

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. AYERS, Mr. QUIE, Mr. BELL of California, Mr. ERLÉNBOHN, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. ESCH, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. COLLINS, and Mr. HANSEN of Idaho):

H.R. 11048. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to extend its duration, to authorize assistance for projects for foster grandparents and senior companions, to provide assistance to strengthen State agencies on aging, and to otherwise strengthen and improve that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 11049. A bill to enable honey producers to finance a nationally coordinated research and promotion program to improve their competitive position and expand their markets for honey; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 11050. A bill to prohibit the dissemination through interstate commerce or the mails of materials harmful to persons under the age of 18 years, and to restrict the exhibition of movies or other presentations harmful to such persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 11051. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$2,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 11052. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 11053. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 753(e), to eliminate the maximum and minimum limitations upon the annual salary of reporters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 11054. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 704. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring the advice and consent of the House of Representatives in the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.J. Res. 705. Joint resolution proposing amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the eligibility of certain persons to vote for any candidate for elector of President and Vice President or for a candidate for election as a Senator or

Representative in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLD:

H.J. Res. 706. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALIFIANAKIS:

H. Con. Res. 243. Concurrent resolution, International Conference for Territorial Seas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PODELL:

H. Con. Res. 244. Concurrent resolution, support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRASCO (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRADENAS, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CELLER, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DENT, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GIAMMO, Mr. GILBERT, and Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 395. Resolution requesting the President to urge the Soviet Union to process the requests of 50,000 Soviet citizens for reunions with their families who are outside the U.S.S.R.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRASCO (for himself, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. NIX, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. REID of New York, and Mr. ROBINSON):

H. Res. 396. Resolution requesting the President to urge the Soviet Union to process the requests of 50,000 Soviet citizens for reunions with their families who are outside the U.S.S.R.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 397. Resolution requesting the President to urge the Soviet Union to process the requests of 50,000 Soviet citizens for reunions with their families who are outside the U.S.S.R.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRASCO (for himself, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WYDLER, and Mr. YATRON):

H. Res. 398. Resolution requesting the President to urge the Soviet Union to process the requests of 50,000 Soviet citizens for reunions with their families who are outside the U.S.S.R.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

H. Res. 398. Resolution authorizing a Representative in Congress who is a member of

a certain committee to designate one of his employees to be cleared for access to classified information available to the Representatives in his capacity as a member of such committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Res. 399. Resolution to provide funds for the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 17; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

157. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a uniform welfare system, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 11055. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Armetta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11056. A bill for the relief of Despina Legakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11057. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo and Agatha Sgroi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 11058. A bill for the relief of Suriya Sompunth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTAIN:

H.R. 11059. A bill for the relief of Chan Cheuk Kuen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 11060. A bill for the relief of Victor L. Ashley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 11061. A bill to provide private relief for certain members of the U.S. Navy recalled to active duty from the Fleet Reserve after September 27, 1965; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 11062. A bill for the relief of Gonzalo Pino and his wife, Anna Maria Pino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 11063. A bill for the relief of Zofia Chajduk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

104. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Jay Creswell, Orlando, Fla., relative to redress of grievances, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE CELEBRATES CENTENNIAL OF WAKAMATSU TEA AND SILK COLONY AT GOLD HILL, CALIF.

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, 1 month from today, on June 7, to be exact, a California historical landmark will be dedicated at Gold Hill, in El Dorado County, to mark the site of

the Wakamatsu Tea and Silk Colony, the first recognized settlement of Japanese immigrants to the continental United States.

This observance will also officially inaugurate the Japanese immigration centennial commemorating the 100th anniversary of the arrival of the first Japanese for permanent residence in this country.

Gov. Ronald Reagan, Japanese Consul General Seiichi Shima, and national president of the Japanese American Citizens League—JACL—Jerry Enomoto will be among the featured participants in the dedication ceremonies.

A bronze plaque, to be fitted into a 17-ton granite boulder, will carry the inscription:

Wakamatsu Tea and Silk Colony. Site of the only tea and silk farm established in California. First agricultural settlement of pioneer Japanese immigrants who arrived at Gold Hill on June 8, 1869. Despite the initial success, it failed to prosper. It marked the beginning of Japanese influence on the agricultural economy of California. California Registered Historical Landmark No. 815. Plaque placed by the State Department of Parks and Recreation in cooperation with the Japanese American Citizens League and the El Dorado County Historical Society. June 7, 1969.

That same evening the Japanese immigration centennial commemorative banquet will be held in Sacramento, with William Hosokawa, associate editor of the Denver Post, as the guest speaker. Mr. Hosokawa has just completed the manuscript of a book entitled "Nisei: The Quiet Americans: The Story of a People," a popular history of the Japanese in the United States during the past 100 years that is to be published early this winter by William Morrow & Co.

Perhaps the concluding paragraph of the successful application for the historical landmark recognition sums up the reason for this commemorative occasion:

Although the Wakamatsu Tea and Silk Farm Colony was short-lived and suffered its tragic ending, it signaled the coming of Japanese pioneers to America and the beginning of their notable contribution of the agricultural industry of California. During the past three-quarters of the century, they have left their marks in the teeming valleys throughout the length and breadth of this great State. Many descendants are carrying on the work of their pioneer forebears with the same devotion, determination and skill which helped to make California the most productive farming State in the United States and the greatest agricultural region in the world. Thus, it is fitting that the land which was once the Wakamatsu Tea and Silk Farm Colony be historically recognized as the site of (a) the only silk and tea farm in this State and (b) the first venture into agriculture by Japanese immigrants in the United States and (c) where the important participation of the pioneers from Japan to California's agriculture had its beginning.

SUMMARY HISTORY

Henry Taweta, a native Californian and an attorney practicing in Sacramento, wrote about the so-called Wakamatsu story in the winter 1969 issue of the Pacific Historian in a feature article entitled "1969—The Centennial Year."

After describing the research that established the existence of the Wakamatsu Colony, Taketa described the short-lived saga of the Japanese colonists:

The most notable contribution of the pioneer immigrants from Japan to the economy and industry of the State of California and the United States has been in the field of agriculture. With utmost patience, perseverance and industry, they cleaned, leveled and irrigated land and brought crops to bear in soil which had previously remained idle or had been put to limited use for pasturage and grazing.

Japanese immigration of any consequence to the United States was in the late 1890s and early 1900s, and their influence upon California's farming industry was in direct ratio to the number of new arrivals. However, it is most significant that its humble beginning was with the coming of a small but proud and determined group from Aizu Wakamatsu in Japan to Gold Hill, El Dorado County, on or about June 8, 1869, to establish a farm settlement, although this venture lasted less than two years and ended in tragedy.

Aizu Wakamatsu, led by its last feudal lord, Katamori Matsudaira, and a number of other ruling clans had the misfortune of supporting Tokugawa Shogunate in its conflict against the followers of Emperor Meiji who favored centralized imperial power and had suffered a crushing defeat. Chaos reigned for a time in Japan, and there was genuine fear for life and property among the losers. Either at the suggestion of Eduard Schnell,

a trader of Dutch or German descent and a long-time confidant of the lord of the Aizu Wakamatsu, or to prepare for a possible sanctuary of refuge if it became necessary to flee the homeland, Lord Matsudaira made plans for the first organized emigration to the United States and brought into existence the ill-fated and short-lived Wakamatsu Tea and Silk Farm Colony of Gold Hill.

Between nine to ten persons under the leadership of Eduard (John Henry) Schnell constituted the first vanguard of several groups of contingents. Sixteen more were soon to follow, and others (including Okei, nursemaid to the Schnell household, Matsu and Kuni) were to arrive at the Colony later. Gold Hill of El Dorado County may have been selected for this colonization for its scenic and topographical similarity to their Japanese homeland or because many early settlers were from Holland or Germany as was Schnell. Many of the colonists were farmers and those in the trades, but several were samurai followers of Lord Matsudaira. Six Japanese women, including Mrs. Schnell and four young children, were with the pioneer colony. Two of the children were the daughters of Mr. and Mrs. Schnell, and the remaining two were daughters of Japanese families. The original party arrived at San Francisco aboard the sidewheeler China, of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company, on May 27, 1869, proceeded to Sacramento by riverboat, and thence wagoned to Placerville and Gold Hill where Eduard Schnell had arranged to purchase 160 acres for the farm colony. With them came 50,000 three-year-old mulberry trees for silk farming, a large quantity of bamboo roots for food and craft industry, tea seeds, wax tree stocks, grape seedlings and other varieties of plants and seeds of their native land. Also, sizeable shipments of cuttings and plants were to be received at Gold Hill after initial preparations had been completed. However restrictive or limited, the Japanese people were now traveling between California and their homeland of Japan in the interest of their agricultural undertaking at Gold Hill, El Dorado County.

Immediately upon their arrival, the settlers set out to build their homes and clear and plant their crops on the land purchased from Charles M. Graner, and for over a year it appeared that they would be rewarded for their determination and many sacrifices. However, combination of dry climate of the area, scarcity of irrigation water, lack of funds and failure of financial assistance to come from Japan as promised doomed the pioneer project in less than two years. Beset with money problems and other problems, Eduard Schnell left the colony with his Japanese wife and two minor daughters with assurance to the colonists that he would return with much needed funds, but he failed to do this and thus abandoned his Japanese followers to their own fate in a strange and often hostile land.

As dictated by necessity and self-preservation, the settlers sold most of their valuables and belongings to ward off hunger while patiently waiting for their leader who never returned, and ultimately each was compelled to go his own way. Some were able to return to Japan and others moved elsewhere where employment was more promising. From every indication, only Matsunosuke Sakurai, a samurai, and Okei Ito, nursemaid to the Schnell household, remained behind at Gold Hill where they were befriended and employed by the early pioneer family of Francis Veerkamp. His descendants are to be found in the Gold Hill-Coloma area where they are engaged in farming and business. Okei is said to have died of fever at the age of 19 in the spring of 1871, and was buried at the knoll of a hill which she frequently climbed to watch the setting sun and gaze in the direction of her homeland. Her headstone reads both in

English and Japanese, "In Memory of Okei, died 1871, Age 19 years, a Japanese Girl". Matsunosuke Sakurai faithfully served the Veerkamp family until his death on February 25, 1901, and he now lies at rest in the Vineyard Cemetery at Coloma, the historical site of Marshall's gold discovery and a few miles from Gold Hill.

With its tragic ending, the colony soon passed into oblivion, and its very existence was lost and forgotten until after World War I. Unquieted rumor persisted that a Japanese girl, who died in the gold-rush period, was buried at Gold Hill near Coloma. A search was undertaken by several Sacramentans, and the first person they interviewed was the 75 year old Henry Veerkamp, son of the pioneer settlers who befriended and gave shelter and employment to Okei Ito and Matsunosuke Sakurai, the last of the colonists to remain at Gold Hill. He was a year older than the Japanese girl he knew as "Okei San" and, in vividly recalling the past, he told the story of the tea and silk farm, its Japanese pioneers and their hopes, industry, disappointments, suffering, hardships and ultimate abandonment of the colony. He pointed out the site of the settlement and the location of Okei's grave, and thus the Wakamatsu Tea and Silk Farm Colony was rediscovered.

OFFICIAL PROCLAMATIONS

Assembly Concurrent Resolution 10, coauthored by Assemblyman Eugene A. "Gene" Chappie of El Dorado County and Senator Stephen P. Teale of Sacramento, was passed by the Assembly on January 20, 1969, and by the Senate on January 21, 1969.

It resolved:

That the Members of the Legislature join in commemorating the centennial celebration of Japanese immigration to the United States and express the deep appreciation of all citizens of California for the immense and invaluable contributions made by Japanese Americans to the rich cultural heritage of this state and of America.

In February, the legislature approved Assembly Joint Resolution 10, which was also coauthored by Assemblyman Chappie and Senator Teale:

That the Legislature of the State of California recommend that the Post Office Department of the United States of America print a commemorative stamp honoring the centennial of Japanese immigration to the United States of America . . . (and) That Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States of America, be requested to proclaim the year 1969, the centennial year for the people of Japanese descent in the United States. . . .

And, on February 3, 1969, Gov. Ronald Reagan issued an official proclamation, noting—

With patience, perseverance and industry, the Japanese have contributed much to California, particularly in agriculture, for the past decades since their arrival in the Golden State, adding to our heritage and history" and designating "the year 1969 as Japanese Centennial Year, (and) urging all Californians to study the contributions of the Japanese to our California way of life.

WAKAMATSU CENTENNIAL COMMITTEE

The members of the Wakamatsu Centennial Committee are James Murakami, Northern California-Western Nevada JACL District Council Project coordinator and chairman; George Oki, finance chairman; Henry Taketa and Akiji Yoshimura, program cochairmen; Hike Yego, Coloma celebration chairman;

Tom Fujimoto, monument design chairman; John H. Michael, State of California department of parks and recreation; William Matsumoto, public relations officer; George Baba, budget chairman; John Hassler, El Dorado County historical society; S. Nakatani, sponsor, Wakamatsu State Registration; M. Yamasaki, monument placement and landmark chairman and sponsor; Mrs. E. Sayre, sponsor, Wakamatsu State Registration; Mrs. Mary Tsukamoto, Momento booklet chairman; Dr. Kengo Terashita, Northern California-Western Nevada JACL District Council governor; Mas Sataow, National JACL director; and Jerry Enomoto, National JACL president.

NATIONAL JACL JAPANESE IMMIGRATION CENTENNIAL COMMITTEE

The National JACL Japanese Immigration Centennial Committee includes Haruo Ishimaru of Cupertino, chairman; Dr. Roy Nishikawa of Los Angeles, centennial banquet chairman; James Murakami of Santa Rosa, Wakamatsu centennial committee chairman; Akiji Yoshimura of Colusa, chapter liaison chairman; Masao Satow of San Francisco; National JACL director; and Jerry Enomoto of Sacramento, National JACL president, all of California, and Mike Masaoka of Washington, D.C., Washington JACL representative.

The National JACL Committee will soon announce additional plans for a year-long commemorative celebration which will involve both the United States and Japan, the land of the citizenship and the country of the ancestry of most of its members, including a search for the oldest living Japanese immigrant and the oldest living Japanese American born on the continental mainland, Washington and Tokyo observances, and a climatic banquet in Los Angeles, where the greatest number of those of Japanese ancestry on the mainland United States currently reside.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that California Assembly Concurrent Resolution 10, California Assembly Joint Resolution 10, and Governor Reagan's proclamation be printed in the RECORD following my remarks:

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 10

Joint resolution relative to the issuing of a commemorative stamp and a Presidential proclamation upon the centennial of Japanese immigration to the United States of America

Whereas, the first group of Japanese immigrants arrived from Aizu Wakamatsu, Japan, aboard the sidewheeler "China" of The Pacific Mail Steamship Company and entered the United States on May 27, 1869, at San Francisco; and

Whereas, this valiant and brave band of colonists proceeded to Sacramento by riverboat, traveled overland by wagon to Placerville and Gold Hill, and established the Wakamatsu Tea and Silk Farm Colony of Gold Hill by clearing the land, building their homes, and cultivating plants and seeds, including 50,000 three-year-old mulberry trees for silk farming, which they had brought with them from their native land; and

Whereas, although this pioneer project was doomed in less than two years by a combination of dry climate and a scarcity of irrigation water, it nevertheless heralded a period during which the Japanese people

immigrated to California to participate in the beginnings of the Golden State's agricultural industry; and

Whereas, on December 16, 1966, the Historical Landmarks Advisory Committee of the Division of Beaches and Parks unanimously approved the Wakamatsu Tea and Silk Farm Colony of Gold Hill as a historical landmark and stated that "Although the Wakamatsu Tea and Silk Farm Colony was short lived and suffered its tragic ending, it signaled the coming of Japanese pioneers to America and the beginning of their notable contribution to the agricultural history of California. During the past three-quarters of a century, they have left their marks in the teeming valleys throughout the length and breadth of this great state. Many descendants are carrying on the work of their pioneer forebears with the same devotion, determination and skill which helped to make California the most productive farming state in the United States and the greatest agricultural region in the world . . ."; and

Whereas, on June 7, 1969, a monument bearing the state historical plaque will be dedicated in appropriate ceremonies at Good Hill, and the ceremonies will be attended by persons from many parts of our nation who are of Japanese descent as well as visitors from Japan; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California recommend that the Post Office Department of the United States of America print a commemorative stamp honoring the centennial of Japanese immigration to the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States of America, be requested to proclaim the year 1969, the centennial year for the people of Japanese descent in the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and the Postmaster General of the United States.

ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 10

Concurrent resolution relative to commemorating the centennial of Japanese immigration to the United States

Whereas, the first group of Japanese immigrants arrived from Aizu Wakamatsu, Japan, aboard the sidewheeler "China" of The Pacific Mail Steamship Company and entered the United States on May 27, 1869, at San Francisco; and

Whereas, this valiant and brave band of colonists proceeded to Sacramento by riverboat, traveled overland by wagon to Placerville and Gold Hill, and established the Wakamatsu Tea and Silk Farm Colony of Gold Hill by clearing the land, building their homes, and cultivating plants and seeds, including 50,000 three-year-old mulberry trees for silk farming, which they had brought with them from their native land; and

Whereas, although this pioneer project was doomed in less than two years by a combination of dry climate and a scarcity of irrigation water, it nevertheless heralded a period during which the Japanese people immigrated to California to participate in the beginnings of the Golden State's agricultural industry; and

Whereas, on December 16, 1966, the Historical Landmarks Advisory Committee of the Division of Beaches and Parks unanimously approved the Wakamatsu Tea and Silk Farm Colony of Gold Hill as a historical landmark and stated that "Although the Wakamatsu Tea and Silk Farm Colony was short-lived and suffered its tragic ending, it signaled the coming of Japanese pioneers to America and the beginning of their notable contribution to the agricultural industry of California.

During the past three-quarters of the century, they have left their marks in the teeming valleys throughout the length and breadth of this great State. Many descendants are carrying on the work of their pioneer forebears with the same devotion, determination and skill which helped to make California the most productive farming state in the United States and the greatest agricultural region in the world . . ."; and

Whereas, marking the first centennial of Japanese immigration to America, the year 1969 bears witness to a century in which Japanese-Americans have made immense contributions to the culture and heritage of their adopted land and have overcome times of trial by perseverance and boundless faith in the United States, which faith is best personified by the Japanese American Creed, which states:

"I am proud that I am an American citizen of Japanese ancestry, for my very background makes me appreciate more fully the wonderful advantages of this nation. I believe in her institutions, ideals, and traditions; I glory in her heritage; I boast of her history; I trust in her future. She has granted me liberties and opportunities such as no individual enjoys in the world today. She has given me an education befitting kings. She has entrusted me with the responsibilities of the franchise. She has permitted me to build a home, to earn a livelihood, to worship, think, speak, and act as I please—as a free man equal to every other man.

"Although some individuals may discriminate against me, I shall never become bitter or lose faith, for I know that such persons are not representative of the majority of the American people. True, I shall do all in my power to discourage such practices, but I shall do it in the American way: above-board, in the open, through courts of law, by education, by proving myself to be worthy of equal treatment and consideration. I am firm in my belief that American sportsmanship and attitude of fair play will judge citizenship and patriotism on the basis of action and achievement, and not on the basis of physical characteristics.

"Because I believe in America, and I trust she believes in me, and because I have received innumerable benefits from her, I pledge myself to do honor to her at all times and in all places; to support her constitution; to obey her laws; to respect her flag; to defend her against all enemies, foreign or domestic; to actively assume my duties and obligations as a citizen, cheerfully and without any reservations whatsoever, in the hope that I may become a better American in a greater America"; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, the Senate thereof concurring, That the Members of the Legislature join in commemorating the centennial celebration of Japanese immigration to the United States and express the deep appreciation of all the citizens of California for the immense and invaluable contributions made by Japanese-Americans to the rich cultural heritage of this state and of America; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit a suitable prepared copy of this resolution to the Japanese-American Citizens League.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, in May, 1869, the first Japanese in California arrived in San Francisco aboard the sidewheeler "China" and proceeded to Sacramento by riverboat, thence to Placerville by wagon and on to Gold Hill, El Dorado County, a few miles from the site of Coloma, where gold was discovered in 1848; and

Whereas, these early Japanese pioneers set up a colony to grow silk and tea as the Wakamatsu Tea and Silk Farm, which through a series of tragedies, lasted less than two years; and

Whereas, on December 16, 1966, California's Historical Landmarks Advisory Committee, Division of Beaches and Parks, did recognize the Watamatsu Tea and Silk Farm colony of Gold Hill as an episode of historical significance in the history of early California, and will dedicate the historical landmark plaque at the site of the farm colony on June 7, 1969; and

Whereas, the Coloma Gold Discovery Day on January 26, 1969, celebrated the arrival of these first Japanese pioneers by focusing on Japanese arts and crafts; and

Whereas, May, 1969, is the centennial of the first arrival of Japanese in California; and

Whereas, with patience, perseverance and industry, the Japanese have contributed much to California, particularly in agriculture, for the past decades since their arrival in the Golden State, adding to our heritage and history,

Now therefore, I, Ronald Reagan, Governor of California, do hereby proclaim the year 1969 as Japanese Centennial Year, urging all Californians to study the contributions of the Japanese to our California way of life.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of California to be affixed here this 3rd day of February, One Thousand Nine Hundred Sixty Nine.

RONALD REAGAN,
Governor.
FRANK M. JORDAN,
Secretary of State.
By H. P. SULLIVAN,
Deputy Secretary of State.

ABOLITION OF THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF DIRECT POPULAR ELECTIONS

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the need for abolition of the Electoral College is clear and pressing. Every 4 years we are flirting with the possibility of a constitutional crisis and the equally alarming possibility of denying the voters' will. The House Judiciary Committee, after months of private study and public hearings, last week reported out legislation calling for outright abolition of the electoral college and the establishment of direct popular elections. This proposed constitutional amendment—virtually identical to one I introduced the first day of the 1969 session—has a good chance of winning passage in the Congress and ratification in the State legislatures by the next presidential election in 1972.

George Wallace may again run for the Nation's highest office in 1972—and, again, just as he did in 1968, he may threaten to barter away his electoral votes for political concessions. This threat makes the need for swift electoral reform even more urgent.

With permission, Mr. Speaker, I put in the RECORD at this point David Broder's May 6 column and a May 5 Washington Post editorial outlining the need for popular presidential elections:

[From the Washington Post, May 6, 1969] POLITICAL IMAGE IS DECEIVING WHEN IT COMES TO ACHIEVEMENTS (By David S. Broder)

The gap between appearance and reality in politics was nicely illustrated last week by the contrasting performances of the Republican Governors and the leaders of the House Judiciary Committee.

To all outward appearances, the Republican Governors are the kind of men who should be managing the affairs of the country—young, vigorous and tuned in to the contemporary problems of the kind they find in running 30 states with three-fourths of the American people. Or so it would seem.

To all outward appearances, 80-year-old Rep. Emanuel Celler of Brooklyn and 67-year-old Rep. William McCulloch of Ohio, respectively the Democratic chairman and the ranking Republican member of the House Judiciary Committee, are a pair of fusty fuddy-duddies, symbols of the well-known decadence of the Congressional seniority system. Where the Governors stride, Celler and McCulloch shuffle. Where the Governors speak in well-modulated television tones, Celler and McCulloch tend to mumble.

And yet last week it was the old men who furnished an outstanding example of political leadership in bringing the constitutional amendment for direct, popular election of the President out of committee with a bipartisan 4-to-1 majority, while the Governors were again making a spectacle of themselves.

Their three-day session in Lexington and Louisville, designed to bring the GOP Governors to Kentucky at the height of the Derby social season, was a pinnacle of political irrelevance. As usual, the Governors' meetings produced not one statement of substance on any significant issue before the country.

These semi-annual junkets by the Republican Governors have become something of a political scandal. As they have frolicked their way through the country's plushiest resorts, from Palm Beach to Palm Springs, smiling their satisfied smiles and graciously allowing themselves to be entertained at the homes and clubs of the local white business aristocracy, the Governors have systematically undercut any claim to serious consideration as officials concerned with or capable of handling the problems of this country.

When these men come out of the country club just long enough to assert—as they did again last week—that the Federal Government must deal with the cities, city dwellers and city problems only through the Governors themselves, it is hard to believe that they are not knowingly inviting ridicule.

So one turns with relief from them to Celler and McCulloch, the two old men devoid of the stutting of ambition, who showed last week what a splendid thing the committee system of Congress can be when it is employed to encourage the play of argument and the clash of ideas on a fundamental issue of public policy.

At a time when the Governors were golfing and the campus radicals were playing the politics of confrontation, Celler and McCulloch and their Judiciary colleagues showed the vitality of the tradition of non-violent political discourse.

Expert testimony, reasoned argument and careful weighing of evidence changed men's minds, as the Judiciary Committee considered what to do about the way the President is elected. The result was, as Celler said, "the first bold step" in many long years toward a fundamental reform of our system—a reform which now stands a far better chance of final passage because of its conspicuous quality of procedure that produced it.

The Republican Governors showed that some politicians can frolic while their country is being torn apart. Celler and McCulloch showed there are politicians who know how to act when the situation cries out for action. One can hope the voters will treat them with the contempt or the respect their conduct deserves.

[From the Washington Post, May 5, 1969] REFORM OF ELECTORAL PROCESS

The House Judiciary Committee has put Congress and the state legislatures on notice that they will have to move swiftly if they want to avoid the risk of letting George Wallace choose the next President. In 1968 Mr. Wallace let it be known that, if no candidate received a majority of the electoral votes, he would decide between the front-runners by shifting to one of them the electoral votes pledged to him. It is widely assumed that he will make a similar effort in 1972 to hold the balance of power under our grotesquely obsolete electoral system. The Judiciary Committee voted to take that kind of power out of his hands, but its proposed amendment to the Constitution will have to be ratified within the next 21 months if it is to be effective in the next election.

In making the proposed direct-election amendment effective "one year after the 21st day of January following ratification," the Committee was seeking to allow time for the enactment of implementing state and national legislation. The country cannot modify its extremely complex electoral system over night. Possibly the rigid time-table which the Committee has prescribed could be modified somewhat. But it is unmistakably clear that, if the next President is to be elected under the proposed new system, both the House and Senate will have to approve the amendment within the next few months and the states will have to act with great dispatch, by means of special legislative sessions in many instances.

We think the effort is worth making. A nightmare could result from another election in which the winner of the popular vote might be defeated, in which individual electors might repudiate the mandate given them at the polls or a close contest might be thrown into the House of Representatives. The country has been extremely fortunate that only three of its Presidents have been carried to victory by electoral votes after losing the popular vote. That risk should not be run again if it is at all possible to avoid it.

The Judiciary Committee's 28-to-8 vote for the direct election plan, with a run-off if the leading presidential team should have less than 40 per cent of the popular vote, is an impressive showing. It seems to reflect a growing demand for direct selection of the President by the people, without having their voice diluted by electoral votes awarded to the states (one for each Senator and Congressman) or frustrated by electors who may or may not be faithful to their trust. With 12 Republicans joining 16 Democrats to make up the huge majority, the proposed 26th Amendment carries a significant bipartisan stamp.

If the House as a whole can do as well as its Judiciary Committee has done, the movement will be off to a good start. More difficulty will be encountered in the Senate, and a somewhat modified amendment may emerge. The Senate has a tradition for responding to strong demands from the country, however, and a tidal wave of public sentiment for laying the discredited electoral college system to rest could prove decisive. Certainly now is the time for every citizen interested in this vital reform to come forward with all the persuasiveness at his command.

JUDGE FORTAS SHOULD RESIGN

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the May 6, 1969, edition of the Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Argus-Leader, calling for the immediate resignation of Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas. The editorial is direct and timely, and I commend it to my colleagues for careful consideration:

JUDGE FORTAS SHOULD RESIGN

Judge Abe Fortas should resign immediately as a member of the U.S. Supreme Court. If he does not do so voluntarily, he should be removed promptly by such processes as are available to Congress.

The revelation in Life Magazine this week is an indictment of both his ethical values and his common sense.

The record, as printed in the magazine, reveals that Fortas accepted a fee of \$20,000 from the Wolfson Family Foundation to do some research work. This was after Fortas had been made a member of the Supreme Court and while the activities of Louis E. Wolfson were under scrutiny by a federal agency.

