learn "what a bad shape the hospital was in financially."

No sooner back on his feet, Black volunteered to be on the hospital's board and won the first of an unbroken chain of 20 elections as board president a year later.

#### MUCH WORK FOR QUEEN'S

He has poured thousands of dollars and sense into the organization over the years. It was Black who pulled the hospital out of the red, thereby enabling continuing programs to expand and upgrade services.

A long-time Queen's associate remembers this scene: "Our president would walk through the hospital before noon each Wednesday to conduct his board meeting wearing khaki pants, workshirt and workshoes, carrying his lunch in a little brown paper sack."

Alas, sighed the associate, "he wears a suit like the others now."

Black has powerful feelings about Queen's. "It isn't the biggest hospital in the country, but it's just as good as any of 'em."

"Tourists from all over who are unexpectedly hospitalized are constantly flabbergasted at the service and the wonderful job of nursing we offer. This community is very fortunate, too, in having a very competent group of doctors."

While Black has "very little to do with the company's business anymore," he still keeps his 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. hours at his Kakaako office.

#### GREATEST SATISFACTION

Without business pressures and without active Republican Party demands, Black, who supported Goldwater in 1964, fills his days with community work.

He said: "The most exciting thing for me was forming my own company. But the thing that gives me the greatest satisfaction is my community work."

And then he said: "It's good of the community to let me do what I can."

"I need the community more than it needs me."

He continued: "So many people become senile as they grow old. I told Malcolm MacNaughton that he should get me to climb off as president of the hospital board when he has reason to believe that I'm getting senile."

"I am sincere. The hospital is too important to the community. I don't want, and I shouldn't be allowed, to stay on if I'm a detriment."

Then, as a company official stepped into the office for his signature on a wad of business papers, Black laughingly explained the reporter's mission:

"The Star-Bulletin is updating their obituaries."

#### COLORFUL LANGUAGE

As Black shook hands heartily, the reporter noted the absence throughout the long chat of his well-known command of "old English," such as "!\*& \*!?!& \*!?!&."

"Guess I'm just mellowing with age," he grinned, picking up a fresh "1886" cigar, which he buys six boxes at a time.

The matter of salty "old English" brought to mind one of Black's funniest stories:

Many years ago, he had hired an electrical subcontractor as a favor to a friend. When he discovered the man's extremely inferior work, Black tossed him off the job with an assortment of choice words.

The man sued for breach of contract and slander.

When Black's lawyer, J. Garner Anthony, read the plaintiff's complaint that the defendant had called him a blankety-blank, he asked:

"Did you say all this, Mr. Black?"

"That wasn't the half of it," was his client's reply.

Black recalls giving Anthony two instructions on the case: 1—"I don't want to pay that blankety-blank a red cent. 2—I don't want to go to court and lose."

Anthony's job in the slander case was to convince the jury that the subcontractor was, indeed, a blankety-blank.

The jury found in Black's favor on both counts.

Black's tribute to Anthony: "He has succeeded in keeping me out of jail all these years."

### CURRENT HEAD OF U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SEES SERIOUS FLAWS IN MAGAZINE SALES INDUSTRY'S SELF-REGULATIONS

#### HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for the past month I have been discussing the subject of magazine subscription sales fraud and deception. During that period, I have received numerous letters from around the country which support my position that such sales frauds must be wiped out.

Almost without exception, these letters are written by American consumers who have, themselves, fallen victims to the high-pressure sales pitch which often involves offers of prizes, free gifts, free magazines, and so forth, to secure a signature on a contract form.

There is nothing free about "magazine subscription sales," not even when the salesman or telephone solicitor insists that all you have to pay is the "postage and handling charges." The so-called "postage and handling" fee of a small sum weekly, when computed over a 5-year period as most magazine subscription sales are, quickly adds up to a huge debt of \$150 or \$180, payable in monthly installments over a period of about 2 years.

To receive a supporting letter from someone who has not "been taken," someone who is a national representative of business interests, and who is willing to state that "voluntary self-regulation has not been as effective as it should be" in the magazine sales industry, is a most refreshing experience.

I have received just such a letter from the current acting head of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Arch N. Booth, executive vice president. Mr. Booth has been serving as chief executive of the national chamber since the national president accepted the position of Postmaster General of the United States in the administration of President Nixon.

Mr. Booth and I do not concur on the need for strong Federal legislation to clean up the magazine subscription sales industry and several other direct sales industries like it—encyclopedias as a prime example—which have blatantly

used every scheme in the books to deceive consumers. I believe legislation is the only solution which will do the job effectively. Mr. Booth feels self-policing within the direct sales industry can succeed with more teeth and offers some suggestions.

One of his proposals would expand central registry, which now is composed entirely of magazine publisher representatives, to include representation for the chambers of commerce, the Better Business Bureau and consumer groups. Certainly, this is a suggestion which should not be overlooked.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to enter in the RECORD the comments of Mr. Booth, executive vice president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, as one more strong argument for broad congressional hearings on the sales practices of magazine subscription sales companies and possible means to clean up the industry:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Washington, D.C., March 15, 1969.

HON. FRED B. ROONEY, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROONEY: Thank you for sending me copies of the two recent statements you made in the House of Representatives regarding fraudulent sales practices of magazine subscription sales companies.

There is much merit in what you had to say—I congratulate you. There are some severe abuses by subscription selling organizations.

You are entirely right that voluntary self-regulation has not been as effective as it should be. However, we continue to believe that it's the best remedy. Self-regulation should be strengthened rather than abandoned and replaced with government regulation.

In the magazine field, for example, the Central Registry, set up by the Magazine Publishers Association, should put some teeth into its rules. Publishers who deal with unscrupulous subscription sales companies should be penalized in some fashion. Perhaps this could take the form of some sort of fine or perhaps it could simply be publicizing the fact of their dealings with these people.

Another constructive suggestion would be to include groups other than publishers in Central Registry. These could include perhaps local chambers of commerce, better business bureaus, consumer groups, and the like. They could let Central Registry know about some of the unscrupulous practices and who is perpetrating them.

These and other constructive ideas may help the legitimate door-to-door sales organizations.

I congratulate you on your efforts to be helpful. It's a pleasure to work with you.

Cordially yours,

ARCH N. BOOTH,  
Executive Vice President.

### ON CIGARETTE ADVERTISING

#### HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, much controversy has been generated over the Federal Communications Commission's

recent decision to ban cigarette advertising on television.

The Portland Oregonian recently featured an editorial on this subject which I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues:

**SMOKE AD BAN OFF BASE**

The Federal Communications Commission's proposed ban on television and radio advertising of cigarettes is not only unprecedented; it is also beyond the authority of the FCC and is probably unconstitutional.

The FCC has regulatory power over broadcasting because channels are limited and must therefore be assigned by responsible authority. But its commission gives it no power to say what must or must not be broadcast. Moreover, it is clearly out of its field in making a judgment on the dangers in smoking cigarettes. This is the kind of judgment that is entrusted by statute to the Food and Drug Administration. But it is out of place in an agency created for the limited regulation of communication media protected by the First Amendment's provisions of freedom of speech and press.

The majority of the commission bases its action on findings that some 50,000 deaths a year can be traced to lung cancer, which has been linked to heavy smoking of cigarettes. It so happens that about the same number of people die each year as a result of automobile accidents. Does the commission, therefore, have authority to ban automobile advertising, or the advertising of other killers such as sleeping pills and alcohol? It apparently believes it does.

American public opinion recognized the injurious personal and public effects of alcoholic beverages by writing their prohibition into the Constitution, later relenting. A constitutional amendment is the proper course if cigarette smoking is to be controlled.

The FCC might get away with its fiat for a time, if Congress does not act, for broadcasters are beholden to the agency. But surely the enforcement of such a ruling would be attacked in the courts, and the FCC's legal grounds appear to be non-existent.

The moral grounds of such a federal government edict are certainly null. The government not only sanctions cigarettes by taxation; it actually encourages their manufacture and sale through support of tobacco crop prices.

The issue here is not the morbidity that may be assigned to smoking cigarettes. It is whether a federal agency may, by decree, say what may or may not be advertised to the public when there is no question of fraud or other crime being involved. Such authority cannot be tolerated in a free society.

**GREEK DEMOCRACY**

**HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, 148 years ago, on March 25, the Greek people, after a long and fierce struggle won their well deserved independence. On that date in 1821 the brave and long-suffering people of Greece threw off the yoke of the Ottoman Empire and proclaimed liberty throughout their land. Greece, the birthplace of democracy, had suffered under the cruel oppression of the Ottoman Empire. With civil liberties destroyed and with the oppressor's attempts to suppress the mag-

nificent culture of the Greek people, it was surprising to many that the flames of liberty could not be quenched. But the Greeks are a freedom-loving people and often extraordinarily patient. They suffered under foreign domination but never lost the hope nor the determination that they would one day be free.

Under the leadership of and inspired by that great patriot Venizelos, the Greek people achieved their long-sought independence. Many times since 1821 obstacles have fallen in the path of the continued growth and protection of Greek liberty, but each time the determination of the Greek people to be truly free has prevailed. In every generation Greece has faced a threat to her democratic ideals, but as in the case of the Ottoman Empire, the oppressor is vanquished.

I am hopeful that Greek democracy, which has contributed so much to our own system of liberty, will continue to prevail so that that nation, which gave democracy to the world, will share in the fruits of her own contribution.

DR. BRUNO BETTELHEIM

**HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Bruno Bettelheim, one of the world's noted psychologists, has brought a new dimension into the entire discussion of campus unrest in America.

In his testimony before the Special Subcommittee on Education, chaired by the distinguished lady from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN), Dr. Bettelheim has called our attention to the fact that some of those participating in campus disorders are emotionally disturbed and need professional help in the treatment of their personal problems.

I believe it is extremely important that we recognize this aspect of the unrest phenomena sweeping this country.

I am mindful that some of those participating in such unrest are exercising their constitutional right of dissent. I am also aware that some of the young people are genuinely concerned about the lack of relevancy in much of the curricula being offered by American institutions of higher learning and express their concern in these demonstrations.

I am also aware that some of the young people belong to minority groups and feel genuinely left out from the mainstream of university life, both in the curriculum, the social activity, and employment opportunities.

But I believe that Dr. Bettelheim quite properly points out that we ought also to recognize the fact that some of those participating in campus unrest are nothing more than emotionally disturbed young people seriously in need of professional assistance.

It is high time that we recognized that not all of the turmoil on the university campus is directly associated with constitutional rights of dissent.

No one can convince me that a young college student who disrobes on a university campus and cavorts around in the nude is participating in some constitutional right of dissent. Obviously, we are dealing with a sick individual who ought to be identified as such and then given professional help.

It should come as no surprise to us that young people on the university campus should suffer emotional disturbances when we consider the enormous pressures that bear on the young people of today.

I believe that Dr. Bettelheim has performed a notable public service by applying his vast experience in addressing himself to this subject.

I hope that university educators will read his testimony with care and not dismiss it, but rather garner from this testimony some meaningful guidelines for dealing with the problem of campus unrest.

Very shortly I intend to offer legislation which would make funds available to universities for the establishment of psychiatric, outpatient clinics which would be made available to those young people who feel they need professional assistance with their personal problems.

It is not uncommon that people who may be extremely gifted in their intellectual pursuits may suffer to a lesser or greater degree, emotional problems which can be helped by professional assistance.

I believe Dr. Bettelheim's analogy of the situation on our campus today and those events which led to the collapse of freedom in Germany is most timely and offers to us for the first time some professional guidance of dealing with this problem.

In my judgment, we ought to make available on the campus meaningful professional help to those young people, and perhaps those members of the faculty who feel it necessary, some professional help.

I hope no one will read into my remarks a suggestion that everyone who engages in dissent is in need for psychiatric help because this is not the point I am making at all. But I do believe that there are some among the dissenters who could be given more meaningful assistance than venting their emotions in needless destruction as we so often witness now.

Dr. Bettelheim's excellent statement to the committee follows:

STATEMENT OF DR. BRUNO BETTELHEIM BEFORE THE HOUSE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, MARCH 20, 1969

The problems to society which originate in the students' rebellions are so manifold and have such far reaching implications that in a short presentation only a very small selection of them can be alluded to. I shall, therefore, concentrate (1) on the parallels to the German situation before Hitler; (2) on a few of the factors which contribute to the widespread unrest among relatively large numbers of students, black and white; (3) on the small group of leaders who, by making skillful use of the general unrest succeed in doing damage way beyond the importance of this group because of their tactics of intimidation and coercion and due to the publicity they receive; (4) the particular difficulties of some black students which are

exploited by the SDS; (5) the fascination with extreme positions, and (6) what all this does to the universities and higher education.

(1) While history does not repeat itself, and while the present U.S. situation is radically different from that of pre-Hitler Germany, given these vast differences, some of the similarities between the present student rebellion and what happened in the German universities which spearheaded Hitler's rise to power are striking. Of course, the German student rebels embraced politically the extreme right, while here they are of the extreme left, but what is parallel is the determination to bring down the establishment. In Germany the philosophy which gained them a mass following was racist and directed against a discriminated minority (the Jews), while here the radical students intend to help a discriminated minority. While this is an important difference, it does not change the parallel that universities then and now were forced to make decisions in respect to the race of students, rather than on the basis of disregard of racial origin. To use only one example, German universities began to cave in when students coerced faculties to appoint professorships in *Rassenwissenschaft*, that is, professorships devoted to teaching the special aspects, merits, achievements, of one race versus others, rather than concentrating in their teaching on contributions to knowledge, whatever the origin of the person who made the contribution.

Professor Laqueur<sup>2</sup> says, "National Socialism came to power as the party of youth." Its cult of youth was as pronounced as that of Italian fascism whose very hymn was called "Youth" (*Giovinetza*). Hitler insisted all along that his movement was a revolt "of the coming generation against all that was senile and rotten with decay in German democratic society." Professor Gay<sup>1</sup> stresses the prevalence in pre-Hitler days of an ideology that pitted the sons against the fathers, an insistence that the generations cannot understand each other, are deadly enemies; in short, in this respect they said exactly the same as do our rebellious students who insist that nobody over thirty is trustworthy.

Thus, then as now, these rebellious students were pictured as the new generation, disgusted with the complacency of their parents, fighting courageously for a better world. And what were then the mass media often depicted them as idealists, as young people concerned with the real issues of society. In short, they were in their time the wave of the future. And leftist student activists in 1968 burned books they did not like in the same manner and at the same place, Berlin, as did Hitler's equally youthful followers in 1933.

After having stressed these parallels, and some others which I shall mention at the end, one must recognize the vast differences between the present student rebelliousness, and that of pre-Hitler Germany. It is these differences which should permit us to work towards an entirely different outcome.

If I read the signs of the time correctly, I do not think that the rebellious students in and by themselves are a serious danger to the country, though they are a real danger to the universities.

The danger I fear is rather an opposite one: that the disgusting behavior of a very small group of students—the overwhelming majority of our students are sound, and wish nothing more than to take advantage of the opportunities higher education offers them—will arouse a severe counter-reaction, so much so that their left radicalism may lead

to a fascist type of backlash. This I believe is the greatest danger inherent in their efforts to create chaos. In desperation—and they try to test and exhaust the patience of what they call the establishment and thus do succeed in creating desperation—and to prevent such chaos, repressive measures might be embraced which would be dangerous to our democratic institutions. It is because of this danger that I believe the student rebellions must be dealt with in the best interest of all of society, including that of the rebelling students themselves. But they can be dealt with intelligently and constructively only if the measures taken are designed to do away with the causes of the widespread discontent of college students.

(2) In order to understand this discontent one has to realize that so many more go to college than ever before, and hence many more are much less well prepared for this experience. Taking advantage of college, and being satisfied with this experience rather than being defeated by it, requires a considerable amount of self-discipline, and a high degree of satisfaction with what can be derived from developing one's intellect. Present day education both in home and school teaches very little self-discipline compared to even very recent times. The expectation is that education can hand over knowledge and skills, and this nearly instantly. There is widespread feeling that if students do not do well in school, this is the failing of the educational system, not due to their lack of application. With each year in school, this feeling becomes stronger in those who do not do well academically. And with it, the system becomes the enemy which deliberately withholds from them which they believe could so easily be given to them by it, hence the hatred of the system.

To understand why pressures erupt in adolescence on a growing scale nowadays, and why controls seem to grow weaker, we must recognize that adolescent revolt is not a stage of development that follows automatically from our natural makeup. What makes for adolescent revolt is the fact that a society keeps the next generation too long dependent in terms of mature responsibility and a striving for independence.

Years ago, when schooling ended for the vast majority at fourteen or fifteen, and thereafter one became self-supporting, got married and had children, there was no need for adolescent revolt. Because while puberty is a biological given, adolescent as we know it with its identity crises, is not. All children grow up and become pubertal. By no means do they all become adolescents. To be adolescent means that one has reached and even passed the age of puberty, is at the very height of one's physical development—healthier, stronger, even handsomer than one has been, or will be, for the rest of one's life—but must nevertheless postpone full adulthood till long beyond what any other period in history has considered reasonable. And their educational experiences in the home and school prepare only a small minority well for such a prolonged waiting, for being able to control their angry impatience while engaged in such waiting.

And it is this waiting for things—for the real life to come—which creates a climate in which a sizeable segment of students can, at least temporarily, be seduced into following the lead of the small group of militants. It seems to give them a chance to prove themselves as real men. Thus it is an empty waiting for real life to come, which makes for student rebellions. This can be seen from the fact that most rebellious students, here and abroad, are either undergraduates, or those studying the social sciences and humanities. There are no militants among students of medicine, engineering, the natural sciences. They are busy with doing things that are important to them, they are working in the laboratory and at their studies. It is those

students who do not quite know what they are preparing themselves for, and why, the students who sit around waiting for examinations rather than doing active work, which form the cadres of the student rebellion.

One example may stand for many: In a class I am presently teaching, a student was close to the activists. He gave me a very hard time in class at first. Two months later he was one of the most interested, cooperating students. I asked him what happened. He answered: "A few weeks ago I got a job which interests me, and I also began to be interested in my classes; that did it."

In my opinion there are, today, far too many students in the colleges who essentially have no business to be there. Some are there to evade the draft, many others out of a vague idea that it will help them to find better paying jobs, though they do not know what jobs they want. And again many go to college because they do not know what better to do and because it is expected of them. Their deep dissatisfaction with themselves and their inner confusion is projected against the institution of the university first, and against all institutions of society secondarily, which are blamed for their own inner weakness.

To make matters worse, our institutions of higher learning have expanded much too fast, have under public pressure for more education for everybody increased enrollment beyond reason. The result is far too large classes. Many classes in our large universities are taught by teaching assistants some of whom, out of their own inner dissatisfaction and insecurity, tend to side with the rebellion. All this led to the anonymity, the impersonal nature of student faculty contacts about which many students rightly complain. And since many of them are essentially not interested in the intellectual adventure, the knowledge which the faculty can convey to them is not what they want. They want essentially group therapeutic experiences which will help them to become mature, secure, to find themselves. But colleges are not mass therapeutic institutions, and hence disappoint the students where the greatest need lies.

In addition because of such vast expansion in numbers, the old methods to give coherence to the college experience, and to offer students a life geared to the needs of the late adolescent age group have disintegrated. This the fraternities and sororities used to do, which were group homes easing the transition from home to society at large. They no longer can contain the vast number of students. And here the demands of some black students for separate black housing, etc. has to be understood as the consequence of their feeling lost in the anonymous mass of students. Only most of the white students are similarly lost until such time as they find themselves in their work and study experience.

Also, the old rituals which enhanced student life and bound them to each other, and to their college, such as football rallies, homecomings etc., all have lost most of their meaning and have not been replaced by anything but the excitement the sit-ins and rebellions provide. The spirit of intimate comradeship that used to prevail in a fraternity house is now found by all too many students in their sit-ins, where they feel closely bound together, important as at no other time, doing things together which they deep down know they do also for the emotional satisfactions they derive from such being together, whatever high sounding issues they think are motivating their actions.

In this context, the symbolic meaning should not be overlooked of students' invading the dean's or president's office, violently, or by means of sit-ins, big in age and size, who inwardly feel like little boys, and hence need to play big by sitting in papa's

<sup>2</sup> Laqueur, Walter Z. *Young Germany*. New York: Basic Books, 1962.

<sup>1</sup> Gay, Peter. *Weimar Culture; the Outsider as Insider*. New York and Evanston: Harper and Row, 1968.

big chair. They want to have a say in how things are run, want to sit in the driver's seat, not because they feel competent to do so, but because they cannot bear to feel incompetent.

I think it is unnatural to keep a young person for some 20 years in dependency, and attending school. This might be a way of life for that small elite which always in the past went to universities. They were those who could go to school for 20 years. But they were never more than a small percentage of the population. In the past, the vast majority of young people were actively meeting life, proving themselves as men or women. And in this way they found themselves as real, strong human beings. Now the tremendous push that everybody should go to college has brought an incredibly large number into the university who do not find their self-realization through study, or through the intellectual adventure. But they still need to find their early manhood. They try to change the university to something where they can find it through engaging in an active, sometimes even violent battle against the existing order or all of society. Only that would change the university so that it would be no longer an institution dedicated to the intellectual virtues, to the frontiers of knowledge, but one dedicated to a belligerent reshaping of society. And this is exactly what the militants want—not to engage in study and research, but in political battles.

The reason we didn't have student revolts before is partly because only those went to college who wanted to be educated, and partly because those students who had to put themselves through school, by the very fact that they could do that, of their own strengths, could prove their early manhood—at least to some degree.

I think many of the rebellious students are essentially guilt-ridden individuals. They feel terribly guilty about all the advantages they had. And there's also the guilt of their exemption from the draft, which is a serious guilt. Only again, they cannot bear to live with their guilt. They try to destroy society or certain institutions rather than deal with their own inner guilt, because they have it so good.

I think, from these remarks, it should be obvious which, I believe, may be some of the remedies. Firstly, all too many who now go to college have little interest, ability, and use for what constitutes a college education. They would be better off with a high level vocational education which is closely linked to a work program which gives scope to their needs for physical activity and visible, tangible achievement. The complaint of many of these students is that nobody needs them. They feel parasites of society, and hence come to hate a society which they think makes them feel this way. Here we should not be beyond learning from the communist countries where studies are combined with work in factories and in the fields. I believe this to be a much better arrangement for all those who do not feel a deep commitment to the intellectual enterprise, that is to study and research, and these will always be only a relatively small segment of this age group.

As a matter of fact, I would suggest a youth service program (civilian peace corps, or such) of a couple of years' duration where young people work on socially significant projects while earning pay for it, and receiving at the same time, higher vocational training. After this period only those would go to universities who really wish to do so, while the rest would feel a much greater stake in a society that they helped rebuild. At the least, because of the training they received, they would be well prepared for permanent jobs.

While a need for an army draft exists, such program should be an alternative to it: only those young men who wish to do so should serve in the armed forces, which then would

be a voluntary army. And I am convinced if every able-bodied person would have to serve two years in some such program, there would be no scarcity of those who wish to spend these two years in the armed forces instead, particularly if they would, for example, receive some advantages in pay, or other special advantages such as at the end of armed service. This would also do away with the exemption of college students which, in connection with the war in Vietnam, is behind so much of the student unrest. For example, if I am exempt from service when others are not, I can live in peace with myself only if I am convinced this is a vile war.

(3) I feel I can be shorter about the very small group of leaders of the student rebellion because were it not for the widespread student discontent which I discussed above, they would find scant following, and if they should break the law, without such followers, they could be readily dealt with. It is the mass following they can arouse because of the widespread discontent which alone makes them dangerous. I therefore think we should concentrate in our thinking and planning not on these very few, but on what needs to be done so that they won't find ready followers.

There were always a small percentage of persons bent on destroying society, and on fomenting a revolution. In previous generations they were the Wobblies, later there were the campus communists. The reason why the present brand of campus revolutionaries, who are of anarchist and nihilist persuasion, are so much more dangerous is that they can point to success after success of their disrupting tactics. Here, too, nothing succeeds like success. As early as 200 years ago Immanuel Kant warned that we shall never be able to control violence if it is rewarded. "It is far more convenient," he wrote, "to commit an act of violence, and afterwards excuse it, then laboriously to consider convincing arguments and lose time in listening to objections. This very boldness itself indicates a sort of conviction of the legitimacy of the action, and the God of success is afterwards the best advocate." The greatest danger, then, is presently the readiness with which violence is afterward excused, and the seemingly convincing arguments which are brought forth to justify it before and after the act. Worst and most dangerous of all, there seems to be a tendency in our society to legitimize the results of violence so that, as Kant puts it, the God of success afterwards serves as advocate for the violent action that preceded it and suggests its future use. On our campuses those committed to violence (to quote Kant again), "lose no time on considering arguments, or on listening to objections." They simply refuse to be rational about their grievances and through using violent means insist on having their way, no matter what. And if they get their way, as Kant already knew, their success then legitimizes their disruptive actions.

And they gain their success by arousing a sizeable number of students through the tactics of confrontations, and by universities' fear of such confrontations. Confrontations have one important aim—to use the reaction of those they provoke to generate a feeling of new unity among the demonstrators. This has been used in its most direct form by militants, who stand in front of policemen and denounce them as pigs and wait until the man in uniform hits out. The art of demonstrating then lies in seeing that the blows are directed against the less committed demonstrators and, if possible, against completely uninvolved persons. This then provides the mass following they need for their success. A whole system of provocations has been worked out for this purpose.

Speaking of the small group of leaders of the radical left, it has been observed that most of them come from well educated, very liberal families. From my own observations I

would like to add that those whom I got to know might be characterized by having had their intellectual abilities developed very highly at much too early an age, but at the expense of their emotional development. Very bright as they often are, emotionally some of them remained fixated at the age of the temper tantrum. It is this discrepancy between great intellectual maturity and utter emotional immaturity which is so baffling, often even to the universities, where some members of the faculty fail to see behind the obvious intelligence the inability to act rationally, and most of all, the inability to act responsibly. It is one of the weaknesses of university faculties that, as persons committed to value most highly intellectual abilities, they are captivated by the intelligence of these students to the degree as to be ready to excuse, or make little, of their disruptiveness and intellectual arrogance.

As for these students themselves, psychologically I always found them hating themselves as intensely as they hate the establishment, a self-hatred they try to escape by fighting any establishment. Obviously they need help in overcoming their emotional difficulties, and punishing them is hardly the way to do it. If we bring them to the universities, we should provide facilities for helping them. I believe it is their emotional immaturity that explains both their call for immediate action, and the retreat of the dropout and the hippy into utter non-action, because each one masks an inability of these very intelligent young people to take time to think things out first. Essentially these militants must want to destroy the universities because they do not want to be students. Because to be a student means to prepare oneself to do something more worthwhile in the future. The militant student's cry is for action now, not preparation for action later. In this real sense he is no longer a student at all, since he clearly rejects knowledge as a precondition of any meaningful activity. Truth, moreover, is no longer sought, but "revealed"; the contempt for free speech and free thought is demonstrated as much in his actions as in his words. Were he ever to capture the university, it would cease to be a university at all.

In their inability to think things out because they cannot delay action for thought, both right and left extremists, the militants of all colors, are brothers under the skin. This is among the reasons why in history it happened that the young followers of the extreme right can very easily become those of the extreme left, or the other way round. Because the mainspring of their action is their wish to prove themselves strong, and less any particular political conviction, which is super-imposed on their self-doubt and a hatred of a society that they feel left them out in the cold. There were reasons why, in Germany, the National Socialists and the Communists voted together, worked together to bring down the democratic Weimar government. There is a reason why former Nazis could easily become active in the Communist government of Eastern Germany.

But there is also reason why mainly the children of leftist parents become hippies, or student revolutionaries in our society, as in other places or times the children of conservative parents, when the similar emotional conditions prevailed in their families, spearheaded rightwing radicalism. It was the children of conservative German parents, for example, who first embraced the Emperor's War and enthusiastically went to their death, because they felt a need to lay "their bodies on the line," as it were, for ideas their parents had only lukewarmly held. This way they could prove themselves strong, while at the same time proving their parents weak, wishy washy, not worthy of true respect. They felt, too, this was a re-

birth, a way to revitalize an ossified society, to create a new society, one of true authenticity and confrontation. All these were the main tenets of academic Hitler youth, as they are now those of our student left.

Thus, while the emotional constellations which make for very different student revolts are strangely familiar, the specific political content of a student revolt depends to a very large degree on the beliefs of their parents. Because in many ways, it is a desperate wish to do better than the parent, exactly where he seemed weak in his beliefs. In this sense it is also a desperate desire for parental approval. But even more it is a desperate wish that the parent should have been strong in his convictions that motivate many of their actions. This is the reason why so many of our radicals embrace Maoism, why they chant in their demonstrations "Ho Ho Chi Minh" exactly as another generation of students chanted at their football rallies. These are strong fathers, with strong convictions, who powerfully coerce their children to follow their commands. While consciously they demand freedom and participation, unconsciously their commitment to Mao and other dictatorships suggests their desperate need for controls from the outside, since without it they are unable to bring order into their inner chaos.

Thus while these militant students need controls, such controls must not be imposed punitively, nor for the benefit of others. They must be controls that clearly and definitely benefit the person himself, so that he will eventually make them become his own inner controls.

It is this, their inability to wait and work hard for long range goals, which marks these militants as emotionally disturbed, as does their hatred for their parents who failed to give them direction, set them against the world, by exposing their immature minds to criticism of all that could have given meaning to their lives.

It is their hatred of society that makes it so easy for the small group of militant leaders to make common cause with another small group that provides temporary leadership for some of the rebellions: outright paranoid individuals. I do not believe the number of paranoids among students is greater than their number would be in any comparable group of the population. They become dangerous again because of their high intelligence, which permits them to hide more successfully the degree of their disturbance from the nonexperts. Having worked professionally with some of them for years, I know that student revolt permits them to act out their paranoia to a degree that no other position in society would permit them. How understandable, then, that all paranoids who can, do flock into the ranks of these militants. Unfortunately, most nonexperts do not know how persuasive paranoids can be, at least for a time, until they are recognized as such. The persuasiveness of a Hitler or Stalin is now recognized as the consequence of their own paranoia, and their unconscious appeal to the vague paranoid tendencies that can be found among the immature and disgruntled. I have no doubt that the ranks of the militants contain some would-be Hitlers and Stalins, hence again their dangerousness.