In an effort to defend himself, Fortas says that he returned the \$20,000. But he did not say in his explanation that the return was made 11 months after he had received the money and three months after Wolfson had been indicted for a federal offense.

This disclosure of a payment to Fortas follows another one made earlier about his acceptance of a fee of \$15,000 for limited appearances at a summer seminar. The \$15,000 was not paid by the college conducting the seminar but by a group of industrialists.

A member of the U.S. Supreme Court must conduct himself so that he is above suspicion. Most certainly Fortas has not done so.

CONGRESS SHOULD INCREASE FUNDS FOR EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, college campus disorders have obscured some of the basic issues involved in education, as well as the role of the colleges in recruiting thousands of needy disadvantaged youth and helping to lead them out of poverty into meaningful lives.

Among these efforts are several highly successful programs: the educational opportunity grants—EOG—to pay basic college costs, the national defense student loans which provide low-interest, long-term loans to students from the less affluent families, and the college work-study program which provides paying jobs for those who seek to work their way through.

Unfortunately, however, while Congress has authorized fairly respectable funds for these programs, less than half of the funds have been appropriated.

These cuts bear more heavily on the

poor students, the very ones which the colleges and community people have been encouraging to continue "in school," to make something of themselves, and to believe in our way of life.

Mr. Speaker, it makes no sense for us to squabble over who is to blame for these cuts. Whether the Johnson budget proposals were inadequate or the Nixon budget merely implements cuts proposed in the previous session of Congress, the hard, cold facts are that thousands of our neediest youths will continue to be condemned to poverty, degradation, and bitter disappointment in the slum ghettos unless we act to restore sanity and financial support in these educational programs.

It must be obvious, too, that in meeting the crises on our college campuses we must do more than talk big and pass punitive laws. If worthy students seeking our help are turned back, we help to ignite the flames of discontent which are kept burning by those who seek to destroy the institutions we cherish.

Representative of the groups providing leadership and technical expertise in recruiting and inspiring minority and low-income youths for higher education is the California Council for Educational Opportunity, Inc. I submit the following letter which I received from them for inclusion in the RECORD:

APRIL 22, 1969.

Congressman AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,
Representative, 21st Congressional District,
Longworth Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAWKINS: The California Council for Educational Opportunity is an independent corporation which was established statewide two and one-half years ago to facilitate the transition of minority and low-income students into higher education. We have been successful in receiving two talent search grants from the Federal government and have an operation in both Los Angeles and Fresno under our supervision. In addition we received a \$100,000 Ford Foundation Grant to provide an administrative base for the Council. Our efforts, along with the efforts of both public and private colleges, primarily in the State of California, have permitted hundreds of students to attend college who otherwise would be unable to attend.

The colleges, both public and private, have been encouraged to develop programs of support for minority students generally referred to as Educational Opportunity Programs. These programs have two financial aspects, one is the administrative cost the other is the student support costs. We are managing to arrange administrative costs through the regular or separate funding from traditional sources. The student support costs, however, depend almost entirely on Federal student support funds.

The reduction in Educational Opportunity Grants that is anticipated for the academic year 1969-70 not only requires that the existing rate of program development decrease but threatens the continuation of programs where the commitment, the facilities, and the operation are already well underway. Here in California we are pleased to report that the recruitment, the admissions practices, the student support programs and the student successes are at an admirable productive level and are developing in a socially positive direction. These efforts must continue.

We therefore ask that you lend your influence to the congressional efforts necessary to fund these programs at a level neces-

sary to continue the admirable efforts that are being made nationwide.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

KENNETH S. WASHINGTON,
President, CCEO.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1969

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, May 3 marked the 178th anniversary of the adoption of the 1791 Constitution in Poland. This action, a pioneer effort in East European liberalism, followed by only 2 years adoption of our own Constitution here in the United States.

While we have had to fight wars and put down internal rebellion, our people have lived a relatively secure existence compared to the turbulent times experienced by the Poles. Since the adoption of their Constitution in 1791, they have experienced for only a small portion of that time the civil liberties and governmental guarantees of that document. Instead, Poland has lived many years under the domination of foreign powers. Most recently she has suffered under the harsh rule of Nazi and Communist regime.

While we take our constitutional freedoms for granted, the captive Poles remember their Constitution in terms of a national holiday. They and the many Poles who have migrated to other lands long for the day when the homeland once again will enjoy the basis constitutional rights where "All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation."

PRINCE HALL: A GREAT NEGRO AMERICAN

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD about America's first Negro Mason and outstanding, loyal citizen and patriot, Prince Hall, of colonial Boston.

Thanks to the alertness and kindness of our very dear friend and great Negro leader, Mr. Ernest Petinaud, whom we of the House so highly esteem for his peerless character, dedicated service, and inspiring loyalty, not to speak of his outstanding contributions to our activities, my attention has been drawn to the most extraordinary historic part played by the illustrious Prince Hall, outstanding Boston leader of the colonial period, who

served with the advice and assistance of the famous John Hancock, and with great distinction, under the then Gen. George Washington in the Revolutionary War.

It should be noted that this able, farsighted, distinguished Negro leader, a Boston landowner and voter, most vigorously demanded that his State free its slaves, and his city educate its Negro children. He established a school in his own home to educate the people.

He was a man of ability, forthrightness, patriotism, and courage, endowed with commonsense, balance, and good judgment, determined to do his part to end the loathsome discrimination which Negroes faced. He furnished the sagacious leadership by which the laws against his people were changed and their cause was meaningfully advanced.

His eloquent voice spoke out boldly and loudly for justice, and for righting the cruel wrongs from which his people suffered.

His wise, gallant leadership had broad ramifications and produced enduring, effective results.

The deep, sweeping influence of the words and deeds of Prince Hall, which gave his people the courage to cry out boldly against discrimination and prejudice, and strive for recognition as free men and women, was a clear, stirring, clarion call that has come down through the years, and still animates people of every race, class, and creed to persist indomitably in the struggle, not yet won, to liberate the spirit, the body, and the mind of man from discrimination, persecution, and injustice.

Prince Hall was, in truth, an apostle of enlightenment and tolerance for the whole human race of his time, and a fearless leader who inspired his people to achieve ever higher levels of acceptance, dignity, and justice in the American society. His battle was historic and heaven sent. His cause must continue today until every vestige of racialism, hatred, prejudice, and discrimination has been driven from our beloved land—until the majesty of the rule of law is assured for all and true human brotherhood is enthroned in our Nation and the world.

While Prince Hall made lasting patriotic contributions to the Nation, to the Negro Masons he served so well, and to the country he loved with all his heart and soul, like a great symphony of constitutional justice, his words, noble deeds, and his holy cause are indelibly and ineradicably woven into the fabric of our American system of freedom, justice, and equality under law for all.

Prince Hall stood in his great day and spoke out militantly for truth, humanity, and freedom. Let this Nation continue his fight for tolerance and equal treatment under the law for everyone, regardless of race, creed, or class, in our society, so that the full glory and completeness of our marvelous American dream of liberty and justice for all will be totally realized, and everyone in America can be placed, as true justice demands, on a "footing with kings."

CAMPUS DISORDERS: "PROFESSORS MISS THE POINT," CLEVELAND PRESS DECLARES

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Press in its Monday, May 5 edition, carried an excellent editorial dealing with the campus disorders tormenting our colleges and universities. It underscores, in my belief, the urgent need for immediate action on my bill H.R. 10970, to require suspension of Federal aid to colleges and universities which are experiencing such disorders but failing to take appropriate corrective measures. My bill would, in such instances, require termination of Federal help to those faculty members who are guilty of violating any law in connection with such disorders.

The editorial follows:

PROFESSORS MISS THE POINT

At their annual convention in Minneapolis, the American Association of University Professors adopted a resolution expressing grave concern over campus violence and condemning such interference with teaching, learning and research.

The resolution said, quite appropriately, that if this college turmoil persists unchecked it could destroy higher education in this country.

Having properly appraised the campus troubles, the professors then proceeded in the same resolution to flout their own appraisal.

They denounced Attorney General John N. Mitchell's threat to prosecute the campus rioters. They said such action would be "a direct threat to academic freedom and autonomy."

Any efforts to curb these disorders, they said, should be left up to the college administrations themselves.

But in many cases, so far, the college administrations have been unable or unwilling to maintain control.

College officials can deal with grievances, they can listen to student ideas, they can try to update their curriculums; they can do a lot to prevent legitimate discontent.

But they can't deal with bricks and bottles, smoke bombs, arson and forcible seizure of offices and buildings. That's a police job. They can't prosecute the lawbreakers. That's a job for law enforcement officers.

It is not enforcement of the law which is a threat to academic freedom and autonomy—it is the hoodlums who instigate the campus disorders.

LESSON IN U.S. FOLLY

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, columnist James J. Kilpatrick has written a concise and lucid account of one result of former President Johnson's infamous Executive order, which clamped a boycott on trade with little Rhodesia.

As Mr. Kilpatrick points out, President Nixon has ordered a review of our so-called foreign policy in Africa, but I urge him to rescind this Executive order immediately.

It is past time when we should stop kowtowing to the political manipulations of British Prime Minister Wilson and put this country's own interests in first place.

I include Mr. Kilpatrick's article for insertion in the RECORD at this point:

RHODESIAN CHROME A LESSON IN U.S. FOLLY

The chrome ore deposits of Rhodesia surely rank low on a list of the sexiest subjects a columnist might find to write about, yet the dismal story of U.S. policy toward Rhodesia—and the effect of that policy on a vital industry—offers an instructive theme.

Almost no one has much to say any more about Rhodesia. Not in this country, at least; and even in the British press, the volume of comment dwindles. Plainly, Rhodesian independence has become a fact of political life. Just as plainly, the punitive economic sanctions imposed by the United Nations have failed in their purpose.

The White House disclosed last week that the President has ordered a full-scale review of U.S. policy toward all of southern Africa. Presumably, this study will embrace the whole series of bad judgments, blunders, and political follies in which Great Britain, the United Nations, and the United States have shared. If the President obtains some outside advice—outside Joe Palmer's office in the State Department, that is to say—perhaps the study will lead to a wiser course. And if Nixon wants an expert consultant for the task, he could not do better than to ask Dean Acheson to draft the report.

The immediate problem as to chromium may not wait upon a leisurely policy study. Chrome is a vital element in the production of stainless steel and other high-strength steels used in American defense. We have to have it.

In years gone by, when American policy toward Africa made more sense than it has seemed to make lately, our steel industry obtained chrome ore from Rhodesia. The finest chrome deposits in the world lie at Selukwe, about 140 miles south of Salisbury, and in the North Great Dyke 40 to 50 miles west of the capital city. Two American companies, Union Carbide and the Foote Mineral Company, own the mines.

Prior to December of 1966, when the U.N. embarked upon its vain and wrongful intervention in Rhodesia's domestic affairs, the Foote and Union Carbide mines provided a steady source of ore for the free world. The mines are not of overwhelming significance to the Rhodesian economy; they provide jobs for several hundred native workers and bring in some useful income, but the ore exports never approached tobacco as a factor in Rhodesia's trade.

As the U.N.'s sanctions progressively were tightened in 1967, the two American companies were compelled to cease operations. They could not even import some 200,000 tons of ore that already had been mined and put in stockpiles—ore that already had been paid for. It is their property. Present U.S. policy prevents them from putting it to use.

Meanwhile, the American steel industry had to have chrome. The only alternative source—and what an irony it is!—lay in the Soviet Union. The Communists were happy to make a fat profit off the Rhodesian situation. So for the past two years, American steelmakers have had to depend upon Communist suppliers of chrome ore, while two American-owned companies in anti-Communist

nist Rhodesia have been frozen out of the picture.

This lunacy has other aspects. The peculiar geological nature of Foote's serpentine mine demands continued operation. The hard-pressed government of Ian Smith has been providing some maintenance, but it is sheer folly—dangerous folly—to risk the loss of this important source of chromium.

For roughly \$1,000,000 a year, a sum too small to matter to anyone, the Foote mine could be saved. All that is required is a commonsense decision on the part of our government to let Foote spend it in Rhodesia. A second commonsense decision would permit the companies to import the ore they already have stockpiled.

These actions ought to be taken at once, without waiting upon the policy review. Great Britain could hardly object, for Great Britain herself has allowed for hardship cases in the Rhodesian mess. The African bloc in the U.N. doubtless would howl, but so what? Nixon came into office pledging a fresh approach in foreign affairs. One such fresh approach would lie in candidly placing our own national interests in first place, ahead of the political concerns of Prime Minister Wilson and a few black despots in central and northern Africa. Such a course would be sound in principle, and sound business practice, too.

SEARS AIDE DENIES HIGH THEFT LOSSES

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, I inserted in the RECORD an article from the New York Times entitled "Fight Against Crime Costly to Business." Sears, Roebuck & Co., which had been mentioned in the article, later disputed loss figures attributed to itself by virtue of theft. On May 3, the Times published the correction which I insert at this point:

SEARS AIDE DENIES HIGH THEFT LOSSES

A spokesman for Sears, Roebuck & Co. yesterday denied statements by the leader of a citizens' anticrime committee about the company's losses from theft.

The committee head, H. Bruce Palmer, president of the National Industrial Conference Board, said in a speech here Wednesday that 1½ per cent of the Sears price structure—or \$120-million—had been established to offset the value of stolen merchandise, and that the Chicago-based company had a security force larger than the 14,000-man Chicago Police Department.

Mr. Palmer is chairman of the organizing committee of Citizens for Justice with Order.

According to the Sears spokesman, the company's losses from theft last year were under \$12-million, or less than one-tenth of Mr. Palmer's estimate. The spokesman also said that the company's security force was "nowhere near the number indicated."

INDIANA GREEN THUMB WORKERS RECEIVE NATIONAL RECOGNITION

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following articles from the North Vernon (Ind.) Plain Dealer and Sun and the Seymour (Ind.) Tribune on the work of Indiana Green Thumb employees.

[From the North Vernon (Ind.) Sun]

PRAISE FOR GREEN THUMBERS

We were most pleased at the ceremonies held Monday morning at the North Vernon city park when the local Green Thumb crew was formally designated as the "crew of the month" for the entire nation.

The honor was pleasure enough, but we were more pleased to have it dramatically pointed out as was done at the park Monday that no matter how old we are, there is still a lot of good work in any of us. Only some way has to be found to tap it, and to give our older citizens an opportunity to show what they can do. We all like to contribute what we can. It's a human need.

That is just exactly what the Green Thumb program has done, with very significant success. They have taken older men from predominantly rural areas. These are men normally not considered employable, even in this day and age of shortages of workers.

Under the joint sponsorship of the federal government and the Farmer's Union, these men have been put to work. They don't make an outstanding salary and they are limited in the number of days that they can work. But what was wanted was a chance—this was provided.

Here in Jennings, we have seen, thanks to these Green Thumbers in part, great changes at the city park. They helped construct a number of the new buildings on the park grounds as a story on the front page details. They also have and are going to work at the Community Building Center and the Muscatatuck State Park, now under county control.

Maybe you can't teach an old dog new tricks, but that old saying doesn't mean that he's still not as capable of doing the old tricks he knows as well and in some cases better than a young dog.

That's the valuable lesson the Green Thumb program has taught us here in Jennings.

[From the Seymour (Ind.) Tribune, Apr. 7, 1969]

GREEN THUMB PROJECT WORKERS ARE HONORED

An Indiana Green Thumb Project crew working in North Vernon has been selected by the National Green Thumb Program as the outstanding crew of the month for its efforts in the development of the North Vernon city park.

The award was presented this morning in ceremonies at the park by Dr. Blue Carstenson, national director of Green Thumb, Inc.

Also present at the ceremony was Congressman Lee H. Hamilton, ninth district representative, and Harold Wright, president of the Indiana Farmers Union, sponsor of the Green Thumb project.

"I am pleased that the ninth district Green Thumb workers have received national recognition for the outstanding work they are doing in North Vernon," Hamilton said.

"I extend my personal congratulations to Wayne Vance, the state director of Green Thumb in Indiana, and to each of his men who have performed with special distinction to win this recognition."

During the past year, the crew has constructed two shelter houses, two dugouts for little league baseball, 50 new picnic tables, a utility garage and concession stand and has helped paint the swimming pool and assisted in several other projects at the park.

Members have also painted the Senior Citizens Center and have worked at the Jennings County fairgrounds. They also are helping to develop the Muscatatuck County Park recently taken over by Jennings County.

Crew members include Orville Bradshaw, Carl Deputy, Robert Forrester, Harvey Growe, George Marable, Howard Peterson, Asbury Sandlin, Robert Shepperd and Orvil Yates.

Most of the men in the work crew are low-income retired farmers who work three days per week on Green Thumb projects. The oldest is 85.

The Indiana Green Thumb Project operates in 20 southwestern counties, including Brown, Bartholomew, Clark, Jackson, Jefferson, Jennings, Lawrence, Orange, Scott, Washington, Daviess, Dubois, Gibson, Green, Knox, Martin, Pike, Posey, Sullivan and Warrick counties.

Fourteen states now participate in the national program.

GENE KINNALY

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1969

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was a great privilege and pleasure to have known Gene Kinnaly. Gene probably knew more about how to get things done properly through Federal departments and agencies because he had more friends in the departments than any congressional staff member.

Everyone, from the most humble to the most prominent, was immediately struck with the sincerity of Gene Kinnaly, his desire to help everyone, and the easy, quiet, and efficient manner in which he accomplished every responsibility.

Gene Kinnaly probably completed more service to his country, to the Speaker of the House, than any individual it was my privilege to know. His record will long be remembered by the Members of Congress and the staff members he knew so well.

I wish to extend my heartfelt sympathy and condolence to the members of his family and his relatives. He will be remembered daily by myself and staff in our daily prayers.

NIXON WILL HOLD FOUR ACES IN COMING SUMMIT TALKS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we look ahead to the new developments in foreign affairs, it is natural that prospects or possibilities of a summit meeting come to our attention. A very interesting and pertinent commentary on the position President Nixon will be in when and if he meets with Soviet dictators is contained in a column by the distinguished international correspondent of the Copley Press in the May 2 San Diego Union:

[From the San Diego Union, May 2, 1969]

DUMITRU DANIELOPOL SAYS: NIXON WILL HOLD FOUR ACES IN COMING SUMMIT TALKS

With a summit meeting still expected this summer or fall, it is interesting to examine President Nixon's hand when he faces the Kremlin leaders.

In poker terms, it appears very strong. One can count at least four aces:

1. American strength.

We may have lost some of our nuclear advantage but our strength is real and in depth.

Americans can not only send a man to the moon, they can manufacture a ball point pen, or TV sets for every home, or more cars than our roads can handle.

This is not the case with the Russians. They may be good in some selected fields, such as space and nuclear arms, but there is an abyss between these and the other industries.

Free world technology is a giant and it covers every field. Millions of people have been able to afford modern mechanical equipment and they know how to use it. In any confrontation this mechanical ability cannot be minimized.

2. The weakness of the Soviet economic system.

Marxist ideology superseded the requirements of modern science and has caused stagnation behind the Iron Curtain. In agriculture, in particular, Marxism has brought disaster. The once fertile "bread basket" of Europe is now an importer of vast quantities of food and often goes hungry.

In the United States the opposite is true. America can not only feed herself but she has vast quantities of food for export.

3. Red China.

It is not easy to predict how and when a serious clash between China and the Soviet Union will occur, but it seems that the two countries have reached a point of no return.

Expansionist and imperialist China no longer feels an ideological kinship with Russia. Marxism, the one link between the two, has withered and is possibly dead.

This makes the Kremlin shiver. Asiatic Russia, which is a huge source of raw materials and energy, is vital to Moscow. Too far from the industrial centers, with weak lines of communication, it is very difficult to defend.

4. Russia's trouble with her own satellites and with non-Russian nationalities within the U.S.S.R.

East Germany and Poland have seen anti-Russian demonstrations. The Hungarian uprising, the Czechoslovak bid for freedom, the Romanian recalcitrance all loom ominously on the Kremlin's mind.

Nationalism is not a joke in those countries. It is a mighty force that has to be considered.

The Kremlin has failed to make itself popular. On the contrary, the show of force in Czechoslovakia has made it more hated than ever. It might speed, rather than delay, a brush fire that could no longer be extinguished.

Another ace—if there were five in a pack—is the trouble the Kremlin has with its own intellectuals who are screaming and scheming to get more freedom.

With such a strong hand President Nixon should do well if he recognizes and calls the bluff the Soviet Union pulls every time it has a weak hand.

Mr. Nixon must develop credibility with the opponent.

All signs indicate he is a good poker player.

FARM LABOR STRIKE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the farm labor strike in Cali-

fornia is entering its fourth year without any sign of a conclusion meaningful to worker or farmer. The battleground is the rich farmland of California, a land made rich by the farmworkers while they have been denied just rewards for their toil. These workers are now striking. They ask for the protection of a union, a protection granted millions of other Americans, but refused farmworkers, denied under Federal law. The strike, unregulated by the laws which govern other labor-management disputes, has been hard too on the growers of grapes in California, and they have made known their hurt through high-powered public relations firms.

Recently Look magazine published an article on the strike, an article which drew objections from the growers. As a result a statement from Mr. E. L. "Ted" Barr, Jr., of Sanger, Calif., president of the California Grape & Tree Fruit League was inserted into this RECORD. In that statement Mr. Barr made certain unsubstantiated statements about the strike. In reply Mr. Cesar E. Chavez, of the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, AFL-CIO, wrote the following letter. I believe Mr. Chavez' letter reveals much about the strike, its aims and its conduct. I insert Mr. Chavez' comments into the RECORD at this point:

LETTER FROM DELANO

GOOD FRIDAY 1969.

E. L. BARR, JR.,
President, California Grape & Tree Fruit League, San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR MR. BARR: I am sad to hear about your accusations in the Press that our union movement and table grape boycott have been successful because we have used violence and terror tactics. If what you say is true, I have been a failure and should withdraw from the struggle; but you are left with the awesome moral responsibility, before God and man, to come forward with whatever information you have so that corrective action can begin at once. If for any reason you fail to come forth to substantiate your charges, then you must be held responsible for committing violence against us, albeit violence of the tongue. I am convinced that you as a human being did not mean what you said but rather, acted hastily under pressure from the public relations firm that has been hired to try to counteract the tremendous moral force of our movement. How many times we ourselves have felt the need to lash out in anger and bitterness.

Today on Good Friday, 1969, we remember the life and the sacrifice of Martin Luther King, Jr., who gave himself totally to the non-violent struggle for peace and justice. In his *Letter from Birmingham Jail*, Dr. King describes better than I could our hopes for the strike and boycott: "Injustice must be exposed, with all the tension its exposure creates, to the light of human conscience and the air of national opinion before it can be cured." For our part, I admit that we have seized upon every tactic and strategy consistent with the morality of our cause to expose that injustice and thus, to heighten the sensitivity of the American conscience so that farm workers will have, without bloodshed, their own union and the dignity of bargaining with their agribusiness employers. By lying about the nature of our movement, Mr. Barr, you are working against non-violent social change. Unwittingly perhaps, you may unleash that other force that our union, by discipline and deed, censure and education, has sought to avoid; that panacean short cut; that senseless violence that honors no color, class, or neighborhood.

You must understand—I must make you understand—that our membership and the hopes and aspirations of the hundreds of thousands of the poor and dispossessed that have been raised on our account are, above all, human beings, no better, no worse than any other cross section of human society; we are not saints because we are poor but, by the same measure, neither are we immoral. We are men and women who have suffered and endured much and not only because of our abject poverty but because we have been kept poor. The colors of our skins, the languages of our cultural and native origins, the lack of formal education, the exclusion from the democratic process, the numbers of our slain in recent wars—all these burdens generation after generation have sought to demoralize us, to break our human spirit. But God knows that we are not beasts of burden, we are not agricultural implements or rented slaves, we are men. And mark this well, Mr. Barr, we are men locked in a death struggle against man's inhumanity to man in the industry that you represent. And this struggle itself gives meaning to our life and ennobles our dying.

As your industry has experienced, our strikers here in Delano and those who represent us throughout the world are well trained for this struggle. They have been under the gun, they have been kicked and beaten and herded by dogs, they have been cursed and ridiculed, they have been stripped and chained and jailed, they have been sprayed with the poisons used in the vineyards; but they have been taught not to lie down and die or to flee in shame, but to resist with every ounce of human endurance and spirit. To resist not with retaliation in kind but to overcome with love and compassion, with ingenuity and creativity, with hard work and longer hours, with stamina and patient tenacity, with truth and public appeal, with friends and allies, with mobility and discipline, with politics and law, and with prayer and fasting. They were not trained in a month or even a year; after all, this new harvest season will mark our fourth full year of strike and even now we continue to plan and prepare for the years to come. Time accomplishes for the poor what money does for the rich.

This is not to pretend that we have everywhere been successful enough or that we have not made mistakes. And while we do not belittle or underestimate our adversaries, for they are the rich and the powerful and possess the land, we are not afraid or cringe from the confrontation. We welcome it! We have planned for it. We know that our cause is just, that history is a story of social revolution, and that the poor shall inherit the land.

Once again, I appeal to you as the representative of your industry and as a man. I ask you to recognize and bargain with our union before the economic pressure of the boycott and strike takes an irrevocable toll; but if not, I ask you to at least sit down with us to discuss the safeguards necessary to keep our historical struggle free of violence. I make this appeal because as one of the leaders of our non-violent movement, I know and accept my responsibility for preventing, if possible, the destruction of human life and property. For these reasons and knowing of Gandhi's admonition that fasting is the last resort in place of the sword, during a most critical time in our movement last February, 1968, I undertook a twenty-five day fast. I repeat to you the principle enunciated to the membership at the start of the fast: If to build our union required the deliberate taking of life, either the life of a grower or his child, or the life of a farm worker or his child, then I choose not to see the union built.

Mr. Barr, let me be painfully honest with you. You must understand these things. We

advocate militant non-violence as our means for social revolution and to achieve justice for our people, but we are not blind or deaf to the desperate and moody winds of human frustration, impatience and rage that blow among us. Gandhi himself admitted that if his only choices were cowardice or violence, he would choose violence. Men are not angels and the time and tides wait for no man. Precisely because of these powerful human emotions, we have tried to involve masses of people in their own struggle. Participation and self-determination remain the best experience of freedom; and free men instinctively prefer democratic change and even protect the rights guaranteed to seek it. Only the enslaved in despair have need of violent overthrow.

This letter does not express all that is in my heart, Mr. Barr. But, if it says nothing else, it says that we do not hate you or rejoice to see your industry destroyed; we hate the agribusness system that seeks to keep us enslaved and we shall overcome and change it not by retaliation or bloodshed but by a determined non-violent struggle carried on by those masses of farm workers who intend to be free and human.

Sincerely yours,

CESAR E. CHAVEZ.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER:
1890-1969

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the death of our beloved former President Dwight D. Eisenhower occasioned many moving tributes to his greatness and humanity.

None, I feel, excel the following lines by Gordon Hawkins, formerly of Westfield, Mass., for their eloquent simplicity and sincerity. I would like to insert his poem, eulogizing President Eisenhower, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER: 1890-1969

(By Gordon Hawkins)

Delayed by his tenacious grip on life
He now rejoins his comrades of the past—
Those valiant ones who sought to quell
world-strife
In hope that freedom for mankind might
last!
In their long bivouac in foreign lands
And in America, he joins the hosts
Of World War dead, in comradeship joins
hands
With those immortals that our nation
boasts;
Our hallowed dead and those of our allies—
The titan Churchill, others fine and great,
All those whose fame and honor never dies
Who curbed the Nazi menace and its hate!
His epitaph—"He had his country's love,
deserving it all other things above."

EUGENE C. PULLIAM RECEIVES
TRIBUTE FROM PROMINENT
AMERICANS ON 80TH BIRTHDAY

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, prominent Publisher Eugene C. Pulliam recently

celebrated his 80th birthday, and the birthday dinner in Phoenix, Ariz., attended by over 800 people, was highlighted by a phone call from President Richard M. Nixon. The following story from the May 3, 1969, Indianapolis News, one of Mr. Pulliam's newspapers, describes the occasion:

NOTABLES PAY TRIBUTE TO PULLIAM AT 80

PHOENIX.—Newspaper publisher Eugene C. Pulliam was honored on the eve of his 80th birthday last night by some friends—Richard M. Nixon, Lyndon B. Johnson and Hubert H. Humphrey, to name a few.