(4) Paranoids always make a persuasive appeal to any group of the population who rightly or wrongly feel persecuted, and they seek out such groups because they are most likely to view their paranoia as true understanding of this group's particular predicament. Which brings me to the particular problems of some of the black students who, fortunately, seem to recognize ever more than the SDS is using them, rather than helping them. They are not quite as successfully to see through the motives of some of the paranoid student leaders. Their feeling persecuted because of their emotional

disturbance "feels" more congenial because of the black students' experience with discrimination.

Still, the overwhelming majority of the black students desire exactly the same for themselves as does the overwhelming majority of the white students; a rightful place in this society. And only a very small minority of them wishes to destroy it, as do the few rebellious white students. Thus if they could be convinced that there is a good place for them in society, their attitude would change and they all would part ways with the SDS, as many of them have already done. But here the difficulty is that many of the black students, just because of the nature of the commitment of the university, do not feel that being a student is necessarily the best way for them to find their rightful place in society. Here our wish, and theirs, that they should become part of the elite, runs afoul of what for many of them is their reality. Many of the black students who are brought into our colleges are often ill-prepared academically, and lacking in the skills required for making a go in college. At the same time they have been imbued with the notion that it is the fault of the establishment that they are disadvantaged. While this is true to some degree, being aware of such truth is an easy way out if one does not succeed.

All students find the transition from home to college difficult. In past times this was blamed by the student on himself, and most of them therefore tried to do something about themselves and sooner or later succeeded. Today both white and black students tend to blame the faculty for the difficulties they encounter in adjusting to a different way of life and study.

The demand for black study programs originated not only in the justified feeling that one must be familiar, and proud of one's own background, but to a large degree in the feeling that such studies would be easier, that such faculty would have greater understanding for this difficulty.

The fact is that some black students are induced to go to college whose preparation for it is inferior to that of the majority of the college population. While the faculty is ready to make allowances for this, it runs counter to the self-respect of the black student, who rightly does not wish to be made to feel like a second class citizen. But if he cannot compete successfully with those students who had had so many advantages educationally and socially, he is in a terrible conflict. He was brought to college to do as well as the others, but if he fails to do so, his background does not permit him to accept that this is because of his lack of preparation, because this would make him feel second class, while he is in college to get out of such a position. So when because of lack of background and preparation—though intellectually able to make the grade—he has difficulty in adjusting, he feels that the very place that promised to make him equal fails to do so. Disappointed, he rages against the institution that makes him once more feel inferior. And efforts to help him by means of special programs only makes this inferiority even more obvious. The many black students who are well able to hold their own with the best of the rest feel they must not desert their fellow black comrades and hence feel obliged to make their burden their very own.

I believe the answer to this problem does not rest with the colleges and universities. If we want to bring a large number of black students into our universities, as we should, I am convinced we have to start much earlier. I believe from high school age on, it would be necessary to educate a larger number of them, together with white youngsters from culturally deprived background, in true prep schools, so that they will enter college in every respect as well prepared academically

and socially as the rest of the college population.

(5) There is a fascination in society at large with sex and violence, with drugs and insanity which both influences the student militants and provides them with a noteworthy which they exploit to the full. If students protest because of an idea or position and do so in orderly and rational form, they do not receive much public attention. But if they shed all their clothes and walk around naked, this makes news all over the nation, whatever the case they may, or may not have had. It is part of a dangerous fascination with youth and its extreme positions. What passes for modern literature which these youngsters read already in junior high school intoxicates their minds with the appeal of drug induced madness, with sexual acting out and with violence.

The universities, because of their intellectual prestige, give the student activists a prestige for their revolutionary claims which they otherwise could never achieve. For example, for days not more than some 20 to 30 students occupied the administration building of the University of Chicago. They got headlines every day, and were prominently featured on radio and TV. If some 30 people would have demonstrated in any other place, they would have found no attention whatsoever. This the SDS knows, that is why it concentrates on the universities. The contrast between an institution devoted to the highest achievements of reason, and the obscenity and violence perpetrated there, makes it all the more fascinating. It is this fascination on which they try to build their revolutionary success. An idea in itself may be next to nothing, but it becomes news by interfering with something else which is considered, for one reason or another, to be of public importance. In themselves a couple of hundred demonstrators, somewhere in New York or Chicago would mean very little, but if some fifty students march into a large lecture hall, take control of the podium, and broadcast their ideas to people who came to hear something quite different, then they have made news.

Here, too, is where the function of political phraseology becomes operative. If someone advocates urinating on graves as the Fugs did, or if a few girls dress up as witches and put curses on professors, as they did in Chicago, if they would do so without reference to politics, people would rightly wonder about their sanity; but if they do so as a condemnation of the Viet Nam war, or take clothes off while claiming to be demonstrating for some good progressive cause, they have the support of many of the older liberals and enlightened radicals, who will inevitably consider it all to be very socially significant. If you are a teenager wrestling with the police and you say you are doing it because of the moral superiority of a future social order, you cannot fail to get the sympathetic attention of the editors of radio and TV stations rather than psychiatrists. The ritualistic invocation of ideology is thus both an alibi and a defense.

(6) Perhaps it all has made too many headlines, perhaps it has been talked about too much for people to accept the fact: but the truth of the matter is that these rebellions can and do paralyze the universities.

And they do this not only because classes are interrupted and buildings occupied, not only because faculty must devote all their energies to calming things down, but much more so because all the time and energy which should be devoted to more lasting achievements has to be concentrated on preparing for and on forestalling new confrontations. Here at last comparison with pre-Hitler days: Then in Germany, as Professor Mosse<sup>2</sup> puts it "professors tended to

<sup>2</sup> Mosse, George L. *The Crisis of German Ideology*. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1964.

be either scholars who withdrew into their own speciality, taking scant notice of the world around them, or men who attempted to play the role of prophets. The first kind of academic wanted only to be left in peace . . . The professor as prophet, with very few exceptions indeed, was to be found on the side of the revolting students." Of the students he says, "They had found a basis for action that opposed existing authority yet remained independent of any political movement directed by their elders." And of the faculties that they "failed to provide any opposition, failed to use administrative powers, and failed to organize effective alternative groups of students. At best they displaced a detached passivity . . . at worst they joined in the harassment."

Like in pre-Hitler faculties, so in our universities today we can see efforts of faculty members to remain aloof from it all, while others try to anticipate even the most radical student demands, so as to avoid confrontations. Worse, there are no efforts made to organize effective alternative groups of students. And most of all, many are so intimidated that they cave in even before the students exercise any pressures. It is the continuous worry about what the militant students may do next, the anxious efforts to give them no offense, which saps the universities of their strength so that they become paralyzed. This anxious avoidance of taking a firm stand gives not only these militants, but also many non-committed students the feeling that they have the faculty on the run, because these adults are not sure about their values.

If the colleges and universities would feel sure about themselves, take a determined stand against any coercion and intimidation—though always not only open to, but inviting, reasonable, non-coercive discussion about how things could be improved (and much improvement is needed, as I suggested all along)—then I believe student rebellions could be so reduced as to no longer threaten the universities and, because of the consequences, possibly even all of society.

Thus I believe efforts should be concentrated on strengthening the will of the colleges and universities to resist disruption and coercion. If we succeed in doing so, I believe we shall have little need to take recourse to punitive measures; beyond setting into practice that those who do not wish to have any part of our universities should have their will: they should not be permitted to be, live and work at a place they hate, not as a punishment, but because to remain at a place they hate and despise serves no good purpose, and is detrimental to their emotional well being.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE  
JOEL T. BROYHILL, OF VIRGINIA,  
IN SUPPORT OF HIS BILL TO AUTHORIZE FILLING OF VACANT POSITIONS IN THE U.S. PARK POLICE IN WASHINGTON, D.C.,  
MARCH 27, 1969

**HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to authorize the filling of vacant positions in the National Park Service, which are now vacant as a result of restrictions imposed by section 201 of Public Law 90-364, the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968. The impact of this act has been to prevent the hiring of U.S. Park Police to fill vacancies that exist

and are urgently needed to patrol our parks, where serious crimes have risen sharply over the past year.

In a letter written yesterday, I have informed the President of this situation and have solicited his energy and his office to expedite this bill and to take such other action required in the executive branch to fill these vacancies. My letter reads as follows:

The PRESIDENT,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Since you have taken office, I have had the privilege of bringing several matters of concern to the citizens of Washington and nearby Virginia to your attention. Of primary and continued concern to me, as a Member of the Committee on the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives and as the Representative of the Congressional District in Northern Virginia immediately adjacent to the District of Columbia, is the high crime rate in the Federal city of Washington.

Notwithstanding glowing reports appearing recently in the news media of a slight reduction in crime in the past month, I find an overall increase in crime in the District of 43.9 percent in January 1969 over January a year ago. The specific crimes of criminal homicide increased 100 percent and rape increased 64.3 percent during the same period. Based on the statistics released by the Metropolitan Police Department on March 12, 1969, there are no signs that we are winning this war to make our streets and parks safe for our citizens and visitors. On the contrary, we hardly appear to be holding our own against the criminals, and this is tragic.

For these reasons, I would like to offer another suggestion as to one way in which we might gain quick assistance in our war against the criminals of the Washington area. As you may know, the United States Park Police are still 80 men below their authorized strength, and representatives have stated that due to the large waiting list of applicants they can fill these vacancies in short order if permitted to do so.

In order to fill these vacancies, it will be necessary for you to direct the Bureau of the Budget to remove their economy in government guidelines with respect to the hiring of field operations personnel of the National Park Service. Then it will be necessary to effect early enactment of legislation which I am introducing in Congress to exempt field operations personnel of the National Park Service from the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968.

While I am aware that the blame for not filling these positions has been laid at the doorstep of the Congress, I am also sure that an announced intent by the Executive Branch to exert its full influence in this matter would be met with enthusiasm from the great majority of the Congress and the people of these United States. This is particularly true since your proposal for increasing the number of metropolitan policemen seems to have become a controversial matter on which the District of Columbia City Council seems afraid to act favorably.

I cannot guarantee that you will not receive a loud clatter of opposition to my proposal from the same militant and left-wing crowd attempting to run the District of Columbia to suit themselves. But I will assure you that there will be fewer rapes in the parks under the jurisdiction of the Park Police if this course is followed. I urge you to seek the full authorization for the United States Park Police from the Congress and the Bureau of the Budget without delay.

With warmest regards, I am,  
Sincerely,

JOEL T. BROYHILL,  
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, as I explained to the President, the need for more park policemen in the Washington area is urgent. I am confident he will recognize this need and take the necessary action with the Bureau of the Budget. Meantime, however, I believe we in the House must act with great haste to enact this legislation, so that the additional protection we must have can be obtained without delay.

NATIONAL EYE BANK MONTH: "SO OTHERS MAY SEE"

**HON. JOHN C. CULVER**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the month of March has been set aside as National Eye Bank Month, and I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the vital effort which is going on in every part of the country, "so others may see."

It is this program which has helped make possible over the past 20 years the success of corneal transplants to improve defective vision or restore vision for persons with corneal defects caused by disease or accident.

National attention is currently focussed on the dramatic progress in areas like heart and kidney transplants, but until recently, the cornea was the only part of the human body which could be replaced by tissue from another person.

The first eye bank was established in this country in 1945, as corneal transplants became an established part of ophthalmic surgery. Under the sponsorship of the Lions Club, the Iowa Eye Bank was established in 1955, and since that time 505 corneal transplants have been conducted in our State alone.

In addition, the medical director of the Iowa bank, Dr. Alson E. Braley, has been instrumental in encouraging similar programs in other parts of the country, and in organizing a national eye bank network.

With the development of new methods to preserve eyes, it has been possible to establish an International Eye Bank to make tissues available to surgeons in foreign countries lacking donor eyes, as well as to send teams of ophthalmologists abroad to teach and provide services.

The eye bank program operates through voluntary donation of eyes after death by individuals, who do so by filing a notarized donor card with the eye bank, which in Iowa is located at the University Hospitals in Iowa City. More than 21,159 such donor cards are now on file in our State.

A waiting list of individuals in need of corneal transplants is also maintained at the eye bank. There are presently 13 names on the Iowa waiting list, which is relatively typical, although it sometimes reaches as many as 35 individuals awaiting transplants.

Upon the death of a donor, the eye bank is notified and as soon as practical, the eyes are removed by a local physi-

clan and delivered in specially equipped containers by the Iowa Highway Patrol to wherever the transplant is to take place.

In the meantime, the eye bank locates the recipient from its waiting list, and arrangements are made for transplant surgery.

In addition to its function as a clearinghouse between donor and recipient, the eye bank conducts an extensive public education campaign in conjunction with the local Lions Clubs. The eye bank in Iowa has prepared an excellent brochure explaining the program, "What You Should Know So Others May See," and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

**WHAT YOU SHOULD KNOW SO OTHERS MAY SEE: QUESTIONS MOST ASKED ABOUT THE LIONS EYE BANK**

1. What is the purpose of an Eye Bank? Its main purpose is to act as a clearinghouse between the person donating his eyes after death and the person needing a corneal transplant.

2. How can I donate my eyes to the Eye Bank to be used after death?

By writing to the Iowa Lions Eye Bank, University Hospitals, Iowa City, Iowa, and requesting a donor card. This card should be signed and notarized. Section A is returned to the Eye Bank office and an identification card will be sent to you. Section B may be kept by the next of kin or your family physician.

3. Does age make a difference?

Under three years of age eyes are not used, but all other eyes are acceptable.

4. Does the cause of death have any effect on the use of the cornea?

The cause of death is usually of little significance.

5. Does it matter if the donor wears glasses?

No. Previous eye surgery or diseases of the eye do not affect the donation of eyes.

6. How soon should eyes be removed and when must they be used for surgery?

Eyes should be removed as soon as practical, generally within four hours after death. Eyes for corneal transplants are usually used within 36 hours after they are removed.

7. Do eyes donated to the Eye Bank serve other useful purposes than grafts?

The research program is very important and all parts of the eye not used for surgery are used for research and teaching.

8. Are there any charges for the Eye Bank services?

No. Eyes are furnished to surgeons and there is no cost for the eye to the patient. The removal of the eye is done as a service. It is not possible to buy or sell eyes.

9. Is there disfigurement after removal of donor eyes?

There is no disfigurement whatsoever.

10. Can eyes be left to specific individuals?

No. This is not practical. As soon as the physician decides a person is a candidate for a corneal transplant his name is put on the waiting list. It is not necessary for him to wait until an acquaintance dies to receive his transplant.

11. Who can be helped by a corneal graft?

Those people who have defective vision or no vision due to corneal defects caused by disease or accident may be helped by a corneal graft.

12. Can whole eyes be replaced?

No. Only the cornea or surface tissue of the eye can be replaced.

13. Who removes the eyes from deceased donor and where does he get the necessary equipment?

Sixty-eight Eye Bank Kits with all the sterile equipment for removing eyes are placed in strategic places over the state. The

eyes are removed by physicians and if the doctor needs the equipment he calls the County Sheriff, who contacts the Highway Patrol. The equipment located nearest the doctor is immediately taken to him and as soon as the eyes are removed they are delivered to the University Hospital or wherever needed, in the ice filled container, by the Highway Patrol.

Mr. Speaker, the success of the eye bank program in Iowa and throughout the country is due to the combined cooperative efforts of dedicated ophthalmologists, service organizations like the Lions Clubs, public officials like the highway patrol, and the thousands of individuals who donate their eyes.

The impact of the program is perhaps most dramatically evidenced in the lives of the individual recipients. An article recently appeared in the Cedar Rapids Gazette describing the experience of one such recipient, and I include it at this point in the RECORD as testimony of the importance of this national effort:

**EYE BANK CORNEAS PROVIDE SIGHT FOR YOUNG CEDAR RAPIDS MAN**  
(By Ken Sullivan)

Robert Rush, Jr., 2201 Birchwood drive NE, is an unusual young man.

Unusual in the sense that, at 22, he contracted an eye disease more common to older persons and more prevalent among women.

Unusual in the sense that he has undergone surgery three times to correct the problem, although such corrective surgery normally is better than 90 percent successful after the first operation.

Bob, a 1962 graduate of Washington high school, was a junior at Northwestern university in Evanston when he first became aware of the eye defect, keratoconus. It's a disease which causes the cornea to protrude—conical fashion—rather than gently rounded as on unaffected eyes.

**LITTLE KNOWN**

Little is known about the causes of the disease other than it almost always requires surgical corrective procedures. The alternative to corneal transplant is eventual blindness. In Bob's opinion, a transplant was "the only alternative."

Surgical replacement of the cornea from Bob's left eye with one supplied through the Iowa Lions Eye Bank at the University of Iowa hospitals was first conducted last June.

By the time his appointment with surgery rolled around, Bob had overcome his anxiety . . . and "was excited" about the operation and what it would accomplish.

The transplant procedure, he said, lasted about 60 minutes. Bob had been given a local anesthetic and was aware of what was going on around him. His right eye had been covered, but he could hear the doctor's instructions to his assistants and he could feel pressure, but not pain, when the actual transplant was taking place.

**LASTED 7 WEEKS**

That cornea lasted about seven weeks. Then, apparently because of infection, the transplant failed. Bob underwent an emergency operation to substitute the original transplant with a second.

The second proved to be only a temporary measure. Fewer sutures were used in placement of the cornea and, in Bob's opinion, his body eventually rejected it.

The third cornea, however, has been in place eight weeks. All indications currently are optimistic, Bob relates. He returned early last week from a three-week vacation in Florida. While there, he visited Dr. Alson E. Braley, medical director of the U. of I. eye

bank. Braley, too, passed on an optimistic word.

The young man, anticipating a return to his U. of I. law school studies possibly next year, said there is no discomfort in his left eye; although vision remains "fuzzy."

**INACTIVITY**

His primary discomfort during the entire sequence of transplants has been the inactivity. Doctors cautioned him against any strenuous physical activity for three months after surgery.

A handball enthusiast, he has been kept off the courts since last November. He was permitted to play then only because it had been determined the second transplant was a failure.

He worked last summer in Linn county's newly created legal assistance office and hopes to return there again this year; summer school, "not at Iowa," is a possibility, however.

Bob's semi-invalid state—not permitted to indulge in recreational activities, lift heavy objects, etc.—has been, he said, "harder on my parents than me."

**UNOFFICIAL SPOKESMAN**

His experiences over the last nine months have turned young Rush into an unofficial spokesman for the eye bank and its program of soliciting eye donations.

During his inactivity he sent off letters to half a dozen newspapers (including The Gazette) relating the need for eye pledges. Additionally, he said, most of his visitors leave with donor registration cards and a small brochure entitled, "What You Should Know So Others May See", distributed by the Iowa Lions Eye Bank.

Bob will continue, he said, "by word of mouth to point up the needs of the eye bank."

Two of the new corneas transplanted to Bob's left eye have been supplied by Iowans who pledged their eyes before death. Those were the first, which became infected and were removed, and the third, which is functioning well after more than eight weeks.

The second cornea was secured through the national eye bank network because it was needed in a hurry for the emergency surgery.

Dr. Braley and T. A. Hunter of Iowa City were instigators of the eye network.

**SEVENTY-SIX 1967 TRANSPLANTS**

Ruth Fisher, public relations assistant in the department of ophthalmology at University hospitals, and herself a recipient of transplanted corneas, said 76 corneal transplants were conducted in Iowa last year; 66 of them using corneas donated by Iowans, and ten with corneas from the national network. In addition, she said, three corneas were sent to other locations—via the net—from Iowa.

At the time of a donor's death, she said, the eyes are removed . . . usually by the family physician . . . and relayed to Iowa City by the highway patrol.

She was especially complimentary of the patrol's part in the project, citing the dependability of the relay in making sure the vital organ arrives quickly and undamaged.

The eye bank was established in September 1955. Between then and March 1, 1968, Miss Fisher said, 454 corneal transplants have been conducted.

The search for eye donors is a continuing program. The Lions clubs of Iowa are the only perpetual sponsors of the project; although the university, itself, provides assistance, and some eyes are donated independently.

Recipients do not pay for the corneas. They are provided free. The patient must, of course, bear the other expenses, except in charity cases.

**THOUGHTFULNESS**

For Bob Rush, Jr., the thoughtfulness of some unknown Iowan means continuing

sight; the sight which will be so important to him as he continues his studies toward a career in law.

He has another eye operation in store; his right eye also will need corrective surgery. This, however, will be put off a year or so if Bob has his say. Nine months of inactivity are enough.

**POPE PAUL VI ST. CYRIL MASS CELEBRANT IN ROME—BISHOP ANDREW G. GRUTKA, OF GARY, IND., CONCELEBRANT**

**HON. RAY J. MADDEN**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 14 of this year in Rome, thousands from Slavonic nations assembled in honor of St. Cyril, apostle of the Slavonic nations. This assembly of the faithful participated in a 3-day celebration from February 14 to February 16.

Bishop Andrew G. Grutka of Gary, Ind., assisted Pope Paul VI as concelebrant in this religious tribute in honor of St. Cyril. Two Slavonic cardinals who visited the diocese of Gary 2 years ago as guests of Bishop Grutka; namely, Jozef Cardinal Beran, of Prague, Czechoslovakia, and Franjo Cardinal Seper, of Yugoslavia, a Croatian prelate, also participated in the mass. Both cardinals occupy important Vatican positions.

Another happy coincident was that while the 3-day celebrations from February 14 to February 16 were in the Vatican, our American astronaut, Colonel Borman, a native of Gary, Ind., and his wife and two sons were received by Pope Paul in special audience in the Vatican.

The students of Andean High School and the parochial schools in Gary and Whiting were happy that the Reverend Mother M. Bernard, with two sisters of the congregations of SS. Cyril and Methodius who teach in these schools, took part in these historical ceremonies.

The Slovak Catholic Federation of America will meet for its 45th national convention the week of April 20, 1969, in Youngstown, Ohio. I am informed by Editor John C. Sciranka, press director of the federation, that in honor and tribute to St. Cyril, Pope Paul issued an apostolic letter which calls for unity of all Slavonic nations. Considering that they number close to 400 million—of which over 40 million live in the United States—we are indeed happy about this unity as a sign for a better future.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks an editorial from the newspaper Good Shepherd-Dobry Pastier, narrating detailed information regarding the historic gathering of the Slovak faithful in Rome:

**ST. CYRIL'S CELEBRATION IN ROME SPELLED UNITY OF SLAVONIC NATIONS**

The ancient unity of the Slavic peoples blazed into life in St. Peter's basilica in Vatican at a multilingual Mass concelebrated by Pope Paul VI and 14 Slavic prelates on February 14, 1969.

The Pope, prelates and Slavic pilgrims, including 1,000 from Czechoslovakia, were

making the 11th centenary of the death of St. Cyril who gave a large part of the Slavic peoples a common alphabet and the Christian faith.

Slavic languages, both ancient and modern, echoed through the Basilica and the colors of sundry national costumes flashed from the pilgrim ranks.

Pope Paul, surrounded by bishops representing almost all the modern nations, reminded the Slavs that fidelity to the Holy See was at the heart of St. Cyril's enduring achievement of the Christianization and culturalization of the Slavic peoples.

"He always professed the primacy of the Roman Pontiff and submitted to the judgment of the Apostolic See his liturgical innovations, his literacy, work, and the problems of his missionary activity," the Pope said. Here as elsewhere in his sermon and his address later that day to an audience of Czech and Slovak pilgrims, his historical references had overtones of present-day problems.

He told a pilgrimage audience: "Today as in all your history, you have known how to bear witness, often by hard suffering borne with dignity, to your deep conviction, your Cyrillian and Methodian faith, that is a faith that is authentically Catholic." The word "Methodian" was a reference to St. Cyril's brother and fellow apostle to the Slavs, St. Methodius.

The Pope said St. Cyril's greatest merit lies in having "invented an alphabet for the Slavic language and having begun the Slavic version of the Holy Scriptures and of the liturgy."

He pointed out that St. Cyril had put both the Byzantine and Roman Liturgies into Slavic "because he desired the fully aware participation of the people in divine worship."

The Mass he was concelebrating was in the Roman rite but it was sung not only in Latin and Greek but also in Slovak and Czech. Hymns were sung in the latter languages and prayers were by laymen in various modern Slavic languages. The Lord's Prayer was sung in ancient Liturgical Slavonic.

The Pope called love for Christ's universal Church under the Pope's guidance "the fulcrum of the work and teachings of St. Cyril."

He noted that St. Cyril regarded all as equal in Christ and so strove to integrate the Slavs into the universal Church. At that time there was a serious crisis between the Byzantine Church and Rome. "In those difficult upheavals in the Church's history," the Pope said, "St. Cyril, notwithstanding his Byzantine patriotism and his personal friendships followed the right path both in doctrine and practice."

Here, the Pope made his observation that St. Cyril always professed the pope's primacy. In the basilica were representatives of various Orthodox churches not in communion with the Holy See.

The Pope continued: "Only in communion with the Apostolic See will you be able to find the right solution to your religious problems. Closely united to the successor of St. Peter, you will be able to open yourselves always more to a healthy ecclesial ecumenism toward your separated brothers, as you have already done in the past."

Among concelebrants of the Mass were the exiled archbishop of Prague, Czechoslovakia Jozef Cardinal Beran; the present apostolic administrator of that see, Bishop Frantisek Tomasek; Franjo Cardinal Seper, Prefect of the Vatican's Doctrinal Congregation, at Croat; and Bishop Andrew Grutka of Gary, Ind., an American of Slovak ancestry. Also among the concelebrants were five Bishops of Czechoslovakia, including Bishop Ambroz Lazik and Bishop Robert Pobožny. Also Slovak-Byzantine Bishop Michale Rusnak of Toronto, Canada, and Bishop Ladislav Rubin, a Pole who is secretary general of the Synod of Bishops.

L'Osservatore Romano, Vatican City daily, reported that an official delegation from the

Macedonian Republic of Yugoslavia was present, along with three representatives of the Macedonian Orthodox Church. Also at the Mass, in a place apart, was a representative of Metropolitan Chrysostom of the Orthodox ecumenical patriarchate of Constantinople, Archimandrite Gennadios Zervos.

At the audience for pilgrims from Czechoslovakia shortly after noon, Pope Paul observed that they constituted "the first official pilgrimage" from their country for 30 years.

He said Czechs and Slovaks were characterized by love of truth, justice, freedom, and peace. But, he said, "these goods are indivisible. Nobody can be free if there is no religious freedom. Culture is incomplete when transcendental values are denied. There is no genuine justice when it is not applied equally to all."

The Pope said he could read in their eyes that they wanted no privileges but only their natural rights. And here he cited the rights to have a bishop govern each diocese freely, to have seminaries, religious orders and congregations, a Catholic press and religious instruction.

The Ambassador of Czechoslovakia in Italy took part in the ceremonies.

**JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT IN WILMINGTON, DEL.**

**HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.**

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, Junior Achievement is a most promising, but little publicized, privately sponsored job experience program. Each year it offers thousands of young Americans of all races and backgrounds experience in business and practical economics. When we talk of ways to foster greater economic participation by all segments of our society, the example set by Junior Achievement would be a good one to follow and build upon.

Bill Frank, in a recent edition of the Wilmington, Del., Morning News, wrote an excellent editorial on the fine work being done in Delaware's largest city by Junior Achievers under the guidance of George Freytag, Jr. I would like to place the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

**JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT ACHIEVES QUIETLY**  
(By Bill Frank)

George A. Freytag Jr. turns out to be so utterly right.

One of the most important non-racial youth programs in Wilmington today is the Junior Achievement.

Freytag, executive director of Junior Achievement in the Wilmington area, says: "We read, hear and watch on television all kinds of reports of young men and women who are ready to tear apart existing organizations and institutions. We hear this kind of thinking and action is filtering down to high school students.

"But what about Junior Achievement?" So, what about it?

Freytag says: "In the past 13 years in Delaware, more than 7,000 young people, blacks and whites, have worked together in complete harmony. We have never had an unpleasant incident. This experience can be multiplied by the hundreds of Junior Achievement programs in operation all over the United States and other parts of the world."

Okay, so what makes Freytag so utterly right?

Simply this. He says:

"Despite the 13 years' existence of Junior Achievement here, it is suspected that many businessmen, educators, parents, community leaders and others don't really appreciate the job Junior Achievement is doing. For some reason, it has been difficult to communicate and motivate enough adults to visit Junior Achievement operations to see what takes place."

According to Freytag, Junior Achievement in Delaware, with a most modest budget, brings together an average of 600 young men and women of both races each year to teach them practical economics and the potentials of the free enterprise system—or capitalism, if you want to call it that.

Unfortunately, Junior Achievement hasn't gotten the headlines it deserves, because it appears to be a positive program. No conflict; no name-calling; no mugging; no "stick 'em up" business.

Junior Achievement in Wilmington is located at 227-A. W. 9th St., right in the heart of downtown Wilmington. Or, hadn't you known about it?

Junior Achievement is a long story. Let me be brief:

It is a nationwide "learn by doing" practical economic education program in which high school students organize and manage their own small-scale businesses under the guidance of adult advisers from business and industry.

Each Junior Achievement company is organized in the fall as a corporate structure. About 20 youngsters are in each company, with a board of directors, working force and sales staff.

They select the product they are going to make or the service they will render. They capitalize their business through public sale of capital stock at \$1 a share.

They pay dividends, pay rent, etc., and at the end of each program year, they liquidate their company and issue stockholder reports.

What do the youngsters think of their Junior Achievement experiences? Freytag recently took a poll. As I give some of their experiences, it is important to designate who is white and who is black because therein you get an idea of the compatibility among the youngsters.

I'm selecting the youngsters from a fat file Freytag has shown me:

Mike Chivis, Wilmington High School (black): "Junior Achievement gives me the chance to work with people of different ethnic backgrounds. We are all here for one purpose and that is to work for unity."

Nadine Brainard, Mt. Pleasant High School (white): "J.A. can be described as an ice breaker between different ethnic and racial groups. Teen-agers from different backgrounds meet with each other once a week and work together as a team. No one is judged by his race or creed."

Tom Burns, P.S. du Pont High School (white): "Before I joined J. A. I thought a company just earned money from products it had sold and then it paid its workers with some of that money. Now that I have joined J.A. I have realized that our business system is very complicated. I now have a fairly good idea of how a company operates. I also know that it makes no difference who you are, or what race, nationality or religion you are a member of, as long as you do your job in the company."

Debbie Burke, Howard High School (black): "I signed up for J.A. to learn more about the business world. I have never been involved in the manufacture of any products, so I decided to learn all I could by coming to J.A. To date, it has been a very fulfilling experience."

Henry Brookins, Wilmington High School (black): "One of the main requirements I think that makes a J.A. company a success is brotherhood, each and every member working together in unison and cooperation."

Bernadette Brown, Wilmington High School (black): "I think that being together and forgetting the outside problems of the world brings us all together. Having fun and learning to work together is one of the J.A. purposes. . . ."

Kathie Ritchie, Padua (white): "I don't feel that there is a color barrier in J.A. It provides an opportunity for teen-agers of all races and creeds to work together in fellowship and harmony—with lots of fun involved."

I don't hear of television panel moderators rushing over to interview Junior Achievement tycoons. Maybe the peaceful constructive life isn't as appealing as the violent restless, turbulent one. Too bad.

This Nation has grown wealthy and powerful, Mr. Speaker, on the enterprise of its people. That some today are denied full opportunity to participate in the economic life of this country is not only wrong, it is wasteful. I have been privileged to visit the Wilmington Junior Achievement Center on several occasions and each time have come away more impressed than ever with the job Junior Achievement is doing and the potential of this program.

Undoubtedly, there are and will continue to be problems in helping under-educated Americans achieve their full potential, but the Junior Achievement program of offering practical training and experience is a sound approach that merits study.

#### CLEAN WATER NEEDS BIG U.S. AID

### HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the lack of clear water affects many communities in the United States. Cognizant of this problem, Cleveland citizens have voted to tax themselves in the enormous amount of \$100 million toward an effort to provide clear water for their people. Cleveland cannot attain their objective of clear water unless there is Federal financial participation to assist them.

It is fair to assume that some other communities may likewise need Federal assistance. The problem affecting Cleveland as well as other cities is presented in a very sound editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 26, as follows:

#### CLEAN WATER NEEDS BIG U.S. AID

Massive federal assistance will be required if Cleveland is to achieve the total program of water quality control sought by Dr. Edward J. Martin, chief of the city's Clean Water Task Force.

Clevelanders have agreed to spend \$100 million for the program, but it will cost 10 or 15 times more than that.

Industry will help by paying fees for city services in removing industrial pollutants and providing clean water for industrial processes.

The state must help, too: It has \$100 million to spend on pollution control.

But the federal government will have to come through with some really big money.

Congress has long recognized—in theory, at least—that the federal government has

important responsibilities for halting water pollution.

In its Clean Water Act, Congress authorized ever-increasing expenditures for water pollution control (they were supposed to reach \$1 billion for the year 1970). But Congress reneged when the time came for appropriations, which were small in relation to the need.

This is a serious default on the congressional commitment to help the pollution battle. It is shameful guardianship of the nation's water resources.

What is really needed to achieve a total program of water quality control, here and throughout the nation, is a federal aid program of the magnitude suggested by former Mayor Ralph S. Locher.

He proposed that the federal government help cities build treatment works as it helps states build highways, by providing 90% of the construction costs.

Under such a program, Cleveland would already have in hand the local money required for Dr. Martin's grand design.

Is it hopeless to expect the federal funds will be available for such a program?

Not at all. The March issue of Fortune magazine points out that federal tax revenues in the years ahead will rise with the steady climb of the gross national product.

This will provide a "fiscal dividend" that can be used for stepped-up spending on domestic problems: pollution control, better medical care and education, rebuilding the inner city, and welfare reforms. Plugging tax loopholes and ending boondoggles could enlarge the dividend.

The nation has the wealth. It is high time that a decent share of it is applied to making life more livable.

#### REPRESSION IN GREECE: AN ARTIST ON THE SPIRITUAL RACK

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, this is the week that Greece observes the 148th anniversary of its War of Independence, which began on March 25, 1821.

Greece's experiment in parliamentary democracy began in the 1820's. Despite many setbacks, including the imposition of a king upon them by the great powers in 1842, and a number of brief dictatorships, the fact remains that Greece is one of the oldest democracies in the world.

This is preface to the melancholy observation that a repressive dictatorship exists in Athens today. Freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, political parties, and due process of law are all prohibited.

Postwar Greece benefiting from the fruit of Greek individualism and increased educational opportunities, had begun to produce a brilliant array of musical composers, actors and actresses, film directors, poets, designers, and city planners. Some Hellenophiles even began to talk hopefully of a "Second Golden Age."

Now the lights are going out for this new wave of creative people. Isolation inside Greece or exile is their lot, for the military junta, emphasizing characteristics of dictatorships, made the creative arts one of the first targets of repression.

As we know, one of the most popular films of recent years was "Zorba," starring Anthony Quinn, based on a novel written by the late Nikos Kazantzakis.

Three Greeks played prominent roles in "Zorba." They were Irene Papas, the accomplished actress, Michael Cacoyannis, the brilliant young director, and Mikis Theodorakis, who composed the music.

Today, Irene Papas and Michael Cacoyannis, critics of the regime, remain abroad. Mikis Theodorakis is in bitter exile within Greece, assigned by the junta to the remote village of Zatouna, located in the highest reaches of the mountains of central Peloponnesos.

Theodorakis was a parliamentary deputy for EDA, a party dominated by Communists and fellow travelers and representing perhaps 12 percent of the vote. In Greek political circles he was regarded as more of a decorative figure than a serious tactician. Politically, he was more naive than sinister.

In any event, Theodorakis the composer represents an enormous natural resource for Greece. He is one of the greatest composers in the world, and it would be a tragedy if his career ended in misadventure.

The measure of the man is suggested in a tribute written by Michael Cacoyannis in the LP album, "Irene Papas Sings Theodorakis." He writes:

Mikis Theodorakis is best-known outside Greece as the composer of "Zorba the Greek." What is more important, if less widely known, is that in the last ten years Theodorakis has reshaped and dominated the musical life of his country in a way that has no parallel in the world today. His songs which number well over a hundred, have sprung from the enormously rich soil of Greek traditional music with a fresh, individual and often very sophisticated vigour. Many of them are extremely difficult to sing and their complex tempi rule out any possibility of orchestral dance arrangements. And yet, one after another, they have risen to the top of the popularity lists, invading everyday life with the obsessive appeal of hit tunes, though clearly stamped with a quality that transcends fashion.

A new Theodorakis song does not replace an old one. It becomes part of an ever-growing cycle, a vibrant tradition that has taken firm root in the country's cultural life. There is no doubt that this is due, in no small measure, to the quality of the lyrics, which express the problems and passions of the Greek people through the vision of our best living poets, among them Nobel-prize winner Seferis, Elytis, Ritsos, Gatsos, Christodoulou, and others. It is a startling and stirring experience to see poetry break loose from the printed page and become a living voice in the street, the way it was in ancient times when people sang the verses of Homer.

The Washington Post Outlook section of Sunday, March 23, 1969, carried a powerful story, written by John Barry, of the London Sunday Times. Dated in Zatouna, Greece, it tells of the fate which has befallen Theodorakis. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, the article follows:

GREEK MAN OF MUSIC FACES DEATH BY EXILE  
(By John Barry)

ZATOUNA, GREECE.—The coffee house at Zatouna doubles as the village barbershop. Here, most afternoons between 3 and 5, Mikis Theodorakis comes to while away a little more of his exile in this desolate place. And

it was here that a smuggled message had arranged for me to meet him.

I had walked for two days to reach this coffee house.

Just out of sight of the window, round the bend in front of the church was Mikis Theodorakis's home. For seven months, all thru the last bitter winter, Theodorakis, the greatest composer in Greece, has been confined to this mountain village with his wife and two young children.

The regime in Athens says this is necessary because he is a dangerous Communist (he was a Marxist deputy in the last freely elected assembly). But the more potent reason for his banishment is that above and beyond politics, Theodorakis and his music have become a symbol of resistance to the military rule.

The symbol is fading. Theodorakis is dying in Zatouna. In the inclement climate of this village, the tuberculosis he contracted in his previous exile during the civil war 20 years ago has returned worse than ever. Now he is coughing blood.

He finds movement increasingly painful, too; a weak heart has given him poor circulation, and in the mountain cold his hands and feet swell. There is no doctor in Zatouna and Theodorakis refused to be taken to a prison hospital, defiantly demanding the right to go to an ordinary hospital in Athens. But those who see him are convinced that unless he is brought down from Zatouna soon, he will die.

I learned this from the villagers of Zatouna and its neighbors. Theodorakis himself was too ill, or too well guarded, or perhaps just too despairing, to meet me.

All I saw was his white, ill face—much thinner than in the photographs I knew—looking down from an upstairs window of his house. But Zatouna, the journey to it and my brief encounter with the village itself revealed perhaps more than Theodorakis could have about the everyday life of a dictatorship and the nature of exile and repression.

I got to this desolate spot by the relatively simple expedient of avoiding the Greek police for a week. No journalist has been allowed here officially, and the guards in the village have orders to turn away all outsiders. So I decided to go by a devious route.

To enter the country, I took the Orient Express from Belgrade. (Security police concentrate on airports.) A local train took me on from Athens to Tripolis, the railroad for the central Peloponnese. And at dusk in Tripolis, I boarded a village bus carrying peasants home from a day at market.

Zatouna is approachable only from the south, east and west; to the north, the way is barred by almost impassable mountains. But from the south and east, it would be obvious to police that a traveler could be heading only for Zatouna.

Thus I resigned myself to a long march to Zatouna from the west. A dirt track leads into the village from that direction, then—turning into the only road out of Zatouna—heads east to the village of Dimititsana.

Once I had hit the dirt track, I had a valid reason for passing through Zatouna. I could say I was heading for Dimititsana on my way back to Tripolis.

I got off the bus at Langadia, the nearest village to the start of this makeshift route. Next morning, after a night's sleep above a butcher's shop, I set out on my two-day hike.

I stuck to the rocky paths winding along the mountain contours. At each little hamlet along the way, while the pot of Turkish coffee brewed on the shallow charcoal brazier, I was politely interrogated.

#### WELL SUITED FOR EXILE

New posters glared down from the coffee-house walls. They showed a blue arrow winding its way through a maze, the evils of decay, the old politics and communism lying in wait. But the arrow emerged triumphant,

pointing to a new start for Greece. I wondered how much the regime was spending on propaganda.

Too much, the peasants seemed to think. No peasant has ever admitted to good times, of course, but the woes of the Peloponnese were consistent enough. Everything was going up in price—shoes, tools, even the bus fare to Tripolis.

Over large glasses of ouzo, a village headman estimated that the cost of staples like flour had gone up by one-fourth. The rest of the room nodded in agreement.

Shortly before 3 p.m. on the second day, I swung around the final bend in the track and Zatouna lay below me. It was siesta time; nothing stirred. I headed down toward the village square.

What I learned in Zatouna was disquieting. It is widely believed—even in Athens, by those personally acquainted with the regime's less amusing aspects—that Theodorakis, within the boundaries of his exile, is allowed to live a normal life. The regime has encouraged this belief. Exile, the colonels have said, is more merciful than prison.

But the truth is less happy. To his banishment, Theodorakis's captors have added refinements of unpleasantness.

#### A FLOODLIT HOUSE

Theodorakis himself has virtually no freedom. He may not travel beyond the bounds of Zatouna, and his guards have decided that these lie 300 yards either way along the village road.

Even within these, he is accompanied wherever he goes. His one luxury is a small upright piano, and his neighbors say he plays almost incessantly.

His wife Myrto does have more freedom: she may travel to Dimititsana to shop. But to discourage this, and to search for hidden messages, the police undress her twice on each occasion—once before she leaves and again when she returns.

The village schoolmistress actually inspects her, while a policeman examines her pants, brassiere and garter belt. When Myrto has dressed again, the policeman accompanies her to Dimititsana and back.

Nor are their two children, Margaret and George, spared the smaller humiliations. They are 8 and 10, respectively, and they go to the village school just by the church. But to prevent them from smuggling messages, they are segregated from the other children most of the time.

The family has no visitors. Contact with the outside world is reduced to a telephone call once a week from relatives in Athens. Mikis also used to be allowed to consult his lawyer every Friday, but this is now forbidden.

Day and night, a guard stands by the door of the Theodorakis house. At night the guards floodlight the house from all four corners.

Theodorakis remained a face at the window. But in spite of all the precautions the ten guards in Zatouna could take, he still found it possible to give me what he wanted to say. I left bearing letters as well as a tape of Theodorakis playing and singing the last nine songs he has composed in Zatouna.

#### TESTIMONY TO DESPAIR

There are two letters—an appeal to U Thant at the United Nations and a plea to the Council of Europe, whose subcommittee on human rights is now taking evidence in Athens on allegations of torture and the suspension of civil liberties in Greece.

"I ask to be examined as a witness by the commission," Theodorakis says, "so that I may produce evidence documenting my denunciation of the regime."

"From the isolated village where I am detained," he tells U Thant, "I have been following your attempts toward the consolidation of world peace and respect for human rights . . . I should like to submit to

your consideration my own case as an example of how a man's dignity can be humiliated in Greece today . . .

"But despite all this," he says, "I do want to hope that all those 20 or more centuries of civilized life have convinced at least a large part of mankind that the assassination of the intellect of a regime's political opponent is as hideous and intolerable a crime as the physical liquidation of that opponent."

Nine songs in seven months is a pitiful fraction of his former output (more than 200 popular songs, ten symphonic pieces and other works, including ballets and film scores). But even the little music he can write is still banned in Greece.

The ending of the last song he has written in Zatonua expresses his mood:

The laws have taken our dreams away,  
And our songs have turned to smoke.  
The roads have taken our lives away,  
And the joy of us all.

They search among the trees and in the soil.  
They search in my heart.  
But they still find my wound in my eyes  
And in my tears.

## COASTAL WATERS AND THE NATION

### HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call to the attention of the Congress and the American people an excellent address by Edward Wenk, Jr., executive secretary of the National Council on Marine Resources Engineering Development, given at the National Meeting on Water Resources Engineering of the American Society of Civil Engineers in New Orleans, La., on February 3, 1969.

Mr. Wenk sets forth in his address a few principles which could provide a basis for achieving more rational use of coastal resources and meet the problems and the conflicts involved. The address follows:

#### COASTAL WATERS AND THE NATION

(Address by Edward Wenk, Jr., for the national meeting on Water Resources Engineering of the American Society of Civil Engineers in New Orleans, La., February 3, 1969)

Although it is a high compliment for any speaker to be invited to address the American Society of Civil Engineers, it is a special privilege for me because this is the second time in recent years that I have been asked to discuss the questions:

"What stake does this nation have in the oceans?" and "What is the role of our engineering profession in transforming that promise into reality?"

In the first paper delivered in 1964, I pointed out how maritime and exploration development contribute to our country's security, to its economic development and to benefits for an increasingly urbanized society.

Today, I want to go beyond generalities. For one thing, since 1964, our understanding of the marine environment has sharply improved. There have been advances by the scientific and engineering communities, key developments in the Congress, and further involvement of industry and State Governments. Finally, there have been new steps toward Federal policy planning. We have begun to set goals and priorities, and we

have begun to mobilize the necessary knowledge, capital, talent, and institutions to translate aspirations into reality.

Secondly, I feel we must differentiate between sectors of marine environment that differ markedly in physical characteristics and in use: the deep ocean, the deep seabed, the continental shelf and the coastal zone.

This paper is concerned with the coastal zone—that sector of our marine environment where the sea and the land meet, and where the sea and the people meet. It is that part of our marine environment that is most familiar, and which unfortunately we tend to take for granted. I speak here neither as an ecologist nor as a coastal engineer. Rather, I want to share views as one responsible for helping identify the ways and means by which our coastal zone may more effectively serve a people. That will be the theme of this paper.

I shall try to:

Define the challenge presented to the nation to use its coastal resources wisely;

Highlight the issues which should be brought into the forum of public consensus and; finally,

Suggest the engineering content of our future decisions that should engage the attention and the leadership of your profession.

It is especially appropriate to discuss these issues in this gracious city. Nature endowed New Orleans and our Gulf Coast with a beautiful and prolific maritime geography which in the last two decades has been intensively utilized—for transport and trade, for fishing, for oil and gas production and for recreation. As our population mounts, the same waters become used for disposal of liquid and solid wastes, the inevitable products of a technological society. New Orleans and the Gulf have discovered the benefits of the Coastal Zone. And they are fast discovering the problems created by conflicts among these uses.

#### THE COASTAL ZONE—DEFINITION BY USE

What do we mean by the Coastal Zone? Much of our nation's history, and indeed much of its future, is derived from the narrow, irregular band of shallow ocean and coastal land that comprise some 17,000 miles of our country's boundary. The 30 coastal and Great Lakes States contain more than 75 percent of our population. A preponderance of this country's investment by heavy industry is located there. The proximity of land and ocean makes this zone a gateway for a maritime trade of 500 million tons annually, valued at \$40 billion; a staging area for harvesting \$500 million of fish and crustaceans; a locus for shipbuilding, a base for our naval strength and for our seaward thrust for offshore oil and gas that today involve over 6000 wells producing fuel valued at over a billion dollars.

The concentration of population along the coast translates to a growing concentration of markets and of labor. These in turn attract other non-maritime industries, and in turn, more people. All the megalopolis projected for the year 2000 lie in this band. And with the increasing utilization pressure on the coastal zone in its natural form, we also seek to modify it to suit new purposes: offshore airports, offshore oil terminals; offshore nuclear power generation plants.

Beyond economic significance, the coastal zone is a refuge for a busy people—a mecca for the vacationer: 30 million people turn annually to the sea to swim; 11 million to fish; 8 million to sail. The salubrious climate and aesthetic pleasures of our shores are the targets for the fast growing leisure time and money in an affluent society. Tens of millions patronize coastal resorts, and an increasing number select this region for retirement homes.

We could define limits of this zone in terms

of ecology, or of geology, or in terms of legal boundaries. But with this diversity of uses, we first require a definition that is meaningful operationally.

In terms of physical geography, the area is punctuated by estuaries and lagoons, wetlands and beaches, peninsulas and coastal lands. It is characterized by a dynamic interaction of wind, tides, currents, waves, storms and the land. It supports a rich variety of flora and fauna; provides a wintering habitat for most North American waterfowl and nursery grounds for most coastal fisheries.

Conceptually, the coastal zone is a band of water and land surrounding the continent in which the sea exerts a measurable influence on uses of the land and on its ecology; and the land exerts a measurable influence on the uses of the sea and on its ecology. It extends offshore at least to the outer edge of the continental shelf and onshore at least to the upper reaches of lunar tide and adjacent shore areas. Although the characteristics and problems of the Great Lakes may differ considerably from those of a seacoast, they may be appropriately included in our definition.

While united by ecology and use, this region is almost hopefully fragmented by political subdivisions. Coastal lands involve a mix of municipal, county, State and multi-state legal jurisdictions.

At the sea-land interface, there is a complex legal involvement of the Federal Government and the States. Seaward, jurisdiction is largely Federal but much of the coastal zone lies even beyond boundaries of national sovereignty.

Superimposed on the legal boundaries of public jurisdiction is a further tapestry of private ownership, ranging from individual homes to industrial plants, from marinas to shipyards, from resort hotels to private clubs.

#### THE PROBLEM

To complicate this maze of functions and jurisdictions, we deliberately encourage private uses of waters and submerged lands that are themselves in the public domain, while endeavoring to balance and protect both public and private interests. On top of this, we know that certain uses of the water may so alter its natural state as to potentially degrade the resource or deny its use to others having equal rights to access. Moreover, fish and wildlife held in trust by States freely cross State boundaries. So does pollution.

The competition for such resources inevitably stimulates conflict. But to make matters worse, the resource itself is shrinking and subject to natural and man-induced degradation. Coastal waters have often become convenient sinks into which waste products are ultimately deposited. We have filled wetlands; exhausted sites for dredging spoil; lost 10 percent of our coastal waters for shellfish culture because of pollution; wiped out breeding grounds for shad and other anadromous species. We have seen the catastrophe of an oil tanker wreck and a runaway underwater oil well. And coastal regions are visited by some of the nation's most fearsome ravages; hurricane's over the past 15 years have wrought \$5 billion damage to our economy.

Simply stated, the problem we face is an increasing pressure for more intense, more rational and more variegated use of a scarce resource—a resource that is itself perishable.

#### PLANNING FOR MULTIPLE VERSUS SINGLE USE

In this confusion, we have neglected one essential function—planning. Thoreau once admonished "What is the use of a house if you haven't got a tolerable planet to put it on." Unless we consider rational alternatives among competing uses, we will continue to move toward single purpose use, motivated by short-term advantages to individuals, industry or local governments. Such short term or single use orientation—apart from

inhibiting the greater advantage of multiple uses—may actually dissipate the resource itself: Private beach development restricts public access; dredging and filling may downgrade commercial fishing; offshore drilling rigs may limit freedom of navigation. Each single-purpose use may be justified on its own, but the complete effect of piecemeal development can be chaos.

In this technological age, man can do many more of the things he wished to do. What then, should be our goal? *I would suggest that we begin to plan for a harmony of compatible multiple uses, for only by this means can we maintain options for the future.*

Science and technology become tools to accomplish this goal.

Basic scientific information enables us to define the ecological base from which we operate; to understand the natural forces at work, to predict the consequence of man's insults to his environment. From this comprehension, we can then employ better engineering to maintain water quality, inhibit beach erosion; create modern ports and harbors. An entirely new field of biological engineering is emerging—to stabilize beaches with grass; move anadromous fish over dams, utilize offshore platforms as fish havens; employ estuaries for intensive aquaculture. With such information, we can generate criteria to illuminate choices and bolster political courage. Finally, we can offer remedial measures to correct problems triggered long ago in the absence of information or occurring in the future from inadvertence or accident.

But science and engineering are only tools. Their wise and prudent use involves planning and management of bays, estuaries and coastal lands—shaped by an administrative and legal framework to promote an optimal balance among uses and conservation.

Here lie major decisions of public policy.

#### FEDERAL CONCERN FOR MARINE AFFAIRS

The Federal Government has long been concerned about the Coastal Zone. A number of laws have been passed to deal with individual problems, and missions assigned to numerous different agencies.

Heavily involved are ESSA, U.S. Coast Guard, Maritime Administration, U.S. Navy, FWPCA, Geological Survey, Bureau of Sport Fisheries, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Corps of Engineers, Public Health Service, Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Science Foundation. Functions (not listed in any priority order) include provision of nautical charts and sea and storm prediction, conservation, acquisition and development of recreational lands and waters, enforcement of maritime safety, control of beach erosion, improvement of ports, harbors and waterways, water quality planning and enforcement, waste management, shellfish culture, sanitation, assisting commercial and sport fishing, development of scientific understanding of the coastal ecology, etc.

To meet the obvious problem of developing coherent policy and direction with so many different entities involved, a major step was taken at the Federal level with passage of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966. The Act did three things:

1. It enunciated a national determination to mobilize science, engineering, capital, public and private institutions for a long-term, systematic and coordinated effort to utilize the seas for man's needs;
2. It vested responsibility directly in the President for providing momentum, direction and leadership to this program spread among 23 Federal bureaus;
3. It called for an annual report by the President on policies, programs and funding requirements, and
4. It provided the President with two temporary instrumentalities of assistance—a cabinet-level, policy planning Council chaired by

the Vice President, and a public advisory Commission to recommend major next steps and a national plan for their achievement, including consideration of Federal organization.

Both the Marine Sciences Council and the Commission have been hard at work.

#### MARINE SCIENCES COUNCIL

The Council has endeavored to identify unmet national needs to which marine sciences can be more fruitfully directed to: set goals and priorities of Federal actions; clarify agency responsibilities; and improve communication with State and local interests. The Council has met 15 times since it was activated, and dealt with some 60 issues for the President, including such policies and programs as extracting marine protein to meet worldwide malnutrition, expanding ocean exploration, and developing initial steps toward international legal regimes to guide future deep seabed exploitation.

From its very inception, however, the Council has placed strong emphasis on the importance of the Coastal Zone.

It began pilot studies of the Chesapeake Bay, Seattle Harbor and the Great Lakes to provide guidance to broader policies;

It prepared government-wide plans to meet coastal disasters resulting from spillage of oil or hazardous cargo;

It supported the Sea Grant Program to strengthen the base of manpower, engineering research and information services with particular emphasis on local or regional problems;

It initiated plans for a cooperative study of regional port and harbor systems, taking note of new patterns and technologies of cargo transfer;

It appointed an interagency committee to begin drafting guidelines for all the participating agencies to work together on common problems; and

It sponsored a seminar with non-Federal participants from State governments and private interests to examine these problems and reach solutions—recognizing that State and local governments will have a major role to play in resolving the coastal margin conflicts.

An analysis of Federal budgets proposed for Fiscal Year 1970, just released in the President's Third Annual Report, shows \$30.6 million for marine exploration, science and engineering for coastal estuarine problems, \$11.6 million for the Great Lakes, and \$56.8 million for the Continental Shelves.

#### MARINE SCIENCES COMMISSION

The Marine Sciences Commission transmitted its comprehensive report on "The Nation and the Sea" to the President and to the Congress on January 9. The Coastal Zone was also one of the primary areas of their concern, with recommendations that—

Management of the Coastal Zone should continue to be vested in the States; but as backup to State initiatives, Federal legislation should be enacted to encourage and support creation of State Coastal Zone authorities to carry out national objectives. These authorities would have powers to plan and regulate land and water use, and to acquire and develop land in the coastal zone for public purposes;

University affiliated Coastal Zone laboratories should be designated and supported, functioning similar to agricultural research stations and extension services;

Representative coastal and estuarine sites should be set aside as natural preserves to establish a base for studies necessary to assess effects of man's activities on the environment;

Monitoring and research on coastal pollution should be intensified; and

A national research project focused on Great Lakes restoration should be initiated.

The Commission also recommended that these functions be lodged in a new, independent National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency—created by consolidation of a number of marine science oriented activities, now parts of the Departments of Transportation, Interior, Commerce and the National Science Foundation.

In addition, the Commission urged that—State procedures be developed for leasing of submerged lands for such new uses as aquaculture—an industry quite new to this country but having significant potential;

U.S. Corps of Engineers authority be expanded to deny permits for coastal engineering projects if recreational opportunities were jeopardized or other uses degraded;

AEC be authorized to consider environmental effects of projects under its licensing authority.

Their report, submitted in the final days of the Johnson Administration, is now under study, although it is too soon for the new Administration to develop a position as to their findings.

#### ROLE OF STATES

The Council and Commission agree on the key role of the States in dealing with coastal zone problems.

Under existing law, individual States have jurisdiction over most coastal resources: they decide how mineral resources beneath coastal lands and waters are to be exploited; and how coastal fisheries resources are to be harvested. They decide how coastal land and waters may be altered and which uses should receive preference in tradeoffs.

Nevertheless, present State authority over Coastal Zone activities frequently lags behind the problems—

In most States, there is no single focus for guiding rational development, because conservation, economic promotion, pollution control, tourism, highways and community planning are considered separately.

Funds for land acquisition are hard to come by.

Legal control over land use is complex and ineffectual.

Ambiguous and overlapping jurisdiction between local State and the Federal Governments create serious problems because the marine environment is a continuum.

The answer to these problems, in my view, is not to turn to increased Federal regulation, except as a last resort. Rather, it is necessary to buttress the State role and strengthen coordination so as to protect the public interest.

Zoning of land and water, permits for explicit projects, and coastal planning all have a place, but none will be effective unless States are prepared to enforce decisions.

Local government also must be involved—in zoning, advising on water quality, land use, taxation, and compatibility between future and existing coastal uses.

#### THE ISSUE

Let us be sure we understand the goal mentioned earlier:

The issue is *not* how to preserve our coastal resources in pristine purity, nor how to exploit them for greatest, fastest, economic return. Either of these objectives would be easy to achieve if acceptable to the people (which they are not). Rather, *the issue is how to provide for many diverse and often conflicting coastal demands, public and private, and still obtain the greatest long-term social and economic benefits.*

Similar conflicts occur on land. We know they have never been simple to resolve. Along the coasts, the challenge is all the greater because we have an ecologically sensitive environment of limited size; a complex mixture of public and private ownership; a confusion of legal jurisdictions. And to top it off, we are dealing with an area in which fish, water, ships and people freely cross political boundaries, yet few, if any people reside there.

The users are transients with other regional loyalties. We thus encounter a special question as to who will represent their interests in the normal political process?

Let us consider some of the objectives—

To attract industry and foster real estate development while maintaining wetlands, fisheries, and natural beauty of the seashore for all to enjoy;

To extract oil and gas, or mine seabed minerals from the shelf without suffocating marine life, and endangering trawler operations and safe ship navigation;

To provide deeper channels for the next generation of ships without covering the estuaries with spoil;

To protect our beaches and harbors from accidental oil pollution and still profit by economies of scale offered by larger ships.

If I am accused of sustaining a "have your cake and eat it too," attitude, I plead guilty, for I think these goals are attainable—but only (1) if we actively pursue more and broader scientific and engineering solutions to these problems and make the information available to those responsible for policy and decision-making; and (2) if we engage the cooperation and interest of all levels of government involved—local, State and Federal—the private sector and the citizen so as to provide an effective institutional articulation between social goals and engineering opportunities.

#### ROLE OF THE ENGINEER

This discussion of coastal zone affairs may be a disappointment to those who expected a shopping list of potential engineering projects. The civil engineer has distinguished himself in dealing with natural forces to meet requirements of service to human needs. But the engineers should be a partner as well in setting those requirements:

In articulating their vision as to ways and means to satisfy our national goals;

In understanding the economic-social-legal institutional framework in which action takes place for public or private investment;

In seeking knowledge to foster better decisions—knowledge as to our environment and consequences of our tampering with it; knowledge of our society and its processes;

In breaking down narrow technical specialization or parochial self-interests, to see the forest rather than the trees, to couple together better the producers of technical knowledge and the consumers.

In dealing with these issues, every skill of your profession will be needed. But so will its leadership.