Pulliam, publisher of The Indianapolis News, The Indianapolis Star, the Arizona Republic, Phoenix Gazette, Muncie Star, Muncie Press and the Vincennes Sun-Commercial, received birthday greetings from the President, former president and former vice-president while attending a birthday dinner here attended by some 800 friends and business associates.

The event was sponsored by the Valley of the Sun Chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, national professional journalism society, for its scholarship fund and Theta Sigma Phi, professional fraternity for women in journalism.

Also celebrated last night were the 60th anniversary of Sigma Delta Chi and the 10th anniversary of the Valley of the Sun chapter.

PRESIDENT OF AP AMONG SPEAKERS

Among the speakers at the event were Paul Miller of Rochester, N.Y., president of the Associated Press and Gannett Newspapers, and William Arthur, national president of Sigma Delta Chi, which Pulliam helped found in 1909 at DePauw University.

Pulliam told the group he had received many offers for The News and The Star, as well as the Arizona newspapers, but he said they are not for sale.

He announced he had set up a trust providing that "neither can be sold for 108 years after I die."

The trust provides that the trustees will be the three top executives of the Indianapolis and Arizona newspapers.

A telephone call from President Nixon interrupted the cutting of a six-tier birthday cake. The President wished Pulliam many more birthdays, saying "the country needs your strong editorial voice."

"Hello, Dick," Pulliam said. "I'm glad you couldn't be here. If you had come, they wouldn't be at my party; they would have come to see you."

Nixon's rival in the 1968 presidential race, former Vice-President Hubert Humphrey earlier told the publisher in filmed tribute: "Our politics have not always been the same, but you've always given me a fair hearing."

Former President Johnson said, in a letter, that in addition to being "a great publisher, patriot and friend," Pulliam was also "a trusted counselor whose judgment was a priceless asset."

Former Prime Minister Harold Macmillan of England telegraphed his greetings.

Dr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, said Pulliam's "pen has never faltered no matter how hot the controversy or how unpopular the issues."

The program opened with the pledge of allegiance by Roger Jenkins, 1968 Arizona Republic carrier of the year, followed by the saying of grace by Nina Pulliam, wife of the publisher, and greetings by Mayor Milton Graham of Phoenix.

TOM CHAUNCEY IS CHAIRMAN OF DINNER

Tom Chauncey, president of radio and television station KOOL at Phoenix, was chairman of the dinner and extended a personal tribute to the publisher. Chris Schenkel, radio and television personality and a native Hoosier, was master of ceremonies.

The former chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Paul Porter, now

a Washington attorney, recalled that Pulliam gave up his radio interests, saying "no bureaucrats in Washington are going to tell me how to run my business."

Eugene S. Pulliam, the publisher's son and assistant publisher of The News and The Star, spoke briefly.

The elder Pulliam became the nation's youngest publisher at 23 in 1912. He has owned or operated nearly 50 newspapers, ranging from small dailies to ranking papers in metropolitan centers.

Pulliam's first newspaper job was as a 6-year-old carrier for the Register in his home town of Iola, Kan. He joined the Kansas City Star as a reporter after graduating from DePauw in 1910 and two years later became publisher of the Daily Champion at Atchison, Kan.

MAY 10TH OBSERVANCE BY THE RUMANIAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

HON. JOSEPH P. VIGORITO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak briefly today to observe the commemoration of the 10th of May, the traditional national holiday of the Rumanian people. This day, which honors the achievement of Rumania's independence and the founding of its kingdom on May 10, 1866, is all the more eloquent since no longer can the Rumanian people celebrate this great day within their own country.

It should remind all of us in this land of freedom, that there are others throughout the world who long for freedom. We should, all of us, work to bring about the day when Rumania will again be free and take its rightful place among the peace-loving nations of the world.

We should note today the heritage which the Rumanian people who have come to the United States have so willingly shared with us. We are all richer because of the contributions Rumanian Americans have made to this country.

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE'S 200TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker—
An Institution—

Wrote Emerson—

is the lengthened shadow of one man.

Of no place may this be said with greater truth than of Dartmouth and Eleazer Wheelock. Alone among the pre-Revolutionary colleges in America, Dartmouth owes its existence to the vision, the energy, and the tireless effort of one man who, in the finest American tradition, journeyed to the frontier, to what was then truly a wilderness, and brought into being a college whose name has en-

tered significantly into the pages of our national history.

Born of the enthusiasm generated by the great awakening, the first truly American major religious movement, Dartmouth's origin as an Indian charity school reflects the lifelong zeal of its founder for the upraising of the American Indian. Indeed, the special association of Dartmouth with the North American Indian lasted more than 15 decades until well into the 20th century.

Perhaps the most notable feature of Dartmouth's beginning is the absence from Governor Wentworth's charter in 1769 of any kind of religious test for student, teacher, president, or trustee, a truly remarkable provision for the age and wholly in tune with Dartmouth's long championship of freedom of speech and inquiry.

The Dartmouth College case of 1819, argued by Dartmouth's greatest son, Daniel Webster, before the Supreme Court of the United States, "did more than any other single act," wrote Chancellor Kent, "proceeding from the authority of the United States to throw an impregnable barrier around all rights and franchises derived from the grant of government, and to give solidity and inviolability to the literary, charitable, religious, and commercial institutions of our country." Little wonder the inscription over the entry to Webster Hall today reads:

Founded by Eleazer Wheelock, Refounded by Daniel Webster.

The story of Dartmouth over the past two centuries is at once a vital part of American history and a significant challenge to the present. At a time when universities and colleges across the land are in turmoil, crucial elements in Dartmouth's past appear strikingly relevant, from the peaceful action of the undergraduate body, which, in 1824, persuaded the trustees to admit Edward Mitchell, a Negro from Martinique, to the firm stand taken in 1830 by President Lord against student rioting—

Go, young gentlemen, if you wish; we can bear to see our seats vacated but not our laws violated.

Not without reason has one observer of Dartmouth through many decades—Prof. James Linn of Chicago University—speaking metaphorically of universities and small colleges as the department stores and gift shops respectively of American culture, described Dartmouth as "the great American college; vivid; the one Rubens in our collection."

While few today might share the belief of Eleazer Wheelock that Dartmouth's location "was not determined by any private interest or party on earth, but the Redeemer's," none could deny the beauty of her physical setting in the New Hampshire hills, nor the extraordinary aptness in context of her venerable motto, *Vox clamantis in deserto*: "A voice crying in the wilderness." In a day when the humane and civilizing functions of our colleges and universities seem threatened, these words, spoken by

President Hopkins some 3 decades ago have special pertinence:

Ill nature, intellectual arrogance, and churlish intolerance are but sorry concomitants of any movement, but they are singularly out of place and tragically harmful in association with any movement which desires to be recognized as liberal.

For two centuries, Dartmouth has served this Nation and the larger human community as a voice in the wilderness, calling men to heed those counsels of reason, tolerance, and understanding without which civilization itself will surely perish. Never was her mission more needed nor her message more timely.

LAW AND ORDER: A MORAL RESPONSIBILITY

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to announce that the winner of the Pennsylvania American Legion's annual essay contest is Miss Debbie Skiba of 4859 Londonderry Road, Harrisburg, who wrote on "Law and Order: A Moral Responsibility."

Debbie is a member of the National Honor Society and editor of her school paper. She will be awarded a \$250 scholarship and a trophy at the American Legion's State convention on July 17. Although she is quite talented in the literary field, Debbie is planning her future career in medicine. Her achievements to date point to a promising future.

It is gratifying to know that young people of Debbie's caliber actually make up the majority of our youth and if this were not so we would be living in a state of anarchy with no hope for the future. The leaders of tomorrow will come from today's youth and I strongly feel they should be given every encouragement possible, rather than relegate their accomplishments to the back pages of the newspapers.

In her essay, Debbie has projected some very astute observations about the turmoil and dissension, given so much attention these days. She has expressed wisdom beyond her years and her admonitions are thought provoking.

Congratulations, Debbie, on a job well done.

THE DECISION OF THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY REGARDING THE "PUEBLO" INCIDENT

HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to comment on the announcement made yesterday by the Secretary of the

Navy, the Honorable John H. Chafee. I am referring to the Secretary's decision not to try or otherwise punish anyone involved in the seizure last year by North Korea of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*.

The Secretary carefully reviewed the findings and recommendations of the court of inquiry, of the Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet, and of the Chief of Naval Operations. He then reached his own decision that all had suffered enough, that there will be neither trial nor punishment for the *Pueblo* crew, their commanding officer, Comdr. Lloyd Bucher, nor any of his superiors in the chain of command.

The Secretary made this decision even though it amounted to overruling some of the lower reviewing authorities. But, Mr. Speaker, the basis for Secretary Chafee's decision is probably of greater significance than the decision itself. I should like to quote from his statement of yesterday:

The major factor which led to the *Pueblo*'s lonely confrontation by unanticipatedly bold and hostile forces was the sudden collapse of a premise which had been assumed at every level of responsibility and upon which every other aspect of the mission had been based—freedom of the high seas. At that particular point in history, the common confidence in the historic inviolability of a sovereign ship on the high seas in peacetime was shown to have been misplaced. The consequences must in fairness be borne by all, rather than by one or two individuals whom circumstances had placed closer to the crucial event.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Secretary Chafee's decision was eminently correct. I also believe that his reasoning is sound and well founded.

But, certainly, Mr. Speaker, we must be able to derive some indirect benefit from his shattering and tragic incident. The disregard of some and the lack of other international treaties has led virtually every coastal nation to the point of unilaterally establishing its own boundaries for territorial waters. As is well known to all Members of Congress, the *Pueblo* has not been the only American ship recently involved in seizures by foreign nations well beyond the territorial limits recognized by this country.

As an essential concomitant to world peace is certainly mutually established and uniformly recognized international maritime boundaries. And I submit that the longer the family of nations waits to address this growing problem, the more difficult it will be to resolve.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution expressing the sense of this Congress that the President of the United States consider appropriate steps leading to the convening of an international conference for the purpose of establishing a uniformly recognized boundary for the territorial seas of all coastal nations.

I sincerely hope that all of my colleagues who agree that this step is seriously needed without delay will join me by introducing similar resolutions and by supporting an effort to obtain early adoption of this resolution by the Congress.

REMARKS OF DEPUTY DIRECTOR HARTHON L. BILL, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, AT DEDICATION OF RESTORED SUPREME COURT ROOM, INDEPENDENCE HALL, PHILADELPHIA, PA., APRIL 28, 1969

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on April 28, as a member of the National Historical Park Advisory Commission, I had the honor of attending an impressive ceremony in Philadelphia when the restored Supreme Court room was dedicated at Independence Hall in Independence National Historical Park. On this important occasion the deputy director of the National Park Service, the Honorable Harthon L. Bill, gave the following eloquent address, which I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues:

REMARKS OF DEPUTY DIRECTOR HARTHON L. BILL, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE AT DEDICATION OF RESTORED SUPREME COURT ROOM, INDEPENDENCE HALL, INDEPENDENCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, PHILADELPHIA, PA., APRIL 28, 1969

In his epitaph which Ben Franklin composed—at a relative early age—he referred to himself as “Benjamin Franklin, Printer.” One of the greatest men this nation has produced, Franklin’s list of achievements in so many diverse fields reflects the scope and depth of his mind.

And yet, throughout his long and distinguished career, he retained his interest in the craft of printing, installing a private press in his Paris residence and reporting back to America on new printing methods which he encountered in Europe.

For a number of reasons, the career of Franklin seems to me to epitomize our purposes in gathering here today.

Franklin was first a craftsman, who never lost his love for the work of his skilled hands. And part of our appreciation today should go to the many skilled craftsmen whose combined talents have set a stage in this room which will help us recall, vividly, the events of a dramatic era of our history. Through them, we see this courtroom today much as it looked when the Supreme Court of the United States came here to meet in 1791.

Whether as scientist, philosopher, diplomat, or printer, Franklin pursued excellence. Much is being written these days about the quest for excellence, and sometimes you get the idea that if one were to put his mind to it, he too could achieve excellence.

Unfortunately, to pursue excellence calls for a degree of devotion and patience which Franklin had, but which is seldom encountered.

John Gardner, you will recall, turned a memorable phrase a few years ago when he declared that we must recognize there can be excellence or shoddiness in every line of human endeavor, and that we must honor excellence, however humble the activity, and scorn shoddiness, however exalted the activity. Or, Gardner wryly observed, we could end up as a society with neither plumbing nor theories holding water.

Franklin has a relevance, also, because he was a consequential participant in many of the events which took place in Independence Hall.

The National Park Service has, as you

know, uncovered portions of the foundation of Franklin’s home, and I have appointed a special committee to recommend how best the Franklin Court remains can convey to park visitors the contribution of Franklin. Before we can decide, for example, whether or not to reconstruct Franklin’s home, we must answer the question, “why?”

Why, indeed, do we painstakingly restore historic buildings such as Independence Hall, or entire districts such as Society Hill?

The Colonists, who declared their independence here, fought the Revolutionary War in pursuit of an idea, a concept best expressed by Christopher Gadsden, that “There ought to be no more New England men, no New Yorkers . . . but all of us Americans.”

We have been engaged in a search for national identity ever since the arrival of the first settlers, by which time Shakespeare had already portrayed the British character. Franklin himself had begun to note “American Traits,” during the Revolution.

It is in the preservation of the important sites of our cultural heritage that we help our children to appreciate their identity as Americans.

But there is, perhaps, an even more critical reason for the saving of historic buildings and urban districts. The preservation of a great historic monument is one thing. The integration of such a project into a major effort to improve the quality of the urban environment and to enhance the life of each citizen is quite another. This, perhaps, is one of the greatest contributions of Independence National Historical Park.

Not too long ago, when most Americans lived in rural areas, conservation was concerned almost completely with preserving natural resources and landscapes.

Today, when nearly three out of four Americans live in cities, the most effective conservation work is being done in urban areas, by organizations such as the Old Philadelphia Corporation, the Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority, and your City Planning Commission.

Arnold Toynbee reduced his whole theory of history to a basic equation: How has this come out of that?

The answer to this question should determine what this nation will do to celebrate the 200th anniversary of its founding here in Philadelphia in 1776. What has truly been the flowering of the spirit of the American Revolution?

A few years from now, in 1972, the National Park Service will celebrate the 100th anniversary of the establishment of Yellowstone as the world’s first national park. We, too, must answer the question: How has a National Park System of 275 separate areas come out of the Yellowstone idea?

It has evolved in response to the needs of people. It is a long way from busy Chestnut Street in Philadelphia to the wilderness back country of Yellowstone, but both are part of the single fabric of our natural and cultural inheritance. And in a world of change, national parks must maintain their relevancy to the needs of the nation.

The completion of this Supreme Court Chamber of Independence Hall is another milestone in fulfilling the dream of men such as Judge Lewis for the Independence Square group of buildings which served as the seat of the Legislative and Executive Branches of our Federal Government. As funds become available, we hope to complete the second floor of Independence Hall so that concerts and other social activities, once a part of the life of the city, can be resumed.

I am delighted that the Chairman of the Independence National Historical Park Advisory Commission, Arthur Kauffman, is providing the leadership for a fund raising drive to reconstruct the Graff House, where

Thomas Jefferson wrote the draft of the Declaration of Independence. As you know, the Federal Government has agreed to provide matching funds.

We live in a highly technical age which threatens to submerge the individual, and to root out or cover over the elements of beauty and tradition in our lives.

The face of America, the nature of the environment in which we live, these are the standards by which historians at the 300th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence will rightly judge us.

Changes in our lives and in the face of our cities and our countryside are inevitable. But, let such change reflect the consensus of a deeply concerned and widely informed nation.

GENE KINNALLY

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1969

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I learned of the passing of Eugene T. Kinnaly, administrative assistant to the Speaker of the House, and one of the finest men who has ever served the Congress of the United States.

A kindly and modest man who was as completely loyal to Speaker McCORMACK as it is possible for any man to be, “Gene” Kinnaly was the very model of a congressional assistant.

Like Speaker McCORMACK, he was a native of South Boston, a peninsula which juts out into Boston Harbor and is one of this Nation’s greatest incubators for public servants.

Fifty years ago last summer, he came to Washington to serve as the right hand of the late Congressman James Ambrose Gallivan who then represented the Ninth Massachusetts District.

He served with Mr. Gallivan until the latter’s death in 1928 and such was his own popularity that there were many in South Boston and Dorchester who urged him to seek election to Congress in his own right.

It is a matter of history that instead of seeking elected public office, he offered his support to a young attorney and former minority leader of the State Senate named JOHN W. McCORMACK.

The association between these two men continued unabated for more than 40 years until Gene’s passing this week. It has been a happy relationship full of mutual respect and confidence.

Despite his familiarity with generations of this Nation’s most important public figures dating back to the Coolidge administration, Gene remained the same kindly, thoughtful human being who came here more than a half century ago.

A daily attender of mass at St. Peter’s Church here on Capitol Hill, Gene was widely respected by men of all faiths for his simple piety and devotion to his faith. His faith was not showy or ostentatious, rather it manifested itself in the simple acts of Christian charity that he performed daily. Gene Kinnaly’s life was

one of doing things for other people. If ever there was a man whose life was dedicated to the Judeo-Christian concept of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, that man was Eugene T. Kinnaly.

Mrs. Daniels joins with me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Gene's family and to our beloved Speaker on the loss of this fine spirited, public servant.

HORTON URGES INCENTIVES FOR MILITARY LAWYERS

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the Armed Forces are having a very difficult time in retaining lawyers in their career ranks. The problem is not one of obtaining lawyers, but of keeping them.

This is a crucial situation and one that demands our immediate attention. The quality of legal advice and military justice must be maintained in the services.

Yesterday, I introduced legislation to help alleviate this situation by providing incentives for legal officers to stay in the service. This is similar to incentives currently received by doctors, dentists, and veterinarians in the Armed Forces.

That the retention rate of JAG officers is indeed critical is illustrated by the following statistics:

The Army has only a 12½ percent retention rate;

As of last October, the Navy retained an average of 12 lawyers a year in each year group.

Since 1956, the Air Force has been able to retain only 19 percent of its judge advocates.

In addition, approximately 700 more military lawyers will be needed this year to meet the requirements of the Military Justice Act of 1968, which Congress passed during the last session. The legislation safeguards the right-to-counsel of military personnel and also requires the Armed Forces to provide qualified and experienced lawyers as military judges in trials by special and general court-martial.

Thus, to achieve justice, I feel this bill is extremely necessary. It will provide a monthly pay allowance based on rank and a bonus which the officer could earn by continuing in the service past his initial obligation and after he becomes eligible for voluntary retirement with pay.

The retention incentives are as follows: \$50 per month for captains; \$150 per month for majors and lieutenant colonels; \$200 per month for full colonels and above.

Secondly, the continuation bonus would be payable at the rate of 2 months' basic pay for each year the judge advocate remains in active service beyond his initial active duty. The contract would be for a minimum of 3 years and a maximum of 6 years. Judge advocates would be eligible for this bonus, either

at the completion of 4 years active service or at the time when they become eligible for voluntary retirement with pay.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

SPEECH OF PROF. S. J. TONSOR ON ALIENATION AND RELEVANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, increasing attention is being centered on the campuses of the Nation's colleges and universities. Acts of violence and other evidence of student unrest are the subject of concern by the administration and Members of Congress.

S. J. Tonsor, professor of history at the University of Michigan, outlined his views on higher education and dealt with some of the issues underlying the current difficulties on the Nation's campuses in a speech entitled "Alienation and Relevance in Higher Education" presented at a meeting of the Education Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers held in Washington, D.C., on April 1, 1969.

President Nixon described Professor Tonsor's speech as "the most significant and, I think, perceptive analysis of what is wrong with our approach to higher education," and said that it expressed his own views on the subject. Secretary Robert H. Finch of Health, Education, and Welfare quoted from Professor Tonsor's speech in testimony at hearings on the subject of student unrest being conducted by the House Special Subcommittee on Education.

Professor Tonsor's speech is one of the most thoughtful analyses of problems that confront higher education in America. Because of the attention it has received in official circles, it deserves to be widely read and carefully studied. Therefore, I am including a copy of Professor Tonsor's speech at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

ALIENATION AND RELEVANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

(By Prof. S. J. Tonsor, University of Michigan)

There is a striking parallel between the crisis in government at the national level in America and the crisis in the universities. In both cases the institutional structure has recently increased gigantically in size and in the scale of operation. Along with this increase in size has gone a tremendous augmentation of power both real and potential. However, it is a characteristic of this power that it is diffuse and focused only with difficulty: that it is all but impossible to bring this power to bear effectively on the problems of the state and the university. The problems which bedevil both the state and the university are frequently not problems which can be solved by the application of power. Along with the augmentation of size and power has gone a singular inability to match commitments with resources so that the state and the universities in spite of megadollar budgets find themselves perennially impoverished. Finally, and most importantly,

each finds itself alienated from its constituency. Each has discovered that it is increasingly difficult for it to project an objective which will move men to its single-minded pursuit. It is not that men no longer believe in government and education. Indeed, they believe passionately in both. It is rather that they no longer understand either the purposes or the designs of big government or big education. Even those who conform do so without enthusiasm and are reluctant to defend the institution from its enemies. While the power of both institutions has steadily increased their authority has declined. Ultimately authority is far more important to education than power and power without authority in the state soon gives way to tyranny.

The parallel between the state and the university is instructive. Both big government and big education face a crisis of confidence and they face this crisis for basically the same reason; they have done a good many of the right things in the wrong way and they have been doing a good many things they should never have attempted, things for which they were totally unequipped. What is necessary in order to restore the institutional authority of higher education? How can higher education regain the confidence of those over thirty and command the respect of those under thirty who listen with reluctance and dissent without debate?

It would be false to assume that all our difficulties are institutional in origin, that they arise from the fact that the university has either done too much or done too little. It must be said at the outset and the fact faced with candor and resolution, that the most important problem which higher education faces today is the growing wave of irrationality and anti-intellectualism which has caught up large numbers of both students and professors. Student and professor activists inside the university and certain ideological groups outside the university no longer believe that truth must be the essential consideration in the academy. Both the extreme right and the extreme left hold the same destructive view. Both Mark Rudd of Columbia and Governor Wallace of Alabama stand in the schoolroom door, and seen from the vantage point of the academy they both hold the same low view of reasoned discourse. They believe that force ought to be substituted for sweet reason, that power ought to replace persuasion and that only "socially approved" voices and views should be heard. They believe that toleration is a weakness rather than a strength in intellectual enquiry and they are in the deepest sense of the word anti-intellectual. They aim at nothing less than the destruction of the life of reason. The university and the parent society have no alternative to repression. These groups cannot be permitted to disrupt and destroy the institutions they so obviously do not understand. They constitute a small minority and it is possible that had university administrations not been long accustomed by their faculties to bearing fools gladly these groups would already have disappeared from the campus scene. Their disappearance, however, will not restore the authority of the university.

If the institutional aspirations of education are once more to become credible, universities must regain a sense of modesty and a selectivity in the formulation of their objectives. They cannot be all things to all men. The notion of the multiversity is rejected with justice by students and by perceptive faculty. They reject it not simply because it is impossible to administer but because it is an institution without goals. It does not know its own mind. The able administrator in the setting of the multiversity is not a man characterized by unusual educational vision but someone whose social

acoustical equipment is highly refined and who acutely senses all the many needs of his society. He is committed to servicing those needs and adjusting and compromising between these many conflicting interests. Modesty is unknown or is swept aside by megalomania and mediocrity. Little wonder that in such circumstances the teacher feels he is an unwanted encumbrance and the student senses that he is a forgotten man. To compound the problem now by expecting the university to become a court of last resort for the solution of the major social problems of our time will only deepen the crisis which the university faces.

Until there is a restoration of genuine educational purpose there will be no restoration of confidence by society in its institutions of higher education. That educational purpose does not lie in the first place in pure or applied research, in problem solving or in providing revolutionary change or defending traditional values in the society, though all of these may result from the legitimate endeavors of higher education. Higher education has as its chief goals the education of young men and women in such a way as to make them capable participants in our complicated technological civilization, sophisticated and creative members of our common culture and active and concerned citizens.

In order to ensure circumstances in which teaching rather than research or community service are the primary objectives of the university, government at all levels must forgo the temptation of easy recourse to the enormous resources of the university. Recently there has been a great deal of debate concerning the use of the talent and facilities available in the university for defense research. It is not inconsistent to argue that under very exceptional circumstances the university ought freely to use its talent in the defense of society, and still maintain that both the government and the university would be better served under most circumstances were both basic and applied research in the national defense area done in autonomous research institutes. The same case can be made against the use of the facilities of the university for the solution of social problems. Social tasks are better performed by institutions and facilities outside the university. Finally business and industry should increasingly look to sources than the university for their pure and applied research.

Much of the debate concerning university research at the present time misses the point. War research is no more illicit or licit than peace research. Nor is the test of the validity of research within the university context whether or not it has direct relevance to the social and political problems or the technical needs of the moment. The only sound test is whether or not research enhances or diminishes the primary teaching function of the university. And it must be confessed that in spite of the brave talk to the contrary and considerable administrative legerdemain, research has become the tail which in many instances wags the dog. Faculty members on fractional appointments who spend the greater part of their time in other than teaching activities distort and confuse the educational purposes of the university. Foundation grants for centers and programs which are often inconsistent with the needs and basic educational directions of the institution are as dangerous to the university as government, civic and business research for which there is no clear-cut teaching mandate.

The university cannot be all things to all men. There is a difference between being alma mater to generation after generation of students and being the not so well paid kept woman who does the bidding of the most recent and persuasive suitor.

"Where there is no vision the people perish," is an observation which is as true of institutions as it is of nations. In education, however, our pressing need is not for a single and unitary vision but rather for visions as different and as diverse as the pluralism of our society. Education cannot be genuinely relevant to our society and to its needs unless it is diverse both in objective and technique. The possibility for educational diversity in America is immense; but in reality American education is homogenous and uniform. The privately endowed colleges do poorly what the state universities do only a little better, and a handful of determinative major universities, as alike as peas in a pod, set the tone and direction for the whole educational enterprise. American education has become a single mechanism; its professors and students interchangeable parts. Under these circumstances, even student riots are monotonously, repellently, alike. Among the most important functions of education is that of widening the options available to men in the solution of their problems and in the improvement of the quality of their lives, yet our universities steadily diminish and dilute the differences between themselves. Students are still able to choose the quality of their educations; they are unable, however, to do much through their own choices about the kind of education they receive. It is important that we reestablish a free market in education. It is important that the church-related school survive, not as a secularized ghost of its former self but as a school with a genuinely religious vision of the world, a school in which men learn to serve God and their fellow men rather than themselves. It is important that private humanistic colleges with their commitment to civilization and decorum and their quiet emphasis on freedom remain an important constituent of our educational system. It is essential that we have genuine experimentation in curriculum and method and not the pseudo experiments hatched by administrators and departmental chairmen who need an excuse for hitting the foundations or the legislators once again for funds.

We cannot have this diversity, however, until the federal and the state governments drastically alter the role they play in financing higher education. American education will become diverse and relevant to the needs of both the student and the nation when and only when the student is forced to pay a very substantial portion of the total costs of his education. Privilege without responsibility is a very dangerous condition; privilege without either responsibility or choice generates unbearable tensions in the society which makes such privilege possible. State schools which compete unfairly with private schools through discriminatory tuition rates have been the chief force in leveling and homogenizing American education. Indiscriminate federal grants on the basis of administrative judgment rather than student choice have only reinforced this movement toward uniformity. If we genuinely desire diversity we will do all in our power to encourage students to pay for their educations through a tax on future earnings. If we genuinely wish diversity we will insist that such educational grants as are made by the federal government will be made directly to the student rather than to institutions of higher education.

Only there is a free market in education with the student and his parents able to choose from among schools diverse in kind and quality will we be able to say honestly to students; "We do not pretend to supply the sort of education you wish or need. If you really want a totally unstructured, ungraded course of study, segregated, revolutionary and socially relevant, you can get it at, let

us say, Columbia, or Brandeis, or Rutgers, but you can't get it here." The growing sense of alienation among students arises in substantial measure from their inability to choose the quality and kind of education they believe relevant to their lives.