C. P. Snow has written that the engineer "the people who made the hardware, who used existing knowledge to make things go, were—interested in making their machine work but indifferent to long-term social consequences." James Killian, President Eisenhower's science advisor, has written, "The engineer's concern for social problems must grow steadily as his work affects society more profoundly." And Whitlock and Edington before the ASEE have said the problems are those whose answers are not found in engineering courses but concern people, sociological needs, aesthetic judgments, political decision—"The complexity of our society today makes an engineer who cannot handle such problems not only limited but dangerous." Our society does not seem to appreciate that its affluence now permits collective political decisions in applying science and technology to our major social problems, but that we don't have a way yet of doing it. For a long time, for example, we used engineering to protect man against his environment. Now we must also consider how to protect the environment against man. Engineers must increasingly become a partner in making national decisions—decision making formerly dominated by men of commerce, law and finance.

I ask that every member of this audience and in the Society begin to consider the pos-

sibilities available to make effective and intelligent use of our marine environment; review the recommendations of the Marine Sciences Commission and articulate their views to this Administration. The Nation needs your help.

#### LOOKING AHEAD

Fortunately, initiatives for recognizing our opportunities as a coastal nation have been free of political partisanship. Both parties supported this enterprise in their platform.

President Nixon has stated that he would make full use of the Marine Sciences Act; that the new Administration would consider an integrated program in oceanography a first priority and would give immediate attention to the Commission Report; and that Vice President Agnew, statutory Chairman of the Council, will take an active part in defining our national interests in the many uses of the sea.

The Coastal Zone evokes a challenge to the nation.

This profession has an opportunity to assist in responding to that challenge.

### RECORD OF PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE STIMULATES PATRIOTISM

#### HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, a recording of Red Skelton's interpretation of the Pledge of Allegiance is being played by local radio stations in Baltimore, and I understand it is also extremely popular in many other cities. This response is gratifying proof that good, old-fashioned patriotism is far from being dead or passe.

Red Skelton has combined the deft touch of the superb showman with the deep feelings of the patriot to produce a masterpiece with his recitation of the pledge. As Americans, we should be grateful to him for having the eloquence to so aptly express what so many of us feel, but which so few are capable of translating effectively into words.

I hope other successful people—not only those in show business, but leaders from all walks of life—will follow this inspiring example and find the courage and pride to publicly voice their patriotism at every opportunity. It is time for the millions of silent, flag-loving Americans to stand up and let the rest of the world know that the dissenters, the extremists and the malcontents are truly an insignificant minority.

Americans everywhere have been touched and impressed by the Red Skelton recording, and I think a national campaign should be launched to carry the words and the spirit of that recording into every home in our great Nation. To help achieve that goal, Mr. Speaker, I submit the following transcript for insertion into the RECORD:

[From the Red Skelton Show, Jan. 14, 1969]

#### THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

I remember this one teacher. To me, he was the greatest teacher, a real sage in my time. He had wisdom.

We were all reciting the Pledge of Allegiance, and he walked over. Mr. Lasswell was his name. He said:

"I've been listening to you boys and girls recite the Pledge of Allegiance all semester and it seems as though it is becoming monotonous to you. If I may, may I recite it and try to explain to you the meaning of each word?" This is what he said:

"I—me, an individual, a committee of one. "Pledge—dedicate all my worldly goods to give without self-pity.

"Allegiance—my love and my devotion. "To the flag—our standard, Old Glory, a symbol of freedom. Wherever she waves, there is respect because your loyalty has given her a dignity that shouts freedom is everybody's job.

"Of the United—that means we have all come together.

"States—individual communities that have united into 48 great states, 48 individual communities with pride and dignity and purpose, all divided with imaginary boundaries, yet united to a common purpose, all that's love of country.

"Of America— "And to the Republic—A state in which sovereign power is invested in representatives chosen by the people to govern. And government is the people and it's from the people to the leaders, not from the leaders to the people.

"For which it stands— "One nation—meaning, so blessed by God. "Indivisible—incapable of being divided. "With liberty—which is freedom and the right of power to live one's own life without threats or fear or some sort of retaliation.

"And justice—the principle or quality of dealing fairly with others.

"For all—which means it's as much your country as mine."

Since I was a small boy, two states have been added to our country and two words have been added to the Pledge of Allegiance—"Under God."

Wouldn't it be a pity if some one said, "That's a prayer," and that would be eliminated from schools, too?

### FEDERAL LOAN TO A FIRM IN AN INDUSTRY SUBJECT TO OVER-CAPACITY

#### HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in a time of general prosperity, it is more important than ever to take vigorous action to eliminate the pockets of poverty that are a disgrace to the Nation and a blight in our economy. I applaud many of the actions that government at all levels has taken to get at the root causes of such poverty, particularly the efforts of help—help that communities all over this Nation have taken. That a Federal agency, such as the Economic Development Administration, exists to assist these communities is commendable. What is not commendable, indeed what is most reprehensible, however, is a situation in which such an agency uses its authority to take an action that has no economic justification, one which gives every indication of both costing the Federal Government a substantial sum, and of failing to help the area where it has agreed to make a loan. Let me be specific. On January 28 of this year, the Economic Development Administration announced that it was making a 20-year

loan of nearly \$1.5 million at 5¼ percent interest—quite a bargain at a time when the prime rate was 7 percent; it is now 7½ percent—to Television Electronics, Inc., of Newport, Tenn., to help it set up a color television tube manufacturing plant. The loan was granted, reportedly, because that part of Tennessee suffers from chronic high unemployment. But less than 3 weeks later, one of the leading manufacturers of color tubes, National Video Corp., filed for reorganization under chapter X of the Federal Bankruptcy Act because of, as it claimed, "continuing excess tube-manufacturing capacity in the industry and the resulting competitive pressure."

It seems highly questionable to me that by any stretch of the imagination the EDA can be excused for lending money to a firm for the purpose of producing a product which, as repeated observers in the trade have pointed out, is in oversupply. The president of the Television Manufacturers of America, for example, noted last month that tube manufacturers of the Nation now have a capacity of around 10 million tubes a year while current production lags at the level of 6 million tubes a year. Leading business advisory services reflect the same opinion. Under these circumstances it seems uncalled for for the Government to encourage production in this already glutted field. I do not wish to suggest that I am opposed to programs that are designed to help areas with high chronic unemployment help themselves. But the least that we can expect is that such help will be intelligent and economically sound in the long run. It may well be that eastern Tennessee needs and can make a go of certain new industries. But it is unwise in the extreme to foster production in an overcrowded field. This is an action that both Newport, Tenn., and the Federal Government, not to mention the overburdened U.S. taxpayer, may have grave cause to regret. I would urge that all lending programs of the Federal Government be scrutinized with added care and expert economic counsel so that this kind of fiasco will not be repeated.

**HANDLOADER DENIED CHANCE TO BE HEARD**

**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, having received permission I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article appearing recently in the Handloader of January-February 1969 discussing not only the evils of the recent firearms control legislation, but some of the heavy-handed and unfair administration which has accompanied that regrettable piece of legislation.

The article follows:

**HANDLOADER DENIED CHANCE TO BE HEARD**

During the Senate hearings on the less-restrictive Administration firearms bill that preceded the one which became law, some-

one (Franklin Orth of the NRA as we recall) noted with approval that the Administration had eliminated ammunition controls. Sen. Thomas Dodd acidly replied that he was glad there was something in the bill of which gun owner organizations approved.

But other advocates of maximum firearms restrictions were quite displeased that ammunition had not been included. Treasury Department officials explained to them that ammunition had not been included in the bill for the simple reason that controls upon ammunition were impractical and unenforceable, as proven by their experience with the old Federal Firearms Act, which included certain controls upon ammunition. The Treasury officials pointed out that ammunition bears no serial number or other identifying mark, making it impossible to trace.

Nevertheless, when the Administration introduced the new law in the aftermath of the assassination of Sen. Robert Kennedy, its earlier position had been reversed. And how! Dealers were required by the proposed regulations under the law to inventory all ammunition in their business on the effective date of the law and to record all future acquisitions, showing "the serial number or other identifying marks of the ammunition."

Ammunition, as defined in the law, includes "ammunition or cartridge cases, primers, bullets, or propellant powder designed for use in any firearm." "Bullets," we have been told, is a generic term which includes lead shot.

How is a dealer to record the "serial number or other identifying marks" of a bag of shot? We've seen plenty of ammunition and components, but we've never seen a cartridge, bullet, primer or can of powder with a serial number. The lot number found on some ammo and component boxes is for quality control purposes only and is useless for identification, since thousands of cans or boxes may bear the identical number.

With each sale of "ammunition," including a box of bullets, can of powder or box of primers, the dealer must record the name, address and date of birth of the handloader buying it. Because "ammunition" can no longer be sold by mail order, handloaders no longer may buy bullets by mail from small manufacturers whose products are too specialized to be economically stocked by dealers. Handloaders won't even be able to buy once-fired rifle or shotgun cases from out-of-state suppliers!

The effect of all this will be to reduce the number of dealers handling components, and to increase the cost of those who do continue, thus increasing the costs to individual handloaders. The result could be fewer handloaders.

Although the stated purpose of the law was to reduce crime, does anyone envision some hardened criminal learning the intricacies of handloading ammunition in order to pursue his "trade"? We doubt it.

The Treasury Department, by its own testimony, is aware that the requirement to record sales of ammunition and components can serve no useful purpose. So are the sponsors of the bill. But most of Congress was not even aware that these punitive provisions existed in the law.

Although there were a series of hearings on various firearms bills, there was never a hearing on the bill which became law. And there were no hearings of any bill which included provisions for controls upon ammunition and components.

It may seem incredible, but we know for a fact that 16 members of the House Judiciary Committee voted for this law the same morning copies were distributed—without the committee even having read it!

Another 16 members who voted to delay consideration for a week so the bill could be read were subjected to a furious tirade from the press and the Administration. As one of

the members of the committee told us privately, "I'm an old country lawyer and I wouldn't let one of my farmer-clients sign a five-acre land lease without at least reading it. But they blistered us because we felt the nation's business should be conducted with the same common sense."

It is astonishing to think that any law could be rammed through with such disregard for sensible deliberation. But that's the way our new gun law came into being—and the reason it contains such travesties as the reloading component restrictions.

Every handloader and shooter is entirely within his rights to insist that the new Congress hold hearings on a bill to remove reloading components from the law. Unless some relationship can be shown between reloading and crime—and we defy anyone to produce evidence of such a relationship—there is no legitimate reason for Congress to refuse to repeal the reloading components section.

Admittedly we would prefer to see the entire bill substituted by a law which would cure the defects of the old Federal Firearms Act without pointlessly penalizing law-abiding citizens. But we see little hope of making substantive changes in the law at the present time.

However, although the new law was passed in a state of near hysteria, all of its major provisions had at least been discussed in open hearings concerning other bills. All that is, except one—the ridiculous reloading components restrictions. And we handloaders should at least be given the right to object to those provisions in a formal hearing.—Neal Knox

**THE NEW VIETNAM POLICY?**

**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, can this be the new U.S. policy in Vietnam to appease the Communists or a surrender-type peace at the cost of additional millions of unfortunate victims? Can any thinking human being feel for 1 minute that if all the troops are removed and the National Liberation Front terrorists allowed to remain, that South Vietnam will be anything but a slaughterhouse for their people?

The report yesterday that the Saigon Government of free Vietnam would confer with the Communist liberation front causes many Americans to raise their eyebrows to question—is this the new administration's new Vietnam policy?

I place the reported Kissinger plan, contained in a report by David Hoffman, Washington Post Foreign Service, on March 26 and headline from this afternoon's lead story from the Evening Star at this point in the RECORD.

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

**KISSINGER PLAN RECALLED**

This kind of talk, plus Thieu's proposal, reinforces the view that President Nixon has fully subscribed to the proposals of Henry A. Kissinger, which called for the United States and North Vietnam to settle the military problems, centered on the mutual withdrawal of forces, while leaving the political future of the South to be settled by the rival Vietnamese groups.

American officials here, in attempting to place Thieu's move in line with previous

South Vietnamese statements, pointed to Vice President Ky's remarks last Dec. 22. On a television program in Paris, Ky then advocated direct talks with the Front.

But at that time Ky drew a distinction between the Front as a "reality" with which his government would have to deal and as an "entity" which he said he would never accept.

Thieu's proposal has the effect of accepting the Front as an entity at least for the purposes of the Paris peace talks.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 27, 1969]

SAYS PRESIDENT DOES NOT SEEK MILITARY WIN—STRESSES PEACE BY PRIVATE TALKS, TROOP WITHDRAWAL

## LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

### HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, this week the League of Women Voters is celebrating its 50th anniversary. This outstanding and great organization has my congratulations for 50 years of dedicated and devoted service to our country.

A splendid article appeared in the South Carolina State and Columbia Record about a beloved constituent of Aiken, and a dear friend, Mrs. Eulalie Chafee Salley.

Mrs. Salley worked tirelessly for woman suffrage and for the League of Women Voters. She was a national leader in organizing both great movements. I commend these excellent articles about a great lady and the League of Women Voters to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and to the people of the entire Nation:

#### LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS TO CELEBRATE 50TH YEAR

Beginning this week, 150,000 members of the League of Women Voters will celebrate the organization's 50th anniversary.

It was on March 24, 1919, that Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, proposed the formation of the League of Women Voters.

Once the women who had worked so hard for suffrage had their goal in sight, they wanted a means of educating feminine voters about government.

The 19th amendment giving women the right to vote was passed in 1919 and ratified in 1920.

All over South Carolina, the 700 state members are celebrating the anniversary. The Columbia-Richland County group will kick off its 50th anniversary campaign drive Thursday with a 12:45 p.m. luncheon at Shandon United Methodist Church.

On a national level, the league hopes to raise \$11 million during the anniversary year for its varied programs.

The league's interests through the years have changed but the organization has consistently supported those policies which the majority of members felt were for the good of the country.

In the 1920s members were working for the Child Labor Amendment and campaigning on disarmament.

In the 1930s they were behind the Lame Duck amendment and the TVA Act.

Support of the UN charter and the Marshall Plan were projects in the 1940s.

Members in the 1950s were behind the

extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements and beginning their work on the conservation of water resources.

Among the national league's programs today is the support of equality of opportunity in education, employment and housing.

The state league, which is celebrating its 20th anniversary this year, was recently commended by Gov. Robert E. McNair for its work on compulsory education, constitutional revision, election and registration laws, jury service for women and water pollution control.

Organized in 1947, the Columbia league has worked for county-wide equitable tax assessment, minimal housing standards, fluoridation of water and a new Columbia Hospital.

Local members are currently supporting the consolidation of the county-city governments and increased personnel and adequate financing of the Juvenile Domestic Relations Court of Richland County.

Mrs. Sherrod L. Bumgardner is president of the state league and Mrs. Robert K. Moxon is the 50th Anniversary chairman. Mrs. Nelson Jensen is the Columbia league president.

Mrs. Jensen notes that women are attracted to the league today for the same reason they organized it in 1920—the desire to actively participate in the governments around them and to do so as informed citizens.

"Our purpose, though, goes beyond simply educating ourselves," said Mrs. Jensen. "On the one hand we select timely governmental issues for concentrated study with the objective of finding solutions members agree on. We then work to accomplish these solutions by convincing the electorate and public officials of the validity of our position.

"The other phase of league purpose we call 'voters' service.' We supply unbiased information on candidates' qualifications and views on issues, registrations and voting, and explanations of constitutional amendments."

#### FRIEND'S FLIGHT PROMPTED WOMEN'S RIGHTS INTEREST

(By Betty Sadler)

At 85, Eulalie Chafee Salley would like to live to see two things—South Carolina ratify the 19th amendment and a woman elected president.

An ardent feminist all her adult life, Mrs. Salley is, as far as she knows, the only living member of the League of Women Voters' first national board.

Though she's worked for women's rights for over half a century, and has seen many accomplishments, she thinks her sex still has a long way to go.

One thing that rankles her is that South Carolina women have never been able to get the state legislature to ratify the amendment giving women the right to vote.

"It's been brought before the legislature time and time again—the last time was 1963—and it gets voted down every time," she said.

(As of 1968, South Carolina was one of only seven states—according to the U.S. Code Annotated—which have never ratified the amendment.)

She doesn't expect to be around when a woman runs the United States but does think it will eventually happen.

#### NEVER RAN FOR OFFICE

As for herself, Mrs. Salley never got around to running for office.

"I had a husband (the late Julian B. Salley) who was very much opposed to publicity and I hurt him enough with all the fool things I did for women's suffrage," she said. "I told him if he'd just let me alone with my suffrage work, I'd never run for office," she remembered fondly.

"The worst thing I ever did was in a play we were putting on to raise some money," she reminisced.

"One of the acts was a prize fight and this cousin and I agreed to do it. We wore black tights and were billed as the 'Gold Dust Twins.'

"I didn't tell my family about it, but when we came out on stage my son, who was 9 at the time, shouted, 'Hey, mother, mother' and gave me away.

"I almost got a divorce. My husband didn't speak to me for days.

"But I did it all for suffrage," she said philosophically.

Eventually, Mr. Salley discovered the suffrage work was taking more money than she "could get out of my husband's pocket before daylight."

So she decided to go into business for herself. Mr. Salley told her she "couldn't make \$8 in six months" and bet her \$100 she wouldn't show a profit the first month.

She went to city hall, got the clerk to read her a list of the licenses available and chose the real estate license.

She paid \$25 for the license (this was 1916) and sold one house that month for a profit of \$1,000. She was the first woman in real estate in the state and still runs her own business. Through the years she's handled many sales for Aiken's wealthy winter colony.

#### FRIEND'S FLIGHT

Mrs. Salley got involved in the woman's suffrage movement because of the plight of a friend.

Lucy Tillman, the granddaughter of Gov. Francis W. Pickens, was divorced from B. R. Tillman Jr., the son of Sen. Ben Tillman.

Under South Carolina law of that time, a man had a right to deed away his children without his wife's consent. Mr. Tillman gave his children to his parents.

"I thought that if there were such laws in my state, I should work for women to have the right to vote," she said.

"There was also a law that allowed a man to beat his wife with a stick, provided the stick was no bigger in diameter than his thumb," she recalled.

One woman was beaten almost to death by her husband for joining the suffrage movement. Fellow members felt, however, that she probably had her revenge.

One day the man inexplicably dropped dead after his wife brought him a glass of buttermilk. She left town shortly thereafter and was never seen again.

Members of the movement had to make their own arrangements and pay their own way as they traveled around. Mrs. Salley traveled a great deal of the time—once arriving in a hearse.

"I went as far as I could on the trolley and got off at the closest station where people from the place I was going to speak in were supposed to meet me," she said.

"When they didn't appear, I hired the only conveyance in town—the hearse—for the last eight miles.

"They listened to me when I got there," she remembered.

One of the unhappiest aspects of suffrage work was the opposition of many women.

"There were more women in the anti-suffrage league than in the suffrage league," said Mrs. Salley. "Many women thought we were some kind of wild animals until they got used to the idea."

The amendment was passed by the U.S. House of Representatives in May, 1919, by the Senate in June, 1919, and finally on Aug. 26, 1920, was proclaimed law.

#### BIG PARADE

"That was a day," said Mrs. Salley. "We had a big parade and the officers of the Aiken County Suffrage League (she was president) led on big black horses.

"There were autos and buggies and we rang all the church bells and fire bells in town."

Once they got the right to vote, members of the suffrage leagues went to work for the

newly formed League of Women Voters to educate women in the use of the ballot.

Mrs. Salley spoke in 41 states in 18 months encouraging women to join. She was regional director of the seventh district in charge of organizing the league in seven states and the District of Columbia.

She's still active on a local level but believes it's time for younger women to carry on. "I go to their meetings sometimes and tell them what to do—but they never do it," she smiled.

Mrs. Salley still thinks the league made a mistake in choosing to be nonpartisan.

"At our first three national meetings there were big fights between those who wanted to be nonpartisan and those who wanted to be partisan. The nonpartisans won and I think this has been a weakness of the league ever since.

"I'm not nonpartisan. I want to say whether I want to vote Republican or Democrat—I don't want to be bound to one party, though I was born a Democrat and I guess I'll always be one. But I want to be able to vote independently."

Mrs. Salley thinks all women should do more than just keep house, though she readily admits she had an ideal situation with both her mother and her childhood nurse at home to raise her son and daughter. (Her son, Julian B. Salley, is a lawyer in Aiken; her daughter, Eulalie Rutledge, runs her own real estate office.)

"Just housework and children isn't enough," Mrs. Salley said emphatically. "It's dreadful to waste that much on house work."

"My husband used to say, 'Why don't you stay home and just take care of the children and the house.' I would tell him that giving me that job was like plowing a race horse . . . you can get any old mule to plow."

FISCAL ENLIGHTENMENT: MODERN  
REPUBLICAN WONDER

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, last week this House raised the national debt limit, after vast heavings and profound soul searching. I was much moved by these spasms of patriotism and expressions of altruism. The tornadic blasts of rhetoric made a hurricane seem like a playful zephyr.

Suddenly, honorable Members who had manned frontline trenches in wars against Government spending emerged as shining knights-errant of a higher national debt limit. I would have sooner expected to see the Joint Chiefs put on hair shirts and open a cooperative pants pressing parlor than to observe what transpired here.

What was a national crime under the Democrats has suddenly received a Republican imprimatur. Previously, whenever a Democratic administration asked for permission to raise the national debt, our brethren across the aisle acted as if we were proposing to throw the Constitution, Declaration of Independence, and Revised Statutes into the fire. This is why I was so amazed last week that I next expected to hear the second coming was imminent, and had caused this change of heart.

Even Mr. Nixon asked for our poor Democratic assistance in putting this raise into effect. Enlightenment rages through Republican congressional and executive halls like a veritable pestilence these days. Refreshing change.

Has light dawned? Will the leopard change his spots? Was Bluebeard really a tambourine player for the Salvation Army? Will the Republican Party stay in this state of enlightened stupefaction? I would sooner hope that an alcoholic in a distillery would take the pledge.

Yet in humble hope but scant expectation, I await the next entertaining episode.

HISTORY OF HOSPITALS AT FORT  
DEVENS, MASS.

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include herein the text of a very interesting, informative press release on the history of hospitals at Fort Devens, Mass., a famous Army installation in my district, prepared by the information office of that great post.

This splendid, very well-done recital of the long, illustrious history of hospitals at Fort Devens is all the more timely because of the recent groundbreaking there for a new, ultramodern hospital facility at the post, filling a real need in providing the best possible treatment for the members of the armed services and their dependents.

I want to compliment the information office of the post for its fine piece of work, which I regard as so important that I will forward the text of the release, together with these remarks, to the Library of Congress and the State library at Boston. The press release follows:

HISTORY OF HOSPITALS AT FORT DEVENS

FORT DEVENS, MASS.—When the War Department decided to erect a cantonment in the Northeastern part of the United States for training conscripted soldiers to fight in Europe in World War I, the town of Ayer was selected for the site, because of the contour of the land, the abundance of good water, the accessibility of modern railroad facilities, and the proximity of the coast in the event of an enemy attack.

The contractor (Fred T. Ley Company, Springfield, Mass.) began clearing the scrub oak and pine from the cantonment site on June 19, 1917.

One week later, there were 1489 workmen at the site ready to erect living quarters for the men who were to be assigned to the cantonment for training as soldiers.

On June 25, 1917, the first medical officer arrived at the camp site to work with the contractor. His name was Captain Glen I. Jones, and he had the title of "Sanitation Officer".

On Tuesday, Aug. 28, 1917, the first large group of medical personnel arrived at the site from Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind. They were members of a sanitary corps detachment and there were 38 officers and 240 enlisted men in the unit. The commanding officer was Captain George Waters.

On Sunday July 15, 1917, the cantonment

site was named Camp Devens, after a native son, Major General Charles Devens, a hero of the Civil War, Attorney General of the United States in President Rutherford B. Hayes' cabinet.

The first permanent Army hospital at Camp Devens opened on Sept. 1, 1917 with 46 of its 59 ward buildings completed. It was designated Camp Base Hospital and was commanded by Major Glen I. Jones. (The first medical officer assigned to the camp in June.)

It was originally planned as a 1600 bed hospital, but by December 1917, it had grown to a 2740 bed hospital making it the 7th largest of the 35 camp hospitals then in existence in the United States, and the 12th largest of all the U.S. Army hospitals throughout the country.

The first patient admitted to the hospital with the dreaded "flu", occurred on Tuesday, Aug. 27, 1918. By the end of the day, six more men were admitted with the same symptoms.

By Sept. 14, there were 1765 cases of flu in the hospital and four days later the number had climbed to 7400 with 68 deaths.

The hospital was staffed with 210 nurses at the start of the flu epidemic, but as the number of patients increased, the Army rushed nurses and doctors to Devens from Army posts all over the country.

12,707 cases were reported by Sept. 30, with 593 deaths attributed to the flu.

The disease had disabled 14,280 servicemen by Oct. 8 and the death toll had risen to 775, including two doctors and five nurses. Camp Devens was the hardest hit of all the military installations in the United States.

The flu started to wane on Oct. 8, and two days later, the post lifted all quarantines and restrictions.

Wounded soldiers from the fighting in France began arriving at Devens on Dec. 1 for treatment and rehabilitation.

The Camp Base Hospital at Devens was staffed with 940 medical corpsmen making it 5th in numbers of enlisted personnel assigned of all 35 camp base hospitals in the United States. With 146 officers on the hospital staff, Devens hospital rated number 2 in the country in the number of medical officers assigned.

On Jan. 2, 1927, the House Committee on Military Affairs authorized expenditures of \$300,000 for a permanent hospital at Camp Devens.

The hospital was to have 105 beds and its total cost would have been over \$400,000, with the extra money to be appropriated before the hospital was completed. Nothing came of the above proposal.

In July 1930, 10 bids were received for the construction of a new hospital. The lowest bidder was the Shawmut Construction Company of Boston who submitted a bid of \$115,284. The bids were forwarded to the War Department for final action.

In October 1930, construction began on the new hospital. It was completed May 10, 1931 at a cost of \$118,708. The hospital contained 35 beds, a dental lab; an operating room; a narcotics vault; an x-ray room, and a diet kitchen. The commanding officer of the hospital was Major William T. Fisher. He had 18 corpsmen assigned to the hospital to care for the patients' needs.

Contracts were drawn up between the U.S. Army and civilian doctors from the immediate area, who would come to the hospital at specified times to assist in medical diagnosis and/or operations that may be required.

On Oct. 7, 1931 Devens was designated a permanent post and referred to as Fort Devens.

When the first peace time draft in our nation's history was instituted in 1940, Fort Devens was given an A-1 priority for new construction.

One of the projects in the construction program was the erection of two hospitals—both to contain 1,000 beds. In the fall of

1940, construction of the two hospitals began, and both were completed in early 1941.

On Feb. 16, 1941, the first of these two hospitals was dedicated and designated Lovell General Hospital, in honor of Surgeon General Joseph Lovell, a native of Mass., who served as an Army Surgeon with the 9th U.S. Infantry during the War of 1812. He was appointed the first Surgeon General of the U.S. Army on April 18, 1818, a post he held until his death on Oct. 17, 1836.

The first commanding officer of Lovell General Hospital was Brigadier General Henry G. Pillsbury, a native of Lowell, Mass. The hospital consisted of 83 buildings housing 32 wards. The first patient was admitted to the hospital on June 15, 1941.

Lovell General served the needs of all the Army posts throughout New England (except Fort Devens), and New York state.

The other 1,000 bed hospital was designated New Station Hospital and was for the care of military personnel and their dependents stationed at Fort Devens. Lieutenant Colonel Miner F. Felch was the first commanding officer of the New Station Hospital.

Both hospitals at Devens were merged in July 1944, and Lovell General Hospital became Lovell General South and the former New Station Hospital became Lovell General North.

On June 24, 1946 both hospitals were inactivated when Fort Devens was slated to be closed. The patients still in the hospitals at the time, were transferred to Murphy General Hospital, Waltham.

The Fort was officially inactivated June 30, 1946.

After the closing of the post, Lovell General North (formerly New Station Hospital) was converted into 400 family units by the Federal Public Housing Authority for use of married veterans who were attending Harvard University, and who were unable to acquire housing facilities near the university due to the heavy influx of veterans returning to college.

As the veterans who lived in the old Lovell General North area were all attending Harvard University, the housing area itself became known as Harvard-Devens.

On July 15, 1948 Fort Devens was once again reactivated, and on Oct. 1, 1948, Lovell General South (the original Lovell General Hospital) was re-opened with 100 beds to care for the needs of the 2200 troops who were then stationed at Fort Devens. The hospital was designated Lovell section of the Murphy General Hospital, Fort Devens.

On May 1, 1950, the hospital was redesignated Station Hospital, Fort Devens and in 1956 was redesignated U.S. Army Hospital, Fort Devens.

The hospital which is now slated to be built on Fort Devens, had its origin back in February 1963, when plans were submitted to the Defense Department for inclusion of the hospital construction in Fiscal Year 1966.

#### DR. WILLIAM S. SHIELDS HONORED

#### HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Service Academies rank among the finest educational institutions in the country. We can be proud of the young graduates who, through their training and experience, make valuable contributions to both the civilian as well as the military way of life. We owe a great debt to those who devote their lives to training these young men.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to one such devoted educator, Dr. William S. Shields, the dean of admissions at the U.S. Naval Academy. Dr. Shields began his career teaching romance languages at Western Reserve in 1937. In 1940 he was commissioned in the U.S. Navy and was assigned to the modern languages department at the Naval Academy. In 1949 he returned to civilian life and was named educational adviser to the Superintendent of the Academy. He acted in the capacity of adviser until 1962 at which time he was appointed to his present position, dean of admissions.

Dr. Shields was honored recently by the Naval Association of New York. They presented him with their annual award for outstanding service to the Naval Academy. I would like to take this opportunity to add my congratulations and thanks to Dr. Shields and to the many other fine Academy educators, who give invaluable service to this country.

#### SOUTH SHORE HOSPITAL MOVES AHEAD

#### HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on March 9, 1969, I had the distinct pleasure to hear the speech of Col. Harry Zubkoff, U.S. Air Force, retired, who is performing a distinctive and outstanding service as executive director of the South Shore Hospital and Medical Center of Miami Beach, Fla.

It was my good fortune to be on hand as Colonel Kubkoff reviewed the amazing rapid growth of this community-serving hospital and its ambitious and worthwhile objective to expand from 50 to 200 beds.

It was my pleasure to address the fundraising dinner and join with all in paying tribute to Dr. David K. Pinks, founder and inspirational leader of the hospital.

So that we might all better understand the difficulties and triumphs of a progressive hospital such as South Shore Hospital and Medical Center, I would like at this point to insert into the RECORD the text of Colonel Zubkoff's speech:

Tonight you see before you an envious man. I have been asked to tell you how reality has caught up with a man's dream. To bring substance to a man's dream may be some measure of achievement but I would much prefer to have been the individual with the dream and that someone other than I had been given the job of describing to you the brick and mortar.

Other speakers who follow—far more qualified and competent than I—will pay earned homage to our honored guest of the evening. I must content myself with cold realities of statistics and brick and mortar. South Shore Hospital is a reality. It is here. It is completely filled with patients. It is bulging at the seams. It now belongs to you. Its future belongs to you.

Our non-profit—I repeat, non-profit—to dispel an old wives tale perhaps spread by one or more groups of "haves" who with

perhaps suspect motives may have resisted the normal growth of medical activities to the detriment of Dade County and Miami Beach, in particular—our non-profit hospital is accomplishing its one and only function; namely, good patient care.

I am sorry that I must use the word "suspect" when referring to the motives of the "haves" but I have no choice when I recall five or six years ago our guest of honor initially tried to build this hospital. The city of Miami Beach council was told by the "haves", we need no more beds in Miami Beach. Since that date, over 50% more beds have been added by those same people and today they probably would again allege "we need no more beds". You people here, especially the physicians whose hearts and backs are perpetually burdened with the chore of no place to take care of the sick and injured people who look to you for actual medical salvation, know this allegation of "enough beds" to be a falsehood.

It is you physicians who must lead the way if you agree with what is said here tonight. It is you physicians who must give materially and always remember to tell each and every patient you care for "support south shore hospital—we all need it".

Every dollar invested in our hospital will buy only one commodity. Good patient care.

No money will be spent on research. No money will be spent on formal education. Unlike some hospital administrators I feel that school systems know more about formal education than do hospitals. Like the old Greek restaurateur cliché, "We cash no checks and the bank serves no soup". So I say, let the schools do the education.

At south shore no money will be spent on experimental equipment. We will provide the very latest tested and accepted equipment. We will not purchase each new fad in cardiac monitoring devices that hits the market only to fade in a short time, or sometimes, even before it is fully installed. To repeat, we will put every ounce of our dedication, ability and dollars into kind and competent concern and care for our patients.

I do not take issue with the medical complexes that have developed across our country.

There are medical schools and there should be medical schools to educate the student and do research.

There are university hospitals and there should be university hospitals to expose the students to some on-the-job experience and to train interns and residents.

There are non-affiliated large hospitals and there should be non-affiliated large hospitals which, unfettered by inbred academic restrictions that may be present in schools and university hospitals, can bridge the gap between research and training at the medical schools and the practitioners in the community.

But the problem is that none of these want to stick to their own knitting.

The school wants to get into the hospital business; the hospital wants to get into the school business. The result is a hodge podge where the patient and "good patient care" are almost forgotten.

For instance, if medical schools had stuck to their knitting of educating students, these schools would have been more successful over the past 20 years in responding to the request and heavy outlay of funds by the people and the Government to produce increased numbers of physicians that this country needs so desperately. This inability to produce in my mind is directly proportionate to their desire to spread into any and all areas of health, perhaps at worst financially motivated or at best overestimating their capabilities in their desire to serve humanity.

What about the large nonaffiliated or quasi-affiliated hospital? Why have they historically turned their backs on the very

communities from which they sprang and where they still are situated?

For some unknown reason, it is almost a dirty word to be a small or moderate size hospital—let's say arbitrarily 250 beds or less. Hospitals that reach this size, for some unknown reason, do not turn their efforts to refine and improve patient care—they try instead to get bigger and bigger, they play at doing research and believe me it is frequently only play which doesn't fool skilled field representatives from our Government who must judge before authorizing grants. These institutions fly off in all directions—education, new equipment evaluations, home care programs, full time staffing, product evaluations, etc. The fact that good patient care may be the loser seems not to concern the semi-large hospital or should I call it the large semi-hospital that has been bitten by the growth, research and education bug.

These large hospitals lose sight of the benefits that come from a patient staying with his hospital family during his stay; the same room, the same nurses, the same orderlies, the same food service people and the same surroundings. It loses sight of laboratory reports that don't catch up with the patient and his doctor until too late to be of diagnostic use: it loses sight of the radiology reports that somehow take second place to the alleged research being conducted, (sometimes nothing more than getting someone's name in print).

There is no doubt that at some indefinable number of beds these are the things that happen. I think the magic number is 250 beds. At this size hospital we can have the benefits that size does bring and I hope none of the disadvantages that real bigness brings.

Already the government is concerned about what it is buying with its Medicare dollar. With the advent of Medicaid which is almost upon us in Florida, the State government is even more concerned about what it will be buying for its dollar.

Recently at a South Florida hospital council meeting I heard Dr. Flipsee make a statement that the Government is concerned because it wants all of the medical benefits possible for its scarce dollar but that the triad or should I say the bigamist marriage of education, research, and large medical complexes make it impossible to relate the costs with the exact benefits. And well Dr. Flipsee and other government agencies should be concerned. The February 18th, 1969 issue of the hospital administrators bible "Hospitals" published by the American Hospital Association states that the same procedure—identical mind you—costs \$17.40 at a small hospital and \$57.77 at a hospital with over 400 beds. I do not suggest that the \$17.40 hospital is the one I recommend. There is no doubt that at this price many basic services and precautions probably were missing. However, on the other end of the pendulum's arc I am sure that the \$57.77 hospital included many "tie-in sales" which were either superfluous or not essential. I would recommend some middle range where the price would be consistent with the needed services.

It is my view that the Federal Government had its chance and muffed it but maybe it is not too late. With the advent of Medicare the Government should have frozen the expansion of any hospital of over 250 beds in size and then supported the creation of principal and satellite hospitals. Existing large hospitals could have improved their capability to perform their primary functions. They, in turn, would be equitably surrounded by smaller hospitals not to exceed 250 beds.

As I have visited large hospitals I have never found a single one that has not been devoting its major thoughts and energies to expansion, expansion, expansion. Never have I found one that was concentrating on improving the things that were their primary

reason for being and never, never, never did I find one that was really giving its major efforts to simply improving patient care. Federal grants for special projects or bed expansion including intensive care complexes seemed to be their sole reason for being.

This should not be.

I say, let's stop the numerical bed growth of these expensive non-oriented to patient care medical institutions. Let us start supporting our communities with a type of health facilities that can best provide for our needs in a personal and competent manner. Let us here in Florida let the rest of the Nation know that we are not only thinking but are doing something about it.

On two occasions I have heard a former president of the South Florida Hospital Council emphasize that hospitals are a "business" with no qualifying, amplifying or explanatory footnotes. Except that it is extremely important to bear in mind that hospitals are primarily a humane endeavor undertaken by a dedicated people who have a passion for compassion, I agree with him. However, if there are more who agree with him it is not sufficiently evidenced in their practices nor in their planning. If it is a business, then it would follow that competition upon which all business is based should be the accepted practice. Competition should be the leveller not some magic bureaucratic formula that is more interested to protect the "haves" than provide the finest and most economical health services through economic competition. "Figures are foolers." For instance, Florida is in group 3 for almost all medical geographical studies done by the American Hospital Association. Thus, Florida is included in the same group as Georgia for certain hospital studies. With no anthropology background and no statistics but only my eyes, ears and mind to make a judgment, I maintain this is absurd. Statistics are misleading. Again—an example. The State of Florida health plan states that 11.7% of the people in Dade County are over the age of 65. This may or may not be so but again when applied to my observation of a sample of the 75,000 individuals in South Beach, I would question whether our planning should be on the 11.7 percentage.

Too, statistics reflect the past and frequently are a poor barometer for the future. I would much rather rely on healthy American competition even when it means that an older medical institution may close its doors or curtail some of its activities because a younger and more competent health activity has managed to provide better health services. It should not and must not be a matter of which came first. Caliber of services delivered should be the criterion. Only competition will rid us of inefficiencies and wastefulness.

At South Shore Hospital our next phase will give us 150 beds and our final phase, I emphasize final phase, will give us 250 beds.

If and when more hospital beds are needed, and the daily replacement of individual homes by condominiums that significantly increase the population density per square foot of land that makes this a certainty on Miami Beach, I vow to support anyone who embarks upon construction of another small independent hospital where youth and vigor will make South Shore Hospital stay on its toes, knowing full well it is in a competitive field whose aim must always be "good patient care".

It is to this philosophy that I ask you to subscribe with both your spiritual and material assistance. To find within each of you the ability to give. To provide both for your community, yourselves and your family a most precious gift—the comfort of knowing that when illness strikes there is in your community the ability to give good patient care.

## CONSTRUCTION SAFETY LEGISLATION

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Select Subcommittee on Labor of the House Committee on Education and Labor was privileged today to hear from Secretary of Labor, George Shultz, and Under Secretary of Labor, James Hodgson, on H.R. 3290, the construction safety legislation which is currently being considered by our committee.

For the benefit of my colleagues I include their statements as part of my remarks:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE P. SHULTZ, SECRETARY OF LABOR, BEFORE THE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR ON H.R. 3290, CONSTRUCTION SAFETY AND HEALTH, MARCH 27, 1969

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: It is a pleasure for us to be here today. I am accompanied by the Under Secretary of Labor, Mr. James D. Hodgson, who will stay following my brief opening remarks, to answer any questions you may have.

It is fitting, Mr. Chairman, that our first meeting with you concerns, generally, the subject of occupational safety and health, and, specifically, H.R. 3290 which is related to this subject to the extent that the bill recognizes the Federal Government's obligation to promote the safe and healthful working conditions of those employees who work under Federal contracting authorities.

The safety and health aspects of working conditions are already protected under Federal law in the case of those employed on Government supply and service contracts. The extension of such protection to the one group of workers presently unprotected; that is, to the construction workers employed under Federal and federally assisted construction projects, strikes us as wise.

I favor the enactment of legislation along the general lines of H.R. 3290 which recognizes that the Federal Government has a special obligation to those who work on Government contracts and extends safety and health protections to the one remaining class of workers who do not now have the benefit of those protections.

Mr. Hodgson will, I'm sure, expand on the Labor Department's views on this subject and answer your questions.

STATEMENT OF JAMES D. HODGSON, UNDER SECRETARY OF LABOR BEFORE THE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR ON H.R. 3290, CONSTRUCTION AND HEALTH, MARCH 27, 1969

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: Since I first assumed my duties as Under Secretary of Labor last month I have looked forward to the opportunity to discuss with you important legislative matters bearing upon the welfare of the working men and women of this country.

Therefore, I am pleased that H.R. 3290 reflects an interest in the broad subject of occupational safety and health, even though its provisions deal only with the working conditions and practices of the building and construction industry when Federal contracting is involved.

H.R. 3290 would promote safe and healthful working conditions for those employed in one segment of a single industry. The measure recognizes that the Federal Govern-

ment has a special responsibility toward those persons who work on contracts entered into under authority of the Federal Government.

Before going into the particulars of H.R. 3290, I believe it might be best to first examine the broad picture of industrial safety and health. In this way, we can gain some perspective on how H.R. 3290 fits into the more general view of industrial safety matters.

We have figures based on the year 1967 covering all industries, grouped into six major categories, which give us a fair overall picture of the workplace hazards for American employees. In industry as a whole, 14,200 persons are killed on the job every year; and over two million are disabled by injuries at work. Our figures show that these total deaths, approximately 20 percent occur in the construction industry. Of the total disabling injuries, the construction industry accounts for about 11 percent.

National Safety Council figures for the same year, but in a more detailed grouping of 41 industries, show an all-industry injury frequency rate of 7.22 disabling injuries for every one million man hours worked, the highest since 1954. That same rate for the construction industry is nearly double; that is, 13.21 disabling injuries. However, among the 41 industries, 22 of them have higher incidences of disabling injuries than the all-industry rate. And 8 of these industries, Mr. Chairman, have injury frequency rates that are higher than that of the construction industry.

In terms of accident severity rates, instead of frequency rates we see from the National Safety Council data more or less the same picture. There are 20 industries which have higher severity rates than the all-industry rate. Five of these have severity rates higher than that of the construction industry.

I want to digress a moment to say that we realize that our statistics on work-related deaths and injuries are not what they should be. One of the major problems in the field of occupational safety and health is the insufficient and inadequate reporting of such fatalities and injuries. But, incomplete as they are, the figures add up this way.

First, we see over 14,000 people killed and over two million injured every year while earning their living.

Secondly, we can conclude that the construction industry involves a more than normally hazardous type of employment. Indeed that industry is one of the most hazardous in the Nation. And it is a sizeable industry employing millions of workers, and involving the investment of billions of dollars annually.

At the same time, we might observe that while construction represents one of our most hazardous occupations, it is, in perspective, only a part of a general problem; it does not represent the whole problem. The construction industry accounts in statistical terms for a little less than a fifth of the overall National workers safety problem.

In the view of the Department, it would thus appear that some sort of comprehensive approach toward improving the working conditions and practices of all industries, including, of course, the building and construction industry, as a whole would be desirable.

However, legislation along the lines of H.R. 3290, which is confined to providing safe and healthful working conditions for the one group of employees working under Government contracting authorities who are not presently protected by Federal law, would be a step forward. The Federal Government would thus round out its safety coverage of those who work under its contracting authorities.

The purpose of H.R. 3290 is to extend to Federal construction contracts the same health and safety protections already provided under other Federal laws to those who work under Government contracts for the

procurement of services and of supplies. Those other laws are the McNamara-O'Hara Service Contract Act and the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act.

We are not yet prepared to speak to the specific provisions of this construction safety bill, or of a general bill. I am sure you appreciate that we will need more time to work out the details of such legislation.

I would like to note, however, that as we see it, H.R. 3290 would operate as follows:

The new safety and health protection would operate as follows:

The new safety and health protection would take the form of a condition in a contract. The condition would be inserted in the types of contracts specified in the Contract Work Hours Act.

In the event the Secretary of Labor should find a violation of a contract condition relating to worker safety and health, the Government agency for which the work is being done could, after full due process of law, cancel the contract and enter into other contracts charging the additional cost to the original contractor.

H.R. 3290 would authorize the Secretary of Labor to enforce the bill's provisions in the same manner as the safety and health provisions of the Walsh-Healey Act are enforced. The Secretary would hold hearings, make decisions based on findings, make rules and regulations, and take other appropriate actions.

Finally, the bill substantially adopts the provisions of the Walsh-Healey Act authorizing the Secretary of Labor, following carefully defined procedures, to debar contract violators for 3 years.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I reiterate that we have a strong interest in a comprehensive occupational safety and health coverage for all industries, including the building and construction industry. However, we endorse the idea of legislation which is especially designed for the building and construction industry—thus filling a gap in Federal coverage of on-the-job safety and health of those employees who work under Federal contracting authorities.

#### WHOSE HAND

### HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a poem entitled "Whose Hand" written by Mr. Ted Cook, of Brilliant, Ohio:

#### WHOSE HAND

(By Ted Cook)

Whose hand has shaped the firmament?  
And placed the sky the lightning rent?  
Who put the stars up in the sky?  
And made the moon to shine on high?

Whose hand has caused a flower to grow?  
To make the gentle breezes blow?  
Who makes the cooling rain to fall?  
And grows a tree so green and tall?

Who makes the bird's song sound so sweet?  
And grows the green grass 'neath our feet?  
The autumn leaves with colors gay?  
The sunset glow at close of day?

Whose ear has heard a baby's cry?  
And heard a mother's lullaby?  
And made the softly falling snow?  
To blanket earth so far below?

Who made the oceans vast and wide?  
And caused the ever changing tide?  
Who rules the destiny of man?  
The one o'er all since time began?

So, men in space look up to God,  
For they have risen from the clod,  
And give their thanks to Him on high,  
Who guides them safely through the sky.

So, atheists may rant and rave,  
And say there's nothing but the grave.  
But Christians know a peace of mind,  
That infidels will never find.

So, people live and people love,  
For they must look to God above,  
Beyond the grave for you and me,  
There is no death there's immortality.

#### CHINESE EMBASSY IN WARSAW ACCUSES SOVIET UNION OF KATYN MASSACRE

### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an interesting article appeared in the Polish Daily Zgoda which reflects the growing intensity of the conflict between the Soviet Union and her neighbor Red China.

It is most interesting that the Chinese Embassy in Warsaw is showing a film which clearly establishes that Soviet police murdered 15,000 Polish Army officers in the Katyn Forest near Smolensk, Russia in 1940.

This is the first time that a Communist nation has formally accused the Soviet Union of perpetrating this monstrous crime and I do not believe the world should remain aloof to this charge by Red China.

May I remind this House that in 1952 a congressional committee headed by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman MADDEN, conducted a very exhaustive investigation of the Katyn massacre and concluded that it was the Soviet Union which was responsible for the murder of these Polish officers in Katyn.

The Soviet Union has denied these charges, but I believe it is extremely significant that its one-time staunch ally, the Republic of China, now brands the Soviet Union as the perpetrator of this crime against Polish soldiers.

It is also most significant, Mr. Speaker, that if this article is correct, members of the Polish Armed Forces apparently are now admitting that the Soviet Union was responsible for the Katyn massacre and is now trying to alibi that the Russians were justified in the brutal assassination of these Polish officers.

If this is indeed true, then this is also the first time that spokesmen for the present regime in Poland acknowledge Russian guilt for this hideous crime against the people of Poland.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be the chief investigator for the congressional committee which in 1952 investigated this international crime.

I said then and I say now that this horrible atrocity against the Polish officers committed by the Communists shall come back to haunt them time and time again.

Make no mistake. The ghost of Katyn hangs heavy over the Communist heads in Russia. I have every reason to believe

that some day the souls of those 15,000 Polish Army officers, so brutally murdered by the Communists in Katyn, will come back and provide the very impetus which will bring the collapse of communism in Poland and the Soviet Union.

While I have spoken in the sharpest tones against Red China and did not want any of my remarks ever to be misconstrued as in any way condoning the Chinese Communist Government, one cannot help but acknowledge the fact that the Communist Chinese have performed a notable public service by again bringing into sharp perspective this infamous crime by the Soviet Union against the people of Poland.

In 1940, the Katyn massacre was suppressed because American authorities and Soviet authorities did not want to drive a wedge between the allies in World War II.

This was one of the most tragic decisions of modern history. Had the people of the world been told about this Soviet infamy against Poland, the whole course of history could have been changed.

I do not believe that in 1969 we Americans should again make this mistake. I believe that it is important for the free world to again reflect upon the full details of Katyn, for in the brutal massacre of these 15,000 Polish officers we see a true picture of Soviet treachery and brutality.

Mr. Speaker, the recent invasion of Czechoslovakia and the wanton destruction of those brave Czechs who dared stand up to Soviet rule clearly shows that nothing has changed in the Soviet Union. The same forces of evil that engineered the Katyn massacre are still in command and Katyn stands as an everlasting monument to Communist treachery and infamy.

I hope the free world will never forget Katyn.

The article to which I have referred, and which appeared in the Polish Daily Zgoda in Chicago, follows:

**CHINESE EMBASSY IN WARSAW SHOWED THE FILM OF KATYN**

On the premises of the Chinese Embassy in Warsaw the film on Katyn, charging the Russians with the responsibility for the murder of Polish officers, was shown again. The show was accessible to the public which appeared in throngs.

The [Polish] regime's Ministry of Foreign Affairs submitted an official sharp protest to which the Chinese replied that this film was being shown for the employees of the Embassy to facilitate their study of the Polish language.

As a side effect of this film showing, a special meeting was called of higher officers of all branches of the Armed Forces at the General Staff office.

At this meeting the responsibility of the Russians for the "Katyn case" was not denied, but it was maintained that "this action was justified at that time" because, it was alleged, one of Beria's deputies prepared a false evidence to the effect that the Polish officers had been in contact with anti-Stalin opposition in Russia and tried to organize a mass escape.

On the basis of such "false charges" which "the Soviet Government had no opportunity to verify", an order was issued to liquidate the Polish officers.

The Chinese maintain the biggest embassy in Warsaw. Many of their members are fluent in the Polish language. They are very active

and try to maintain as extensive as possible social contacts with the Poles.

This is rather easy to do because, according to the information from Poland, there are people there who see in China a potential destroyer of Russian imperialism.

So far, the Poles are not afraid to visit the Chinese Embassy. In summertime one can see many Polish families in the gardens of the Embassy. The children play and their parents have conversations with the members of the Embassy.

**"MR. BASKETBALL" LEAVES**

**HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as I am sure you know, Mr. Basketball, Bob Cousy, has retired as coach of the Boston College team. The Boston College basketball, its fans and the entire Boston area have known with Bob Cousy the great joy of victory and the extreme happiness of consistently playing well.

When Cooz retired from the Celtics and No. 14 retired with him, part of an era was over. The Boston Celtics under the direction of Red Auerbach was I think the finest team in pro basketball but when Bob Cousy left something more than just one player left with him, and I am sure we will never forget that St. Patrick's Day in 1963 when Bob Cousy was honored at Boston Garden.

We all knew that great things were going to happen at Boston College when Mr. Basketball took over the coaching job and we were not disappointed. Cousy's first team had a 10-11 record. After 1 year working with the kids Cousy's club was 22 to 7 and Boston College was invited to the National Invitational Tournament for the first time. The following year came another National Invitational Tournament invitation followed by two NCAA tournaments. This year Boston College made the finals in the NIT and a beautiful, superb finish to Bob Cousy's coaching career.

It is almost impossible to describe the change that came over the Boston College team and its loyal fans. Every team wants to win but this team wanted to win not only for themselves and their school but for their beloved coach, and Mr. Speaker, they did win. The explanation for this lies primarily with Bob Cousy the man. He was a great player and a great coach but more than that he is an extraordinary human being and a dedicated athlete. He understands the joys and the benefits of team play and exalts in a good hard and fast competition.

Bob Monahan, staff writer for the Boston Globe, has described Bob Cousy the man and his effect on teammates, on players better than anyone else I have ever read. Under unanimous consent I place his article of March 9, 1969, in the RECORD.

One of the great stars of our day is entering a new phase of life and in order to pay tribute to him it helps to under-

stand him. I know Mr. Monahan's article will contribute to that understanding:

**HAPPY MEMORIES LINGER AS COOZ LEAVES**

(By Bob Monahan)

Thank you, Bob Cousy . . . for the memories by the dozens. You made your last official Boston appearance Thursday night at Boston College. You left a void that will take this town some time to get over.

Cousy, alias Mr. Basketball, still is the Boston College basketball coach. He announced his retirement 16 games ago and it becomes official when his Eagles either win or are eliminated from the National Invitational Tournament in New York.

He has been a figurehead in this area for 23 years. Four of them were at Holy Cross where he earned All-America honors. Thirteen of them were with the Boston Celtics. The last six were with Boston College.

Bob is more than an out-going coach. He's a gentleman with a magic touch, former college great, ex-N.B.A. super star and he's in a class of his own.

His career at Boston College started with an ending. He took the B.C. job in 1963 after the Celtics won their fifth straight N.B.A. championship. It was during those years he earned the Mr. Basketball tag which he still owns.

He was a floor general who came through in the clutch. He made the Celtics fast break go. He thrilled thousands with his play-making ability. No one who ever saw his behind-the-back dribbles or his pin point "blind" passes ever will forget them.

Cousy was unique. He still is.

On Mar. 17, 1963, the Celtics played their last regular season home game against the Syracuse Nationals at Boston Garden. It was a Sunday afternoon and it was Bob Cousy Day . . . a day to remember.

Cousy was on the court before more than 15,000 fans. His wife, Missy, and daughters, Mary Patricia and Marie Colette, were with him. He kept his head bowed and swallowed hard as people praised him. Red Auerbach and Bill Russell were close by. The plaudits were great, but they started to get to him. He swallowed hard again and again as did people in the stands. They knew one of the greatest athletes ever was leaving the game.

For a moment there was complete quiet . . . no yelling . . . no talking . . . not even a whisper or a cough.

Then it happened like a bolt of lightning. The silence was broken by a yell that touched everyone.

A young man in the balcony said it all with five words. He hollered: "We all love ya, Cooz." That did it. The words echoed throughout the Garden.

Those five words hit Cousy right in the heart. He wept. He wasn't ashamed and he need not have been. He couldn't fight off the tears any more. Over half the spectators wept with him as Cousy rubbed tears from his face.

Hard-nosed men cried with him . . . it was too much. But what a tribute. And he deserved it. Cousy, who flashed up and down the court with his now retired number 14 . . . who made the impossible play . . . who kept Boston basketball alive until the arrival of Russell was leaving and it hurt . . . it hurt deeply.

Then came the final playoffs against Los Angeles. The Celts were up three points when Cousy sprained an ankle. He left the game. L.A. made a charge and it looked as though they would take command. Coach Auerbach looked at Cousy. Number 14 limped back to the court.

He lifted the team even though in pain. He made the big play and kept control. With seconds remaining he hurled the ball into the air. The final buzzer sounded before it hit the court. Teammates hugged him. Mr. Basketball went out a winner which was in keeping with his style.

Bob displayed a great deal of emotion as a player. He carried that with him into coaching.

Cousy played pro ball to win. He carried that philosophy to B.C. where he was to launch a sensational basketball tradition. It didn't take long to catch on and he started to mold a top notch club. Great players wanted to play for him. Mr. Basketball was Mr. Magic. Kids looked at him in awe. To play for the Cooz . . . well, it was almost unreal.

His aim at B.C. was to install, build and retain the Celtics' winning tradition. He wanted a team which would feature the fast break. He wanted aggressive players who would excel at man to man defense. He did it.

"Playing the game is one thing," said Cousy. "Coaching is another. College ball was new to me.

"At first you expect too much from the kids. After a while I adjusted and knew what I was doing. It took a few years before I considered myself any kind of coach. I've been in it all my life and I'm still learning."

Two friends helped Cousy in his early coaching stages. They were Dee Rowe, new UConn coach, and former Assumption College coach Andy Laska who was a teammate at Holy Cross.

"I knew what I wanted but it was a bit slow coming," said Cousy. "But it did come . . . fast break . . . man to man and pressure ball. Of the six clubs I've had this current one does all those things the best."

Cousy's first team had a 10-11 record. The 1964-65 club was 22-7 and the Eagles were invited to the N.I.T. for the first time. The following year they were 21-5 and again played in the N.I.T. Cousy did breathe life into what was the corpse of B.C. basketball.

The 1966-67 team was 23-3 and last year's was 17-8. Both played in the N.C.A.A. tournament.

Cousy, one of the most dapper looking guys in the business, has many mannerisms of his ex-coach Auerbach. He always rolls up a program and holds it during a game. He's not the fire eater Auerbach was and is, but Cooz has been known to take the heat now and then. Most of the time he plays it cool. He keeps most of it inside.

"When I was playing I always felt sick before a game," said Cousy. "This happens to a lot of athletes. But I still get that feeling before a game now."

He's ultra emotional and that's one of the reasons why he'll quit at the end of this season.

"When I started coaching I knew it wouldn't be a life-long deal," he said. I'll miss Boston College and the wonderful kids, but I'm doing what I feel in my heart I have to do."

Bob, who never lost his New York accent, is easy going. No matter where he goes he's the center of attraction. At times he doesn't like it, but he doesn't show it.

He can be emotionally drained and physically tired, but he'll manage a smile and honor requests for autographs before or after a game or even while he's having dinner.

In December of 1966 he took his team to New Orleans to play in the Sugar Bowl classic. It was held several days before the Alabama-Nebraska Sugar Bowl football game.

Coaches and players from all the teams were invited to a luncheon. Cousy was sought after more than Alabama coach Bear Bryant. He's just magic no matter where he goes.

Cousy demands all out efforts from his players and gets it. The kids are loyal to him and vice versa. He more than proved his loyalty two years ago at a breakup dinner in Boston.

The dinner was planned for 6 p.m. and Cousy was grounded in New York. He rented a car and started to speed to Boston. The dinner started without him. The players knew he would make it. Dinner ended and

there was a call from Hartford. Cousy said, "I'm still coming . . . I'll make it."

The program was stalled. Players who were not scheduled to talk, did. Some kids stumbled over words just to give Cooz more time. It appeared he wouldn't make it and the crowd of 250 was disappointed.

All of a sudden he was there. He was greeted with a wild standing ovation. All knew he went all out to be with his players. Not many coaches would do what he did. He did it because he's class. Players put out for him and he puts out for them. That's his way.

The man is loved and respected. This year's team proved it when he said he was going to resign. They were crushed at first.

Capt. Terry Driscoll called for a team meeting. The players agreed to try to prove their feeling for the coach by winning all their remaining games. They had won 15 in a row before meeting Duquesne two days ago.

The woman behind this man is something, too. Missy, the former Marie Ritterbusch, met Bob when he was 13. She followed his All-Scholastic career through Andrew Jackson High in St. Albans, Long Island, and at Holy Cross.

"I've known him since I was just a kid, but we never dated until he was in college," said Missy. "I've seen most of his games and I'd never trade a minute of what we've had together."

"He's had a lot of big moments and I enjoyed them with him. Two of my biggest thrills were the Celtics' first playoff championship and this year's B.C. team. And there are a hundred others."

You can't sum up Bob Cousy with several hundred words. You have to admire him for the goals he set for himself and how he attained them . . . that touch of class which is always there . . . the way he is respected . . . the many ways people went out of their way to honor him.

Thank you, Bob Cousy . . . thanks for the memories. And that guy in the balcony was so right. We all love ya, Cooz.

#### FREEDOM NOT POSSESSED

### HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have printed in the RECORD a poem written by the Reverend L. Milton Hankins, of New Matamoras, Ohio. The Reverend Mr. Hankins is a member of the American Poets Fellowship Society. His work has been published in the following periodicals and journals: Christian Century, the Baptist Leader, Tangent, the American Poet, United Poets, Major Poetry—an anthology—Prairie Poets, the Marietta Times, and St. Mary's Oracle. His latest poems appeared in "Field of Daisies," Nina Brewer Henry, editor, Prairie Press Books, 1968.