Not only should there be a diversification in the kind of college and university training available, but diversification should bring into existence a wide range of educational alternatives. Apprenticeship programs, proprietary schools, technical institutes operated by industry for the training of specific needed talents, a strengthening and broadening of the junior and community college programs are all of considerable importance in the problem of making education relevant to the needs of the student and the needs of society. The American public must be disabused of the notion that the AB degree holds some sort of magic. For some time it has not been a mark of status and certainly it is not a guaranteed pass to higher income. The right of entry into a craft union is often more difficult to achieve than entry into the most exclusive college. It strikes me as odd that the New Left which has been so concerned with the indiscriminate admission of all minority group students into our colleges irrespective of their qualifications has had little or nothing to say of the restrictive practices which deny the right of entry of many of these same minority groups into those favored unions which possess monopoly advantages in our economy and society. Someone should say clearly that the way to status and achievement in our society is not through learning Swahili but through learning English. Someone needs to say clearly that the way to affluence does not lie through an AB degree granted by yesterday's second rate normal college, but a marketable skill which will secure for its holder and his family the dignity of achievement.

Nearly every professor has in the past several years encountered, in what he thought a rather sober discussion of an academic question a sudden denunciation by a student member of his audience. The student does not challenge the professor's method or even question his data but simply rejects his position as immoral, as fascist or racist or as simply irrelevant. There is no debate or discussion, no attempt to identify the question or purposefully expose the issue. It is assumed that absolute right prevails on one side and that moral obtuseness, Marxian false consciousness, or plain wrong-doing characterizes the other side. The issue is not joined; it is not even discussed. Question periods at lectures are not occasions for refining the position of the lecturer but are seen as opportunities to present long, rambling denunciations and counter lectures. The student usually ends his harangue with a plea for relevance and the lecturer, if he is smart enough, gathers that the young man or young lady, (it is sometimes difficult to tell just which it is), is alienated.

Last fall the London Times reported an international meeting of philosophers in Vienna in the following words: "While their elders and betters solemnly discuss the epistemological significance of the phrases 'Johnny has lost his pen. I have found a pen. I know Johnny lost it,' the students are racing through the corridors, shouting 'What about the Soviet invasion of (Czechoslovakia), Russian and American flags, and wrestling with their professors for microphones during debates.

"It is disgusting, say the students, that 3,000 of the wisest men from every country of the world should have gathered together in the largest philosophical talk-in in history and have nothing forceful to say about the Russian tanks on the Czech border less

than 50 miles away. If philosophy has any real function it should be performing it now."

Clearly, what the student seeks is a relevant orthodoxy rather than an agonizing enquiry. Faced with some of the toughest choices in history and living in a period when traditional certainties and traditional values have been challenged and opposed by alternatives the student is really calling upon his professor for a clear and definitive answer and one preferably couched in a currently fashionable vocabulary and bearing the marks of current social concerns. To the student education is irrelevant if it cannot provide a solution; preferably of course, a solution which costs the student nothing and whose weight is born by the non-student sectors of society. The student wants to know what to think rather than how to think.

And the student has far too many professors who are willing to tell him what to think rather than attempt to teach him how to think for himself. The student has learned his lessons only too well. His professors, especially in the humanities and the social sciences have all too often been exponents of an established orthodoxy rather than masters in the art of reasoned enquiry.

The situation is not to be mended by diversifying orthodoxies. This is the student's solution. He wishes to replace the Liberal orthodoxy with a New Left orthodoxy, a WASP orthodoxy with a Black orthodoxy, a permissive and tolerant orthodoxy with a repressive orthodoxy. What the student wishes is a substitution of orthodoxies rather than an end to all closed systems. His efforts will only compound the problem, for the Liberal ascendancy in today's colleges and universities is like the pre-1918 Austrian Empire; "an autocracy ameliorated by inefficiency," while the student's Maoist dictatorships would end altogether the life of reason.

The professor, if he is to reestablish the authority of reason must not only admit of the possibility of his being wrong but must have the openness of mind necessary to, as Lord Acton said, "make out the best possible case for error." He must actively court diversity and contradiction rather than seek the world of like-minded men. He must continuously engage in a great debate not only with his students and his colleagues but above all with himself, and as President Truman said, "if he can't stand the heat he should get out of the kitchen."

The ideological and cultural uniformity of higher education in America is a disgrace. Why is it that our colleges and universities have conformed themselves over the past two decades to the orthodoxy of secular liberalism? Why has the atmosphere been so increasingly hostile to open debate? Why does it take the crisis of the exclusion of the Negro from the university to make us see that not only people but ideas have been excluded by higher education?

The authority and the relevance of the university lies in its ability as an institution to explore systematically and rationally the problems men face. Its success is not dependent upon current fashions in ideas or current solutions to particular problems. Its success derives from its ability to take the long view and ask the hard questions, and the hardest of these is the question the professor asks of himself, of his colleagues and his society about the possibility of being wrong.

DEMOCRACY ON THE OFFENSIVE

HON. LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Speaker, standing toe to toe in angry confrontation, one

could hardly believe that the bearded young militant, the campus radical in the dirty military uniform could have anything in common with the "super patriot" who wants to beat him to a pulp and drop the bomb on all his Communist friends.

Yet they are alike for they represent the extremes of our political spectrum and as such are irresponsible advocates of simplistic solutions to the world's problems.

The hairy, militant radical is impressed by his intellect. He prides in the notoriety of being way out and considers it intellectual to spout the stock phrases of the far left.

"The Establishment is a fascist swamp. The imperialist United States makes wars on babies. Capitalistic racists make slums," he shouts.

His answers to the problems—communism and violence.

He advocates total change, now.

What change?

"Well let us start with closing down the university and burning the library," he proposes.

His counterpart on the far right, dresses better. He is a true patriot and will tell you so. He is for law and order and against communism. Anyone who disagrees with him is soft on communism, a Communist dupe or a fuzzy thinker who really does not understand the international conspiracy.

His solution to today's problems are also simplistic. He advocates cracking a few heads, "ship them back to Russia," "throw the rascals out" and drop the bomb.

The middle-of-the-road American, the individual who faces today's problems with sincere concern and a desire for moderate solutions has had to tolerate a great deal from the extremists on the left and right.

Because of the loudness of these extremists the world has been left with the impression that our democracy is in danger and that, in our Nation, irresponsibility has replaced reason and tolerance.

On the one hand they see radical young people leaning toward communistic philosophy. On the right they see others, while professing to preserve and protect democracy, responding with simplistic solutions that in the end would destroy our freedom and our society.

I feel it is about time that we as a nation get on the right track and show the world that democracy is the best system under which to live.

It is about time that we start developing an attitude and a national policy that is "prodemocracy." And that, my friends, means taking the offensive for democracy rather than accepting the status of 20 years of only reacting to communism.

For the past 6 years the United States has spent an average of 12 percent of its national budget on what I call positive programs. These are the programs of education, research, medicine, housing, transportation, et cetera. At the same time 44 percent of our budget is for military expenditures.

I think it is about time that we start to beef up the positive side of democracy and control our reliance on the militaristic side.

There are those who think that we should strip down and stand naked with an olive branch in hopes that such a position would bring about world peace. There are others who want total reliance on weaponry and advocate more atomic arms.

I think that an arms philosophy based on rational thinking, not fear, is in our best interest.

Should we be strong militarily? I believe we must.

But at the same time I believe that there can be a better ratio than 12-percent expenditure for programs of peace and 44 percent for arms.

I cannot remember a one-handed fighter who became champion. Nor can I think of a baseball team with one star pitcher and no fielders or hitters that made the World Series.

It is the same way in world politics. If democracy is to be a champion we have to have more than superiority of arms. We have to have superiority of morals. We must have a humanitarian concern and we must show the world that our hearts are as big as our fists.

The world is going to judge the political systems and we are going to be judged on our ability to eliminate crime, conquer narcotics addiction, cure the ill, and feed the hungry. We are going to be judged on what we do to educate people and clean up our atmosphere.

We are not going to be judged on our ability to eliminate civilization.

THE LATE HONORABLE
HARRY SHEPPARD

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress in January of 1963, I was greeted and welcomed by the then dean of the California delegation, the Honorable Harry R. Sheppard. His warmth and his kindness guided me during those first confusing days, and since.

Harry Sheppard served in the House of Representatives for 14 terms, 28 years, spanning the generations, as he represented California's 27th Congressional District. He was well equipped for the representation of the people of his district, equipped by his youth as an orphan in Mobile, by his labors in a livery stable and with threshing machines in the Midwest, in the hunt for gold in Alaska, and as a businessman in southern California.

He served and served well, using his depth of experience as a bridge to understanding the needs of a changing congressional district, a changing State, a changing Nation, and a changing world.

His passing after a long and fruitful life takes from all of us a wise and kind friend. I and all of the Members of this House join in mourning our former colleague Harry R. Sheppard and in offering our condolences to his family.

A TOTAL OF 294 MEMBERS OF CONGRESS SUPPORT DECLARATION FOR PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on April 28, 1969, on page 10592 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD there was set forth a declaration for peace in the Middle East with the names of Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate, who at that time had lent their support to such declaration. Since that time a number of others have joined in that support so that there are now a total of 59 Senators and 235 Members of the House of Representatives, making the majority of the Senate and the majority of the House in agreement with that declaration. The additional names are as follows:

MEMBERS OF THE SENATE

JAMES B. ALLEN, of Alabama.
CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico.
HARRY F. BYRD, JR., of Virginia.
HOWARD W. CANNON, of Nevada.
FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho.
THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut.
MIKE GRAVEL, of Alaska.
CLIFFORD P. HANSEN, of Wyoming.
WINSTON L. PROUTY, of Vermont.
JOHN J. SPARKMAN, of Alabama.
WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR., of Virginia.

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE

JOHN B. ANDERSON, of Illinois.
WALTER S. BARING, of Nevada.
WILLIAM H. BATES, of Massachusetts.
PAGE BELCHER, of Oklahoma.
ALPHONZO BELL, of California.
RICHARD BOLLING, of Missouri.
FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio.
WILLIAM G. BRAY, of Indiana.
J. HERBERT BURKE, of Florida.
LAWRENCE J. BURTON, of Utah.
DANIEL E. BUTTON, of New York.
WILLIAM T. CAHILL, of New Jersey.
JOHN N. CAMP, of Oklahoma.
JAMES C. CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire.
WILLIAM O. COWGER, of Kentucky.
WILLIAM L. DICKINSON, of Alabama.
HAROLD D. DONOHUE, of Massachusetts.
THOMAS N. DOWNING, of Virginia.
JACK EDWARDS, of Alabama.
DON FUQUA, of Florida.
NICK GALIFIANAKIS, of North Carolina.
EDITH GREEN, of Oregon.
CHARLES S. GUBSER, of California.
G. ELLIOTT HAGAN, of Georgia.
JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT, of Arkansas.
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, of California.
KEN HECHLER, of West Virginia.
LAWRENCE J. HOGAN, of Maryland.
W. R. HULL, JR., of Missouri.
JOSEPH E. KARTH, of Minnesota.
HASTINGS KEITH, of Massachusetts.
PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR., of California.
WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH, of Ohio.
RAY J. MADDEN, of Indiana.
CATHERINE MAY, of Washington.
LLOYD MEEDS, of Washington.
THOMAS E. MORGAN, of Pennsylvania.
CHARLES A. MOSHER, of Ohio.
JOHN M. MURPHY, of New York.
ANCHER NELSEN, of Minnesota.
CARL D. PERKINS, of Kentucky.
PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Massachusetts.
OTIS G. PIKE, of New York.
HOWARD W. POLLOCK, of Alaska.

GRAHAM PURCELL, of Texas.
RAY ROBERTS, of Texas.
WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR., of Delaware.
DONALD RUMSFELD, of Illinois.
DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III, of Virginia.
GEORGE E. SHIPLEY, of Illinois.
JOHN M. SLACK, of West Virginia.
WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, of Illinois.
JAMES W. SYMINGTON, of Missouri.
FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey.
ROBERT O. TIERNAN, of Rhode Island.
G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST, of Virginia.
JAMES C. WRIGHT, JR., of Texas.
LOUIS C. WYMAN, of New Hampshire.
The list will be kept open for additional supporters.

**JUDGE GERALD R. CORBETT,
FOUNDER OF HONOLULU'S FAMILY COURT, RETIRES AFTER NEARLY 23 YEARS ON THE BENCH**

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, when Gerald R. Corbett, 65, senior judge of Honolulu's family court, retired on May 1, 1969, after nearly 23 years of service, he commented to Drew McKillips, legal affairs writer for the Honolulu Advertiser, that the most pressing need of today's courts is people:

We need more personnel. We need more social workers, more referees, more court clerks, more support personnel all the way down the line. You can't run a ship without a crew. We could do a better job with at least 25 per cent increase in help.

Always unpretentious, Judge Corbett was forced to quit the job he loved, one which he could have worked at for another 4 years before mandatory retirement, because of a troublesome back. But Judge Corbett has accomplished one of his major goals: the establishment and operation of a family court. In his own words, Judge Corbett believes that he has organized a "team of skilled workers who have helped thousands of young people to make a better adjustment to the community—Honolulu. I feel we have one of the best statutes in the country in our Family Court Act. It brings together for analysis and treatment virtually all legal problems affecting family life."

We in Hawaii are grateful for the solid foundation Judge Corbett has laid for our State in his search for "alternatives to incarceration" for young violators. Our best wishes and aloha go with him as he enters upon his well-earned retirement after an outstanding career on the bench.

As one who was privileged to appear before Judge Corbett in innumerable cases while engaged in the private practice of law, I take considerable pride in submitting for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the story of a judge who was repeatedly reappointed because his capabilities were found to transcend the political appointive nature of his post. That story first appeared in the Honolulu Advertiser on May 1, 1969:

A JUDGE LOOKS AT THE JOB

(By Drew McKillips)

This is the story of the man who served 22 years and nine months as judge of the Juvenile Court in Hawaii.

He held a political appointive job, but his capabilities enabled him to transcend politics.

Two presidents—one Republican and one Democrat—appointed him to terms as judge. Two governors of Hawaii—one Republican and one Democrat—named him to the bench.

Down through the years he had his share of critics. Some said he was too soft on juvenile law violators. Even after he announced his retirement, a State senator unleashed a verbal attack on him. He said the judge had done more to contribute to the increase of crime in Hawaii than any other man.

But the judge had heard it all before. Five years ago. Ten years ago. Twenty years ago. The judge stayed on the job and did his job the best way he knew how.

He was always unpretentious. Other judges continually remodeled their chambers. Put in new drapes, new wall-to-wall carpets, wrap-around desks, oil paintings on the walls, insulated water jugs on the desks.

Some of the chambers looked very nice.

The Juvenile Court Judge had the smallest chamber in the courthouse. It was half the size of anyone else's. The drapes were faded. The carpet was faded. There was nothing ornate there. No abstract art on the walls. No hand-carved heads on the desk. Only government-issue bookcases filled with well-worn law books. A desk piled high with files that should have been disposed of weeks before if he had been supplied with the personnel he needed. (What good does it do when a probation officer has so many cases that he can talk with a kid only a few minutes once a month?)

ILLNESS TAKES TOLL

In the end it was an ailment that forced him to quit the job he loved. He could have worked another four years before mandatory retirement.

But in the last few years the climb to the second floor of the Judiciary Building has been taking a little longer each day. He has a bad back. He has to use heating pads in his office chair. Sometimes he walks with a shuffle.

He stayed on long enough to accomplish his goal: The establishment and operation of a Family Court.

Gerald R. Corbett, 65, senior judge of the Family Court, today will begin a long deserved retirement. Tomorrow night, 300 friends will honor him at a luau. On Sunday, he and his wife, Nancy, will fly to Europe for a month's vacation. It will be his first trip there.

A reporter who has known him for ten years interviewed him Tuesday.

The judge sat behind his file-strewn desk. What did he think was his most noteworthy accomplishment?

He leaned back, lit a cigaret, and reflected.

GOOD TEAM, LAW

"I feel I have organized a team of skilled workers who have helped thousands of young people to make a better adjustment to the community," Corbett said. "I feel we have one of the best statutes in the country in our Family Court Act. It brings together for analysis and treatment virtually all legal problems affecting family life."

Did he have anything to say to his critics who charge him with being too lenient?

"Everyone is entitled to his own opinions," Corbett replied. "Some mistakes have been made in dealing with individual cases. But anyone who is in the business of trying to

forecast the future of any other human being is bound to be wrong sometimes.

"I still think that with regard to young law violators an effort must be made to search for alternatives to incarceration. I don't think that anyone learns to adjust to the community, to get along with his neighbors and fellow citizens, by being removed from the community, and locked up.

"Youngsters in institutions are more likely to learn to adjust to the institution than they are likely to learn to adjust to the community that they must eventually return to."

NEED FACILITIES

Did he favor the establishment of different facilities than are now offered to youthful law breakers? What about putting young men in their late teens and early 20s together with hardened inmates?

"I believe we need a variety of facilities," Corbett said. "We need more facilities and resources to house and train youngsters who are homeless or who have to be removed from their homes. We need better segregation for different types of people. This would apply to both young people and adults.

"Human beings who are kept in confinement should not be lumped together. They should be divided by age groups, by degrees of sophistication, by degrees of intellectual ability. We badly need these facilities. We don't have them now."

What about the credo reputedly attributed to the late Father Flanagan, of Boys Town, Neb., that "there is no such thing as a bad boy." Does Corbett believe this?

"No, I don't believe that," he said. "I have encountered some pretty tough youngsters. But if you mean that no boy is born bad, I would be inclined to agree with that.

"Some youngsters are so badly damaged by mishandling—usually by their parents—that it will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to get them to reform."

Did he believe that fear of incarceration deterred youths from crime?

"I don't believe that severe punishment acts as a deterrent to the general public," Corbett said. "We'd have a pretty sick community if the majority of citizens were law abiding merely because they were afraid."

What about youths who are rioting and protesting and refusing to be inducted into the armed services? What does he read into this?

THEY'D COME FORWARD

"As I observe these youngsters, they seem to conform generally," Corbett said. "They don't commit burglaries, rapes or robberies.

"One of their main thrusts seems to be in resisting the draft and protesting the war. I think the large number of youngsters who argue against the draft are sincerely opposed to war as a means of settling international problems. I tend to doubt that, in general, their protesting is based on personal fear or cowardice. I think if our country were attacked, as it was in the Pearl Harbor situation, the majority of these youngsters would come forward."

What about the growing use of marijuana among youngsters? Does he see any kind of a moral breakdown in our country?

"I think the penalty for smoking marijuana is completely unreasonable and unrealistic," Corbett said. "The handling of the marijuana situation is comparable to the handling of the liquor situation in prohibition days."

As he leaves the Family Court, what does he think is the court's most pressing need?

"People," Corbett said. "We need more personnel. We need more social workers, more referees, more court clerks, more support personnel all the way down the line. You can't run a ship without a crew. We could do a vastly better job with at least a 25 per cent increase in help."

IS THE WAR LOST?

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, all of us hope that the current Vietnam peace talks in Paris meet with success. The American people are tired of this prolonged, seemingly endless conflict, and would like to see an honorable withdrawal of our forces begin as soon as possible.

Nonetheless, it appears that the new administration is finding it just as hard as the previous administration to achieve peace in Vietnam. While there have been reports of secret sessions, it is unclear to the public whether any real progress has been made. Consequently, many are now questioning the advisability of continued exclusive reliance on the peace talks, which were started by the previous administration, as our best hope for an honorable solution. They may remain as one potential remedy, and I feel that they should continue as long as there is any hope at all for a negotiated settlement, but the time is approaching when our Government must also explore new approaches to getting us out of Vietnam.

Implicit in the campaign pledges of our President was a promise to bring new thinking and new proposals for a Vietnam settlement. We have been patiently waiting for these new concepts, and it would be tragic if we continued to be bogged down in the patterns of the past.

A recent article on this subject comments on the lack of progress, or hope for progress, at the Paris peace talks. Published in Newsweek, it was written by Mr. Stewart Alsop. Because of the interest of my colleagues in achieving an end to the Vietnam fighting, I am inserting the article at this point in the RECORD:

IS THE WAR LOST?

(By Stewart Alsop)

PARIS.—It is glaringly obvious in Paris, though for mysterious reasons it does not seem to be so obvious in Washington, that Cabot Lodge, the chief American negotiator here, is in a virtually hopeless bargaining position. He is like a man trying to sell a house for \$50,000 to another man who knows he would be glad to take \$15,000 for the place—and might even be willing to give it away.

Lodge's mission is to attempt to negotiate with Hanoi and the NLF an "honorable" political settlement in Vietnam, based on mutual withdrawal of North Vietnamese and American troops. But the Communist side knows—or thinks it knows, which amounts to the same thing—that the Nixon Administration is so anxious to "de-Americanize" the war that a unilateral American withdrawal is inevitable anyway. Under the circumstances, why in the name of Marx and Lenin should the Communists agree to a mutual withdrawal?

The answer is that they presently have no intention whatever of doing so, as they make clear at great and tedious length every week. Moreover, as long as Cabot Lodge's bargaining position remains so feeble, no agreement of any sort is at all likely to emerge from the negotiations here—not, that is, unless

the Nixon Administration is ready to accept a lightly camouflaged defeat.

There never was much hope among the American negotiators here that a formal, written agreement to end the war, all spelled out with semicolons and subsidiary clauses, would emerge from the talks. "We'll never get a piece of paper," one American negotiator said to this reporter here six weeks ago. But at that time, the Americans were hoping for a tacit agreement, a sort of peace-by-conspiracy.

MURKY AGREEMENT

As this agreement was rather murkily envisaged, the war would first be mutually scaled down. "We'll still be shooting at each other, but less and less," one negotiator explained. Then there would be a deal that would give the Communist minority representation in the Saigon government, followed by general elections overseen by "mixed commissions." Meanwhile, North Vietnamese and U.S. and allied forces would be withdrawn on a tacitly agreed schedule.

Even six weeks ago, this scenario sounded pretty dubious. When Cabot Lodge was ambassador in Saigon, he tried to persuade Saigon's then President Ky to adopt a generous program of reconciliation. "Mr. Ambassador," Ky replied, "you do not understand. I regard the Communists as traitors and they regard me as a traitor. If I catch them I'll shoot them, and if they catch me they'll shoot me." It has always been a bit difficult to imagine people who would very much like to shoot each other forming a workable coalition government.

Again, any agreement on mutual withdrawal would be only a camouflaged defeat unless the North Vietnamese agreed to withdraw from their Cambodian and Laotian sanctuaries as well as from South Vietnam. The North Vietnamese have yet to admit that they have any troops in any of these three places.

For such reasons, even six weeks ago, it was difficult to believe that a compromise settlement was possible. By now, to believe that the Communists have any interest in a reasonable settlement it is necessary, like the Red Queen, to "believe six impossible things before breakfast."

SECRET TALKS

It is necessary to believe, for example, that when the Communists demand—as they have at every formal meeting, week after weary week—the immediate, total, and unilateral withdrawal of the "American imperialist aggressors," they are subtly hinting that they really want to talk about mutual withdrawal. It is necessary to believe that, when they demand a "peace government" excluding all "lackeys"—meaning all members of the present government—they are really hinting that they want to talk about forming a coalition with the present government.

The hopes of six weeks ago were largely based on the assumption that when secret talks began the Communists would show some give. Secret talks have begun, and although in private the Communists are a bit more polite than in the formal meetings, in matters of substance they have not budged a millimeter. So hopes for a compromise settlement are certainly moribund here, if not entirely dead.

The French have from the first considered American hopes for a compromise settlement naive. During President Nixon's visit to Paris, one of the President's chief policy advisers had a last-minute talk with a high official of the French Government. The talk, as rather gloatingly repeated by the French official, went about like this:

AMERICAN ADVISER: "As you know, the President very much wants peace in Vietnam. But we feel that General de Gaulle ought to understand two things. First, we

cannot withdraw American forces without any withdrawal by the other side. Second, we cannot sacrifice the Saigon government."

FRENCH OFFICIAL: "Then the President cannot have peace."

The French, in short, believe that the Communists came to Paris to accept a camouflaged American capitulation, and that eventually the Communists will get what they came for. The French would not be at all displeased if the United States were humiliated in Vietnam as France was humiliated in 1954. But they could be right, all the same, unless Cabot Lodge's bargaining position is somehow improved.

It would be improved by a marked deterioration of the Communist military position in Vietnam or by sharply increased military pressure by our side, or by both. But neither seems at all likely. And it is an insult to the intelligence to argue, as some Washington casuists argue, that the Communists will be more willing to compromise if American forces in Vietnam—and therefore the military pressure on the Communists—are reduced. Communists are serious people—something we Americans should have learned by this time. They are deadly serious about achieving the goal—Communist rule over all Vietnam and in time all Southeast Asia—for which they have fought and bled for more than a generation. It is just plain silly to suppose that if we are nice enough to reduce the military pressure on them, they will be nice enough to abandon that goal.

BASIC WEAKNESS

President Nixon may, even so, have no choice but to begin withdrawing American troops. For the basic weakness in Cabot Lodge's bargaining position here lies in the simple fact that the American people have lost stomach for the war in Vietnam, and the Communists know it. People who have lost stomach for a war in the end generally lose the war. If that happens, it will be interesting, if perhaps a bit frightening, to see how the American people react to their first lost war.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, since I was in California yesterday representing my committee, I was not able to give my support to H.R. 5554, which extends the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. I wholeheartedly support this legislation and had I been here, I would have cast my vote for it. This special milk program has been very successful. It enabled 17 million children last year to receive a half pint of milk each day during the school years—and in many instances, the only whole fluid milk which children received was through this program.

Nutritionists say that children of school age need a minimum of 1 quart of milk a day. Statistics show that these needs are not fulfilled, especially with respect to children of low-income areas. The special milk program has made good progress toward correcting this deficiency.

The value of this program is clear, Mr. Speaker, and I am happy that my colleagues gave such overwhelming approval to making it a permanent one. It is a sound investment in the health of our younger generations.

A MAGNIFICENT TRIBUTE

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, prior to being appointed Assistant Secretary of the Navy, for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Brig. Gen. J. D. "Don" Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, wrote a multitude of outstanding and penetrating articles concerning our national security.

There is no doubt in anyone's mind who knows Don Hittle that he is a recognized military expert, so far as national or international strategy and military requirements are concerned.

But the wisdom of appointing him as Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserve Affairs has been clearly and quickly demonstrated when one reads General Hittle's last article, a tribute to a marine, entitled "If a Rose Blooms Where Elmer Fell."

This is a beautifully written tribute, not only to Sgt. Elmer Montgomery, but to thousands of other young men in our Nation. I think it is most significant that the last column General Hittle wrote for publication by the Copley News Service prior to his appointment should deal, not with national strategy, not with hardware, but with that indispensable commodity so well understood by our new Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Don Hittle—people.

The article follows:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Mar. 9, 1969]

TRIBUTE TO A MARINE: IF A ROSE BLOOMS WHERE ELMER FELL

(NOTE.—The following tribute to a fellow Marine was written shortly before the author became Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserves. The sentiment expressed by the writer should assure readers that the right man for the task has been appointed to the secretariat of the Navy.) (By Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired)

In late February in each of the last 24 years my mind reaches back to a little island in the far Pacific called Iwo Jima and a man named Elmer Montgomery.

After all those years, I'd like to write about Elmer.

We first met on Guam in late 1944 during the final phases of that campaign. I had been ordered to take over the G-4 logistics job for the 3rd Marine Division. We needed a clerk-typist. Sgt. Elmer Montgomery reported.

Elmer looked like the vindication of the whole Marine Corps personnel system. He wore the stripes of a buck sergeant, but there was nothing tough or fierce about this young man from Montana. His sensitive face, deep-set eyes, thin, almost frail figure hardly matched the gung-ho Marine prototype.

As we began to work together, I became more and more convinced that Elmer was the right man in the right job. He typed well, took shorthand, understood administration, kept things moving. He was a perfect man behind the man behind the gun.

After Guam was secured, attention shifted to the invasion of Iwo Jima. Work piled high and the hours were long in that little quonset hut office, but when Elmer did have a moment, I noticed he would lean his chair against the wall and pull a small, white

leather-covered Bible from the hip pocket of his fatigues. It had a zipper around the edge that he would carefully loosen.

Wherever the Bible fell open in his hand, he would begin to read—and find serenity.

The other NCOs had trouble "figuring" Elmer, but they liked him. He was quiet and a bit withdrawn, but he was no "loner." He could chuckle at a bawdy joke and join in the bull sessions, though he winced at some of the more earthy profanity.