The poem follows:

#### FREEDOM NOT POSSESSED

(By L. Milton Hankins)

While malignant scars remain upon our flesh  
And fester threaten to deface  
Our pride in grandest freedom for our race  
Let us not boast in shallow selves  
And glibly swear the swollen sore  
Has vanished to appear no more.  
Health is not restored until the wound is  
done.

Can it be said in truth that race is free  
Though statutes grants the freedom's not  
possessed

Until the man can measure to the rest  
In every word and deed.

Freedom not till every man is pressed  
By a choice response to every call  
Not till liberty means the same to one and  
all.

#### THE POWER OF NATIONAL POLITICAL REPORTERS

### HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Daily Calumet is a Chicago-based newspaper which provides its readers the latest in community developments and, through its able columnists, informs on national issues as well. In the February 7 issue, Calumet columnist William Rentschler commented on a fascinating essay by nationally known David Broder of the Washington Post on the power of political reporters. The Broder offering appeared in the first issue of the Washington Monthly, a political-affairs publication newly born to the Washington scene.

Upon inspection, sections of the Broder account proved to be interesting indeed. Reporter Broder observes:

At any given time in this country, there are several hundred persons who are potentially candidates for nomination as President or Vice President.

He continues:

They are Senators, Representatives, Governors, Administration officials, mayors, military men, scientists, businessmen, educators, astronauts, and other assorted celebrities. Who is it that winnows this field down to manageable size? The press—and particularly that small segment of the press called the national political reporters.

Who comprises "that small segment of the press called the national political reporters?"

According to Broder, a member of the coterie:

The group is small. It probably includes a couple of dozen members, representing news organizations with a commitment to coverage of national politics year in and year out, in dull seasons as well as exciting times.

These organizations include: the three news magazines, the two wire services, the three radio-television networks and The New York Times, the Washington Post, Washington Evening Star, the Los Angeles Times, the Christian Science Monitor, the Baltimore Sun, the Knight newspapers, the Field papers, and the Gannett, Newhouse, Scripps-Howard, and Hearst chains. The political reporters for these organizations, plus a few syndicated columnists who cover politics along with other subjects, comprise the screening committee.

Broder then proceeds to give a general rundown of the characteristics of the select group:

Not only is the group small, but its characteristics make it a highly atypical group of Americans. Its members are all Easterners, by residence if not by birth. They are all college graduates. They all enjoy, despite the low-paying reputation of newspapers, in-

comes well over the national median. Not one of them is a Negro. Only two are women.

#### The listing continues:

More of them vote Democratic and fewer of them regularly attend church. I would guess, than in a random sample of the population. None is under 30 and few, except for the columnists, are over 45.

Finally, we get a fleeting glimpse of the group in action:

I often thought, for example, as I saw Romney during his Presidential campaign, surrounded by our circle—men a generation younger than he, many of us with cigarettes in our mouths, drinks in our hands, and cynicism in our hearts—that he must have felt as helpless with us as I would feel if my fate or future as a journalist were being decided by a committee of Romney's colleagues among the elders of the Mormon church.

There are other aspects to the Broder piece which, all in all, merit the "strong stuff" classification, to quote William Rentschler of the Daily Calumet. And I agree with Rentschler that—

David Broder, at the risk of alienating his clubmates, raises hard questions. He rates praise for raising them.

Let us hope that Mr. Broder is not "expelled from the press bus for life."

Under unanimous consent I submit the article, "Political Reporters in Presidential Politics," by David S. Broder for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

#### VIEWS OF THE PRESS: POLITICAL REPORTERS IN PRESIDENTIAL POLITICS

(By David S. Broder 1)

("Views of the Press," in which various contributors will discuss the handling of news on American politics and government, will be a regular feature of The Washington Monthly.)

It is nine o'clock in the morning—almost any morning of the Presidential campaign—and one of the great unpublicized rituals of American political journalism is about to begin.

The reporters, sleepy-eyed, file aboard the chartered 727 jet, many of them reaching for Bloody Marys to steady their nerves, then slump into their seats to grab some extra sleep while the candidate and his entourage are transported westward across the country to begin another day's stumping.

There is silence aboard the plane, except for the click-clack of a single typewriter in the staff section up front, where one of the candidate's speechwriters is putting the finishing touches on the advance text for tonight's speech.

He is working under pressure, with his portable typewriter in his lap, because he knows that when breakfasts and naps have been concluded, the reporters will be demanding the speech that should furnish the lead for their stories for the next morning's papers.

As the speechwriter finishes each page of the text, it is taken from his typewriter and handed to a staff secretary, who cuts a mimeograph stencil. A few more minutes, and 100 copies have been run off on the airborne mimeograph machine, and shortly thereafter the whole speech has been distributed to the reporters.

Now their sloth disappears, as they quickly read through the offering. "Where's the lead?" someone asks. "Bottom of page six!" shouts a wire-service man, who took a course

in speedreading. Everyone underlines the designated passage.

In a trice, the click-clack of the speechwriter's portable has been replaced by the amplified chatter of 100 typewriters, as every reporter on the plane struggles to rephrase the speechwriter's prose in a fashion that will meet the demands of his own journal.

By the time the plane lands, 100 versions of The Speech will be in the hands of the Western Union man aboard. He will, if he is forehanded, have a dozen teletype operators at the airport, ready to punch tapes that will carry the stories into the newsrooms and wire service headquarters, and thence to the presses, where millions of copies of the papers will be printed.

As often as I have seen and participated in this ritual of campaign journalism, the artificiality of the process never ceases to amaze me.

If the speech is, let us say, prepared for delivery at an evening rally in Los Angeles, the stories in the Eastern morning papers will be on the newsstands long before the event itself takes place. Indeed, the candidate may not—if he is as harassed as candidates often are—even have seen the speech on which the stories have been based; he may not deliver it when the time arrives; but he will, as his press secretary assures the reporters, stand behind every word of the prepared text.

There is an element of essential phoniness to the whole procedure, in which all parties agree to delude the reader into thinking he has read something the candidate has said and to conceal from him the reality—that nothing has happened more significant than the passage of words from typewriter to mimeograph machine to typewriter to printing press. From beginning to end, the process has a life of its own, unrelated to reality, as the word moves from the speechwriter's typewriter to the newspaper headlines almost untouched by human minds.

Yet, ironically, it is when he is performing this almost-imbecile function of digesting and regurgitating someone else's thought that the political writer or campaign reporter is in his least controversial role. Almost anything else he attempts—and he does attempt other roles—will land him in some sort of difficulty.

These days political reporters are in increasingly hot water—both with the politicians and with the public. Their particular controversy is but part of the larger fight enveloping the press and the communications media. The fact is that the press as an institution in American life is under attack just as much as the universities, the churches, the labor unions, the businesses, and the agencies of government. Like these other institutions, the newspapers are being hard-pressed to adapt to the changing demands of their clientele. And the measure of their failure is the open skepticism and even derision with which they are viewed by their customers. The press has as big a credibility gap as any institution in this society—a vulnerability which other elements of the power structure have recognized and exploited.

That tiny undercurrent of anti-press emotion which General Eisenhower tapped when he invited the 1964 Republican convention delegates to express their scorn of "sensation-seeking columnists and commentators" has quickly become a flood. George Wallace found that newspaper editorial writers ranked right up there with those "pointy-headed guideline-writers who can't even park their bikes straight" as sure-fire targets for his oratorical fire. In Chicago at the Democratic convention, the press became—in quite literal terms—the favorite target of Mayor Daley's men.

The press is caught up in what John Gardner has called the crisis of our times—the necessity for institutional adaptation to

the forces of change unleashed by the population explosion and the simultaneous revolutions of education, technology, and economics. It is my impression that the adaptive response from the press has been perhaps more sluggish than that of any other major institution. The practice of journalism has changed less than the practice of medicine or law or education or even politics in the past generation.

There are at least two reasons for this sluggishness of response, I believe. One is the comforting rationalization which all journalists—myself included—employ to convert outside criticism from a measure of our failure into a measure of our success. A political reporter who gets complaints about his work from both Republicans and Democrats is apt to say to himself, "Good, I'm catching hell from both sides, so I must be writing it right down the middle." There is, of course, another possibility—that his reporting is so far off-base that it outrages anybody of either party who understands what is really happening. But that is a possibility he does not usually examine.

The other reason that the press is so lag-gard in responding to criticisms of its performance is that most of us in journalism have not really taken a very reflective view of our own functions and responsibilities. We are in the habit of asking politicians and businessmen, labor leaders and generals to justify their actions and policies, but we do not often make the same demand of ourselves.

This essay is an effort by one political reporter to set forth some observations on the way he and his colleagues behave in their work—to describe the roles we play. They are personal observations and probably none of my colleagues would agree with the description. It is intended as a description of the behavior only of this one segment of the press—not of the press as a whole. It is not an effort to grade the reporting we do. I risk expulsion from the lodge in even attempting to describe what political reporters do; it would take a lot more nerve than I have to try to evaluate how well we do it.

My excuse for taking up the subject, under these limitations, is twofold: I think the political reporters are at the eye of the storm of controversy enveloping the press; there is, I suspect, a good deal more public concern over the impact of journalism on campaigns, elections, and government than there is over the press' influence on science or the economy.

Second, I have been persuaded by hours of bull sessions with my colleagues in the press, with politicians, and with political scientists concerned about the interaction of politics and journalism, that there is a real gap in the three groups' understanding of the role or roles the political reporter plays.

So, with apologies to those who will find much of what follows elementary and obvious, let me lay down what I consider a descriptive basis on which the discussion of the impact of the press on campaigns might proceed.

There would, at first glance, not seem to be much doubt about what a political reporter's job is. Most people think of him as the public's unseen proxy, the trained observer, dispassionately setting down what the candidates do and say. In this conception, the candidate is real and the public is real, but the reporter is the invisible man. His role is as insignificant as that of the telescope tube by which light from a distant star (the candidate) is captured and conveyed to the eye of the astronomer (the reader).

The classic plea for the reporter to act as a neutral observer was given by Richard Nixon in his famous "last press conference" after his 1962 campaign for Governor of California. Employing that delicacy of phrase for which he was noted, Nixon said he recognized the right of newspapers, "if they're

<sup>1</sup>David S. Broder covers national politics for the Washington Post.

against the candidate, to give him the shaft," but asked plaintively if they could not "put one lonely reporter on the campaign who will report what the candidate says now and then."

Well, what is wrong with that? Why shouldn't the reporter just tell his readers what the candidate is saying? Doesn't a candidate have the right to that kind of coverage?

There are two problems with the kind of political journalism that President Nixon—and dozens of other politicians—have recommended.

The first problem is this. The same Richard Nixon who made that earnest plea to have his words set down as he uttered them went around the country last fall systematically bending the truth to his own advantage. In this he was, of course, behaving no differently from any other candidate. Take the simple—and essentially inconsequential—matter of crowdmanship. Nixon's crowds were fine, but they were rarely as big as Nixon made them out to be. A reporter who followed the Nixon Rule of Political Journalism and quoted Nixon's own crowd estimates would no longer have been informing his readers but systematically misleading them.

So what does the reporter do? He checks Nixon's crowd estimates with an "independent authority," i.e., the local police chief. That is a fine method until you reach a place like Philadelphia, say, where the redoubtable Frank Rizzo, a stalwart of Mayor James H. J. Tate's Democratic regime in City Hall, deliberately underestimates the size of Nixon's crowd.

Faced with this sort of double duplicity, the reporter who has seen both Humphrey's and Nixon's crowds in Philadelphia is forced to make a judgment of his own. And as soon as he does so, he is on the way to becoming the controversial character that General Eisenhower, George Wallace, Mayor Daley, and so many others complain of.

The second problem with the Nixon Theory of Political Journalism—"Just write what I say"—is that he (and every other politician) says more than anyone in his right mind cares to read. Moreover, in a campaign, much of what he says today is the same thing he said yesterday, and the day before that, and the day before that. Moreover, his words are only part of the story of his campaign day. It is also important where he went, what he did, and what he did it to, and what they did to him. Some days, what he does not say is more important than any words he utters. When Eisenhower campaigned with Joe McCarthy and said nothing about General George C. Marshall—the man who had sponsored his military career and whose reputation McCarthy had defamed—that was a story. When Hubert Humphrey walked arm in arm with Lester Maddox and said nothing about the racial views that had made Maddox the Governor of Georgia, that was a story. What the candidate says is only part of the picture of his campaign day—and sometimes the least significant part.

It is the job of the political reporter to cull from the thousands of words and the hundreds of incidents that comprise each day on the road with a Presidential contender those few words, incidents, and impressions that convey the flavor, the mood, and the significance of what occurred.

Here we can broaden the frame of our discussion, for the process of covering a campaign is no different from covering any story.

Selectivity is the essence of all contemporary journalism. And selectivity implies criteria. Criteria depend on value judgments, which is a fancy word for opinions, preconceptions, and prejudices. There is no neutral journalism.

Now, it happens that a great deal of a political reporter's time is spent in doing

what Mr. Nixon recommended: summarizing the candidate's own statements. The anecdote at the beginning of this article gave only a slightly exaggerated picture of a typical campaign day. Obviously, the stories filed from the campaign plane contain more than just excerpts from an undelivered speech. But it is a rare day in the campaign that the candidate's words do not comprise a substantial portion of the story.

Even here, however, we find that the values or prejudices of the reporters play a part. Reporters are—or at least fancy themselves—literary fellows. They pride themselves on their "feel for words." Thus literary values, graceful phrases, balanced sentences, have an importance to them that is hardly reflective of the value the general public attaches to eloquence. A candidate like John F. Kennedy whose writers can turn a phrase will enjoy an advantage over those, like Humphrey and Goldwater, whose writers are pedestrian. There is very little justice in this, but a wise politician recognizes the premium on literary values and seeks to equip himself accordingly. Nixon, for example, reaped great publicity mileage from the series of radio speeches he gave in the past campaign—not because very many people heard them on the radio, but because the quality of the writing that went into them—much of it by Raymond K. Price, Jr., former editorial page editor of the late, lamented *New York Herald-Tribune*—was so extraordinarily high that papers like *The New York Times* and the *Washington Post* were often urged by the reporters covering Nixon to print full texts or extended excerpts of these addresses.

So, the reporter's first role is that of a summarizer of the candidate's positions. As we have seen, his own prejudices—at least his literary taste—enter into even this role, but nonetheless, of all his functions, it is probably the least controversial.

In a sense, I have leaped ahead of my own story in talking of this role. Serious attention to the man's words implies that he is worth paying attention to. And who decides that? The political reporters do—in their second role, that of talent scouts.

At any given time in this country, there are several hundred persons who are potentially candidates for nomination as President or Vice President. They are Senators, Representatives, Governors, Administration officials, mayors, military men, scientists, businessmen, educators, astronauts, and other assorted celebrities. Who is it that winnows this field down to manageable size? The press—and particularly that small segment of the press called the national political reporters.

Russell Baker has given us the concept of The Great Mentioner, that mysterious Someone whose existence is implied when we read that so-and-so "is being mentioned for President or Vice President." He works in clandestine ways. The Great Mentioner mentioned George Romney as a Presidential possibility before Romney made his first race for Governor of Michigan. The Great Mentioner has mentioned Mark Hatfield for Vice President every four years since Hatfield turned 30, and he never seems discouraged by Hatfield's failure to win the job. On the other hand, The Great Mentioner never mentioned Edmund S. Muskie for anything until just a few days before he was actually nominated for Vice President.

Just why The Great Mentioner mentions some names and not others is very puzzling. It has something to do with personality, but more, probably, to do with the black arts of public relations. George Romney, for example, became known through those big Rambler ads showing him, square-jawed and shirt-sleeved, addressing the workers on the joys of profit-sharing and the evils of big cars. His image was further enhanced by some controversial testimony to Senate committees on the dangers of concentration in

the auto industry. But it takes something more than the arts of advertising to rate a mention from The Great Mentioner. It takes some special break. In the case of Romney, it is interesting to recall that the nudge to The Great Mentioner came from none other than Richard Nixon, who tabbed Romney as a comer at several of those infamous Washington backgrounders in 1960 and 1961.

The function the political reporters perform in their role as talent scouts is one that most people would regard as a positive service. After all, the individual citizen can hardly be expected to discover for himself all the able people who feel a calling to public service. The reporter's job makes him a constant traveler in the political community; he is uniquely well positioned to detect the early intimations of greatness, to discover these statesmen in embryo and bring their rare qualities to the attention of a wider public.

But, alas, it is not quite that simple—or non-controversial. In his function as a talent scout, the political reporter not only puts some men forward, he rather ruthlessly bars the door to advancement for other men. Martin F. Nolan of the Boston Globe has compared the national political reporters to a band of traveling drama critics, covering the new political acts at their out-of-town openings in Sacramento or Lansing or Harrisburg. Their reports, like those in Variety, are frequently make-or-break. "No talent," they will say of one man, and his name is forgotten. "Promising," they'll say of another, and he is booked into the Gridiron Dinner or "Meet the Press." It's a formidable power, and one that the screening committee of reporters is thoroughly conscious of possessing.

It is important at this point to say something about the members of this screening committee. Obviously I am not the one to describe their shortcomings, since as a member of the group I probably have more than my own share of the characteristic failings, but I think I can give some description of the fraternity.

The group is small. It probably includes a couple of dozen members, representing news organizations with a commitment to coverage of national politics year in and year out, in dull seasons as well as exciting times. Those organizations would include the three news magazines, the two wire services, the three radio-television networks and *The New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, *Washington Evening Star*, the *Los Angeles Times*, the *Christian Science Monitor*, the *Baltimore Sun*, the *Knight newspapers*, the *Field papers*, and the *Gannett*, *Newhouse*, *Scripps-Howard*, and *Hearst chains*. The political reporters for these organizations, plus a few syndicated columnists who cover politics along with other subjects, comprise the screening committee.

Not only is the group small, but its characteristics make it a highly atypical group of Americans. Its members are all Easterners, by residence if not by birth. They are all college graduates. They all enjoy, despite the low-paying reputation of newspapers, incomes well over the national median. Not one of them is a Negro. Only two are women. More of them vote Democratic and fewer of them regularly attend church. I would guess, than in a random sample of the population. None is under 30 and few, except for the columnists, are over 45. I am deliberately not commenting on their school, political, or ethical views, but I think I have said enough to indicate that they—or we, I should say—represent a narrow and rather peculiar slice of this society.

I often thought, for example, as I saw Romney during his Presidential campaign, surrounded by our circle—men a generation younger than he, many of us with cigarettes in our mouths, drinks in our hands, and cynicism in our hearts—that he must have felt as helpless with us as I would feel if my fate or future as a journalist were

being decided by a committee of Romney's colleagues among the elders of the Mormon church.

Nonetheless, the fact is that the reporters do function as a screening committee for aspirants to national office. (Other reporters do the same thing at state and local levels.) And whether their standards are good or bad, whether they are characteristic or eccentric so far as the society is concerned, they make their standards stick.

Thus, the same George Romney who was touted as a Presidential possibility before he ever ran for Governor was discarded as a Presidential possibility (by the press) before he ever got around to declaring his candidacy in late 1967. "I was the victim of the Teddy White syndrome," Romney has said, referring to the influence the author of *The Making of the President* books has had in impelling reporters to start covering Presidential possibilities long before they formally enter the race. There's not much doubt in my mind that the Governor is right—he was the victim of serious, sustained scrutiny at a point when he was not prepared for that kind of critical cross-examination. Whether the reporters performed a national service or caused a great wrong in eliminating Romney as a contender is an arguable proposition. What is not debatable is that the reporters have this power and regularly exercise it.

Closely related to the function of talent scouts is the political reporter's third role, that of race caller or handicapper. He is supposed to tell his public, every day, how the Presidential (or gubernatorial or senatorial) sweepstakes stands.

Here is a point where serious problems enter. Much of the reading and viewing public really doesn't care much about what happened yesterday in politics or in the campaign. Still less are these readers enamored of weighty analyses of why something happened. What they want to know is: What's going to happen tomorrow? Who's going to win or lose? And if the reporter has even a vestige of conscience, he knows that that is the one question he can never answer with any confidence.

Yet much of political journalism is an artful effort to disguise prediction as reporting. Look at the use of public opinion polls by newspapers. A public opinion poll, when properly conducted and presented, is a perfectly legitimate tool for measuring opinion at a point in the past, i.e., the period of several days when the questions were actually being asked. But if the significance of the poll were accepted in those limited terms, few newspapers would give polls the prominence they now accord them. There is, let's face it, almost nothing as insignificant as a measure of how people would have decided last May a question that we know will not come to them for decision until November. Newspapers print and give prominence to the polls because they know their readers will take the poll to be exactly what it is not—a predictive device for guessing how the actual vote will come out.

A lot of political reporting is in the newspapers under exactly the same false pretenses, i.e., the assumption that a description of the standing of the race in May has some relevance to the actual order of finish in November. Indeed, we have now so far advanced this pseudo-science of political handicapping that all of us, myself included, write two or three years in advance of a Presidential election that so-and-so is the front-runner.

And what is the basis on which the political reporter makes these judgments? What are the landmarks we rely on in calling the race?

There are four types of evidence that go into the reporters' judgments, and I will list them in descending order of reliability.

First, there are the nationally-known public opinion polls—Gallup and Harris—which give periodic reports on the standing of the Presidential contenders. These polls are not without their problems, but they do offer the journalist a relatively standardized set of measurements, made by reputable practitioners whose methods of operation are open to scrutiny and whose full results are disclosed.

Far more often, the reporter bases his judgment, in part, on a private poll someone has given him. These may or may not be as carefully prepared as the Gallup and Harris polls, but they are much less reliable from the reporter's point of view. Rarely is he informed how the poll was made; rarely does he see the full results. Typically, a private poll on the standing of the Presidential (or other) race in some state is "leaked" to him by an interested party—often the candidate who is favored by the poll or one of his managers. If the reporter is properly skeptical, he will let his readers know that his information is second-hand and tainted by the possible bias of his source. But however he qualifies it, his reporting of the poll lends it an air of authority.

There are literally dozens of examples of inaccurate private polls distorting the journalists' and the public's judgment of a political race. Do such misjudgments have an effect on the outcome? Obviously, in many cases they do. The candidate reported trailing in these polls has a substantially harder time raising money, building an organization, or attracting publicity than the presumed front-runner.

To guard against the multiple distortion implicit in the "leaked poll" procedure, reporters have two other sources of information. Unfortunately, these two sources are even flimsier, in most cases, as a basis for handicapping the race.

He can consult the judgment of so-called informed politicians. Typically, a reporter making a political survey of a state will begin by asking, say, the Democratic chairman what he thinks of the situation—"I mean really, not for attribution, I want to know what you really think." The chairman hems and haws for a few minutes and finally allows as how his candidate just might win by 10,000 votes if he got all the breaks the rest of the way. The reporter thanks him, phones his Republican counterpart, and goes through the same procedure with him, eliciting the view that if they can manage to keep the candidate's alcoholic wife from making too many more public appearances, he ought to win by 40,000 votes.

Now, the scientific method, journalistic style, comes into play. The Democratic chairman has—sort of—claimed victory for his man by 10,000 votes. The Republican chairman has—with a shade more confidence—claimed victory for his man by 40,000 votes. The reporter cogitates and composes the following sentence: "While informed observers do not discount the possibility of a Democratic upset, the betting favors Republican candidate so-and-so to carry the state, perhaps by less than 40,000 votes.

That description is something of a caricature, I confess. The reporter will talk to more than two people, and he will weigh the words of each source according to his own past experience with the quality of the man's judgments. He will attempt to find some witnesses with no particular ax to grind. But in the end, he will attempt to construct some kind of consensus of informed judgment. Almost every one of the news organizations I listed earlier goes through this kind of process for its pre-election surveys, contacting party officials, informed citizens and newspapermen in all 50 states in order to make an "educated guess" in advance on the election results.

The enterprise of that sort I happened to be involved in this past fall was notably successful. Not only did we hit very close to Nixon's actual electoral vote, but we were equally on target in our estimates of changes in Congress and the governorships. But using exactly the same methodology in 1966, we managed to be off by a factor of 100 per cent on the size of the Republican gain in the House. We said 24 seats; they gained 47. What I would like to know, and what no one has told me, is how we could be so smart one year and so dumb the other, when the procedure was exactly the same?

Many veteran newsmen would say that all this is stuff and nonsense. They scorn the polls, published or private; they have only minimum trust in the judgment of politicians. What they rely on is their own "feel" of the situation.

Reporters of this school are easy to identify in the campaign. They are the ones who stand on their chairs to stare intently at the faces in the crowd when the candidate makes his entrance. I have never known what they see in those faces, just as I have never known how the emotions in a crowd at a political rally give you any clue to the likely voting behavior of the city or state in which the rally is taking place. I have yet to see the first bit of evidence establishing a positive correlation between the size of the crowd a candidate draws in a city and the number of votes he later receives there. But, like everyone else, I count the crowds and measure their reaction as "friendly" or "cool." Just because an old method has no validity is no reason to get rid of it.

The reporter as summarizer, as talent scout, and as handicapper has his problems, but he is behaving in a role that recognizably has some relation to the demands of his newspaper and, presumably, his readers.

In his fourth role, however, the political reporter tends to carve out for himself a function just a bit more glorious than any that his employer or his readers ever envisaged for him. He becomes, in his own eyes, the Public Defender.

Reporters—unless they are highly-opinionated columnists to begin with—really don't start the campaign with this role in mind. They couldn't care less who wins, they assure each other. There are no heroes or bad guys in the political drama they see, just mortals struggling with terribly complex problems.

But for months on end, they are locked up covering one of these mortals, engaged in an endless discussion of his personality, his mentality, his strategy, and his tactics. They become, in short, monomaniacs on the subject of the man they are covering. And eventually, some of them, at least, will discover that The Candidate Is Trying to Pull Something We Don't Like. The candidate and his men are artful manipulators, propagandists, slick Madison Avenue operators. The reporter is the truth-seeker. And he resolves, "I'm not going to let him (the candidate) get away with it. He's duping the poor voter and it's up to me to see that the poor little sap isn't conned by This Slicker."

Now in any setting less irrational than a campaign plane, the reporter would probably recognize that the charge of "duping the voter" really involves no more than the customary trimming of issues to suit the public mood. And the companion charge of "deliberately obscuring his stand" rarely indicates more than bafflement by the candidate on how to solve such essentially insoluble problems as the rise in crime or the decline in the dollar.

But, no matter. A wave of moral outrage sweeps over the reporters. It is expressed in the declaration, "We're not going to let him get away with this." Demands are sounded for press conferences. Questions are plotted that will cut off every avenue of escape or

evasion for the candidate. The trap is carefully set and, unless he is very wary, the candidate sooner or later walks into it.

Now, the serious point I would make about this mode of behavior is that once the reporter appoints himself Public Defender he abandons almost all pretense of being anything less than an arbiter of the outcome of the election. There is no consistency and no predictability as to when or whether he will adopt the role of Public Defender. Usually, he is provoked into it by the candidate's repeated use of an argument that is offensive to the reporter's own prejudices. Nixon, for example, "got away with" his Law and Order argument all year, even though many of the reporters thought there was an element of demagoguery in it. What finally provoked the reporters covering Nixon to become Public Defenders was a day in late October when he delivered a dozen whistle-stop speeches in Ohio (six times the usual number for a single day) and managed at each successive stop to give a more lurid description of the dangers that stalked the city streets under the unconcerned Democrats. That night, for the first time, a wave of "we-can't-let-him-get-away-with-it" talk swept the Nixon press corps, and the toughest stories of the campaign went whizzing out over the wires.

Nixon averted a new press crisis by softening his tone on that issue in succeeding days, a response that was in itself a measure of the power of the press when it goes on the warpath.

But it doesn't always go on the warpath. Often it is strangely passive. In 1960, for example, when John F. Kennedy promised day after day to get the country moving again, no petitions were passed in the press car demanding that he spell out how. When he spoke of a missile gap, no proof of evidence was demanded. When he spoke of America's falling prestige, no one pressed him on the definition and relevance of that word.

By contrast, Humphrey last year was hounded at almost every press conference to spell out his differences on Vietnam policy with the Johnson Administration. First Romney and then Nixon were pressed unceasingly to specify their program for ending the war. Innumerable other examples could be cited. The point is simply that with some candidates and on some issues—but not others—the press will "bore in." And in choosing when to push and when not, we are responding almost exclusively to our own values and prejudices and opinions.

Fifth and finally, I am constrained to report that from time to time the political reporter will so far forget himself that he becomes a volunteer, unpaid assistant campaign manager for the candidate he is covering.

This is the opposite of the Public Defender syndrome, and in every respect more obnoxious. When he is playing Public Defender, the reporter at least is living up to the stereotype of the hard-nosed, independent, aggressive news hound—even though his motives may have precious little to do with the pursuit of news.

But when he appoints himself Assistant Campaign Manager, he becomes a fawning lackey of the candidate, waiting on him with bits of advice, reveling in the supposed intimacy of his relationship. He takes to defending the candidate in the press bus, and may even go so far as to remonstrate with his colleagues who are writing "unfriendly" pieces about his new hero. He is a sad spectacle, but there is no blinking the fact that on every campaign I have seen, one or more of our colleagues have strayed from the paths of righteous skepticism and become avowed, active promoters of the candidacy of the man they are covering.

There is a subtle revenge, however, for the candidate who allows this to happen. Invari-

ably, the advice that newspapermen give candidates is the worst claptrap imaginable. I could cite examples, but I will not. I have probably said enough already to be expelled from the press bus for life.

## RAILROAD REDEVELOPMENT

### HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, having received permission to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a recent very able address by my distinguished friend, former Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Honorable William H. Tucker, now New England vice president of Penn Central Railroad.

This fine speech was delivered before the chamber of commerce in Providence, R.I., on March 5, and I was so much impressed with it that I thought it should be placed in the RECORD.

It is most encouraging to note Commissioner Tucker's statement that Penn Central must be a dynamic force for improvement in regional railroading.

Our great railroad system was one of the principal contributing factors to the growth, power, wealth, and fabulous success of the American free enterprise system and the growth and prosperity of the Nation. It is truly a pity that leaders at every level apparently did not have the vision, or the will, nor were they prepared to assume the responsibilities and risks entailed, to keep this great system, or most of it, intact, operational and useful to American industry and the American people.

The collapse suffered by railroad transportation has adversely affected our economy and our way of life. Not only have we lost much of an extraordinary, efficient system of transportation but American life has also been largely stripped of one of the most colorful, engaging, fascinating and interesting of all modes of transportation.