I remember one evening when we were working late. He went to the NCO Club and returned with a couple of cokes. They were a tonic on a steamy tropical night and we sat and chatted at my desk.

Elmer's glance fell on a stack of books. "I see you have a copy of Omar Khayyam's Rubaiyat," he said. "It's one of my favorites."

The book was a gift from my wife. I explained that it offered a mental change of pace.

"What's your favorite verse?" I asked.

"I sometimes think that never blows so red,

"The rose as where some buried Caesar bled."

He had it perfect.

In February we sailed for Iwo Jima.

After several days of fierce fighting, division staff sections were ordered to provide replacements for badly mauled front-line units. I had to provide two.

It's not a pleasant job to pick men trained in support tasks for the "meat grinder." I selected the two I thought could best be spared from my supply operation.

I was just about to send the names to the division adjutant when my executive officer, Maj. Malcolm Beyer (later a brigadier general) popped into my dugout.

Sgt. Montgomery wanted to see me.

The sergeant saluted and informed me he had heard about the call for reinforcements.

"You're not one of them," I told him, thinking it would put his mind at ease.

"That's what I want to talk to you about, Colonel," he said. "I want to go forward."

I explained that I considered him essential to our supply mission and for the first time he argued. He wasn't loud, but he was firm.

"I'll never feel right if I don't go up when I'm needed," he said. "I'm needed now."

"I'm older than most of these kids. I've had a lot of experience looking after myself while hunting back home in Montana. I can look after them up forward."

I realized he wouldn't take "No" for an answer.

"Alright, I'll grant your request, but only because you're old enough to know what you're doing and because it means so much to you."

I never saw Elmer again.

A Marine from his front-line unit told me the story.

The platoon commander had been killed and Elmer was assigned, under a staff sergeant, as assistant platoon commander.

The order came to attack.

The patched-up platoon moved across a slight rise and into a small saucer-shaped area where it was pinned down by a carefully camouflaged Japanese machinegun. If the men tried to move back across the rise, the gun would get them. If they stayed, they would soon be blasted apart by mortars.

Elmer crawled and rolled within yelling distance of the staff sergeant.

The Marine who told me the story paused, pulled on his cigarette and pressed a bandage on his arm tighter against his own wound.

"Sgt. Montgomery yelled, 'When I draw the fire, roll the platoon back over the rise,'" he said.

"And while the platoon commander was saying 'no', Sgt. Montgomery stood up and,

firing his rifle from his hip, walked into the machinegun.

"We're here because he drew the fire long enough for us to slide back over that rise."

They never found Elmer. A few minutes after his platoon reached safety our artillery laid down a barrage on the machinegun emplacement. The big shells churned the ground and everything on it mercilessly.

He and his little white, leather-covered Bible became, forever, part of the hallowed ground of Iwo Jima.

I suppose memories fade and maybe Sgt. Montgomery's Navy Cross is almost forgotten. But whenever I think back to all the brave men I have been privileged to know, Elmer heads the list.

And whenever my eye falls on a copy of the Rubaiyat, I can't help but believe that if a rose were ever to bloom where Elmer fell, it would be more red than any "Where some buried Caesar bled."

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly honored and privileged again this year to join my colleagues in the participation of the commemorative program marking Poland's May 3 Constitution of 1791.

The observance of this May 3 anniversary deepens the faith and heightens the courage of every Pole and of every American of Polish origin. It reminds all Americans of Poland's destiny in the history of mankind and prophesies the ultimate triumph of justice, even though Poland once more has been deprived of her independence, sovereignty, and her territory.

Wherever Americans of Polish descent live throughout our country, this holiday is observed with appropriate exercises during the month of May to pay tribute to the Polish nation and remind fellow Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers of free, representative government in Europe.

Throughout history, the mettle of the Polish people has been tested in many crucibles of death, destruction, and fire, yet their faith has never been shattered, their courage has never been dimmed, and their high purpose to fight for liberty, freedom, and justice has become stronger through the years.

Although they are bound by the chains of tyranny, they will never give in. They will continue to fight for their birthright as free men and women until they have achieved their goals.

It is up to us, and other freedom-loving nations, who admire their struggles and honor them for their priceless sacrifices for freedom, to hold out the hand of friendship toward them, and render them every encouragement and assistance.

Let us resolve on this occasion that the fight for Polish liberty and freedom will continue until it is won and, pray God, may that day be soon.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, this is the fifth time that I have the privilege to stand up in the House of Representatives and freely and under no restrictions, address this august body in commemoration of the Constitution of Poland which was adopted on May 3, 1791.

On this 178th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the nation which was capable of such a great document of human rights and social justice.

Poland was the first country in Europe to have a written constitution. It came into being after the second partition of Poland and was the fruit of the famous 4 years' Diet, assembled in Warsaw to draw up a new constitution. The nation was in a feverish state, and Europe at large was shaken with political disturbances. The leaders of Poland perceived that social and economic reforms were needed if the country was to survive.

Throughout the course of her history the people of Poland have always desired to live peacefully with their neighbors. Her Constitution was adopted not many years after the Constitution of the United States had been adopted and was an outstanding milestone in the evolution of democracy in Europe.

With over 1,000 years of national existence, Poland ranks among the oldest of European nations. Varied was her fortune through the centuries. There was a time when she constituted one of the major powers of Europe, when princes and monarchs sought her favor and aid; but at no time has she sought her neighbors' possessions, or sinned by invading and terrorizing their lands. If she grew territorially, it was not through conquest, but as a result of concord with the adjoining countries who freely desired a permanent union with her. For through alliance with Poland they found a realization of the freedom and personal liberties which no other country offered.

Poland and her people have been partitioned four times, ravaged, despoiled, murdered, and enslaved by greedy and imperialistic nations. No nation, no people have suffered so much in the last two centuries. National honor, national integrity, the nation's boundaries, after two centuries of suffering, are sacred things to every Pole—young and old, rich and poor. Two long centuries of Polish tears, prayers, songs of sorrow, have made it so. For two long centuries their women and children were starved and slaughtered; husbands, fathers, brothers shot and sabered or condemned to prison for life. Two long centuries of the most cruel and inhuman practices upon a peaceful and agricultural people, of persecution, brutal barbarism and savagery have instilled in every Polish heart a deep consciousness of national honor, national integrity, and that the nation's boundaries be respected.

Today, the people of Poland are not even permitted to celebrate publicly this great national holiday, the anniversary of their Constitution. The alien government leaders fear that the shining light which such celebration would cast upon the bright history of Poland, upon the gallant efforts of its people to free themselves from the yoke of containment, would dim and blot out the false promises and the changes brought into the life of Poland by the puppet government supported by Soviet Russia. They fear that the brightness of that great Constitution would bring to light the utter emptiness, filth, and wickedness of their orders, by which there is thrust upon the Polish people the project of the Communist constitution, intended to completely enslave the Polish nation. I feel confident, however, that the Polish nation, strengthened by the ideals of freedom and social justice contained in the May Constitution will never give up their rich heritage.

Mr. Speaker, as we join in this tribute to Poland on this anniversary, the United States of America is deeply indebted to Poland for its many contributions to our progress and well-being. It is also indebted to Poland for the millions of its citizens who came to this country to help build it to the greatest nation of all times. That same zeal and warm desire for freedom, that same resistance to persecution, and the same determination to develop, which characterized the Poles through the ages, has been a dominant factor in the growth and development of our great Nation.

Let us give Poland, equivalent in size to the State of New Mexico, and its over 32 million people, our most sincere assurance of our moral support, encourage them in their continued fight for freedom in the full sense of the word.

Poland must be free, since without a free Poland, there can be no true peace.

On this May 3, Americans of Polish origin will join with others of Polish origin, whether they be in Canada, Europe, the South American countries; yes, even in Poland itself, to pray for Poland's freedom and hope that Poland will soon again take her place in the society of free nations and that her future will be guaranteed from further domination by governments alien to her spirit of democracy.

THE HONORABLE HARRY R.
SHEPPARD

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I, too, was deeply saddened to learn of the death of Hon. Harry R. Sheppard who for 28 years so ably served the people of California's 27th Congressional District. I knew and admired Harry for many years and had the privilege of serving with him on the House

Committee on Appropriations for almost two decades. With the rest of my colleagues I was quite unhappy to see him retire in 1964 because of ill health. His presence was greatly missed as was his expertise on defense matters within the Appropriations Committee. But more than that it was his warmth and kindness and genuine good humor that we missed so much. Harry Sheppard, Mr. Speaker, was one of the great ones—gentleman, statesman, and patriot. To his charming wife, Kay, Mrs. Rooney and I extend our sincerest sympathy in this time of grief.

ABOLISH IT

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have often expressed the opinion that this Government is—to put it mildly—overstuffed with commissions, committees, councils, and boards which have little or nothing to do.

I am interested, therefore, to see that the Wall Street Journal today points out that the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission, in the true tradition of empire building, wants a new, 5-year lease on life.

I am pleased that the newspaper takes note of the opposition to this extension of my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL), and if legislation to pump new life into this Commission ever gets to the floor of the House I shall be happy to join him in voting against it.

I include the newspaper article for insertion in the RECORD at this point.

LEWIS AND CLARK TRAIL COMMISSION CAN'T BRING ITSELF TO QUIT

(By Arlen J. Large)

On Aug. 12, 1805, deep in the mountains of southwestern Montana, Capt. Meriwether Lewis drank from a small stream and watched as a comrade "exultingly stood with a foot on each side of this little rivulet and thanked his god that he had lived to bestride the mighty & heretofore deemed endless Missouri."

It was a thrilling moment in one of history's great adventures. The 7,500-mile round trip between St. Louis and the Oregon coast led by Mr. Lewis and his co-captain, William Clark, has inspired succeeding generations as a saga of man's persistence.

That spirit of persistence still lives.

Five years ago Congress established the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission to promote popular interest in the expedition's route up the Missouri, over the mountains of Montana and Idaho and down the Columbia to the Pacific. One of the commission's chief tasks was to post distinctive markers on highways adjacent to the explorers' route through 11 states. That chore is largely completed now, and by law the commission is to write its final report and expire next October.

But the ghosts of Lewis and Clark seem to be whispering "forward, against all hazard" to Sherry Fisher, the Des Moines banker who heads the 27-member commission. The affable and enthusiastic Mr. Fisher contends the group's work isn't done, and he wants Congress to extend its life for another five years.

Mr. Fisher feels that the unpaid commission, which gets along on an annual \$25,000

dab from Congress for expenses, ultimately can turn its duties over to a permanent private association. "But we haven't got this thing quite cranked up," he says, "and that's why we need an extension."

The Federal commission's duties haven't included any actual search for the Lewis and Clark trail; the route has been known rather exactly since the 30-man military expedition—given up for dead—returned to St. Louis with its maps and journals in September 1806. Probably the greatest uncertainty involves the difficult Lolo Trail across the mountains of northern Idaho, where the supposed route and campsites may be in error by one or two miles. In Missouri, a state committee instigated by the Federal commission has precisely located 44 of the 52 riverside campsites of the Corps of Discovery. Many of the campsites in North Dakota and Montana are under the waters of the Garrison and Fort Peck reservoirs.

SCHOLARSHIP AND SHOWBOATING

The Commission's Congressional mandate is to "advance public awareness" of the explorers' feats. The job is being done with a curious blend of historical scholarship and promotional showboating. The group decided Capt. Clark's talent for getting along with Indian tribes had been unappreciated; to redress the oversight, it ceremoniously presented a plaque honoring Clark to tribes at the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota last year. Chairman Fisher rightfully is indignant about an old Fred MacMurray movie portraying pitched battles between the expedition and the redskins. A small party led by Lewis got into a scrape with some Blackfeet in the Montana grasslands and one brave was stabbed to death, but Indians elsewhere along the route provided food and horses. The corps lost only one man, who died of appendicitis. The only serious casualty was Lewis himself, shot accidentally in the rump by a hunting companion.

The trail commission is composed of governors or their aides, Members of Congress, officials of Federal agencies and representatives of a private conservation foundation. Chairman Fisher says the group acts as a "catalyst" to get recreational areas built along the trail, for example, and to persuade state highway departments to cooperate in route-marking.

Despite the commission's clout not all of its projects succeed. It wanted to change the name of Lemhi Pass, on the Montana-Idaho border not far from the spot where Capt. Lewis watched Hugh McNeal straddle the Missouri. The new name, logically enough, would be Lewis and Clark Pass. A complication: There already is a Lewis and Clark Pass in Montana. The commission proposed condensing this name to Lewis Pass and renaming Gibbons Pass in Montana as Clark Pass, thus honoring the captains both together and individually. The Federal Board on Geographic Names, which is in charge of such things, rejected the idea.

HIGH PRAISE AND CRITICISM

This commission has received high praise for coordinating more park-building along the trail and stirring historical interest in the expedition. But it also has been criticized for trying to expand into the roadbuilding business, and for succumbing to crassly commercial tourist promotion. Chairman Fisher wants Congress to authorize a Transportation Department study of building a "continuous Lewis and Clark Trail Highway" because existing roads in several places are distant from the trail. "How the hell is anybody going to enjoy these wilderness areas if you can't get people there so they can look?" he asks.

Roadside businesses have a legitimate interest in luring tourists to Lewis and Clark landmarks, but commercial pressures on the commission and on state highway officials can produce sloppy history and outright confusion for travelers. In Montana, business

groups along U.S. Route 2 and State Route 200 succeeded in getting the official trail markers installed on both highways—each on its own side of the Missouri and, in places, as much as 50 miles from the water.

So commerce joins history in generating strong local pressures along the trail route for extension of the commission's life. In Clatsop County, Ore., on the Pacific Coast, where the expedition spent the winter of 1805-1806, appeals have been voiced by the Astoria Chamber of Commerce, the county commissioners and the county historical society. Idaho's Republican Sen. Len Jordan has expressed reluctance to extend the commission's life, but he's getting heat from home.

Chairman Fisher has a strong ally in Democratic Sen. Quentin Burdick of North Dakota, who is sponsoring a bill to keep the commission in business. But its prospects have been jolted by the defection of GOP Rep. John Kyl of Iowa, member of the commission and an original sponsor of the 1964 bill that created it. Mr. Kyl, who suspects the commission's roadbuilding ambitions were getting it off the track anyway, wants the Lewis and Clark promotion job handed over this year to a private association. In a letter to Interior Secretary Walter Hickel, Mr. Kyl said the Washington habit of extending "temporary" commissions forever makes them the target of jokes and brings "disfavor to worthy enterprises."

His recommendation to let the commission die on schedule in October is expected to carry heavy weight with the Nixon Administration, which thinks there's already a surplus of such commissions. A final decision hasn't been made, but "there'll be a great deal of reluctance to continue a project such as this," says a White House staffer.

The original attempt by Congress to preserve the spirit of a great adventure was a legitimate national enterprise. And in the main, the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission is credited with doing a good job, at little cost. In trying to decide whether to write its final report and quit, the commission could well follow the example of Lewis and Clark themselves—who knew when to stop. "A fine morning," noted Capt. Clark at journey's end in St. Louis. "We commenced wrighting &c."

CONGRESSMAN PETTIS' SPEECH IN SAN FRANCISCO

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in this highly technological age, I am pleased that a man of the caliber of the Honorable JERRY L. PETTIS represented the Science and Astronautics Committee at the 28th annual conference of the Society of Aeronautical Weight Engineers in San Francisco yesterday. Mr. Pettis was the keynote speaker for that conference with the topic, "Program Initiation Philosophy." We are fortunate that a man of his broad experience in scientifically oriented business, and one who has become well acquainted with the scientific and technological programs which have come before our committee, was available to represent the committee and this body at that important gathering.

I commend my colleague and fellow Californian for taking the time to make this appearance in San Francisco on our behalf.

RESULTS OF THE MINSHALL
OPINION POLL

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to insert in the RECORD a copy of my May Washington Report in which are given the results of my recent opinion poll, a copy of which was sent to every home in the 23d Congressional District.

WASHINGTON REPORT: MAY, 1969

Results of the 1969 Minshall opinion poll reveal that the more than 25,000 people who returned their questionnaires were almost evenly divided over the controversial ABM . . . overwhelmingly in favor of a national popular vote and suspending federal funds to colleges which tolerate continued flagrant disorders . . . strongly opposed to the SST, 10% surtax and guaranteed annual incomes . . . Law and order—in all phases including civil strife—head the list of problems facing the nation, according to nearly a third of those polled. Taxes and inflation rank second, the war in Vietnam third . . . Percentage of returns this year reached an all-time high: I welcome this enthusiastic response and only regret that time and staff limitations prevent my personally answering each of you who added comments to your return. All were read with great interest. Results of the poll follow:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you favor 1 year of compulsory training for all young men?	67.7	30.4	1.9
2. Do you approve of the proposed limited antiballistic missile system?	45.4	45.2	9.4
3. Does the U.S. space program justify its cost?	43.9	50.8	5.3
4. Should the voting age be lowered to 19?	43.7	54.6	1.7
5. In cases of continued flagrant campus disorder, should Federal funds for the college involved be suspended until order is restored?	78.6	18.8	2.6
6. Should the electoral college be replaced by a national popular vote for the Presidency?	86.0	11.9	2.1
7. Do you favor financing the research and development of a supersonic transport aircraft at an estimated Government cost of approximately \$1,500,000,000?	20.6	76.5	2.9
8. Are you in favor of continuing the 10 percent income surtax?	20.3	77.4	2.3
9. Should the Government subsidize a guaranteed annual income?	15.5	81.1	3.4
10. Do you think the Nixon administration has made a good start?	63.0	26.5	10.5
11. If the Paris peace talks do not succeed in ending the war in Vietnam, what alternative would you suggest?			
	Percent		
Escalate the war and win	30.0		
Get U.S. troops out of Vietnam now	27.6		
Phase out, turn war over to the South Vietnamese	14.4		
"Win or get out"	8.6		
Negotiate elsewhere or call in U.N.	3.9		
Miscellaneous suggestions	4.3		
No opinion	11.2		
12. What do you think is the principal problem facing the Nation today?			
	Percent		
Law and order	30.9		
Taxes and inflation	23.1		
Vietnam	13.7		
Race relations	9.4		
Big Government/excessive Federal spending	6.1		

	Percent
Poverty	3.2
Communism in the United States	2.2
U.S. Supreme Court decisions	1.0
Miscellaneous	5.3
No opinion	5.1

THE NAVY WAY

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Navy, John H. Chafee, yesterday announced that he has overruled a board of inquiry recommendation seeking a court martial for Comdr. Lloyd M. Bucher, captain of the *Pueblo*. The Secretary's decision, I think, is eminently just.

Secretary Chafee pointed out that the entire Navy—the chain of command stretching all the way from the Pacific to Washington—shares responsibility for this incident. Circumstances that the Navy's high command did not anticipate thrust Commander Bucher into this cruel dilemma: surrender his ship, or sacrifice the lives of his men. Commander Bucher, I feel, made the wise and humane choice. Armed with only a few small machine-guns, surrounded by a veritable flotilla of North Korean speedboats bristling with armament, Commander Bucher realized that to resist would be to invite certain disaster. It seems plain, too, that armed resistance would have given the *Pueblo's* crew even less time to destroy classified documents and devices.

The officers chiefly responsible for this task—Lt. Stephen R. Harris and Lt. Edward R. Murphy, Jr.—have also been exonerated from the board of inquiry's allegations. Caught up in the chaos of a sudden armed attack, lacking adequate equipment for the destruction of secret material, unaware whether the North Koreans meant to seize their ship or merely harass it, these two men reacted predictably under the circumstances. It is easy—after months of pondering their plight and analyzing their options—to second guess Harris and Murphy. It is far less easy to carry out, in the midst of battle, a mission made virtually impossible by the Navy's lack of foresight.

If anyone is responsible for the *Pueblo's* seizure, it is the Navy's high command itself. The Navy failed to equip the *Pueblo* adequately, failed to brief her officers on the latest relevant intelligence reports, failed to prepare defense plans in the event of an enemy attack.

Yet the board of inquiry placed little emphasis on the Navy's failures, preferring to level charges at the victims of these failures. I am delighted that Secretary Chafee has ruled against the board's recommendations. I am delighted, too, that Defense Secretary Melvin Laird has made assurances that the records of the *Pueblo's* officers will not be blemished by this incident.

With permission, Mr. Speaker, I put in the RECORD at this point a Washington Post editorial dealing with the *Pueblo* incident:

[From the Washington Post, May 7, 1969]

THE NAVY WAY

It figured that the Naval Court of Inquiry into the *Pueblo* case would render a stern and starchy judgment, recommending court-martials for the two principal officers-in-charge on the ship, and reprimands or admonitions for failures of one sort or another on the part of three other officers intimately involved in the affair. Orders must be obeyed and ancient traditions served for the sake of military discipline. And it also figured as the case moved up for review, first by the Commander in Chief, Pacific, and then the Chief of Naval Operations, and finally the Secretary of the Navy, that justice would be tempered by compassion and a keen awareness that there was blame enough to spread rather liberally up through the higher echelons to the top men of the service.

This is the Navy way, or more correctly the military way, and it is understandable, as far as it goes. Down the line there is morale to think about; and at the top there is an instinct for self-preservation that is by no means unique among military men.

So there would be much to be said for forgetting this whole unhappy affair were it not for the fact that its ending somehow doesn't satisfy. "I make no judgment regarding the guilt or innocence of any of the officers of the offenses alleged against them," Secretary Chafee was careful to say, in setting aside the court's recommendations—and there is something to his argument that, if punishment were indicated, the three who were actually captured by the North Koreans have suffered punishment enough. The fact remains, however, that a cloud of sorts has been cast over them and not dispelled; the real test of the Navy's compassion will therefore come in the effect this cloud will have on their careers.

Secretary Chafee is a good deal less persuasive in his argument that the two other officers—and by implication, even more senior officers who had a hand in this the *Pueblo* mission—should not be punished because their "failure to anticipate the emergency that subsequently developed" resulted from the "sudden collapse of a premise which had been assumed at every level of responsibility and upon which every other aspect of the mission had been based—freedom of the seas."

If this was in fact the premise upon which the whole project was based, it is hard to see how the Court of Inquiry could then have found any grounds for recommending a letter of reprimand against Rear Admiral Johnson, for "failing to plan properly for effective emergency support forces for contingencies . . . and negligently failing to verify effectively the feasibility of rapid emergency destruction of classified equipment and documents . . ." Apparently there was some planning for the worst, some consideration that "freedom of the seas" was not protection enough; it just wasn't done properly.

Secretary Chafee put it rather well. The charge of failure to anticipate the emergency, he said, "could be levelled in various degrees at responsible superior authorities in the chain of command and control and in the collateral support structure." And he added: "The consequences must in fairness be borne by all, rather than by one or two individuals whom circumstances had placed closer to the crucial event."

Amen, Mr. Secretary. But is that an argument for letting the matter drop? There obviously is more here than has met the public eye—more about how these missions are cooked up, how they are reviewed by higher authority, how the risks are weighed, and what has been done to improve the odds that this sort of thing doesn't happen again. We are told by Mr. Chafee that "a variety of corrective actions have flowed and will flow"

from the Pueblo incident. But we aren't told what they are and it is not all that easy, any more, to take these things on faith. Perhaps Congress can elicit more light. Perhaps the Defense Department will, on its own accord. The one interest that hasn't yet been adequately served in the Pueblo affair is the right of an uneasy public, long since grown skeptical, to know.

SMOTHERED BROTHERS

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on April 8 I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter which I sent to Dr. Frank Stanton of the CBS network registering my objections to the dismissal of the Smothers Brothers by CBS. I should like at this point to place in the RECORD his reply:

COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC.,
New York, N.Y., April 16, 1969.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: By your letter of April 8 concerning the cancellation of the "Smothers Brothers Comedy Hour": you accuse CBS Television Network "censors" of having "little respect for the intelligence of the 33 million Americans who regularly enjoy these talented and irreverent entertainers" and you charge "that a few cautious and humorless men can decide what political or religious satire can be televised on air waves that belong to the American people in the first place."

The action of the CBS Television Network was taken precisely because of its obligation to the public—not despite that obligation. The central issue involved here is whether a broadcast organization has a responsibility to the public with respect to questions of taste and, if so, whether it is entitled to establish reasonable procedures in order to exercise that responsibility. The Smothers Brothers made it abundantly clear that they were unwilling to accept the criteria established by the Network. Moreover, they failed to observe their contractual obligation to deliver tapes of their programs in time for review by the Network and for preview by closed circuit to stations affiliated with the Network.

In the larger question of taste, we recognize that there are no simple, across-the-board standards that will be appropriate to all audiences or all times. What is in good taste for one individual may offend another. And certainly of all art forms, topical satire and parody are the most difficult to assess. At the same time there is also the problem of reconciling two distinct responsibilities. On the one hand, we have an obligation to the ideals and purposes of creative art, and we try to do everything we can to expand creative freedom and encourage artistic expression. On the other, we have an obligation to the audience—and to its sense of decency, propriety and morality.

In your letter you seem to suggest that we should eliminate all standards of taste, and let the viewers fend for themselves. As a mass medium that seeks to inform and entertain, television must maintain standards, as must other mass media. Standards of taste are basic to any civilized society, and it is the main function of the mass media to reflect those standards. If television were to eliminate such standards, I suspect that you—as a public official and a concerned citizen—would be among the first to deplore broadcasts you found offensive.

An editorial in the current *TV Guide* (copy enclosed) puts it this way—"The issue is: Shall entertainers using a mass medium for all the people be allowed to amuse a few by satirizing religion while offending the substantial majority? The issue is: Shall a network be required to provide time for a Joan Baez to pay tribute to her draft-evading husband while hundreds of thousands of viewers in the households of men fighting and dying in Viet Nam look on in shocked resentment? . . . For all the Smothers Brothers' pseudo-intellectualism, it seems doubtful that they have encountered George Bernard Shaw's statement that 'Liberty means responsibility.'"

At CBS we try to be constantly aware of that responsibility. And the vast majority of the public, I am certain, would have it no other way. The CBS Television Network affiliates—who, under the law, must bear the ultimate responsibility for what they broadcast in their communities and surrounding areas—have endorsed the Network's cancellation of the "Smothers Brothers Comedy Hour."

In light of these considerations, I trust you will understand my dismay at your letter.

Sincerely,

DR. FRANK STANTON.

EUGENE TIMOTHY KINNALLY

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 6, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it was less than 10 months ago that we gathered in the House on a very happy occasion. We were honoring a great and noble American and a very dear friend on his 50th anniversary as a congressional aide in the House of Representatives. We were joyous in our tributes to Eugene Kinnally and were happy to have the opportunity to honor him.

Today we join once again to pay tribute to Eugene Kinnally, but this time in great sorrow for he has left us. I am doubly glad today that we did pay tribute to Eugene Kinnally on July 18 of last year, for all too often it is only after death that appropriate tribute is made to great men and great friends. We were fortunate to have known Eugene Kinnally and it was our fortune to be able to honor him while he lived.

For more than 50 years this exceptionally good and kind man served as the confidant of legislators and administrators. For 50 years he was a behind-the-scenes technician of legislation. For 50 years he was a dedicated public servant. But more than that, Mr. Speaker, he was a loyal, able, and devoted friend. He was a man of great responsibilities who never tired. He was a man of tremendous tasks whose energy never diminished. He never sought the fame and praise that was due him. His only goal was to serve the Speaker, the Commonwealth, and the Nation. This he always did, and he did it with such great knowledge and ability that all who came near him benefited from his assistance, his intelligent advice, and his great kindness.

He had a multitude of duties that covered the entire range of our beloved Speaker's endeavors, but throughout his

hectic day he was never too busy to take time to give someone a reassuring smile or a kind, encouraging word. He was a patient listener who always gave sound and thoughtful counsel to those who sought it. He was loved on Capitol Hill as he was loved in his home city of Boston. He was respected not only for his great ability but also for his magnificent virtue, for he was one of the most charitable and religious men I have ever encountered. He was considered a living saint by his friends and relatives and this was entirely justified for he had none of the vices and all of the virtues.

Ralph Waldo Emerson said that virtue was its own reward. This must be true, for Eugene Kinnally sought no other and his goodness was increased by the good he did for others. Emerson also said that the only way to have a friend is to be one, and Eugene Kinnally had so many friends because he had befriended all he encountered.