If we spent half of the money to retain our railroad system, both freight and passenger, that we spend sometimes rather casually, in other areas of transportation, we would have reaped fantastic results in the form of improved carriage of commodities, industrial and agricultural products, and in fact, virtually everything transportable. We would have also been assured of comfortable, speedy service for the traveling public and the people, including service for many communities now isolated from any type of transportation.

I want to compliment and laud Commissioner Tucker for his able and vigorous speech. He said many things that should be said about the revival and rehabilitation of our great railroad system, and I certainly would continue to welcome the chance to move in this direction, to strengthen our rail system so that it is able to modernize, equip, and streamline many of the splendid services that it rendered the people in other years.

I am very anxious to join in reviving, rehabilitating, modernizing, rejuvenating, and strengthening the railroads for broader service in this space jet age. Comparable to what they once rendered the American people.

It is good to know that we have an experienced, dedicated and highly trained able leader like Commissioner Tucker, with his knowledge of transportation systems and their problems, engaged at high levels in bringing the railroad system back to its former glories and services in certain areas that would now find the rails truly indispensable.

Commissioner Tucker's remarks follow:

#### REMARKS BY WILLIAM H. TUCKER

I am pleased to have been invited to address you. I know what an important role the members of the Chamber's Down Town Council and Transportation Committee and, of course, the Board of Directors, play in the economic life of Providence and the entire State.

Some of you may be aware that I was to have delivered an address before a meeting in Boston a week ago. Due to the near blizzard, which I'm sure you remember well, the meeting was called off. Thus, this is my first opportunity to voice my thoughts on the inclusion, its problems and its meaning. And I'm glad to be doing so with you. Rhode Island's contribution to regional railroading—in interest and in revenue—far outstrips its population or geographic rank.

I'd like, therefore, to devote much of the few minutes I have, to talking about Penn Central and its relation to Rhode Island. And first, I'd like to make a major announcement. I think it's major, because it concerns something that, according to your papers, is one of the most vital issues of the day in Providence.

Gentlemen—we are going to fix the clock atop our Providence Station!

I may seem a bit facetious about its importance, but I'm not kidding about our pledge to repair it. As you know, the pigeons and starlings loved to roost on the hands. And their weight, especially at a quarter to three, was so great as to stop the clock completely. We had to stop the clock with the hands at noon.

Our building engineers tell me they expect shortly to install an electric mechanism which will be capable of making the birds, as well as time, fly.

I've mentioned this first because, in a way, it symbolizes the Penn Central inclusion of the New Haven.

What happened at the first of the year was not just a simple change of ownership of the New Haven operations. There's been a complete revision of attitude, morale, direction and spirit.

Penn Central knows that it must be a dynamic force for improvement in regional railroading. And it is going to be.

I hope that this has become evident in the recent discussions involving the possible relocation of the railroad in downtown Providence.

A week ago today, as you know, I met with Governor Licht, Mayor Dorley, and our associates at the Capitol.

Mayor Dorley told us that he had been disheartened for years by the lack of progress on numerous plans for relocating the mainline tracks of the railroad. He referred to these tracks, and the viaduct which carries them as a "Chinese Wall" dividing the heart of Providence.

Now, within two months of the inclusion, the Penn Central has gone to work on this—and at this time we are working on an engineering study. But, since it is still in the

study stage, I cannot be as definitive as I, or you, would like. I can say that what we do or propose will be that which we feel promotes the best interests of city, state and railroad.

I hope it can be seen that any effort we make to remove the Chinese Wall will be clear evidence of Penn Central's willingness to face the realities of the present and the responsibilities of the future.

We did not wait to be persued by events. We realized that the construction of the next segment of I-95 would have a serious effect upon the railroad and its facilities. We instituted planning to deal with that effect. And we did so with the welfare of the public, as well as the railroad, in mind.

If this can be worked out, the relocation of track and facilities will make available prime downtown land. It will consolidate our various operations such as engine maintenance, freight forwarding, etc., in a much more efficient location. It will provide the best solution to the overall problem of the bisection of our downtown Providence tracks.

There are a number of alternatives being studied by state and city. A number of proposals have been made. We hope that what is now essentially a sketch plan will become in 60 days a blueprint upon which we and the city can build.

I would like to pay special tribute to Governor Licht for the role he has played, first in acknowledging the importance of the concept involved and, second, in galvanizing the various state and city agencies into quick constructive action with us.

There should be one word of caution, however. I'm sure you are aware that there are three railroads involved here—Penn Central, Boston and Providence and Worcester. Naturally, there are attendant legal complications. I can speak, at this time, only for Penn Central. But we do not regard any foreseeable problems as being insurmountable.

I spoke earlier of the role Rhode Island has been playing in the survival of rail service in this region. It is not a role that can be abandoned now.

Frankly, one of the greatest concerns to us in the past two months has been a public attitude that the Penn Central has an obligation to maintain, and underwrite, the same rail operations which dragged the New Haven down into bankruptcy.

When the Pennsylvania and New York Central railroads were allowed to merge, it was for the economic benefit of the people in regions they served. It was never ordered, nor was it ever intended, that the savings from the Penn Central merger were to be siphoned off into the near-bottomless pit of New Haven deficits.

At a time when airlines have been earning a rate of return of over nine percent, Penn Central and other eastern roads have been earning less than two percent.

And last year, Penn Central suffered a passenger deficit of about one hundred million dollars.

This year, we began with the New Haven inclusion, and absorbed a line which in 1968 had its own passenger deficit of more than ten million dollars and a freight deficit to match. To heap deficits upon deficits—as of the first of the year, changes in post office transportation resulted in a loss of postal revenues on the New Haven region of more than one million dollars.

Thus, when we took on the New Haven, it became even more of a liability for Penn Central than it had been under Trusteeship!

This serious financial problem was recognized by the Interstate Commerce Commission when it approved the inclusion. In fact, the I.C.C. specifically called the New Haven operations a "burden" for Penn Cen-

tral . . . a burden that the states should share.

I quote the I.C.C. report: "Part of the burden falling to Penn Central consists of its common carrier obligation to sustain essential service in the New Haven territory. Since we find that the operations involved are likely to be at a continuing deficit, there is a concomitant obligation on the part of the state and local governments to help sustain the service."

You note that the I.C.C. said that we have an obligation to continue essential services. Penn Central plans to meet that obligation. But we can not do it alone.

Much of our current planning and our policies involve the restructuring of the New Haven's freight and passenger services—streamlining the New Haven operation down to essential operations. In cooperation with representatives of the states, we have begun—but not completed—the restructuring of our long haul passenger service.

We are pruning the low-revenue, high-cost branch freight lines. Again, where appropriate, this is being done in cooperation with public or private representatives.

A good example of this is our freight line between East Providence and Bristol. As you know, we are planning to abandon this branch. But we have initiated discussions with your State on what public use might be made of the line after rail service is withdrawn.

We are meeting our obligations in another way, too. We have begun extensive improvement programs in both freight and passenger services.

Single line freight service will save one to three days from Chicago, St. Louis and other midwest points. New special purpose equipment is being made available. We're preparing for the construction of ten additional tracks at the huge electronic classification yard at Selkirk, N.Y. These will be used for the assembly of fast-moving freight trains direct to Providence and other major centers in the region.

About a dozen renovated passenger coaches have already rolled out of our shop at New Haven. Car washing facilities have been reopened. We've repaired more than half of the big backlog of broken windows. An inspection team project has been started with supervisors riding our trains every day to check on the performance of equipment and crews.

It is going to be a long, hard job. It is impossible to catch up overnight with the years of deferred maintenance on the New Haven.

And, as I said, it is not a job we can do alone. Currently, we are meeting with representatives of the states, including your very able Public Utilities Administrator and Deputy Administrator, Archie Smith and George McLaughlin, and Director of Business Regulation, Francis J. Pazzano. Beyond our immediate needs to keep things going, we want to arrive at a permanent program by which the states can assume their fair share of the burden of continuing essential services.

The basic principles of our passenger service program can be summarized in this way—we plan improvement and upgrading of that passenger service for which there is a public need, a phasing out of little-used or unnecessary service, and public underwriting of the deficits of the service required to be continued.

Thus, you can see that there will be a continuing, and even permanent, role for Rhode Island and the other states in the maintenance of rail service in Southern New England.

Penn Central does not want year-to-year subsidies. It seeks permanent support programs, as I outlined, under which the states would join us in a continuing partnership, an investment in reliable, efficient railroad service.

What would Rhode Island's fair share be? This has not yet been determined, because our discussions with the states have not yet finalized what the permanent service will be.

Perhaps the states will decide that fewer trains are required to handle passenger demand, that the present level of service is not truly essential. We don't know. But we are making all of our information available so that everything is on the table.

In another area of State-Penn Central relations, we have stressed that tax relief for the railroad has no direct connection with the state's responsibilities concerning the continuation of long-haul passenger service.

Tax relief recognizes the facts of our economic life today—that to pile burdensome taxes upon a public utility simply results in higher costs to patrons of that utility or a drain of badly needed capital and assets. In the case of railroads, taxation has also become grossly unfair and inequitable.

Highways are constructed for the auto and bus with the use of Federal and state funds. Airports, air signal, communication and weather reporting systems are paid for by the government. In the face of such heavily-subsidized competition, is it any wonder that rail traffic has been dwindling?

The magnitude of the mistreatment of railroads is readily apparent in comparing the aid given transportation facilities. As Senator Harrison Williams of New Jersey points out, the Federal government spent approximately four and one-half billion dollars for highways. In contrast, the eleven million dollars committed to the Washington-New York Northeast Corridor project represents the first major public funds allocated to the rails in this century.

Tax relief is an effort on the part of fair-minded governments and their officials to make up for—even to partly remedy—past unfair treatment of the railroads. We anticipate that this enlightened attitude will continue to be displayed by Rhode Island in the future.

And I am hopeful that I have been able to convince you that there's a different, and enlightened, attitude at Penn Central.

We're glad that Mayor Dorley has said so. So has Mayor Burns of Pawtucket. As you may know, he met with us last week in Governor Licht's office in a discussion of the future of the empty, dilapidated Pawtucket station. Much to his evident pleasure, he found that we already had assigned an assistant vice president to study the station problem. The two met the following day and are now reviewing proposals developed at that session. We hope to seek bids on demolition and have expressed our willingness to investigate the city's own plans for municipal use of the area.

Yes, there is a new attitude now in regional railroading. Penn Central is ready to meet the obligations and the challenges imposed by the inclusion of the New Haven. It is moving ahead, making more than a reasonable effort to improve freight operations, to upgrade passenger equipment and restructure the service. It is not waiting for the states to act first on the matching reasonable level of support directed by the I.C.C.

But Penn Central cannot do the job alone. If it becomes apparent that public representatives are looking for a way to avoid, rather than to implement, their fair share of the task that lies ahead, we will be forced to reappraise our plans.

But at the moment I'm confident and optimistic. Like the clock atop the Providence station, the whole New Haven situation has been stopped at the desperation hour of high noon far too long.

Let's make sure that the clock will start to move again—and keep moving.

Thank you.

WHAT EVERY EMPLOYER SHOULD  
KNOW ABOUT THE HANDICAPPED

**HON. JOHN JARMAN**

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments of our youth today are too often submerged by the tidal wave of headlines about demonstrations and other displays of discontentment. Yet, some of us are likely to overlook the deep insight and keen interest our youth shares with certain problems existing in our present-day society. In this respect, I would like to take this opportunity to call attention to one particular young girl who has given serious thought to the problem of the handicapped person and his desire to be employed.

Becky Schumacher of Oklahoma City is one of this year's Ability Counts Contest entrants, and for her theme, entitled "What Every Employer Should Know About the Handicapped," Becky received top honors. For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to include in the RECORD this outstanding essay:

WHAT EVERY EMPLOYER SHOULD KNOW ABOUT  
THE HANDICAPPED

(By Becky Schumacher)

The American way of life is taking on new dimensions. The canopy of opportunity is spreading over segments of human life which previously knew only the oppression of despair and prejudice. We are becoming an enlightened people; yet corners of darkness remain—shadows cast by fallacious information and conceptions. One of these shadows is the prejudice against the handicapped. To dispel this shadow, many must know the facts now available about the handicapped.

Otherwise-willing employers hesitate to hire the handicapped because of misinformation. Some hesitate because they believe the handicapped worker to be accident prone and thus assume that the company's workmen's compensation rates will rise. However, neither premise is true. Handicapped persons have about the same accident rate as that of the average work force. The handicapped are acutely aware of the results of accidents; consequently, their accident rate, in fact, is frequently lower. Since they are not accident prone, hiring handicapped workers does not raise the workmen's compensation rates. Only two factors determine these rates: the relative hazards of a company's work and its actual accident rate. The physical disability of the personnel is not a determining factor. Other employers hesitate because they believe that insurance company regulations prohibit their hiring handicapped persons. This, too, is untrue. The insurance contract says nothing whatsoever about the physical condition of workers whom an employer may hire. These premises, if true, would form valid barriers to the employment of the handicapped. However, none of them are true. Thus, the light of truth should eradicate these barriers.

Many of yesterday's reasons for reluctance to employ the handicapped are no longer sound. In today's society there are many jobs to be filled; and with automation, fewer of these required physical dexterity. The United States Department of Labor found that in a single ten-year period, thirteen million jobs disappeared and twenty million new jobs became available, creating a net gain of seven million new jobs; most of which were less physically demanding. We know that handicapped workers can perform these

jobs with competence. Evidence that disabled persons are effective and productive employees has increased over the years. Recent studies made by the Veterans' Administration and the Rehabilitation Services Administration show that the quality and quantity of work by the handicapped compared favorably with that of able-bodied persons, as did their rates of accidents and absenteeism. These studies also show that handicapped persons help stabilize the work force. When properly placed, they tend to stick to their jobs because they know the difficulty of finding employment.

Knowledge can dispel many misconceptions about the handicapped, and this knowledge must include facts about the mentally retarded also. Those handicapped mentally show two strong points: a desire to perform well and the initiative to work hard. The mentally retarded are co-operative workers who stay with the numerous jobs which require repetitive, routine tasks. These people have known much failure and, like all other human beings, yearn for an experience of success which will allow them to retain their self-respect. The repetitive nature of these jobs provides the opportunity for such success.

Prejudice concerning the handicapped is often fostered by the image many have when they hear the word *handicapped*, an image of a completely dependent person, unable to perform the basic functions of life. However, some employers know from experience that this picture is distorted, that the handicapped individual when matched to job requirements is no longer "handicapped." In fact, employers have found it advantageous to give certain jobs requiring sharpened sensibilities to handicapped persons. These employers know that the image of the handicapped as a useless, dependent member of society is a false one, that exactly the contrary is true. The handicapped worker seeks to command respect; he wants no preferential treatment. The greatest service an employer can render the handicapped is to treat him as he would any other employee.

Ironic, is it not, that in the twentieth century, when enlightenment is our crowning virtue, our knowledge of things far outstrips our knowledge of people. However, a new force is stirring in our country, and this force consists of kinetic energy, a desire to know more about people and to provide each of them a place where he can know self-respect and have assurance of his worth to mankind. The handicapped will share in the results of this new force. They will soon find that for which they seek, a product of our new dimension.

IDAHO STUDENTS BACK EDUCATOR

**HON. JAMES A. McCLURE**

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, University of Idaho students were told in mid-March that students all over the country will rebel because that is the only thing left to do. The speaker was leftist leader Thomas Hayden, a cofounder of the Students for a Democratic Society and a guest speaker at the university's annual Borah Foundation Symposium. His subject was "Violence and War," and Hayden predicted:

A person who is in every respect a normal American will become a warrior.

Two days after his fiery speech and grim predictions, university students—4,500 strong—gathered in torrents of rain before the house of University President Ernest W. Hartung. They were not there as warriors, and they did not carry protest signs. They were simply there expressing their support for Hartung and his policies.

Student body president Larry Craig of Midvale, Idaho, summed it up well:

President Ernest Hartung has moved the University of Idaho forward in three years as it has not been moved in 50 years. He has given to education and to the State of Idaho progressive leadership. Through his leadership, we have seen change without the violence seen at many other universities throughout the country.

Civic and educational leaders joined the students in their rally. The remarks of Moscow, Idaho Chamber of Commerce president Philip Guilfooy were particularly appropriate:

I see here tonight thousands of salesmen doing a great job for the University of Idaho. This is probably the first time a college demonstration has ever been held for and not against a president.

Mr. Speaker and my honorable colleagues, I am proud of those students and I want to take this opportunity to pay my greatest respect to a fine university and its leader. All too often, American students are guilty of destruction and pointless dissent.

I think the students at the University of Idaho have proven that they can work in close cooperation with the educational administration to achieve common goals and intellectual freedom.

MONEY LASTS LONGER IN AUSTIN,  
TEX.

**HON. J. J. PICKLE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has made official what I have been championing all along. According to statistics compiled in "Three Standards of Living" issued last week, it costs less for a family of four to live in Austin, Tex., than any other urban area in the Nation.

The model budgets set forth by the Department of Labor are designed for high, moderate, and low family incomes. In each instance, it takes less money to live in Austin than anywhere else. Specifically: the "high" budget on the national average is \$13,050—in Austin, to maintain the same standards requires only \$11,299; the "moderate" budget nationally is \$9,076—in Austin it is \$7,952; and the "low" budget nationally is \$5,915—in Austin, \$5,237. All budgets include taxes.

Statistics are useful only to statisticians and are not very meaningful to individuals; but it is comforting to know that dollars can go farther in Austin. Especially when we read that the consumer price index rose 0.4 percent in

February and is up 4.7 percent in the past 12 months.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics explains that the printed budgets are not especially "typical" or "average"—but they are liveable. The family used by definition is: a 38-year-old husband working full time, a nonemployed wife, a boy of 13, and a girl of 8.

It is no accident that Austin ranks first. As Texas chronology goes, Austin is an old city; but nationally, it is young, and Austin has been blessed with leadership which kept the city abreast of development through the lean years and the boom years. Austin does not have the decay which is evident in some of the older cities of this Nation. It is still vibrant, moving and desirable. The tax base is broad enough to pay the way without imposing excessive burdens upon the taxpayers. Proof of this is easily illustrated. Just a few months ago, Austin became the first city in the State to receive an AAA rating on revenue bonds issued by the city. This resulted in a tremendous savings to the people who foot the tax bill, especially in light of the rising interest rates.

I am not advocating mass migration to Austin, but I would like to point out a few of the "reasons why" Austin is such a delightful place to live. My remarks are factual and without prejudice.

The population of 225,000 has a wealth of cultural and educational benefits at their fingertips: The University of Texas, St. Edwards University, Maryhill College, Huston-Tillotson College, Concordia College. These are available, too, for the men stationed at Bergstrom Air Force Base.

There are over 80 State and over 50 Federal agencies in Austin with over \$94 million in payrolls. Being the State capital, Austin has attracted over 200 statewide association offices, 35 insurance offices, 300 manufacturing plants, medical centers, and many State schools and institutions. Total payrolls are in excess of \$130 billion.

Then there is the sheer, natural beauty of the hill country and the highland lakes, and the weather, and the mood and atmosphere of the people—and most of all the people, for they are the daily writers of Austin's success story.

OUR RESPONSIBILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Arab world are largely illiterate, wracked by disease and poverty, without the education and organization to enrich their harsh desert land. For decades, even the wealth of their oil fields has gone into palaces and Cadillacs, and above all into the armaments and trappings of war. For decades, irresponsible leaders have turned their people's frustration outward—toward the West, and to that tiny outpost of Western culture and ideals which is the State of Israel.

Israel has been fighting for her very existence too long. Only her arms and courage have allowed this tiny nation, with less than the population of New York City's Queens County, to defeat the armies of nations with total populations of tens of millions.

This gallant democracy, this nation of survivors from history's greatest example of man's capacity for senseless cruelty to his fellow man, cannot be allowed to succumb to the threats and assaults of her neighbors. And while this period of danger continues—until lasting peace settlement is achieved—we must maintain our vigilance in her behalf.

Since the creation of the State of Israel in 1948, the Middle East has been the setting for three bloody wars linked by border skirmishes and verbal threats. These conflicts have been both the flame and the fuel of an intense level of hatred in the area.

The loathing and hatred between Arab and Jew is an all consuming thing. Why has such mutual hostilities developed?

As many of us know, the story goes back nearly 2,000 years to the expulsion of the Jews from Palestine by the Romans in the year A.D. 70. This Diaspora marked the birth of a dream harbored by Jews throughout the world that someday they would be able to return as a people to the promised land. At last, in 1917, their chance came. Britain consented to establish a Jewish homeland in Palestine.

However, the Jews who immigrated to Palestine in the 1920's and 1930's, to buy land and to create a new state, were regarded as unwanted outsiders by many of the Arabs, who had been living in this barren land since the days of Christ. Under the yoke of foreign oppressors themselves for centuries, these Arabs dreamed too of an independent Palestine. Increasingly, growing Arab nationalism and Zionism clashed, often violently.

After World War II, under mounting pressure, the British proposed dividing Palestine into two states, one Arab and one Jewish. The Arabs protested that they wanted nothing less than one Palestine under Arab control. It might be true, they argued, that the Jews had been persecuted terribly in Europe. But then let Europe bear the cost of solving its own conscience, not the Arab world.

Without first reconciling these grave differences, the United Nations adopted the British partition plan, and in May 1948 Israel formally became a state. Outraged, the Arab armies attacked the new nation, vowing to drive the Jews into the sea. But, Israel, even in its infancy, had much more spirit and zest and determination and discipline than the Arabs. They were tougher inwardly and outwardly than the Arabs.

Israel did win the 1948 war, but peace in the Middle East was not realized. The Arab nations steadfastly refused to sign a peace treaty for this would have amounted to an unpalatable concession—recognition of the State of Israel. Instead, they declared they would not rest until our Jewish brethren were destroyed.

In less than a decade, the Middle East was ablaze again.

Following Egyptian President Nasser's nationalism of the Suez Canal in 1956 at

which time he barred the passage of all Israeli ships, and his blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba—Israel's only remaining outlet to the East—Britain, France, and Israel together invaded Egypt.

Within a matter of days, Israel had routed Nasser's Army and driven across the Sinai Peninsula to the Suez. But again victory did not result in a peace treaty. A cease fire was arranged which called for Israel to withdraw her armies, and the situation remained as explosive as before.

Since then, the Egyptian Army has grown in power—and continues to grow in power. Unified Arab command has forced Jordan to double the size of its army. Sophisticated weapons—jets, guided missiles and submarines—continue to flow in from the Soviet bloc.

These arms are a threat to peace. They waste valuable development capital; they threaten the only near Eastern state with traditions of democracy.

The irresponsible and dangerous nature of the course chosen by Israel's enemies is becoming more clear to the world every day. And our commitment to Israel must be equally clear; it must be a total one. We owe our Jewish brethren nothing less.

JOHNS HOPKINS PROFESSOR SAYS RISKS OF STARTING ON "SAFE-GUARD" ABM OUTWEIGH ANY BENEFITS

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Robert Rothstein, in a second article on the ABM in the March 29, 1969, New Republic, says:

The risks of doing without a new weapons system may be much less than the costs of learning how to live with it.

I commend his perceptive observations on the so-called Safeguard ABM system to my colleagues. The text of the article follows:

NIXON'S ABM: VERY THIN INDEED

(By Robert Rothstein)

All that was missing from Mr. Nixon's virtuoso performance, when he announced his intention to begin deployment of a modified ABM system primarily designed to protect our land-based retaliatory forces, was the invocation of Eisenhower's name, or at least his benediction by telephone "consultation." Perhaps the omission is explained by the fact that several of Eisenhower's leading scientific advisers had spent a good deal of time that very week blasting the system as ineffective, unnecessary and provocative. Not at all, replied the President; instead, it will protect us from accidental attacks, from a Chinese attack within the next decade, and from a direct Soviet attack against our land-based retaliatory forces. He also assured us that the Russians will not regard the ABM as provocative, for its defensive intent is "unmistakable."

The contention that an ABM system would save lives in the event of an accidental missile strike, presumably involving only a handful of missiles, makes some sense in the abstract, but loses most of its force when placed in context. We cannot protect our-

selves from every conceivable danger; we do not keep to our bed because we are fearful of being killed in the streets. When we are thinking about survival, we make some rational judgment about probabilities. How probable is it that an accidental strike—released somehow without anyone's intending it, or by a mad commander hoping to trigger a third world war—will hit those missile sites? Mr. Nixon plans to "safeguard"? The chances are what? One in a hundred, a thousand, a million? It's an unanswerable question.

If an accident were to occur, we would want to protect our cities, not missile sites. Protecting two missile complexes and areas around them means that the rest of the country goes unprotected—unless, of course, the system is expanded into a countrywide area defense, plus point defense of missile sites. In the interim (after 1973 but before more sites are protected), the notion that we are safe against accidents is something of a joke, except in regard to the metropolitan areas of Montana and North Dakota. Finally, there are technical questions about the degree to which the ABM system *itself* is accident-prone.

We have to choose between insurance against every possible contingency, in which case we simultaneously create more dangerous strategic instabilities; and an action (forestalling ABM deployment) which may leave us somewhat more exposed if the improbable occurs, but which also offers one of the last hopes we may have of maintaining a stable deterrent.

Most professional students of Communist China believe that Peking's international behavior is not nearly as provocative as Peking's rhetoric. Mao and his colleagues know that they could be annihilated in any nuclear war with the United States. The probability that they will threaten or attack the U.S. with their rudimentary nuclear force is extremely low. If we have been able to deter a much stronger Soviet force without an ABM, why do we need one against the Chinese within the next decade?

If we could treat the Chinese threat in isolation from our other strategic concerns, it just might be worth trying to buy some insurance against it. But unless all informed current estimates are wildly off the mark, the Chinese nuclear force will be small in number and fairly unsophisticated for the foreseeable future. I can hardly imagine a situation in which the Chinese would attack our missile sites. If they did strike, it would surely be at our cities, so as to assure maximum destruction. Finally, no matter what the Chinese did, no matter where they might aim their missiles, they could not prevent us from retaliating, thus inviting their own demise. The ABM deployment Mr. Nixon has outlined not only does not protect our cities, but also fails to provide a missile area defense for the whole country—unless, of course, it is expanded well beyond the two sites.

Suppose we expand it? In terms of the assumed Chinese threat, the Chinese could counter that expansion by various tactics—for example, by a saturation attack on a city inadequately protected by an area system. We would then have to begin protecting our cities. But that of course begins to undermine the Soviet Union's retaliatory capacity, and could be very destabilizing, as Mr. Nixon himself explicitly noted. In sum, even if we decide we have to do something about a Chinese nuclear threat, the deployment contemplated by the President is thoroughly inadequate, and a "thicker" deployment threatens the Soviet Union, forcing them and us into more costly, dangerous and inadequate counter measures.

The essential rationale for the current ABM proposal is the capacity of a "thin" system to "safeguard" our land-based missile forces against a Soviet first strike; "to protect," in Under Secretary Packard's

words, "our second strike capability." But if the Soviets want to maintain a first-strike capability against us—and it is not sure that they do—they have it within their power to do so, simply by increasing their offensive capability substantially: by investing in MIRV's (missiles with multiple warheads) for example, or penetration devices. If, on the other hand, the Russians settle for a second-strike capability, our ABM would be protecting the wrong targets—missile sites instead of cities—because the Soviets would reply to any first strike against them by retaliating against our population centers, not military targets.

It is extremely hard, therefore, to understand exactly what Mr. Nixon and his advisers have in mind, and why they are doing what they are doing. If the Russians chose to attack our missile sites, the ABM system proposed by the President would at best only complicate their efforts marginally. The system might be effective against a very light Soviet attack launched against a few of the sites, after we have completed full deployment of the ABM system recommended. But given the risk they would be taking against a strategically superior opponent, a light Soviet nuclear attack is almost beyond belief. Surely it would be all or nothing, and if it is all, Nixon's system is worthless.

I can only conclude that the Administration is trying "thin" deployment to a parallel effort to freeze current offensive missile levels; it's a bargaining counter. But that makes little sense either. If the Russians are willing to go along with such an agreement, we do not need the ABM at all. For it is designed to protect our retaliatory forces, and if the Soviets agree not to raise their offensive missile level substantially, our retaliatory force is not in jeopardy in the first place.

The bargaining thesis simply cannot be taken seriously. After all, the Russians know what we can do; they know too that we do not tend to underreact to their arms deployment. If they want an agreement, we hardly need initiate something which we may have to tear down. The best time to control the spread of arms is before they are deployed, not after. Once in place, they develop a role of their own, as well as a band of supporters. Consider the difficulty we had in extricating our useless and provocative missiles from Greece and Turkey, even after President Kennedy ordered it done! Their initial emplacement has to be justified on both political and strategic grounds; removing them also requires a complex and sophisticated justification. Inevitably, there are delays while political comprehension catches up to the notion of strategic obsolescence.

Anyway, Mr. Nixon has no intention of abandoning the ABM system, an arms agreement with the Russians notwithstanding. He said at his press conference that "the abandoning of the entire system, particularly as long as the Chinese threat is there, I think neither country would look upon with much favor." It is absurd to discuss the ABM as a bargaining ploy; once set in motion, the system is going to be with us permanently in one form or another.

Mr. Nixon argues that ABM's defensive intent is "unmistakable," primarily because the system he's recommending (sites, not cities) does not undermine the Soviet's capacity to retaliate against cities. ABM only improves our ability, the President says, to ride out a Soviet first strike and to strike back. In part, this reasoning appears to rest on the contention that the distinction between different kinds of ABM systems is hard and fast. Any system, however, can be seen as a preface to another, for the components and techniques are very similar. "Thickening" the system is primarily a matter of our willingness to spend more money. If the Russians do not trust Mr. Nixon and Mr. Laird, they may very well "read" this deploy-

ment as the beginning of a larger and more threatening one, which they can counter by greater investment in MIRV's and so forth. An ABM system *plus* larger investment in offensive missiles as destabilizing as the MIRV offers less security at a higher price. Parenthetically, Mr. Nixon's allusion to the possibility of reexamining the question of civil defense in this country could also be regarded as provocative; for that is a development which certainly would undermine the Soviet's second strike capability.

The President suggests that one reason his "safeguard" system is preferable to the Johnson Administration's alternative is that it is easier to defend missile sites than cities: for one thing, one need not worry very much about the fallout problem. However, Mr. Nixon's statement does not squarely face two other issues. First, though I agree that a city system requires virtually perfect defense, it is not clear that a missile site defense needs *only* a high percentage of kills to be effective. Missile site defense, for various reasons, may require a more accurate performance than the contemplated system promises. Second, once Mr. Nixon's system is installed, are there problems involved in getting our ICBM's off the ground during an attack, if there are Sprints exploding in the path of Soviet missiles in the immediate environment? I don't know the answers to these questions, but it is very important that they be asked.

There is, in my opinion, at least one other explanation for the deployment, to which I referred last week: the military wants an ABM system primarily because it would, they think, give them greater offensive flexibility in situations that are less than total confrontations (a third world war). What if the Russians threaten our "vital interests" in Europe, or the Chinese in Asia, the military asks? What response should we and could we make? One answer has been, in effect, that we ought to respond with equivalent force, in kind and degree. What happens, however, if the threat or the attack involves large numbers of ground troops and we are unable to meet in kind? In this instance, so the argument runs, we should contemplate *initiating limited nuclear strikes*, not necessarily against the attacking forces but against the enemy's *missile sites or airfields* in an effort to dissuade him from continuing his attack for fear of further limited strikes by us. This is *not* the same as Secretary McNamara's efforts to create some elements of control during a major nuclear war between the US and the Soviet Union. Mr. Laird has something different in mind, something that would occur at a level of provocation well below general war; it would involve, to borrow Mr. Laird's phrase, "limited nuclear reprisals."

Secretary Laird is not the only one who favors such a response. Harold Brown, formerly a top Pentagon official, said two weeks ago that we must anticipate nuclear confrontations in which each side fires a limited number of ICBM's at the other side's missile sites. So, Mr. Brown argued, our missile sites need ABM protection. I have also seen this argument raised in terms of a Chinese ground threat in Asia, but with the difference that in this instance our cities would need ABM protection, because the Chinese could not hit much else. I doubt that these advocates of "limited nuclear reprisals" really believe the Chinese would hit us; what they hope is that our President would not be deterred from a limited use of our nuclear force against the Chinese, if he was confident that the Chinese could not hurt us in turn. The "shadow of incertitude" which has kept the nuclear trigger from being pulled, might finally be lifted; no more need to step back from the brink, and no more need to ignore military advice as was done during the Cuban missile crisis.

This "limited nuclear reprisals" strategy tries to deal with a problem for which we

have no solution, but by means which are incredibly dangerous. If we are seriously contemplating this kind of action, its justification ought to be thoroughly debated.

The drawbacks to this strategy of limited nuclear reprisal are identifiable. It presumes that both sides will maintain control during a series of escalating nuclear exchanges, an eventuality which the Russians at any rate regard with considerable skepticism. Its advocates tend to act as if only we can protect our missile sites. But if the Soviets get an ABM as effective as ours, how will our small "limited" attacks get through? And what will they do in response, if our missile sites are protected but they feel the need to retaliate? Will they, like the Chinese, then aim at our cities? In effect, if both sides invest in ABM defenses, the "limited" exchanges may have to be very powerful to get through, and the chances of control are nil.

Underlying this strategy is an assumption about continued American strategic superiority. Throughout the strategic debates that have gone on in this country—over massive retaliation, the use of tactical nuclear weapons, limited nuclear war—we have presumed that our superiority will not be challenged. That may be true today, but it will not be true for very long. A strategy that allows for limited nuclear retaliation not only tries to compensate for political deficiencies by technical virtuosity, but makes sense only if you think that you are superior enough at the nuclear level so that rational opponents will pull back in time. Let me repeat: this would require circumstances in which the Russians, in theory, would be firing only a limited number of missiles at our missile sites. It is almost the only conceivable circumstance in which the contemplated ABM deployment would make any military sense. I would be delighted to be convinced that my assumptions about the attractiveness of this strategy in certain quarters are wrong.

Most of us accept the fact that we must protect our retaliatory forces. But since ballistic missile defense, in the current state of the art, can neither guarantee that it will do that job better than other alternatives, nor guarantee that it will save lives, the critical question is how the other side would respond. What it can guarantee is that it will cost the aggressor more to mount an attack, and the defender more to meet it (especially if payloads go up to compensate for the possible kill rate of the ABM system), which is small consolation. No one knows what will happen once ABM deployment begins to take shape. The worst that might happen is much worse than the best that might happen if we go ahead.

The Soviets are still considerably weaker than we are in strategic terms. Understanding that, one understands their reliance on terror weapons, their desperate gamble in Cuba, their frenetic rhetoric and persistent fear of inspection. They must react to our actions, because it has been so difficult for them to maintain even the appearance of near equality. It is a grave risk for them to gamble that our purposes are wholly defensive, for their margin of error has been very, very narrow. They are, inevitably, more concerned with problems of defense. Finally, they are beset from all sides by problems and conflicts which must appear increasingly ominous to them. The prospects for reaching some serious arms control agreements with them are said to be substantial. If that is so, any development that appears potentially threatening to them could be very foolish. It would be especially foolish to overreact to defensive measures on their part, for their response to yet another such challenge could be destabilizing.

A plea for underreaction at this time is also justified because the Soviet ABM system has done nothing beyond "complicating our effort" (according to our own officials). We should resist the desire to complicate

their effort, in turn. We can stand the marginal complications without undue strain. If we are ever going to achieve some control over these dangerous cycles of innovation, exploitation and obsolescence, it is by taking the short-run risk of foregoing development of something well within our means. This is a world in which stability is tenuous, and in which we are uncertain about how to maintain it. It may be a good rule of thumb—and we have nothing else—that the risks of doing without a new weapons system may be much less than the costs of learning how to live with it. Taking that risk now might yield nothing; but it would be a prudent gamble, for we are strong enough to survive any interim challenge, and the Soviets may be ready to recognize the futility of persisting in a weapons race that yields ever more insecurity at ever higher costs.

OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in this day of riot and unrest in and around our various institutions of learning, it is heartening to know that Dublin High School in the First District of Georgia is taking steps to instill in its senior class sensible, progressive thinking, and voting prerogatives which will help so much in making these young people good and responsible citizens.

The following is an opinion questionnaire and the tabulated results of 131 senior students at Dublin High School, and I am truly gratified that 26 of these young people are already registered to vote.

I am indeed proud that the State of Georgia is a leader in allowing the registration of 17-year-olds and granting the voting privilege to 18-year-olds. I believe that this right-to-vote to our 18-year-olds is the first and most logical step in preventing further student unrest. With a voting privilege, our young people of Georgia and, hopefully, across the Nation will be able to voice their opinions and earn an expression of their views through their Representatives in Congress, rather than through disruptive influences and methods evidenced today in our universities and colleges. Because of frustration, bewilderment, and lack of a feeling of belonging to and having a voice in our Government, they choose the more radical methods of expressing their discontent.

I am sure that you agree with me that only praise should go to this group of high-school students and their teacher, Mr. Edward B. Martin, for such active interest in government:

DUBLIN, Ga.,  
March 13, 1969.

Congressman G. ELLIOTT HAGAN,  
Cannon House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAGAN: Enclosed is an opinion questionnaire administered by a United States Government Class to the senior high students. There were 131 respondents, all of whom are to graduate in June of this year.

The results are as follows:

Question No.	Yes	No	Undecided
1.....	107	14	10
2.....	99	7	25
3.....	53	60	18
4.....	79	30	18
5.....	100	14	16
6.....	75	29	25
7.....	79	33	11

Enclosed also are the ballots for each person. You may note that of the 131 persons responding, 26 are already registered to vote. Almost all of this group will be registered within the year.

Highest regards,  
EDWARD B. MARTIN,  
Teacher, Social Studies,  
Dublin High School.

OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE: UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT CLASS, DUBLIN HIGH SCHOOL

1. If the Paris Peace talks fail to produce positive results within a reasonable time, would you favor an all-out conventional effort by the United States to end the war in Vietnam?

Yes . No . Undecided .

2. In the U.S.S. Pueblo incident, do you feel Navy Commander Lloyd Bucher acted in the best interest of his crew and his country?

Yes . No . Undecided .

3. Would you favor a separate congressional investigation of the Pueblo incident?

Yes . No . Undecided .

4. Are you in favor of President Nixon's proposal to eliminate the Draft System and have a Volunteer Army?

Yes . No . Undecided .

5. Would you favor any change in the Draft System?

Yes . No . Undecided .

6. In your opinion, is the Electoral College System outdated?

Yes . No . Undecided .

7. Do you think Congress should move to eliminate the Electoral College System, so that the President of the United States would be elected by popular vote?

Yes . No . Undecided .

Are you registered to vote?

Yes . No .

MORE ON THE PRESIDIO

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to apprise my colleagues in the House of the sentiments of some members of the legal fraternity, and in particular, members of the law faculty of New York University School of Law and Harvard Law School. I trust you will find their statement of interest.

A large portion of the NYU law faculty, including Dean Robert B. McKay, signed the statement, as did three-fourths of the Harvard law faculty. The names of the signators from the New York University School of Law have been made available to me and are also included:

STATEMENT BY NYU LAW SCHOOL FACULTY

As members of the legal community, we feel an obligation to express our concern over the court martial trials which are now being conducted at Fort Presidio, California. 27 soldiers, most of them under 21, are being

tried on charges of mutiny for staging a brief sit-down strike at the Presidio Stockade on October 14, 1968. The soldiers linked arms, sang "America the Beautiful" and "We Shall Overcome" and presented three demands asking for elimination of shotgun-type work details, psychological evaluation of stockade personnel prior to assignment, and better sanitary facilities.

An investigating officer, appointed as required by the Uniform Code of Military Justice, described the stockade grievance procedures as "shoddy and inefficient" and recommended that the mutiny charges be dropped and the soldiers be tried by special court martial (the maximum punishment is 6 months) or administratively discharged. The Commander of the 6th Army, Lt. Gen. Stanley R. Larsen, disregarded the recommendation and referred all cases to a general court martial on charges of mutiny. Last week the first three soldiers tried were convicted and sentences of 16, 16 and 14 years were adjudged.

We believe that serious questions have been raised by these courts martial concerning the administration of criminal law in our armed forces and the capacity of the present military justice system to insure basic due process rights to members of the military.

First, it must be asked whether the use of the serious charge of mutiny is appropriate in cases such as these. A peaceful and passive sit-down strike by prisoners is sometimes the only method for dramatizing and expressing grievances, and such demonstrations have not usually resulted in prosecutions when they have taken place in civilian prisons. It has been alleged that conditions at the Presidio Stockade were unsatisfactory and that there were 33 attempts at suicide during the 6 months preceding the sit-down strike.

Second, it must be asked whether the intense command interest in prosecuting these soldiers for serious crimes and the unusually severe sentences indicate that the court martial proceedings did not result in a fair and impartial trial.

The Presidio courts martial do not do credit to the Army or the American judicial system. We urge the Army authorities to give consideration to stopping the courts martial of the remaining soldiers and remedying the sentences already imposed. We also ask that serious consideration be given by the Department of Defense, the departments of the services, and Congress as to what steps can be taken to prevent a recurrence in the future of this type of proceeding.

Thomas G. S. Christensen, Leroy D. Clark, Daniel G. Collins, Norman Dorsen, Carr M. Ferguson, Thomas M. Franck, James B. Gambrell, Albert H. Garretson, Gideon A. Gottlieb, James Graham, Hyman Gross, Jerome R. Hellerstein, Graham Hughes, William D. Hutton, Carol Katz, Lawrence P. King, James C. Kirby, Charles L. Knapp, Homer Kripke, Jack L. Kroner, Andrew F. Lowenfeld, Robert B. McKay, Gerhard O. W. Mueller, John Peschel, Robert Pitofsky, John R. Reid, Charles Sellgson, Lois Sheinfeld, John Y. Taggart, Peter A. Winograd, George E. Zeitlin, Stanley A. Zimmerman.

RADIO HAVANA PAYS DR. MANOLO REYES A "COMPLIMENT"

### HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, Radio Havana recently paid the highest possible compliment to Dr. Manolo Reyes,

Miami's respected television news commentator and Cuban patriot. In a verbal attack seldom heard before, Radio Havana denounced Dr. Reyes for 15 minutes in reply to an interview Dr. Reyes gave to the Associated Press on the occasion of the anniversary of the "Declaration of Freedom" adopted by the Cuban people in exile.

Following is the Associated Press interview of Dr. Reyes along with Radio Havana's invective reply:

RADIO HAVANA PAYS DR. MANOLO REYES A "COMPLIMENT"

(By Theodore A. Ediger, Associated Press Writer, Miami, AP)

On February 14, 1969, Dr. Manolo Reyes gave an interview to the Associated Press in reference to his Declaration of Freedom which was proclaimed on January 23, 1966 at Key West, Florida at which time the entire audience of one thousand, five hundred people assembled on the streets of Key West, in front of the place where Jose Marti had his headquarters, to hear Dr. Reyes' speech.

The interview was broadcast by Associated Press International through its news service and reads as follows:

Cuban exiles, using secret channels, are flooding their homeland with copies of a "Declaration of Freedom."

"More than 10,000 copies of the document proclaiming a 'Revolution for Independence' have been infiltrated into Cuba," said Manolo Reyes. He uttered the declaration three years ago, and 1500 fellow exiles signed it. The paper invasion of Cuba is accelerating, Reyes reported.

"We can't disclose how we get the copies into Cuba because that would tip off Fidel Castro," said Reyes. "But I can say that some get in cloak and dagger methods . . ."

The Declaration says "the present Cuban regime is guilty of high treason." It pledges a fight to death "to free Cubans from communism."

The objective is to stimulate people inside Cuba to rise up against Castro, Reyes said.

"This is going into the hands of people of the regime as well as other persons," he reported.

The exile television commentator exhibited a cautiously worded letter recently arrived from Cuba. It said: "Some who are in the Castro regime and some who are not have received papers and copies of the declaration. Certain things have happened here and this is attributed to the type of propaganda coming from your city." Reyes interpreted "happenings" as sabotage acts. Exiles call the paper invasion "ideological warfare."

"It is bringing up a mystique among people inside Cuba, not for a leader but for an ideology," Reyes said.

The declaration of freedom calls God, country and family the cornerstones of the anti-Castro revolution. It calls for freedom of worship, teaching, press and enterprise. "One day Fidel is going to see the declaration of freedom plastered inside the windshield of his car," Reyes said. "It already is on walls of cities in Cuba."

Assisting in various ways in the paper invasion program, Reyes said, are exiles in New York, New Jersey, Illinois, California, Puerto Rico, Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia, and elsewhere as well as in Miami.

The password is "family", said Reyes. "The workers remain anonymous—names don't matter, just ideology. We have no organization. We just say, 'we are part of the family'." A joint resolution commending the declaration of freedom has been introduced in Washington by Rep. Claude Pepper, D-Fla. The resolution is before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Reyes has put aside a giant copy of the declaration "for signing inside Cuba some day."

Four days later specifically on February 18, 1969, radio Havana in a broadcast in short wave, in the Spanish language to the Americas picked up at 1300 GMT—responded violently to the Associated Press item with a feature story entitled "Cuba Replies to Aggression." (Observers believe that this is the first time that Red Radio Havana, the official voice of the Fidel Castro regime devoted an entire program of fifteen minutes to attack an individual Cuban exile.)

The Communist broadcast from Cuba stated as follows:

"A News Release from the AP U.S. News Agency, from Miami, devotes special attention to a terrible and threatening ideological campaign against Cuba started by Manolo Reyes.

The Cuban Exiles, using secret means, are sending to their country copies of a freedom declaration. The News Release said that more than 10,000 copies of a document titled "Revolution for Freedom" had been infiltrated into Cuba, according to Manolo Reyes.

"Reyes said that its delivery to Cuba is being rushed."

According to statements of this impudent person, the objective is to stimulate the people in Cuba to rise against the revolutionary regime. The news agency reported that the exiled television commentator said that the preparation of the declaration began three years ago and that 1500 (fifteen hundred) exiles had signed it. As we see it, the job is a difficult one, to get 1500 exiled Cubans in Miami to sign the Declaration, you do not need that much time. Reyes is a very slow man even though he seems to be happy about the results attained. Reyes, after casting furtive glances to his right and left, showed the AP newsmen a letter which, according to him, arrived recently from Cuba and which says "some who are here and some who are not have more papers. Certain things have taken place here and that can be attributed to the type of propaganda coming out of this city." Reyes explained the meaning of that mysterious letter. Those who are here are people from the revolutionary regime, those who are not here are enemies of the revolution. The papers are copies of the Declaration and the phrase 'certain things have taken place here' are evidently sabotage actions against the Revolution."

Manolo Reyes affirmed that the Declaration is now posted on walls in Cuban cities and said that very soon it will be posted on the windows of the cars used by the revolution's leaders. As we can see it, the imagination of a worm has no limit. Reyes said that he has the support of exiles in U.S., Puerto Rico, Mexico, Venezuela, and Colombia. Quick calculations tells us that either there are too many worms in those places or there are not enough signatures or Manolo Reyes is kidding the AP newsmen.

Manolo Reyes was very popular in Cuba a few years ago when he was a small boy and advertised cafe pilon. Later the small boy grew, his pants are longer but everything indicates that his brain did not develop normally. "Manolo Reyes promises to fight until Death." This is a theatrical phrase, because for those who try to fight the new Cuba, an inglorious end and death awaits. Manolo Reyes will not take that step; he prefers to win battles from Miami, make statements to press agencies, dream about sabotage, and chatter about the terrible ideological war which he will unleash in Cuba which we learned about from the Association Press.

Manolo Reyes considers that it is necessary to fight in Cuba to achieve religious education, and freedom of the press and enterprise. To achieve the first three freedoms we do not need declarations of worms. We have had complete religious freedom in Cuba since 1959; we have free education, which means anyone can study whatever he or she wants,

depending entirely on their wishes. In the past only the sons of rich people could study. We have freedom of the press because the press here fulfills its obligation to inform and orient the people. Manolo Reyes has other concepts of freedom; for him it is the freedom of the people who try to exploit the poor and the humble, the freedom of Yankee monopolies to loot the country, the freedom of the large landowner to condemn the landless farmer to die of hunger, and the freedom of the politicians to steal from the national treasury and later, in the newspaper, to appear as a benefactor. That type of freedom has disappeared forever from Cuba.

As far as freedom of enterprise is concerned, our people do not need promoters. They are self sufficient and are capable of organizing and developing the economy. The revolution has elevated the dignity of man and for those like Reyes the present is gloomy and there is no hope of returning to the past.

#### IRRATIONAL PATTERN DISCERNED IN STUDENT REVOLTS

### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 27, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, nearly 60 percent of the Nation's high schools are being plagued by student unrest. These protests have ranged from the usual student murmuring to actual student rioting. The contested issues have included prohibitions against long hair and short dresses, teachers' qualifications, racial composition, and academic credits.

As are many of my colleagues, I am bewildered by the riots on our college campuses within the last year. But I am even more perplexed and concerned with the unrest in our high schools. In an effort to increase awareness of these protests I am inserting in the RECORD three newspaper articles.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 14, 1969]

#### IRRATIONAL PATTERN DISCERNED IN STUDENT REVOLTS

(By John Leo)

A study of 19th- and 20th-century student movements has concluded that all student uprisings are "symbolic parricide," in which a young generation tries to humiliate and overthrow the institutions of its parents, regardless of the political issues or consequence.

Because of this "irrational element," says the author of the study, Lewis Feuer, professor of sociology at the University of Toronto, student revolts are almost always counter-productive, leading to a period of reaction or repression.

The study will be published on Feb. 28 by Basic Books under the title "The Conflict of Generations."

"Student movements are the most sincerely selfless and altruistic the world has seen," Professor Feuer said in an interview. "But they are distorted and pulled toward extreme and amoral means because the driving energy comes from unconscious sources."

#### TWENTY NATIONS INCLUDED

The book surveys student movements in more than 20 nations, with particular attention to Russia, Bosnia and Germany in the 19th century and Japan and the United States in the 20th.

"The pattern is the same in practically every country," said Professor Feuer. "The

movement is rooted in altruism, a concern for establishing community and overcoming alienation. It begins by celebrating liberal democratic values and usually ends by discrediting those values for the whole society.

"In Prussia, the great student movement of 1819 postponed the liberalization of Germany for 30 years. In Russia, as Kropotkin wrote, a liberal constitution could have been achieved in 1881 if the students hadn't polarized the society. In Bosnia, the universal acceptance of assassination by the student movement produced the murder of the Archduke and touched off World War I.

"Student movements commonly escalate to terrorism, and sometimes assassination, not because these tactics are politically wise, but because they satisfy the needs of generational hatred on the latent, unconscious level. This symbolic parricide runs through every student movement I studied."

#### TYPE OF LEADER

The movements, he said, are typically led by young men who have had particular problems with their fathers.

"You can see this," he went on, "in one movement after another: Karl Follen, the key figure in the Prussian movement; Gavril Princip, who assassinated the Archduke; down to Mao Tse-tung and leaders of American movements.

"These leaders reach out to students in whom the problem is much more attenuated. Then at some crisis—let's say the arrival of police on campus—the leaders appeal to generational solidarity, and the struggle is finally revealed in its true aspect."

At this point, he continued, the desire to punish the older generation can easily override rational politics and the initial goals of the movement.

#### ALWAYS THE IRRATIONAL

"I think this was true of the student movement in the thirties that I was part of at City College," he said. "We accomplished certain things and brought life to the campus, but there was always that irrational element. We all circulated the Oxford pledge not to fight in another war at the moment Hitler was arming to the teeth. The anti-generational drive was stronger than reason.

"If we can make this irrational element overt, then perhaps student altruism won't flow into the same self-destructive channels. That's my whole purpose in writing the book."

Referring to the student uprisings at Berkeley and Columbia, he said: "Berkeley led to a remarkable rise in crime in the area, the election of Ronald Reagan, and created a climate for what happened in Watts. Columbia set the stage for the New York school strike.

"If we don't want it to happen again and again, it's important to get moderates, liberals and conservatives to assert themselves on campus. If the whole campus can be involved in electing a student government willing to take over disciplinary matters in case of an outbreak, a rational position may be worked out."

Professor Feuer, who formerly taught philosophy at the University of Vermont, was professor of sociology at Berkeley when that campus erupted in 1964. He was a favorite target for student activists who considered his comments on their movement, both on campus and in national magazines, inaccurate and unsympathetic. He moved to Toronto in 1966.

#### STUDY SEES A RISE IN YOUTH PROTEST

(By Kathleen Teltch)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., February 15—Student demonstrations in more than 50 countries during 1968 represent only a warning rumble of bigger and bolder protests to be expected from youth in the future, according to United Nations sociologists.

Estimating that those in the 12-to-25 age

group number 750 million and will reach a billion by 1980, the experts predict in a report made public yesterday that "youth of the world will begin to predominate in world affairs."

"World opinion is going to become increasingly the opinion of the world's youth and the generational conflict will assume proportions not previously imagined," they add.

"Young people of all walks of life are prepared to march, to demonstrate and to riot if necessary in support of views which may not be those of the electorate, nor of the majority nor yet those of government."

#### MORE THAN IMPATIENCE

The sociologists also see prospects for converting youthful impatience into a positive force. They call for immediate steps by governments to prepare national youth policies and programs at the very highest levels and they recommend that those policies be drawn up not as a response to fears or sudden crises but as comprehensive and lasting undertakings.

Such programs might be coordinated by a single ministry of youth or under the aegis of a prime minister or high authority, the report suggested.

The first detailed review of youth problems by the United Nations, it was made for a two-week session of the 32-member Commission for Social Development that will open here Monday.

The 80-page study is based on an analysis of reports, interviews with youth leaders and field trips conducted in 40 countries over a two-year period, but not for this study alone. The emphasis was on the poorer countries of Latin America, Africa and the Middle East. No in-depth study of the situation in the Soviet Union or the United States was attempted.

#### THE DEVELOPED AND THE POOR

Three sociologists—two Britons and an American youth expert—prepared the report. In keeping with United Nations practice, they were not named. The countries discussed are not identified, but the writers draw broad distinctions between the developed—meaning prosperous—countries and the poorer countries.

They report the existence of a "youth culture" that has cut across frontiers and linked young people in rich and poor countries because of mutual aspirations, tastes and drives. The report finds a strong sense of unity among young people, "whatever the cause of their campaigns may be."

Educated youth vie with trade unions as an effective nonparty force in politics, the study said. This clamor for attention can be expected to continue as young people begin to realize their strength in world affairs.

"The younger generation seems to have lost confidence in the capacity of the older generation to guide affairs without some assistance and planning from young people," the report found.

In the poorer countries, beset by economic difficulties, the report saw prospects that youth could help stimulate national growth. It also pointed out that youthful dissidents could pose a "recurrent political threat."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 3, 1969]

#### STUDY FINDS PROTESTS WIDESPREAD

SAN FRANCISCO, March 2.—Student protests, which range in intensity from vocal complaints to riots, have occurred recently at nearly 60 per cent of the Nation's high schools, a survey of principals showed today.

Results of the survey, which involved a random sample of 1026 principals, were reported at the 53rd annual convention of the National Association of Secondary School Principals. It was made by the association staff.

"The basic message is clear. Student activism is here," said J. Loyd Trump, associate secretary.

"Sixty-seven per cent of the city schools surveyed are experiencing protests. For schools in the suburbs, the number with protests is also 67 per cent. In rural areas, it drops to 53 per cent, still more than half of the respondents.

"One of the surprises of the survey was the fact that protest is almost as likely to

occur in junior high schools as in senior high schools. Among the junior high schools, 56 per cent report protest activities, as compared to 59 per cent of all senior high schools."

Trump said young people are becoming vocal on every topic from glue-sniffing to the vote for 18-year-olds. He said it was hard to discern a pattern because so many subjects were mentioned.

But dress and hair requirements head the list of complaints, followed by smoking

rules, cafeteria and assembly fare, censorship of student papers and scheduling of sporting events.

Forty-five per cent of the schools with protests reported activism regarding the way pupils are educated. Complaints included poor teachers, curriculum content, scheduling, grades and exams.

Protests over racial relations problems were reported by 10 per cent of the schools. Three per cent of the protests involved Vietnam and 2 per cent the draft.

## SENATE—Monday, March 31, 1969

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Reverend EDWARD L. R. ELSON, D.D., Chaplain of the Senate. On the day of his first inauguration, January 20, 1953, President Dwight David Eisenhower attended a brief preinaugural church service in the National Presbyterian Church, after which he went to his rooms and wrote a prayer of his own. Several hours later, in front of this Capitol Building, when he began his inaugural address, he asked everyone to join him as he offered his own prayer. In the words of his prayer, let us pray today:

"Almighty God, as we stand here at this moment, my future associates in the executive branch of the Government join me in beseeching that Thou will make full and complete our dedication to the service of the people in this throng and their fellow citizens everywhere.

"Give us, we pray, the power to discern clearly right from wrong and allow all our words and actions to be governed thereby and by the laws of this land.

"Especially we pray that our concern shall be for all the people, regardless of station, race, or calling. May cooperation be permitted and be the mutual aim of those who, under the concept of our Constitution, hold to differing political beliefs—so that all may work for the good of our beloved country and for Thy glory. Amen."

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 27, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 27, 1969, the Secretary of the Senate on March 28, 1969, received a message in writing from the President

of the United States informing the Senate of the death of Dwight David Eisenhower, the 34th President of the United States.

### DEATH OF FORMER PRESIDENT DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER— INFORMAL PROCEEDINGS IN THE SENATE CHAMBER AND FUNERAL SERVICE IN THE ROTUNDA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the transcript of the proceedings of the informal meeting of Senators in connection with the funeral ceremonies for the former President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower, held in the Senate Chamber yesterday, Sunday, March 30, 1969.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also to have printed in the RECORD the eulogy delivered by the President of the United States and the benediction by the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, Chaplain of the Senate, at the memorial service on yesterday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The transcript of the proceedings, the eulogy, and the benediction were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### IN THE SENATE CHAMBER, SUNDAY, MARCH 30, 1969

An informal meeting of Senators, called by the majority leader, the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD), and the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIRKSEN), was held at 3:30 p.m. in connection with arrangements for the funeral ceremonies for the former President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower.

The meeting was called to order by the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER), as Presiding Officer.

### FUNERAL SERVICES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this is an informal meeting of the Senate, and I wish to make the following announcement on behalf of the distinguished minority leader and myself:

Funeral services for the late President at the Washington National Cathedral will be held tomorrow at 4:30 p.m.

Buses will depart under escort from First Street NE., between the Senate Office Buildings, at 3:30 p.m. and return immediately after the services. Those going in private cars are advised to enter the cathedral grounds from Woodley

Road and proceed to the north transept entrance.

Tickets for the services for Senators and wives will be delivered by the Sergeant at Arms. Members of the Senate delegation are scheduled to be seated in the cathedral at 4:15 p.m.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

The minority leader and I have discussed schedules for the next several days. It is our thought that tomorrow ought to be devoted to eulogies by all Members of the Senate who desire to deliver them, but that on Tuesday we will have regular business.

Unanimous-consent agreements have been asked for and granted. As I recall, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) asked for 1 hour at the conclusion of morning business on Monday. That time will be taken on Tuesday. According to the secretary for the minority, Mr. Mark Trice, several Republican Senators have made similar requests for Monday, and they will be heard on Tuesday.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will there be any votes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be no votes that I know of.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will there be any objection to our having committee hearings on Tuesday? I have postponed hearings previously scheduled for tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It would be appreciated if no hearings were held tomorrow, Monday; but from Tuesday on, hearings may be held.

### EASTER RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the leadership has been discussing the Easter recess, which was planned to expire on April 9. In view of the fact that the calendar is fairly clear and because of our desire not to call the Senate back when there is nothing to be done except to be in attendance, we shall join the House in seeking to adopt a resolution—which no doubt will be agreed to—which will extend the recess to the 14th of April. Senators should keep that in mind and make plans accordingly. We are doing this because the calendar, like Mother Hubbard's cupboard, is bare.

### FUNERAL SERVICES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we were in some doubt as to whether an official delegation from the House and Senate should attend the funeral at Abilene, Kans. At the last minute, however, it developed that it was not desired to have the formal attendance of a House dele-