I mourn his passing and I grieve at our loss. I will miss his great warmth and understanding, his sincere friendship, and his kind and noble character. I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his family and to our beloved Speaker and also to us, for we have all lost a dear and trusted friend. May God be with his family in their time of sorrow.

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE TAX AID TO SERVICEMEN IN KOREA

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to join my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. WOLFF) in sponsoring legislation to provide American servicemen in Korea with the same tax benefits enjoyed by servicemen in Vietnam.

Our enlisted men in Vietnam are currently entitled to exclude all income received for services performed in and around that country in computing their taxes. Officers are permitted to exclude up to \$500 per month from their gross income when tabulating their tax returns. This exemption also applies to income received by a serviceman while hospitalized as a result of injuries received in a combat zone. As my colleagues are aware, the Vietnam area is presently the only area designated as a combat zone.

Our American soldiers serving in Southeast Asia are highly deserving of these tax benefits for their hazardous duty but the distressing fact is that such severe hostilities are no longer confined to Vietnam. The capture of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and the recent fatal attack on an American EC-121 by the North Koreans are strong indications of the growing perils faced by our servicemen stationed in and around Korea.

Here in the House we will shortly be considering legislation that exempts from taxable income, the salaries received by the *Pueblo* crew during their

imprisonment. Hazardous duty should be appropriately recognized by us here at home. It is only fitting that we acknowledge our soldiers in Korea by according them the same tax benefits as their compatriots in Vietnam.

MR. WALTER J. SCHUCHMANN TELLS STORY OF FORT BEN HARRISON, IND.: "HOME OF THE ARMY DOLLAR"

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the May 1969 issue of Army Digest contains an interesting and informative article on the U.S. Army's Finance Center, at Fort Benjamin Harrison, in Indianapolis, by one who certainly knows what he is writing about: Mr. Walter Schuchmann, one of the finance center's top civilian officials.

The article follows:

HOME OF THE ARMY DOLLAR

(By Walter Schuchmann, Finance Center, U.S. Army)

Imagine all the privates and generals and noncommissioned officers of the Army—about 1½ million men and women—cramped into a room the size of a football stadium.

Officers, recruits, nurses, WACs, career men and "short-timers"—all are represented in row after row of file cabinets of pay and allotment records in the Division of Military Pay Operations at the Finance Center, U.S. Army (FCUSA), Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana. In the computer tape library of the Data Processing Operations vault, additional records of all ranks, from Private to general, are stored compactly on magnetic tape.

An organization unique among the varied units that comprise the modern U.S. Army, the Center regularly touches every man and every woman in uniform—and most families too—in a very personal way. Its operation is virtually taken for granted by everyone—so long as pay and allotments show no mistake.

Now in its 16th year of service, the Finance Center is the Army's largest building. Three stories high, and measuring 996 by 612 feet, the FCUSA is not as big as The Pentagon, of course—but that structure gave up its Army identity over two decades ago to accommodate the senior staffs of the Defense and Military Departments.

The Hoosier "Pentagon of the Prairies" cost \$19 million to build, but paid for itself through economies realized in centralizing financial operations under one roof. Back in 1953-54, there were nearly 6,000 on the staffs in St. Louis, Washington, Chicago and elsewhere. Today, commanded by BG Ralph J. Richards, Jr., the FCUSA staff is somewhat under 4,000.

The FCUSA workforce is mainly Civil Service; only 70 military personnel are on duty. Employees—80 percent of them women—operate business machines, or work as allotment clerks, military pay clerks, and claims and voucher examiners. Others are file clerks, typists, computer programmers, management analysts, personnel technicians, secretaries.

Staff members recognize the importance of timeliness and accuracy of pay as a factor affecting morale. Every effort is made to provide allotment and pay checks "right on schedule."

ALLOTMENTS

The FCUSA Allotments, Deposits and Centralized Pay Operations administers over 2.5 million allotments. Included are 225,000 class O allotments to dependents. More than a million are class E allotments for family support or payable to financial institutions and commercial insurance companies.

Indicative of the importance of promptly reporting address changes, an average of 25,000 checks and U.S. Savings Bonds are returned monthly to FCUSA because of delayed notification of changes of address.

Savings administration includes record-keeping, interest computation and repayment of savings deposits. Under a law applicable to military personnel only, members stationed outside the United States are eligible for 10 per cent interest compounded quarterly on money set aside from their pay. Deposits may be made monthly by class S allotment, or in cash. And for members buying savings bonds by allotment, FCUSA will provide "safekeeping" upon request; the bonds are held in secure vaults until the member wishes to receive them.

"Miles of files" contain financial histories of active Army members and those separated in recent years. Frequent searches are made in these records to answer inquiries from members, dependents and field offices; to validate pay adjustments; and settle claims.

After members are paid, original pay vouchers are forwarded to the Center from field Finance and Accounting Offices (F&AOs). Data from these vouchers are then reported to Social Security Administration on a quarterly basis, and to the Department of the Army budget staff. The Center double-checks by comparing voucher allotment deduction data with allotments that the Center has paid.

Punch card accounting machines and automatic data processing systems facilitate processing this tremendous quantity of information. The pay vouchers are filed in the "pay jacket" maintained for each person in active service. Experienced examiners review these files for propriety and accuracy of recorded payments.

AUTOMATED PROCEDURES

Since 1965 the Army has employed centralized automated pay procedures at selected stations, initially on a test basis, and currently for regular service to over 100,000 members.

Members alerted for the 1st Cavalry Division (Airmobile) in Vietnam or assigned to one of nine stations within Continental U.S. and Europe can anticipate a change in their monthly pay procedures. It is possible for these members to receive pay twice monthly under this system, a forerunner to JUMPS (Joint Uniform Military Pay System) prescribed for all services. A master pay file is maintained in the FCUSA Data Processing Operations on computer tape; field stations submit notices of pay changes; and calculations are made with electronic speed and precision. The computers cause pay vouchers and checks to be printed; and checks are mailed to the soldier directly or to a person or financial institution designated by him.

Work is now underway to provide additional space for new computers needed for record-keeping and reporting when the entire U.S. Army is paid under JUMPS.

Many Army members continue receiving service from FCUSA after they retire. Over 260,000 pay checks are dispatched with clock-like regularity to Army retirees each month.

ASN TO SSAN

Soon to affect every Army person and family is the conversion from the Army Service Number to the Social Security Account Number (SSAN) as the numerical identifier in Army records. FCUSA for more than a year has associated SSANs with individual financial records at the Center. Every financial

form, letter of inquiry and reference in correspondence to an Army member should include this vital nine-digit number. Requested actions on allotments, pay claims and records may be delayed for lack of SSAN identification.

FCUSA Settlements Operations processes claims for pay and allowances that separated members did not receive while on active duty. Payments due on deceased members' accounts also are given priority attention. Travel allowances upon retirement and other reimbursements are processed. Amounts due the United States, not liquidated during active service, are collected from former members.

Among other functions, FCUSA pays common carriers' bill for transportation of materiel and military passengers. The Center settles obligations for transportation by the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the entire Air Force and Army. Expenditures in this area alone average more than \$4.5 million each work day.

Last year the "Home of the Army Dollar" disbursed a total of \$4.6 billion in checks for allotments, transportation, pay, claims, withheld tax and other items. That's about \$145 every second, 24 hours a day, 365 days of the year. Placed end to end, one month's checks and bonds would reach from Fort Benjamin Harrison to Fort Knox, Kentucky, and fifty miles beyond.

But while activities of the Center are Big Business, it's still a personal business. The entire staff senses the importance of each soldier's allotments, to him and those depending on him. All are keenly aware that Army Finance Center stands for service that is Accurate—Fast—Courteous.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HARRY SHEPPARD

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues from California in expressing sentiments appropriate to the sad occasion of the passing of Harry Sheppard. All of us feel a sense of void when there is taken from life's scene one who has shared our work and joined us in fellowship. When such a one is taken it turns us with nostalgia to the past and with sobriety to our own future.

Harry had a colorful, a productive, and a full life. Little did I personally realize when in the 1940's I was privileged to be one of Congressman Sheppard's admiring constituents that I would one day be privileged to serve in the Congress from a new district created out of a part of his original territory. I appreciated Harry for his no-nonsense, pragmatic approach to his job. He had little patience with undue ceremony and he even invented language on occasion to be more direct and descriptive.

His State and his district have ample testimony of his ability to deliver what he considered their rightful share of the country's facilities and activities. Installations are in evidence in substantial numbers to demonstrate Harry Sheppard recognized and served the interests of his State and his constituency. This is not to say, however, that his service in any way neglected concern for his

country. Members from every section of our great Nation found in his office an understanding and a cooperation well remembered and fondly recalled.

There have been many kinds of men called to the halls of Congress, most with qualities that set them apart in the eyes and in the judgment of their fellow citizens. None were more imbued with a uniqueness of character and an independence of spirit than was Harry Shepard. We will miss him in this life as we have missed his passing from the service of this House. Our best wishes and kindest condolences go to his widow and to his family.

AN AMERICAN

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Calumet Index, a community publication serving the far South Side of Chicago and adjacent suburbs, carried an interesting editorial in its Wednesday, April 30 edition. There is quite a bit of homespun humor, truth, and facetiousness contained in the article which follows:

AN AMERICAN IS A MAN WHO—

Yells for the government to balance the budget and then takes the last dime to make the down payment on a car.

Whips the enemy nations and then gives 'em the shirt off his back.

Yells for speed laws that will stop fast driving and then won't buy a car if it can't make 100 miles per hour.

Knows the lineup of every baseball team in the American and National League . . . and doesn't know half the words in "The Star Spangled Banner."

An American will get mad at his wife for not running their home with the efficiency of a hotel, and he'll get mad at the hotel for not operating like a home.

He'll spend half a day looking for vitamin pills to make him live longer and then drive 90 miles an hour on slick pavement to make up the time he lost.

An American is a man who will fall out with his wife over cooking and then go on a fishing trip and swallow half-fried potatoes, burned fish, and gritty creek water coffee made in a rusty gallon bucket and think it's good.

An American will work hard on a farm so he can move into town where he can make money so he can move back to the farm.

When an American is at work, he talks about baseball, football, or fishing, but when he is out at the games or on the creek bank, he talks about his work.

He is the only fellow in the world who will pay 50 cents to park his car while he eats a 25 cent sandwich.

An American likes to cuss his Government but gets fighting mad if a foreigner does it.

He is never ready for war but he has never lost one.

We're the country that has more food to eat than any other country in the world and more diets to keep us from eating it.

But we're still pretty nice folks. Calling a person "a real American" is the best compliment you can pay him. Most of the world is itching for what we have, but they'll never have it until they start scratching for it the way we do.

FREEMAN'S LEGACY TO SOYBEAN FARMERS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the grim legacy left by former Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, in respect to soybean producers was graphically described in the May issue of Farm Journal in an editorial entitled "How Not To Help Farmers."

Here is the text of the editorial:

How Not To "HELP" FARMERS

For a short lesson on how a healthy farm commodity can get in trouble, there's nothing better than the modern saga of what's happening to soybeans. Other farm commodities can take heed.

For 30 years prior to 1961, soybeans went merrily along their way—building new markets at home and abroad while expanding acreage remarkably, not depending on price supports, and keeping out of trouble. A miracle crop, they called it. And it was.

For the 10 years between 1950 and 1960, farmers averaged \$2.32 per bushel for their soybeans, and the price cleared supplies out of the market. When Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman and his economist Willard Cochrane arrived in Washington in early 1961, the first thing they did was hike soybean supports from \$1.85 to \$2.30. They said there was a world shortage of oil and that we needed more soybeans.

Instead of U.S. and foreign demand deciding what soybeans we could use, thus guiding production, Messrs. Freeman and Cochrane would decide. Lesson No. 1: It is a common failing of well-meaning bureaucratic planners that they think they are smarter than the judgment of millions of users and growers of a commodity.

Spurred by the increase in supports to \$2.30, soybean plantings soared 3.3 million acres in 1961—but farm prices went below the support level. That year we "gave away" more soybean oil overseas than we could sell.

The next year, 1962, the Administration dropped soybean supports a nickel to \$2.25. Plantings increased only 600,000 acres. Average farm prices once again climbed above supports. Fortunately, the expanding market for soybeans kept market prices above supports for the next four years. Supports were \$2.25, and average farm prices ranged from \$2.34 to \$2.62. Lesson No. 2: Reasonable price supports at a stop-loss level can give protection and let markets operate.

Then came 1966, a Congressional election year. Since soybean prices had averaged \$2.54 the year before, Freeman thought that he could make political points by raising supports to \$2.50. Lesson No. 3: As so often happens, partisan politics get in the way of sound economics.

The response to the \$2.50 supports in 1966 was quick: Acreage, production and the carry-over all climbed to record highs. Export growth slowed noticeably. The warning flags were up, but Freeman kept supports at \$2.50 in 1967. The carry-over mounted nearly twice as high as before. The market used fewer soybeans than the previous year. Export gains slowed more. The Russians, no fools, began grabbing our export oil market with sunflower oil. At home, the use of urea feed mixtures rose dramatically, as the price spread favoring urea widened to the highest in history. Lesson No. 4: Supports can't make a market for a product, but they can certainly ruin it.

Meantime, the \$2.50 guarantee brought in new crop land, particularly in the South where enterprising producers cleared forest land and drained swamps to get in on the \$2.50 guaranteed price. Lesson No. 5: A guaranteed price, a sure thing, encourages more production than an open-market freely moving price—even if the free market price is higher.

Along with it all, the Government's cotton program had gotten into trouble much the same way. It was losing markets for export cotton—and losing sales to synthetics at home. The tight squeeze on cotton allotments pushed Southern farmers into soybeans. In the last 10 years, 13 states doubled their soybean acreage—and 11 of them are in the South and Southwest. The other two are in states where wheat allotments were cut. Lesson No. 6: Government supply controls on one commodity force acreage into other commodities, bringing them trouble.

The facts fairly shouted at Freeman last year to drop supports before he ruined soybeans. But it was a Presidential election year. Lesson No. 7: It's always harder to undo a political action than it is to do it.

Now with soybean surpluses headed for 315 million bushels, the planners and controllers are beating the drums for acreage controls on soybeans. "It's the only way out," they say. Little do they see that it was their own medicine that brought on the sickness. Lesson No. 8: If soybeans have to swallow acreage controls as their next "treatment," this crop may soon find itself fighting for its life to remain a major American farm product.

NATIONAL SOCIALISM ADVANCES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Supreme Court by its anticonstitutional edict aborting all State residency requirements for welfare recipients has set the pattern for national socialism—a national welfare program with uniform welfare checks.

The Court's decision can be expected to swell indigent populations in Hawaii, California, and Florida, creating unprecedented problems. The uncalculated consequences of the Court's ruling can be but that in aggravating a problem it provides no dictum for State elected officials to solve the coming crisis; namely, where does the money come from? Which States and what taxpayers will bear the burden?

The only conceivable solution can be for centralized control and payment—direct Federal disbursements, which must have been considered as the goal in the Court's decision.

Once a Federal welfare program is foisted upon the people as a solution it is certain to be followed by a campaign for the abolition of any residence requirements by the States for voter eligibility.

The dangers of creating a "nationally registered voter"—one who can vote wherever he shows up—can be logically anticipated. National socialism could successfully shift to target areas hordes of indigents—voters registered at large

and entitled to immediate welfare doles—to control elections.

In some States we already find laws which permit nonresident voters to vote in Presidential elections.

I include several news clippings in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 27, 1969]

WEALTHIER STATES FEAR WELFARE INFLUX
(By Jean M. White)

The big question left in the wake of the Supreme Court decision knocking down welfare residency requirements is just who will pay the extra \$125 million to \$175 million a year in relief costs around the Nation.

State and local officials in some northern and western states are complaining that they could go bankrupt if the decision spurs a migration of the poor in search of higher welfare benefits.

On the Hill one Senator quickly introduced a bill to require the Federal Government to pick up the tab for benefits paid to persons ineligible under a state's residency laws.

Recalling the slogan "go West, young man," a California Senator commented acidly: "The Supreme Court might as well hang that sign on the front of welfare offices of every state with benefits lower than the ones in mine."

The response was more temperate in other quarters. The U.S. Conference of Mayors said it agreed with HEW Secretary Robert H. Finch's observation that the ruling will lead to minimum Federal welfare standards.

The National League of Cities has called for abolition of the welfare residency requirements and tied this closely with the need for national welfare minimums.

One thing the Supreme Court's decision has done is focus attention again on the confusion and inequities of the Nation's patchwork welfare system.

Benefits for a dependent child now range from \$8.50 a month in Mississippi to \$67.85 in Massachusetts and \$64.75 in New York State.

Without residency rules—in force in 40 states until the Supreme Court ruling—the higher-paying states have feared that poor migrants would shop around to seek out places with the best benefits. The Court said needy persons should have the right to move as freely as anyone else.

HEW estimates that somewhere between 100,000 and 200,000 persons across the country now will be eligible for relief payments denied them under residency requirements.

Cited figures show that 3000 to 4000 additional persons have been added to California's relief rolls each month since its residency rule was suspended by a Federal court order. The cost to the state, he said, comes to an extra \$26 million this fiscal year.

And another Senator foresees a kind of poor jet set coming into resort states to escape the colder climate of the North.

A Federal floor on welfare payments would not wipe out inequities between states. The talk has been of a Federal minimum of \$25 to \$40 for a dependent child. States like New York and Massachusetts are well above that now.

But such a minimum would mean a greater Federal contribution for states with the higher benefits. The Federal share of Mississippi's \$8.50 child payment is now 83 per cent. New York gets only \$22 for the \$64.75 that it pays.

[From the Washington Post, May 4, 1969]

THE 1970'S WAVE OF NEGRO TEENAGERS TO AFFECT POLICIES
(By Jean M. White)

The prospect of a "demographic siege" of young Negroes in the troubled years of the teens is being studied by Nixon Administra-

tion advisers shaping social policies for the 1970s.

Population statistics show a striking bulge of Negro youngsters now in the 5-to-9 age group, up nearly 25 per cent over the last decade.

Over the next ten years, these youngsters will come into their teens—an age group with problems that can create social turbulence. It is the age now when young people begin to drop out of school, take drugs, have illegitimate children, raise crime rates, look for jobs, strike out in bitter alienation.

Figures on population and changing age structure can have far-reaching implications for public policy. Businessmen use marketing research to decide on future growth. Government social planners can use vital statistics to look for "markets" for the most effective use of social programs.

The statistics pointing to a new wave of Negro teen-agers in a few years are being considered by Nixon Administration advisers as they make decisions on such public policies as income maintenance, job training, education, and health and welfare services.

HOPEFUL NOTE

"It is not that many people if we do it right," says one White House adviser. "If we don't we could be in for troubled times in the seventies."

One hopeful note—but still too fragile to hang a trend on—is an indication of a leveling off of the number of Negroes in the under-5 age group.

By 1980, the worst could be over, and social programs geared up for an abnormal situation could taper off. This offers an argument for selling stepped-up programs on a one-shot basis—a much more palatable package to offer in a time when people talk about rising welfare rolls.

The population figures now being studied at the White House include these:

The number of non-white children (Negroes make up over 90 per cent of this category) in the ages between 5 and 9 will be 3,269,000 by 1970.

This compares with 2,625,000 in 1960, up 24.5 per cent—nearly four times the rate of increase for white children in this age bracket. Up until the mid-sixties, this age bracket for white children also rose, but not nearly as fast as that for non-whites. For whites, it peaked in 1966 and since has been tapering off.

In the under-5 age bracket, there were 3,222,000 nonwhite children in 1966 compared with 2,979,000 in 1960, an increase of 11.5 per cent.

Projections based on the present birth rate point to a leveling off or slight drop by 1970. White children in the under-5 bracket dropped from 17,385,000 in 1960 to 16,629,000 in 1966.

Although birth rates for both Negroes and whites have been dropping since 1957—and now stand at a record low of 17.4—Negro women still have almost half again as many children as white women.

One of six babies born now is black where a few decades ago it was one in ten.

"ECHO EFFECT"

The fertility rate (the number of births per 1,000 women 15 to 44) is a much more significant indicator than the raw birth rate. In 1967, it was about 120 babies for Negro women and around 83 for white women.

A new wave of Negro and white females—the "echo effect" of the post-World War II baby boom—is now entering the fruitful child-bearing years.

White girls in the 15-19 age group increased 38.8 per cent in the 1960-70 decade. For non-whites, the increase has been even more striking—60.3 per cent.

In the 20-24 age groups, the numbers of both whites and non-whites rose about 54 per cent from 1960 to 1970.

Such figures could have a significant influence on Nixon Administration thinking on social planning. The President already has put the Administration's emphasis on the early childhood development years because of findings showing life-molding experiences in these years.

One point Nixon advisers make is that such statistics are "neutral."

Therefore, social programs can be discussed more in terms of numbers rather than race, they say.

Statistics can highlight a situation in stark and startling terms.

For instance, Negroes have to support a fourth again as many dependents with 59 per cent of the income of whites.

This is the fact that emerges from the dependency rate—or the ratio of "mouths to hands." This compares the number of dependents (those under 21 and those 65 or over) to the number in the productive years of life (21-64). The dependency rate for Negroes is 1.02. For whites it is .8.

Demographic projections can be notoriously wrong at times. But the big bulge of Negroes in the 5-to-9 age bracket comes from children born and now here.

SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL PARK

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, 8 years ago legislation was first introduced to establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, a proposed 61,000-acre national park on the eastern shores of Lake Michigan.

Since that time, the Senate Interior Committee has worked extensively on the bill, and the Senate has twice passed such legislation—in 1963 and 1966. Similar legislation was studied and reported by the House Interior Committee in 1966, but did not reach the floor of the House for final vote that year.

I should like to extend my congratulations to my distinguished colleague, Congressman JAMES O'HARA of Michigan, and to the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, the Honorable PHILIP HART, for their diligent efforts to conserve the acreage of this area through a proposed national park.

The Midwest has long been wanting for national park facilities. I believe this proposal, along with the successful completion of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore authorized by Congress in 1966, will fill the void of public recreation areas so desperately needed by the millions of people living in the urban-industrial complexes of the Great Lakes region of our country.

I insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Elkhart Truth, a leading newspaper of my district, in support of the Sleeping Bear Dunes Park proposal:

[From the Elkhart Truth, Apr. 15, 1969]

SLEEPING BEAR PARK JUST SLEEPS

Within easy driving distance of the Elkhart area is a Lake Michigan shoreline region of superb natural beauty.

A number of Elkhartans, we know, already

enjoy the Sleeping Bear Dunes west of Traverse City.

The surrounding area there is rich in geological phenomena and in potential water-based recreation land.

But the question is how much longer this area can be preserved.

The Michigan Natural Resources Commission was told last week that continued bickering with Michigan's congressional delegation has resulted in an impasse over proposed creation of Sleeping Bear Dunes National Park.

Sen. Philip Hart (D-Mich.) has been trying since 1961 to get this measure passed.

Involved in the dispute is a difference of opinion over how to protect private property in that area.

Certainly there should be reasonable protection of private property, such as the highly-developed resort areas on nearby inland lakes.

But that should not be allowed to delay indefinitely the acquisition of areas which properly should be designated for the general public.

Too often, procrastination has resulted in "missing the boat" in similar situations elsewhere. Either the land is used for other purposes or the cost becomes prohibitive.

In our own Indiana, the concern over preserving Lake Michigan shoreline was tardy. More of this area could have been saved for public use had the public demanded it before much of the area was developed and the land cost skyrocketed.

Along lengthy portions of this nation's Atlantic shoreline, one may drive many miles without being able to see anything but closely packed cottages and commercial development—nothing of the pristine beauty that greeted the explorers of yesteryear.

For the good not only of Michigan and Indiana, but of the entire Midwest as well, Sleeping Bear Dunes National Park should be established soon.

IMPORTATION AND EXPLOITATION

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, years ago I used the phrase, "Importation and Exploitation are the main ingredients of our trade policy."

This day I received an open letter from President Paul Jennings of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers. It contained the attached exposé of importation and exploitation by Jeff Miller. I present both the letter and the article for the information of the membership of Congress.

This union is prone to import damage because of the exploitation of foreign workers in many instances by runaway American corporations who are running away from U.S. wage levels and especially, the Fair Labor Standards Act.

As we enter this new session, a new FLSA is being studied by the committee I chair. It will pose new problems for the electrical workers as well as others whose jobs have been and are being taken by foreign low-waged workers producing for the U.S. market.

For over a decade, I have warned the Congress, the business community, and labor—both organized and unorganized—of the dangers present in our foreign trade policy.

President Jennings predecessor opposed my fight for reasonable job protection covenants in our trade policy. He was a doctrinaire freetrader and like most freetraders, believed that all trade was good regardless of the nature of the economy of the producing nation.

Long ago, I predicted the very situation covered in President Jennings letter and Jeff Miller's story on exploitation. I have learned a great deal more about this serious subject in my congressional studies in many of the competitive and exporting nations where wages were even lower than the examples given by Mr. Miller.

I have made personal investigations into the Mexican Pronef territory production. This area, set aside by Mexico along the Mexican bank of the Rio Grande and all of Baja California threatens the further growth of the electrical industry and the jobs of its workers.

I expect to go back with an official committee to investigate this serious challenge to U.S. jobs. This program is responsible for increasing electronic exports from Mexico to the United States from \$350,000 in 1965 to \$33 million in 1967. It is anybody's guess as to the volume in the next 5 years. It may then be too late to do anything about it. Let us do it now.

I find it hard to deny low-waged Americans reasonable and needed minimum wage increases just because our idiotic and self-defeating trade policies make it possible for U.S. industry to run away from our labor standards and still enjoy the privileges of our own domestic free marketplace.

Corporations are in existence to earn profits, but by the token, they have to have customers. Wages make customers. When a low-wage product is sold in a high-wage economy, the high-wage earner soon loses his job and another consumer is lost to both the high-wage economy and the low-wage economy of foreign workers.

The real problem, of course, stems from the fact that with our unemployment compensation, social security, direct relief, and dozens of other aid and grant programs, the market for low-waged imports can still prosper while more and more workers join the unemployed rolls.

Mr. Speaker, I fully intend to put new language into the Fair Labor Standards Act to try to cover runaway industries, and I intend to do it this year. It may not cure all our import problems, but if it saves one small plant that sustains even a small segment of our working people's jobs, it is worth the effort.

I pray every Member will take the time to read the attached letter and special report:

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL, RADIO, AND MACHINE WORKERS,

Washington, D.C., April 28, 1969.

To Members of Congress:

The accompanying article on the impact of imports in the electronics industry deals with a problem of serious concern to the American people.

The article is based on the findings of an inter-union mission to Asia which recently made an on-the-spot study of the imports

situation at its source. The mission reported that electronics corporations are flocking across the Pacific at the cost of U.S. (and Canadian) jobs, and this trend will accelerate unless positive action is taken.

What is happening is harmful to this country and to our members.

Many of you have endorsed the Truth in Import Labeling bills now before you. We appreciate this support and urge you to press for enactment.

It is vital, however, that direct action be taken, preferably in the form of voluntary, negotiated limits on exports by the countries involved.

As a first step, we urge that the appropriate committees of Congress hold hearings to give the public the facts and afford those concerned, including ourselves, an opportunity to express their views. We believe that a reading of the article will convince you that such hearings are needed and that action must grow out of them.

We would be happy to provide additional information and to discuss the problem with you. We solicit your reaction, and your most valued support.

Sincerely,

PAUL JENNINGS,
President.

IMPACT OF IMPORTS ON THE ELECTRONIC INDUSTRY

(By Jeff Miller)

Eleven cents an hour—15 cents including fringe benefits: This is the wage a Taiwanese worker can expect to earn in an American-owned electronics plant. Averaging 12½ to 19 cents per hour, assemblers do little better in Hong Kong, where General Electric, Sprague, Sylvania, Ampex, Fairchild and other U.S. companies have recently begun manufacturing electronic appliances and components for the American market.

Similar wage structures in other Far Eastern countries, guarantees against strikes, tax breaks and other incentives make the Orient look like a western corporate executive's blueprint for Utopia.

American plants in Hong Kong, Taiwan and South Korea turn out a growing percentage of the electronic products imported and sold in this country and Canada. Sizeable American investments and license agreements with Japanese companies send additional boatloads of foreign-made appliances over here to be marketed with domestic labels. Other imports are sold under Japanese names.

The response by American businessmen to the charms of the Far East is becoming ever more passionate. Imports of television sets, including those sold under U.S. brand names, increased nearly 37 percent last year, capturing 20 percent of the total consumer market. A similar situation exists in Canada, where 25 percent of the television market has already been lost to imports.

Half the radios marketed under American brands in 1968 were actually manufactured abroad, yet only about a third were foreign-made the year before. Imports of U.S.-brand phonographs have almost doubled in the last year while foreign-name imports declined about 15 percent. Plans of American companies indicate that practically all domestically-labeled tape recorders will soon be produced in other countries.

The flesh-and-blood result of the corporate shift to foreign production has been tragic in terms of the numbers of American workers laid off. In the U.S. radio and television receiving industry, including the related components industry, there was a loss of 48,000 jobs between 1966 and 1968. This was accompanied by a workweek decline of one hour, an additional 2½-percent total job loss.

The situation was dramatized recently by heavy employment cutbacks at plants where workers are represented by IUE. Nearly 2,000

production and maintenance employees at Westinghouse, Edison, N.J., lost their jobs over the past two years as a result of foreign imports. Approximately 600 members of the unit, represented by Local 401, received layoff notices last December when the company decided to shift television production to the Far East. From a peak of 2,300 members, the unit has dropped to a level of about 400, and President James Aurelio expects additional layoffs in the future.

Hundreds of Local 101 members in Philadelphia lost their jobs last year when Philco-Ford began farming out component work to one of its subsidiaries in Taiwan and importing wholly Japanese-made color television sets under its own brand name. Local President Joe Burns blames foreign importation for gradually reducing the Philco-Ford work force from 9,000 to 2,100 during the past ten years.

IUEers at Singer Sewing Machine, General Instrument, Emerson Radio and Television, Warwick, Muntz, Honeywell, Globe Union and many other companies have also suffered because of foreign low-wage competition. The IUE Research Department is currently analyzing the results of a survey to determine the exact extent of the situation.

PRESENT AND POTENTIAL JOBS THREATENED

Increasing foreign manufacture not only threatens the employment security of those now working in the electronics industry, but can be expected to eliminate potential future jobs which will be needed to serve the mounting labor force in this country. Consumer electronic products should be one of the major growth segments of the industry, but despite a large and increasing market for color television, tape recorders, phonographs and other items, the growth largely has been transferred overseas.

Job needs are growing at an accelerated rate. The labor force is expected to top 94,000,000—an increase of 16 percent—by 1975. Such growth requires an expansion of domestic production.

Unemployment among members of racial minorities is currently running about 30 percent. Ironically, some of the very corporations which are beating the tub loudest over hiring hard-core ghetto residents are moving the needed jobs to foreign shores.

Concerned over the job loss, representatives of the IUE, and the Machinists recently visited four Asian countries to investigate trade problems in the electrical-electronics industry, and to seek possible solutions. The delegation included IUE Canadian President George Hutchens; George Collins and David Lasser, assistants to IUE President Paul Jennings, and IAM Research Director Vernon Jirikovic.

The IUE-IAM team visited Japan, Taiwan, Hong Kong and South Korea during the first phase of a joint trade study in conjunction with the All Japan Federation of Electric and Machine Unions (Denki Roren) and the International Metalworkers Federation's Japan Council. The study will be completed after Denki Roren and IMF-JC representatives visit the U.S. and Canada in June.

The IBEW, which was unable to join the fact-finding mission, is also participating in the joint study and has endorsed the preliminary report.

In each of the four countries, members of the delegation sought to meet with government, management and union officials and to collect information concerning:

Overall employment in key electronic products (radios, televisions, hi-fi phonographs, tape recorders, major components and sub-assemblies) since 1966.

Export of key electronic products for the same period.

Labor costs for the major exporters, itemized by product.

Productivity per hour on products of major exporters.

Export prices of key products.
Future plans involving major manufacturers and exporters.

The preliminary report notes close ties between American companies and the Japanese electronics producers. Westinghouse is associated with the Mitsubishi Electric Co., and GE was found to be the largest stockholder in the Tokyo Shibaura Electric Co. (Toshiba). RCA has patent and license agreements with several other Japanese companies.

The delegation discovered that low-wage conditions there are improving as the Japanese unions become stronger. Though the labor cost in Japan is currently about 30 percent of that in the U.S., Japanese wages have risen 15-20 percent annually for the past three years. The average wage for an electrical worker in Japan, including fringe benefits, is now about \$1 per hour. Denki Roren's major objective is to double wages by 1972.

The chief problems with U.S.-Japan trade cited in the report center on inequities in restrictions on certain electrical products. The tariffs on electronic products imported by Japan range from 28 percent to 12 percent compared with a lower U.S. range of 24 percent to 8 percent for certain components and consumer appliances. In addition, the Japanese Government has lists of products on which quotas exist and others on which it requires import licenses.

SOUTH KOREAN EXPORTS SOAR

In South Korea the delegation found a booming electronics industry fueled by a \$14.6 million American capital investment. Korean exports of electronic products zoomed from a value of .5 million dollars in 1964 to over \$8 million in 1968, and the government's 5-year plan expects to reach \$100 million in electronic exports by 1971.

Companies owned by Korean interests have depended on Japanese electronic companies for parts and technical assistance in the past, but the new emphasis is on encouraging greater U.S. participation.

The fact-finding team encountered very little union organization in South Korea. The average wage for assemblers in the electronics industry is \$30 per month, with female employees grossing about \$23 per month. The typical workweek is 48 hours.

Subsidiaries of Motorola, Fairchild Camera, Signetics Corp. and Control Data were among the American-owned operations found around Seoul, South Korea. Another U.S. company, Oak Electronics, recently closed up shop to transfer production to Hong Kong, claiming that demands by the Korean Metalworkers Union made the operation "uneconomical".

Oak's wage-scale had been far lower than that of other U.S. companies in the area, which pay an average of 12-15 cents an hour.

Accelerated growth is reported in Taiwan, which increased its export value in electronics, mainly to the U.S., from \$36 million in 1966 to \$60 million in 1968. Export value for 1969 is expected to be approximately \$100 million, and the government plans to quintuple that figure by 1972. This sharp growth is accounted for largely by increased manufacture of solid state radios and monochrome television sets. Color television production is set for the near future.

LOWEST WAGES FOUND IN TAIWAN

A study of wage rates showed that 70 percent of the Taiwanese electrical workers make less than 10 cents per hour. Including fringe benefits, the average wage paid by an American employer was found to be 11-15 cents. The minimum work-week is 48 hours.

Major American electronics firms now in Taiwan include RCA, Admiral, Philco-Ford, General Instrument, Singer Industries, TRW Components Co., Sunetics, CTS Corp., Ampex and Cornell-Dubilier.

A look at Philco-Ford's Taiwan operation shows what brought the American invasion of this tiny island-country. Profits for the

company in 1968 were \$1,203,000. The company netted about \$928 per employee and paid an average wage of \$270 for the year. The company expects to make a \$2.5 million profit this year—\$2,000 per employee.

Chronic unemployment in Taiwan brings about this happy situation for the American businessman. And not only does the labor come cheap, but the government provides a guarantee against strikes plus a 5-year tax holiday (with a low, 18-percent corporate tax after the five years).

The delegation also found a number of major Japanese companies setting up plants in Taiwan to take advantage of the low wage rates and absence of effective unions.

In Hong Kong, the electronics industry is reported growing at a spectacular rate with the current American investment totaling \$30 million. Hong Kong producers have the advantage of a wage rate one-sixteenth that of the U.S., plus a much lower profit tax.

Exports—again chiefly to this country—are pouring out of Hong Kong at an accelerated rate. The export volume in units of radios doubled last year over the previous year, and the dollar value increased 64 percent.

Television is rapidly becoming a major export item there. Sylvania's Hong Kong operation recently shipped 800 black and white sets to its Batavia, N.Y., plant to test the American market. If the sets "move," increased shipments will follow.

The delegation's preliminary report foresees an even greater shift of production abroad in the future due to the absence of agreements or laws limiting electronic exports to the U.S. and Canada. Just as the transistor radio has become almost exclusively identified with foreign manufacture, so might other consumer products as a result of competition.

The report warns of the growing dependency of the electronics industry in the U.S. on Federal contracts. Available statistics show that over half the U.S. electronics sales are to the Government—many of them contingent upon the Vietnam war. When that war is over, defense workers who are then dislocated will have difficulty finding new jobs since growth industry largely will have "run away."

The IUE-IAM delegation declined to issue firm proposals for action prior to the arrival of Denki Roren and IMF-JC representatives in June. The preliminary report concluded, however, that the best approach to solving the problem should be in seeking agreements with the major producing and exporting countries to voluntarily limit exports to the U.S.

The report calls attention to the need for a system of international fair labor standards to discourage the exploitation of foreign labor. It notes the importance of American labor's support of foreign trade unions such as Denki Roren as a means of eliminating the low-wage conditions which lure American companies from our shores.

The report also reinforces the necessity for the IUE-sponsored Truth-in-Import Labeling bills (S. 943 and H.R. 6518), introduced by Senator Case and Congressmen Minish, Green, Dent, Ellberg and St Germain. The identical bills would require foreign-made appliances and office machines imported and sold under American brand-names to be clearly marked as to the country of origin.

BUYER SHOULDN'T HAVE TO BEWARE

Knowledge as to country of origin may or may not affect the consumer's decision to buy an electronic product, but it is information he should reasonably expect to have. Obviously a worker who has lost his job or feels insecure in his employment due to foreign, low-wage competition might well have his own reason for preferring an American-made product.

Similar labeling laws for specific products, such as the Wool Products Labeling Act, the

Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and the Fur Products Labeling Act, have been in existence for a number of years. IUE's campaign for the labeling of products of the electronics industry received the full backing of the AFL-CIO at its last Executive Board meeting.

IUE will remain actively concerned over the various facets of the imports problem in the months ahead. President Paul Jennings has stated: "We are greatly concerned by the actions of many American companies which are now stampeding to the low-wage areas of the world in search of a buck. These companies are not only casting many thousands of workers from their jobs, they are negating any efforts to employ the hard-core jobless, and thereby sowing the seeds of future social unrest. They are interested in profits, not people. . . . We must bring to an end this struggle to find the lowest possible wage at which goods can be produced."

A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TO THE DRUG ABUSE PROBLEM

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, because drug abuse is considered to be the No. 1 public health problem in the United States today, I welcome the opportunity to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most thoughtful and enlightening statement on this subject by Dr. Dale C. Garell, M.D., consultant to the Los Angeles County Commission on Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, and chief of the division of adolescent medicine at Los Angeles' Children's Hospital.

Dr. Garell's statement, entitled, "Drug Abuse in Los Angeles County," was originally presented to the Senate Subcommittee on Health during its hearings at Fort Worth, Tex., on April 18, 1969.

The statement follows:

DRUG ABUSE IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY

(By Dale C. Garell, M.D.)

The use of marijuana, hallucinogens, barbiturates and amphetamines by persons in all economic and social classes, particularly by young people, has reached "epidemic" proportions in Los Angeles and in many areas throughout the United States. My purpose in testifying today is to describe the present situation in Los Angeles and to support the need for continued inpatient facilities such as those here in Dallas-Fort Worth. The latter is based on the fact that there exists almost no comparable facilities at present on the local level, including Los Angeles, and the continuing need for further research to understand the long-term effects of addicting agents as they relate to the increasing use of dangerous drugs.

Contrast these drug arrest figures in Los Angeles County. In 1960, there were 13,000 arrests for drug law violations; by 1967 the figure jumped to over 31,000. In juveniles (under 18), drug offenses of all kinds increased by nearly 500 percent in the same time period. While marijuana arrests have contributed the largest single increase, the number of arrests for hard core narcotics has continued to be high—over 5,500—with some recent evidence to suggest that heroin arrests are also increasing.

These arrest figures do not accurately reflect the incidence of drug usage at the pres-

ent time. Estimates for dangerous drugs among high school, junior high schools (and even elementary schools) in Los Angeles range from 25 percent to 80 percent who have experimented with dangerous drugs. The best estimates in Los Angeles would indicate that 18 percent of the initial offenders—or roughly 1 of 6—will be arrested for hard core narcotic use in the future. The data also suggest that the scope of the problem extends far from the poverty and low-income areas of the county to middle and upper-income areas where drug use reaches its highest incidence.

Where can these people go for help? While mental health facilities, particularly outpatient care, are available in the county, they are overfilled with long waiting periods. For acute detoxification from heroin, barbiturates and amphetamines, or the hallucinogens, there are only 10 beds set aside for acute narcotics use at the present time in Los Angeles County. Inpatient psychiatric facilities are being used, but bed space is limited. A 30-bed facility is being planned for acute detoxification by the County and USC and will open soon. Long-term hospitalization is presently at the Narco Center in Corona, where beds are particularly scarce for women violators. Non-criminal cases are sent to Camarillo State Hospital.

To summarize these data, local facilities continue to operate at peak usage while drug abuse continues to rise. The greatest need would appear to be for acute care of the drug user, ambulatory services for ongoing treatment, long-term inpatient treatment and rehabilitative services at the local level. In addition to the lack of facilities despite the combined efforts of both public and private agencies in Los Angeles County, such programs that do exist are fragmented and largely uncoordinated.

For these reasons, there is a clear need for a comprehensive approach to drug abuse. This should not replace but supplement present law enforcement efforts. Such an approach has been outlined by Breslow at a hearing in California.¹ It could include the following:

(1) Studies are needed to determine the extent of the problem, to look at high-risk groups, to precipitating factors leading to drug abuse and to the short-term and long-term effects.

(2) Continuing development of effective health education materials and distribution. Progress is being made in this area.

(3) Professional education of health workers—medical students, physicians, hospital workers, social workers, social nurses.

(4) Development of treatment programs (including rehabilitation) at the local level; they should include emergency and acute care, information services, hospitalization and evaluation. These should be voluntary without stigma and without stipulations attached.

We have recently started an Emergency Telephone Service for adolescents. The Hotline, as it is called, has received over 6,500 calls in its first year of operation. Conceived as a crisis intervention service, interested, unbiased listeners are as close as the nearest telephone. To date over 500 calls have been received from individuals using drugs; another 100 have called requesting information about drugs. We see this as a valuable addition to the direct contact type of resources of the community. It offers initial supportive contact with no strings attached, is totally anonymous and is immediately available when needed. We hope to investigate the full

¹ Breslow, L. Statement for Assembly Committee on Criminal Procedures, State of California, Hearing on Drug Abuse, November 29, 1967.

effectiveness of the program during this year. (Information is available to committee.)

(5) Further studies are needed to investigate the biochemical, physical and psychological effects of drug abuses—particularly non-opiates such as marijuana.

(6) A review of existing legislation and enforcement policies to determine where the activities are supportive of rehabilitation as well as those which are incompatible with a sound comprehensive drug abuse program.

In conclusion, I would like to relate an incident that occurred recently: A 15-year-old boy called the Hotline. He had been taking marijuana and other drugs regularly and recently had shot heroin for the first time. For the last week, he had tried to get help. He had called a social agency and was given an appointment in six weeks; he had talked with his friends but couldn't confide in his parents or his doctor; he had even called the police anonymously, but was fearful of arrest. Perhaps the most important thing which he said was the following: "Is it a crime to want to stop?"

Fortunately, we were able to get him to talk with his parents and he is presently getting help. But his question continues to stick with me—Is it a crime to want to stop? If it is a crime, then we are equally guilty—guilty because there are few facilities to handle the increasing need in local communities, guilty because there is a need for rehabilitative services, guilty because there is a need for human beings to talk with one another in times of crisis, and guilty because there is no coordination of our efforts. Drug abuse is the No. 1 public health problem in the United States today. For these reasons, all of us—private citizen, agency, local, state and federal governments—must work together. The problem is getting worse, not better. We must act now.

CHRISTOPHER MEAGHER IS DEAD, BUT—

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the following letter was written to me by a 22-year-old youth shortly after the death of his friend and neighbor in Vietnam. It is more than just a eulogy to a fallen war hero but an expression of faith in the youth of our Nation and the goals of America. As I humbly told the dead boy's mother: "Mere words can neither erase nor console painful grief. For the loss of a loved one, so young, is a deeply personal thing. But Mr. Muldoon's letter is more than mere words. It is a simple and beautiful tribute to your son, Christopher, by a friend and neighbor. And this heartfelt eulogy says the things, the unpublished things, that are felt and shared by the vast majority of Americans." In these times of campus chaos, it is heartening to know there are exceptional young men like Laurence Muldoon. As he so poignantly phrased it, "Christopher Meagher is dead, but his name and what he died for will live on." Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Muldoon's beautiful and touching letter:

MARCH 13, 1969.

DEAR MR. MURPHY: I'm writing to you today, for something I feel deep in my heart. Last Saturday I attended the funeral of Christopher Meagher, the fifty second Staten Islander killed in Viet Nam. At the moment all that could be done, has been done. But the fact is a boy twenty one years old lies in his grave as a result of being born an American, and living a good and decent life. He had so much more to give to his country, but he is dead. I sit here and ask myself, why him? Why the thirty two thousands others? We all know why, but it goes on and on, with no end in sight, the courage that was shown by his mother and family was enough to move the world. They were proud. They held their heads up high, and you could sense the feeling they were saying, "He was ours, but he died for all of us." Yes, he died just as fifty one others from the Borough of Richmond, and the countless others who have fallen in battle and sleep in Christ. But Mr. Murphy, isn't there something more that we can do? We who live on because of his death. Don't we owe them more because of their sacrifice? The trend today seems to learn the tactics of war on the campus and destroy the very thing they have died for.

Christopher came from a family poor in worldly goods, but were so rich with love of one another. Being the oldest of eleven children, he was graduated from Cardinal Hayes High School, and finished two years of New York City Community College. He had his whole life ahead of him. His brother told me that Chris wanted to go into the Army. Like everyone else to get it over with. But God spoke first. Now it is all a horrible nightmare.

Mr. Murphy I had to write this letter to you, to let you know that I care, and I know millions of Americans feel the same way. Unfortunately, the atmosphere of the society in which we live today, the mere fact that another soldier has died on the battlefield is accepted with a sad look, and "isn't that a shame", just as if it had to happen. They go on about their life complaining about the job, cursing because the bus was late, worrying about the money they owe out. But do they stop and examine the hurt a mother feels when she is told, "I'm sorry Mrs. Meagher, but your son is dead" what is the matter with this country today?

Mr. Murphy I'm twenty two years old, and I've never seen the attitude of a country change so fast. These the people that raise children. Teach them to love God, and country. Be willing to die for it, and are cursed and spat upon because of what they believe. They give their sons, husbands, and brothers, only to be told, "Oh, I'm so sorry, but better him than me." And don't do a blessed thing about it. Well I think it's high time this country woke up and let the true Americans, black and white, fight against this tyranny. Hold high the names of the martyrs up to the face of the world and show them what kind of people we really are.

And so Mr. Murphy, Christopher Meagher is dead, but his name and what he died for will live on. Just as the countless others who have given, and those yet to be called. I hope that I, and every American if called, can answer with the courage that was shown by the true heroes of our land. I know Mr. Murphy you are very busy these days, getting prepared to be the next mayor of our city, but I was wondering if it would be asking too much, if, in your spare time, you could drop a little note of appreciation to Mrs. Meagher and let her know how grateful and proud we of Staten Island are to say Chris was one of us. Thank you Mr. Murphy for taking time to read this letter, but I had to let you know how I felt, and I am proud of it.

Thank you.

LAURENCE MULDOON.

HOW GM HELPS ITSELF BY HELPING THE GI'S

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article appearing in Business Week of April 26, 1969, telling how a great American corporation helps provide training in useful civilian skills for members of the armed services on their discharge.

This is a highly responsible example of industrial statesmanship and one which the Nation could hope will be followed by others in the American business community.

The article follows:

HOW GM HELPS ITSELF BY HELPING THE GI'S

(NOTE.—GM dealers need mechanics, men due to leave the services need job skills. Result is training program Pentagon hopes will become a model for more companies.)

A General Motors project to train servicemen in a civilian skill—and to help GM auto and appliance dealers get the mechanics they desperately want—is helping to provide a model for U.S. industry. The nation, says the Pentagon, must have a broad-gauge program of corporate-sponsored, pre-separation training for the growing stream of Vietnam veterans heading for civilian jobs.

Project Transition, begun by the Defense Dept. in 1967 and conducted by a list of blue-chip companies that includes Ford, Sears, Montgomery Ward, Standard Oil of New Jersey, Mobil Oil, Dictaphone, and others, aims directly at the soon-to-be-released serviceman. Its primary target is the less skilled and less educated man who, unless he gets vocational training, runs a serious risk of joining the hard-core unemployed. Under Project Transition, the company trains him in a skill he can use in civilian life while the Defense Dept. is still paying his salary, board, and lodging.

As it works out for GM—which trained 1,000 servicemen last year and expects to train 1,200 this year—the program is a functional combination of patriotism and corporate self-help.

SHORTAGE

According to the National Automobile Dealers Assn., franchised dealers of all auto manufacturers now have 200,000 mechanics—and need just double that number to provide adequate service to car owners. Independent garages, used car dealers, and service stations need another 620,000 (again, the number they have now), NADA estimates. That adds up to 820,000 jobs that need filling.

Of the 1,000 servicemen trained by GM last year without charge, about half wound up actually working as mechanics, most of them at GM dealers—a good enough record to justify this year's increase in trainees, the company figures.

Nothing in the Project Transition contract requires GM to offer a trainee a job or requires the trainee to accept it. But, with mechanics as scarce as they are, GM is prepared to offer any successful graduate a job in just about any city he fancies.

"I've never seen a better group of students," says Paul E. McDonald, who manages GM's 30 training centers. "They are mature and know what they want to do. They are so highly disciplined in contrast to the 18-year-olds just out of school that it's unbelievable. They absorb everything quickly."

SIGNING UP

Three-quarters of the trainees are Army men, the rest Air Force, Navy, or Marines. All must be within six months of separation and have no plans to reenlist. The latter is a sticky point. Some base commanders reportedly offer less than wholehearted cooperation because they feel Project Transition cuts down reenlistments; a man may have no plans to reenlist, but change his mind if there's no job in sight.

Military staff personnel administer the required aptitude tests. The successful candidate, says GM's McDonald, usually has "good motivation and mechanical adaptability," although prior experience is not needed.

The serviceman's base also provides transportation to the nearby GM training center, where company personnel take over as instructors. The 240-hour course is usually sliced up into six weeks of eight-hour days and five-day weeks, or sometimes 12 weeks of half-days. The decision is the base commander's, and he may insist that the serviceman spend at least half his day on military duty. GM won't accept less than a half-day trainee. "There is too much inertia involved," McDonald says.

EAGER DEALERS

GM finds a potential employer in the trainee's area of choice right at the start, so that the serviceman knows the specific job that's waiting for him long before he's equipped to fill it. If the dealer is located near the training center, the trainee may meet him personally—a procedure GM regards as ideal, since it reduces the chance of a switch to a competing employer. Every such switch costs GM \$1,000, the expense of training a serviceman.

Training consists mainly of "hands on practice" in work areas that resemble dealers' service areas; only 20% of the course is classroom.

The company prefers to recruit trainees as close to the end of their military duty as possible, to shrink the gap between the learning process and experience on the job. McDonald describes the typical graduate as an advanced trainee, although a few do well enough to qualify as auto mechanics. Generally, it takes a year longer to turn an advanced trainee into a full-fledged mechanic. During that time he will take additional classes at one of GM's 30 training centers; only 15 are used in Project Transition because the others are too far from military bases.

The dealer will be grateful even for an advanced trainee, McDonald says. "If he can do 25 or 30 relatively simple operations, he frees the dealer's regular mechanic for more serious tasks," he notes. Simple operations would include seeking out short circuits in a car's complex wiring system or repairing small motors such as the one that operates windshield wipers.

The graduate starts work at \$1.75 to \$2.25 an hour, with prospects of increases that may lift his income to as much as \$15,000 a year.

RECRUITING

GM expects Project Transition plus other training programs to produce 3,700 new mechanics for its dealers this year. Ford also plans to expand its participation; in addition to training mechanics, it will also train potential auto salesmen and is considering training non-commissioned officers to become foremen at assembly plants.

McDonald—and others connected with the program—concede that there are problems. For one, the Army apparently has decided to restrict eligibility for duty-time training to the disabled and those with no civilian skills. This knocks out motor pools as sources of applicants. For another, some of the most populous bases are too far from GM centers to make training feasible.

The Defense Dept., too, feels there is room for improvement. Project Transition trained 45,000 men last year, far less than the 150,000 originally envisioned. The department's own failure to reach potential trainees was a major reason; only 280,000 of the 800,000 released from service last year were told about the transition program. The Pentagon recently hired a consultant to improve the counseling situation, especially outside metropolitan areas. It also expects to increase the number of participating bases from the current total of 250.

HARD CORE

The Defense Dept. also worries that the program hasn't always reached its primary target, the uneducated, unskilled man. In the first Project Transition program at Fort Knox, where men were trained as service station dealers by Humble Oil & Refining Co., all of the trainees were high school graduates. This has been the pattern more often than the Pentagon likes.

Officials say that industry's natural desire to recruit the best-qualified trainee possible is only part of the reason. Industry is showing "an ever improving attitude" on the need to waive traditional requirements in order to attract uneducated recruits, but "some of these guys are leery," says a Pentagon man. "They don't believe that industry really wants to help them."

NATIONAL TIMBER SUPPLY ACT

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, along with my able and distinguished colleague from Alabama, Hon. WALTER FLOWERS, I am today introducing the National Timber Supply Act. We are pleased to join several other colleagues who have previously introduced this important legislation.

There are those in America who consider the Deep South the future "woodbasket" of America. I agree and applaud their perception for the rich lands of Mississippi and the moderate climate have combined to make it possible for southern pine to grow abundantly.

Some years ago when the International Forestry Congress was held here in the United States the Russian delegation insisted that they must have an opportunity to visit the South "where the trees grow like corn." They came and were satisfied that it was true.

There is no question that we can grow trees in abundance on the private lands of the South. Our southern forest industry and landowning organizations—including the Southern Pine Association, the American Plywood Association, Forest Farmers Association, and the Southern Hardwood Lumber Manufacturers Association—have underwritten a study telling us how to do it better. And we will—in the interest not only to our own people who derive their livelihoods from the forest bounty—but in the total interest of the Nation which demands the things the forest can provide in the form of lumber, plywood, paper, pulp, tissues, chemicals, and the 5,000 other products which emerge from the wonders of the forest.

This study, entitled "The South's Third Forest," a report of the Southern Forest Resource Analysis Committee has been included in the RECORD of recent hearings on lumber price and supply problems before the House Banking and Currency Committee on which I am honored to serve. I recommended its review by all in this body concerned with meeting our Nation's future wood needs.

The analysis shows what needs to be done on small, private, nonindustrial forest lands to stimulate production to meet wood demands by 1985 or thereabouts.

In the meantime, however, our Nation is faced with a current problem which will not wait for solution. The 1968 Housing Act set a national goal of 26 million units of housing to be built within the next decade—this is roughly 1 million units more than are presently being built by our homebuilding industry. The current lumber shortage and price situation and its effect on housing goals were the principal concerns of the recent hearings before the Banking and Currency Committees—both in the House and Senate.

At those hearings the Secretary of Commerce testified that the realization of this American dream will require that our American forests produce more than 15 billion additional feet of softwood timber by 1978—we now produce about 40 billion feet. Where, one might ask, will the additional volume come from? It is apparent that private lands are being harvested to the limit of their ability. It would be unthinkable to harvest young trees which have not yet fulfilled their growth. The answer of course lies with the Federal Government which owns 60 percent of our standing softwood sawtimber, but which, as was amply demonstrated during our recent hearings, is not supplying the timber necessary to meet the Nation's needs.

Today we have to house a rapidly multiplying population. Brick, stone, concrete, plastic, and aluminum cannot fulfill the housing needs of the people. People do not want to live in tin cans or plastic cups or steel drums. They want to live in houses like their parents lived in—and those houses are essentially made of lumber and plywood.

I think we owe it to the people to enlarge our timber resources so they can build homes in which they can live. The forests controlled by the Federal Government can do that job now—and with proper management and financial investment they can continue to do it indefinitely.

It is for that reason that I submit today the National Timber Supply Act which will enable the skilled professional of the U.S. Forest Service the chance to do on public lands what the private foresters have done on the lands owned by their companies. I urge every Member of this Congress to apply their best talents to the passage of this bill and to make it possible for all our people to be well-housed, rewarded by adequate return on our national forest investment, and satisfied that the forests of today will not be denuded for immediate necessity but will flourish forever.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States clearly states America's long-standing dedication to the hallowed principle of freedom of speech for all our citizens.

It is entirely appropriate that our Nation's commitment to the elemental right of free speech be contained in this first of the original 10 amendments to the Constitution—our country's "Bill of Rights"—because freedom of speech remains today, as it has been down through the years, among the basic foundations of our American democracy.

In order that a free people may continue to govern itself in freedom, it is not necessary that everyone agree with everyone else, but it is necessary that the right of all persons to express their opinions and to be heard on the vital issues of the day be respected—and that the full exercise of this right be vigorously protected.

For this reason, I was deeply concerned to receive a letter from Mrs. Hope Mendoza Schechter, president of the Democratic Women's Forum, one of the oldest and most active Democratic women's clubs in my home State of California, in which she enclosed material describing a most regrettable incident which occurred at a recent meeting in Sacramento involving a serious infringement of the right of free speech of California's Democratic National Committeewoman.

As Mrs. Schechter indicated in her enclosed open letter to fellow Democrats, it is important to us all that the "marketplace of ideas" be preserved as an arena in which differing views may be judged strictly on their merits.

Mr. Speaker, we can all join with Mrs. Schechter in her statement that "if our democracy is to mean anything, it means that persons of opposing points of view are extended the privilege to state those views."

Because of the timeliness and fundamental nature of this issue, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full text of the open letter from the California Democratic Women's Forum:

ACTION TAKEN AT THE APRIL 15 BOARD MEETING OF THE DEMOCRATIC WOMEN'S FORUM RESULTED IN THE FOLLOWING LETTER

DEMOCRATIC WOMEN'S FORUM,

Los Angeles, Calif., April 21, 1969.

DEAR FELLOW DEMOCRAT: The Democratic Women's Forum, one of the oldest and most active Democratic women's clubs in California, wants to express outrage at the behavior of those in attendance at a meeting held in Sacramento on the weekend of April 11. Our sense of indignation is based on two facts:

a. The Democratic National Committeewoman was subjected to verbal abuse and shouts of derision from some in the audience who apparently have no regard for the provisions of the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. They had neither the courtesy nor the maturity to listen to that which our National Committeewoman had to say. No one asked that those

in the audience agree with or support Carmen Warschaw's views, but if our Democracy is to mean anything, it means that persons of opposing points of view are extended the privilege to state those views. We are continuously puzzled by those who demand their right to free speech, but who are quick to interfere with the free speech rights of others.

This is all the more disturbing to us because the object of that harassment is a woman who led the liberal caucus at the Democratic National Convention in 1968 and who was appointed to help reform the Democratic Party throughout the nation to make it more responsive to and reflective of Democrats, young and old, rich and poor, and who come from all walks of life.

b. More distressing to us than the boos and catcalls which emanated from the throats of the disruptive ones was the silence of the Party leadership, who sat by and did nothing to restore order and to remind the delegates assembled that if the Party of Jefferson, Jackson, Roosevelt, Truman, Kennedy, and Johnson stands for anything, it stands for free speech and fair play.

This abdication of responsibility is not only shameful, but dangerous.

The issue is not Carmen Warschaw. Last year it was Hubert Humphrey. In December of 1968, James Reston, Executive Editor of the New York Times, was prevented from delivering a speech at New York University. In March of 1969, Wayne Morse was the target of a continuous barrage of heckling while he attempted to speak at Riverside Church in New York.

The pattern is clear—unless those who hold leadership positions speak out against these anti-democratic forces and take effective measures to stop this growing intrusion of hoodlumism into the marketplace of ideas where views should be judged on their merits, then no one is safe.

Last year, Hubert Humphrey and James Reston. . . . This year, Wayne Morse and Carmen Warschaw. Will you be next?

Sincerely,

HOPE MENDOZA SCHECHTER,
President.

VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, last month the press noted that the war in Vietnam had become the fourth costliest war in the history of the United States, surpassed in deaths and casualties only by the two World Wars and the Civil War. Over 34,000 American servicemen have lost their lives in the course of our military entanglement in that unhappy country. No one knows how many Vietnamese have been killed, although the estimates run to hundreds of thousands.

Twelve months have passed since the beginning of the preliminary peace talks in Paris, and 5 months have receded since the South Vietnamese Government joined the expanded negotiations. And what progress is there to report? The killing and destruction rage on unabated; millions of American dollars continue to be expended each week in support of the war; and the urgent domestic problems which have cried out for solutions continue to multiply and fester.

Rumors of impending troop withdrawals and a deescalation in our military commitment to South Vietnam reoccur with tantalizing regularity, only to be promptly denied by Secretary of Defense Laird or some other "high administration spokesmen."

One week ago, some 250 student leaders from across the Nation—leaders of the student government and student newspapers of many of our finest universities and colleges—sent a letter to President Nixon which stated their intention to choose jail over military service so long as the war in Vietnam continued. How long will it take the administration to understand the depth of opposition to a war which the majority of our young people, in their own words, regard as "immoral and illegal"?

Historians have told us that one of the most disastrous consequences of the slaughter of World War I was the loss of a whole generation of the future leadership of France and England, a generation whose youth and vigor was sorely needed to help give direction during the critical years when Hitler was preparing for war in Europe. Had the European democracies had the benefit of that generation's perspective while Hitler was arming, historians suggest, the policies of France and England which allowed the Nazis to consolidate their military strength might have been considerably different.

I wonder if there is not a similar risk to our own future. The college students who now say they are willing to go to jail rather than participate in a war they believe to be contrary to the best ideals of this country include many young men who would normally constitute the nucleus of our future political leadership—at local, State, and Federal levels. Will this generation of student leaders assume the burdens of adult leadership for a country that is willing to turn them into criminals because they were so bold as to suggest that America has no business in Vietnam?

During the course of the Democratic primaries last spring, and indeed in the general election last fall, all of the major candidates for the Presidency agreed that the war in Vietnam had to be terminated. President Nixon himself, as early as March of 1968, said:

The next President of the United States must end the war in Vietnam.

It is time to make good on that promise. While the negotiations drag on in Paris, and the calls from the administration for "patience" reverberate, more American servicemen continue to die on the battlefields of Vietnam, and more Vietnamese civilians must bear the death and destruction that has been their lot for over 20 years. All in the name of a war which the overwhelming majority of Americans believe must be ended.

On March 26, a number of Members of Congress joined me in calling upon the Nixon administration promptly to end the war in Vietnam. During the course of that discussion on the floor of the House I outlined a three-point strategy for deescalating our military commitment in that country and for moving the Paris negotiations toward a diplo-

matic breakthrough. That strategy included: First, the immediate withdrawal of up to 100,000 U.S. troops and a concomitant decision not to replace those forces transferred out of Vietnam after their regular tour of duty; second, a public declaration by the President of the administration's willingness to accept the participation of the National Liberation Front in the future political life of Vietnam; and, third, the refusal by Congress to approve any additional requests for funds to support the war. That call was made over a month ago and has since been reinforced by similar statements from other Congressmen and Members of the Senate. Yet the Nixon administration persists in its refusal to take the kind of dramatic action that could lead to a prompt settlement of the war.

Other individuals and groups have also come forward with plans for ending the war. I call particular attention to the strategy outlined by Prof. Richard Falk, of Princeton University, which our colleague from California (Mr. EDWARDS), placed in the RECORD on Monday.

Today I am inserting in the RECORD a white paper on ending the war which has been prepared by the American Friends Service Committee. The strategy advocated by the Friends committee emphasizes the cessation of all offensive search and destroy military operations by the U.S. military, followed by the speedy withdrawal of our troops from Vietnam. As the white paper makes clear, a commitment to withdraw our forces from Vietnam would free the resources of this country for the truly important business before us; namely, "the rebuilding of their country—and ours—and the lifting of the burden of poverty from the backs of Vietnamese and Americans alike." The mobilization of our national resources and energies to that task is indeed an effort which all Americans can join with enthusiasm.

The above-mentioned follows:

VIETNAM, 1969: AN AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE WHITE PAPER ON ENDING THE WAR, MAY 5, 1969

The last year. It has been more than a year since the rhetoric of peace began in Vietnam. During this time scores of thousands of men and women and children have died in the fighting. They continue to die today, and every evidence in Vietnam is that they will continue to die tomorrow unless there is an unparalleled demand from the American people that the slaughter be halted. The American Friends Service Committee calls for a halt—now.

Like millions of others the world over, we felt a sense of relief a year ago that our country was at last moving toward a Vietnam settlement. We welcomed the initiation of the Paris talks, the halting of the bombing of North Vietnam, and, more recently, the reports of an Administration decision to undertake some form of U.S. military disengagement. We have hoped these steps would lead to a cease-fire and our country would begin to right its distorted priorities that require spending billions on destruction while our cities decay and our poor despair. But hope has not been enough. Little has really changed in the year that has passed.

Present illusions: We believe U.S. military and government leaders are fostering illusions in regard to Vietnam. Our own experience in Vietnam is so at variance with official interpretations that we cannot reconcile what we have seen with what is officially re-

ported. Americans are under the impression that the war is all but over; it is not. They are being told that the U.S. military policy is one of restraint in the interest of progress in Paris; it is not. They are encouraged to think that the Thieu-Ky government is becoming more acceptable to the Vietnamese, that it is politically more secure, more resolute in carrying on the war, more ready to institute reforms, more competent to carry on with diminishing U.S. help. We find no evidence that these things are so.

In our judgment, the human situation in Vietnam today is worse than it has ever been; the cumulative result of U.S. involvement (on top of 25 years of warfare) borders not on Vietnam's salvation, but on its death. An entire nation is being physically, morally, and spiritually destroyed—and the tempo of destruction has increased, not decreased, since the beginning of the Paris talks and the bombing halt.

AFSC qualifications to comment: Our judgment on these matters is based on 15 years of relationship with Vietnam, the last four with full-time staff stationed variously in Saigon, Vung Tau, My Tho, Danang, An Khe, Pleiku, Hue, and, for the last two years, Quang Ngai. As far back as June 1954, we urged the U.S. not to follow the French example of trying to deal with Indo-China's problems in military terms, insisting that "nothing but disaster lies down that road."¹ Since the U.S. military involvement escalated in 1965, our field staff, speaking Vietnamese and living as closely as possible among the people, have regularly reported to us on the conditions around them. These reports make hard reading, chronicling as they do a tide of destruction that has gradually engulfed a people and torn apart the fabric of their lives. Here is what these reports have recorded:

Refugees: Four million people—one-third of the rural population of this rural nation—have fled their homes and become refugees in a country where land and village roots have an importance unknown in western culture.² Most have fled to the cities, which are quite unprepared to cope with the influx. Saigon's population has swelled to 2,800,000, making it the world's most crowded city, with more than twice the population concentration of Tokyo.³

Destruction: Physical destruction is enormous. Hundreds of thousands of acres have been defoliated, countless villages have been razed, and bomb craters pockmark the countryside. B-52 raids alone have torn 2½ million holes 45 feet in diameter and 30 feet deep—holes that are now filled with water and serve as breeding grounds for malarial mosquitoes and other insects. More tons of explosives have been dropped on this tiny country than were dropped on all the Axis powers in all of World War II, and with every month that passes the loads are bigger and the bombs heavier.⁴ In December 1968, the U.S. for the first time began using in Vietnam 10,000-pound bombs that had been stored in military depots for 15 years.⁵

Economic impact of war: The basic economy of the country has been destroyed, and only heavy imports of consumer goods from the U.S. and Japan keep inflation from assuming explosive dimensions. Corruption is epidemic. Vietnam's ancient Buddhist culture, with its village roots, its veneration of ancestors, its reliance on the extended family, has been torn apart by the impact of having quartered in its midst a half million foreign troops who know nothing of its ways or sensibilities. Prostitution and black marketing are rampant.

Suffering: In all of this the suffering of the Vietnamese has reached levels that would appall the American people if they could see

it. Many thousands have been forced from their homes on short notice, incarcerated in tent cities and then after weeks or months been permitted to return to their villages—their homes destroyed, their animals dead, and their fields mined.⁷ More thousands are caught under the bombs or between the contending forces, and the result is carnage.⁸ Even before the 1968 Tet offensive it was estimated that there were from 150,000 to 200,000 civilian casualties annually.⁹ Provision for caring for the victims is hopelessly inadequate. Provincial hospitals today have few doctors, poor facilities, and often a shortage of medical supplies and even pain killers.¹⁰ The American Friends Service Committee, which has been involved in the relief of war suffering for more than half a century, has rarely encountered such misery as is found in Vietnam today.¹¹

U.S. escalation since Nov. 1, 1968: The United States, while it is publicly committed to a search for peace, has in fact stepped up its military activity since the bombing of the North was halted on November 1, 1968. Consider the following:

1. There are more U.S. troops in Vietnam today than there have ever been since the war began. On March 15 this figure was 540,500, in addition to 45,000 in Thailand and 35,000 in the Navy offshore.¹²

2. The number of battalion-sized operations initiated by the Allies and in progress during each month has grown steadily since the bombing halt. In November the figure was 800; in December, 956; in January, 1077.¹³ The actual figures for less-than-battalion-sized operations in this same period are still classified, but it is known that they, too, reflect a steady increase. Enemy-initiated actions in both of these categories are substantially lower than allied actions during these months, which indicates that it is the allies who have been pressing the fighting.¹⁴ Indeed, the North Vietnamese withdrew 30,000 to 40,000 troops from South Vietnam after the bombing halt.¹⁵ The inclusion of small scale terrorist activity by the NLF forces does not significantly alter the picture. These actions remained relatively constant through December at a level of approximately 100 a month, involving the deaths of from 350 to 450 civilians monthly.¹⁶

3. Despite the cessation of missions over the North on November 1, the total tonnage of bombs dropped on Vietnam has increased every month since then, except for a slight decrease in the shorter month of February. In November 115,000 tons were dropped; in December, 127,700; in January, 129,700; in February, 115,800.¹⁷ The January figure represents the highest monthly tonnage dropped since the war began.¹⁸

4. Since October the war has been carried into ostensibly neutral Laos with greatly increased intensity. Before November 1 there was an average of 150 bombing strikes daily over Laos in 1968.¹⁹ By the end of January the U.S. had 300 to 400 planes a day over Laos, or more than double the number being used before the November 1 bombing halt.²⁰ U.S. commanders have also been permitted to cross the border and carry ground fighting into Laos when they have felt the military situation required it.

5. U.S. battle deaths—always the inexorable barometer of the level of military action—offer final confirmation of the validity of the preceding statistics. These show a rise every month since the bombing halt: 600 American men lost their lives in October; 703 in November; 749 in December; 795 in January; 1073 in February; 1265 in March.²¹ Renewed military initiatives by the NLF and DRV forces did not begin until the last week of February.

Where is there evidence in these statistics of a scaling down of allied operations?

U.S. Aims in Vietnam: Americans are assured that U.S. goals in Vietnam are limited

ones. Earlier talk of victory has ceased as the death toll has risen and as the decimation of Vietnam has become apparent. Today the apologists for continued U.S. military action argue that our commitment will be fulfilled if our forces can achieve a reasonably pacified countryside, a reasonably stable government, and a reasonably effective Vietnamese army, capable of defending itself against its opponents. The American people are being assured that progress toward these goals is being made.²² On the basis of our experience, however, and without considering whether these are appropriate goals for the U.S. to be seeking, we do not believe they are in fact attainable:

1. **Pacification efforts have repeatedly failed over a ten-year period, and they will continue to fail.** The Hamlet Evaluation System, a U.S. introduced, computerized measurement of territorial security, may show the country to be 75% secure, but all who know the Vietnamese countryside dismiss such figures out of hand. They are worthless because the sources of data are biased, and the definition of "security" is elusive. As the recent Tet offensive has shown once again, the NLF can still move with impunity into any part of Vietnam, even into the very centers of U.S. military power. Despite the contrived reports of the computers and despite the billions of dollars spent on pacification, there is today no part of Vietnam that is truly secure. Neither the U.S. nor Saigon is "winning the minds and hearts" of the Vietnamese. The countryside has not been pacified; it is less secure in 1969 than it was in 1965. Even the major cities, though ringed with fortifications, are vulnerable to attack and infiltration.²³ Quaker workers and Vietnamese sources report to us that anti-American feeling has never before been so intense as it is now.

2. The Thieu-Ky government does not offer any promise of future stability. The government in Saigon is a military dictatorship propped up by U.S. power, despised by most Vietnamese and notoriously corrupt. Freedom of speech is suppressed. No one knows exactly how many Vietnamese political prisoners languish in Vietnam's prisons, but the figure is certainly in the thousands, and includes many of the country's leading intellectuals: university professors, religious leaders, lawyers, students, newspaper editors, politicians—anyone who has dared to advocate political initiatives to end the war. Many of the leading figures in the present Saigon government fought for the French against their own countrymen. They represent an old and vanished order. Whatever the outcome in Vietnam, they will be swept away the moment the Vietnamese regain control of their own affairs. They are too weak a reed on which to pin any U.S. hope for future political stability.²⁴

3. The South Vietnamese armed forces will never successfully take over the military burden now carried by the United States. It is not hardware or training that is lacking in Saigon's armies. It is will, the one ingredient the United States will never be able to provide. Thieu's soldiers have no heart for this struggle and have not had any for years. Indeed, one of the most striking phenomena of the war is the contrast between the contending forces: a Vietnamese dressed in the peasant garb of the NLF is one of the world's most formidable fighting men; the same man in the uniform of Saigon is one of the world's poorest. Why? Because one believes he fights to drive the foreigner from his soil while the other fights only to sustain the power of a corrupt military clique.

Why the U.S. should withdraw: If, therefore, as the American Friends Service Committee believes, a continuing U.S. military presence in Vietnam will not result in any genuine pacification of a war-weary and embittered countryside, and will not make pal-

atable a government that is not palatable, nor an army fight that has no will to fight, it becomes useless to pursue further a course that is leading nowhere. It is useless to stay on even for the purpose of a bargaining position in Paris, because we find no reason to think that time will serve to strengthen the U.S. position. This is why we believe that the only viable option left for the U.S. in Vietnam is to withdraw from the whole tragically misconceived adventure.

This is something the U.S. can do. Our military can cease all offensive action, all search-and-destroy missions, all air and sea attacks, and withdraw U.S. troops to port areas for repatriation. This action would have the paramount advantage of returning the future of Vietnam to the Vietnamese, where it belongs. Questions of reunification and political settlement are questions for the Vietnamese to answer, because the Vietnamese, whether they live in Hanoi or in Saigon, are still a single people. They were divided by foreign fiat at Geneva; they have been kept divided by U.S. preoccupation with anti-communism; but fiat and power do not undo the history of a thousand years. The Vietnamese remain one people and not two. They are presently torn by strife between North and South, and between contending forces within South Vietnam, but these struggles can only be resolved by the Vietnamese themselves.

As the only foreigners in South Vietnam, the U.S. and its allies have nothing to negotiate but the rate and manner of their withdrawal. If our leaders were to acknowledge this and move to act on it, it would at once open up a whole new range of possibilities for the good offices of other nations to be used in mediation and in arranging for sanctuary or amnesty for those open to reprisal. This in itself would be a hopeful development.

There will be suffering and turmoil if the U.S. leaves. There may be a government in Saigon led by Ho Chi Minh; there may not be. Withdrawal does not mean that justice will be done. It does not insure fair elections or well-protected freedoms. It does not even insure that urgently needed resources will at last be released for use in Americas cities, since the Pentagon has plans to use any savings for its own new weapons projects. But whatever happens, or fails to happen, will, in our judgment, be preferable to going on with the present agony of death and destruction that is literally destroying Vietnam, undermining our own domestic social fabric, and damaging our country's name in the world community.

The real problem for the United States in unilateral withdrawal is not in the military consequences in Vietnam, but the political consequences at home. We do not underestimate their magnitude, or the courage that would be required to face them. The President is under great pressure, and it may seem safer and wiser for him to pursue a less drastic course. But we believe that both the American people and the world at large would respond to forthright leadership to withdraw our country from this war, especially if it were made clear simultaneously that the U.S. stood ready to assist generously in the task of economic reconstruction. We are not calling for the United States to abandon Vietnam, but only to replace a destructive American presence with a constructive one that will act in concert with an international effort to provide such economic help as may be requested by the Vietnamese.

This approach would give us a whole new position in Southeast Asia. At the very least, it would change the present tragic image of the United States. Every day sees the armed forces of the world's most powerful nation raining bombs and chemicals and napalm on the rice fields and bamboo huts of one of the poorest and most defenseless countries. As long as this continues, millions

must wonder whether the Americans have indeed become the New Barbarians.

Let us therefore order a cease-fire and withdrawal from Vietnam, unilaterally and immediately. Let us get on with what is really important: the rebuilding of their country—and ours—and the lifting of the burden of poverty from the backs of Vietnamese and Americans alike. These are tasks in which Americans can join with enthusiasm.

GILBERT F. WHITE,
Chairman.
BRONSON P. CLARK,
Executive Secretary.

FOOTNOTES

¹ June 8, 1954, Public Statement issued by the Board of Directors of the American Friends Service Committee.

² Report of the Subcommittee to Investigate Problems Connected with Refugees and Escapees, Senator Edward Kennedy, chairman, May 9, 1968. The same report indicates that 80% of these refugees fled because of U.S. bombing. In our Quaker experience, this percentage is a conservative estimate.

³ The Vietnam Guardian, March 22, 1969: "Saigon: The World's Most Crowded City." Average density of Saigon is reported as 148 persons per acre; Tokyo, the second most densely populated city in the world, averages 63. Densities in Saigon are up to 830 persons per acre.

⁴ The Nation, April 21, 1969. Report from Professors E. W. Pfeiffer and G. N. Orians of the Society for Social Responsibility in Science, as quoted in editorial, "Ravaging Vietnam."

⁵ November, 6.94 tons per sortie; December, 7.00 tons per sortie; January, 7.55 tons per sortie; February, 7.55 tons per sortie. These estimates were computed on the basis of figures on total tonnage and total number of sorties provided by the Southeast Asian News Desk, Directorate for Defense Information of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs), March 26, 1969.

⁶ Washington Post, December 27, 1968: "10,000-Pound Bombs Used to Clear Viet Landing Zone." These bombs, too big for conventional fighter-bombers, are reported as being dropped from C-130 cargo planes or flying crane helicopters.

⁷ In one such removal, during Operation Bold Mariner in January 1969, 12,000 peasants from the Batangan Peninsula were taken to a waterless camp near Quang Ngai over whose guarded gate floated a banner saying, "We thank you for liberating us from communist terror." These people had been given an hour to get out before the USS New Jersey began to shell their homes. After 8 weeks of imprisonment they were ferried back to what was left of their villages given a few sheets of corrugated metal and told to fend for themselves. When asked what they would live on until new crops could be raised, the Vietnamese camp commander said, "Maybe they can fish."

⁸ A Quaker worker, writing from Quang Ngai late in February 1969, describes the situation as follows:

"Several of us went to the roof about 3 a.m. The American unleashed the terrifying 'Puff the Magic Dragon,' a DC3 that spews forth 5000 machine gun bullets per minute. As I watched it circle overhead last night, silhouetted against the low clouds in the light of the flares, flinging indiscriminate bolts of death earthward, I could vividly visualize the scene below. Men, women, children and animals, caught like rats in a flood. No place to hide, no way to plead their case of innocence to the machine in the sky, no time to prepare for death. The beating the civilians are taking in this war is beyond adequate description.

"Sitting behind the others on the roof I felt tears welling up and was shocked as I became aware of feelings foreign to my conscious self, which surfaced under the indescribable strain of watching man slaughter

man en masse. The cold, mechanical, compassionless way that monster circled around and around and around, ruthlessly pursuing an unseen 'enemy,' stabbing viciously earthward again and again, probing, searching, killing and maiming all in its path . . . We have survived, but a lot of Quang Ngai people didn't make it. And a lot more who are now clinging to life over at the hospital will not make it until morning. If only we could bring this horrifying scene of human devastation in its true dimensions home to the people who must know what it's like. The ones who are pulling the strings on this deadly puppet show. Man's inhumanity to man has reached its climax in Vietnam."

⁹ Report of the Kennedy Subcommittee, cited above. These figures, the report notes, are prior to the 1968 Tet offensive, which greatly increased the rate of civilian casualties.

¹⁰ In Quang Ngai's 500-bed provincial hospital, for example, there were in late February over 600 patients, the great majority war-related. At one point, our Quaker physician was the only non-Vietnamese medical personnel available to care for this overflow load, with the exception of a single Vietnamese doctor.

¹¹ Consider the following, taken from one of many recent reports from Quaker workers in Quang Ngai:

"How can I tell you what it was like! These people coming in filthy, with glazed looks, numb. Nobody talking, nobody crying and the sounds of furious battle not yet ended pursuing them in the door. The emergency room floor still covered with blood from yesterday's casualties, smelled in the heat of the day and was oppressive . . .

"One little fella of ten or so, shot in the face. Three bullet or fragment holes in the back and buttocks, one of which had exited through his abdomen, the others lodged somewhere. He, like most of the others, came in lying in a pool of blood. Feces and ground up bits of bone were flowing out of the buttocks wound. Vomitus ran from his mouth and mixed with the blood pouring from the face wound. We worked with him for a long time but his chances are slim. He was in shock (most of them were) and struggling to get up from time to time, at times opening his eyes wide to beg for water or complain of the pain in his belly and then lapsing into unconsciousness. His father stood by silently, grief written all over his face. A girl, maybe seven years old, with a head wound and skull fracture. Also major portions of one foot missing. Mother and grandmother crying quietly while trying to help us dress the wounds. A mother lying on a stretcher on the floor smeared with blood and with her infant lying silently on her chest. The baby also was covered with blood and I never saw it move.

"I've seen all this before! Why can't I get used to it?! Each lifeless form, every scream of anguish, each blank stare of those who have suffered too much strikes pain in the pit of my stomach. Are there really those who can look at a scene like this and not suffer with the people?"

¹² Figures provided by the Pentagon's Southeast Asian News Desk, March 26, 1969.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ This is confirmed by the New York Times, April 18, 1969 ("U.S. Battle Let-Up Denied in Saigon") which reports that "American troops are continuing to follow a policy of maximum pressure against the enemy. Allied units are continuing to patrol and pursue the enemy aggressively." Later in the story an unidentified colonel is quoted as follows: "All our battalions and brigades are out and operating from one end of the country to the other, just as they've been doing for months. If the casualty figures are down, it's because the Vietcong didn't want to fight—not the United States."

¹⁵ Figures provided by the Pentagon's

Southeast Asian News Desk, March 26, 1969. Senator George McGovern, speaking on the Senate floor March 17, 1969, reports this withdrawal was of "22 full regiments." Sources differed as to the reason for the withdrawal. The military attributed it to the need of North Vietnam to rest its battered forces; Senator McGovern suggests it was in response to the bombing halt.

¹⁶ South Vietnamese government figures, as reported by the Pentagon's Southeast Asian News Desk, March 26, 1969. Data available only through December 1968. These show 443 killed in October, 440 killed in November, 355 killed in December.

¹⁷ Figures provided by the Pentagon's Southeast Asian News Desk, March 26, 1969.

¹⁸ Representative Don Edwards (Dem., Calif.) in a speech on the floor of the House, March 26, 1969.

¹⁹ New York Times, November 1, 1968. William Beecher, "Laos Route to Be Pounded."

²⁰ U.P.I., January 29, 1969.

²¹ Pentagon figures, updated from those quoted by W. F. Ryan (Dem., N.Y.) in the Congressional Record, March 26, 1969.

²² New York Times, January 3, 1969. Charles Mohr, "Major Gains Made by Vietnam Allies, Even Critics Assert." Reader's Digest, February 1969, an interview with Admiral John S. McCain, Jr., "In Vietnam the Enemy Is Beaten." When the NLF stepped up the fighting late in February 1969, the military made efforts to keep the vision of U.S. progress alive by downgrading these actions. See New York Times, March 11, 1969, Charles Mohr, "Field Checks in Vietnam Show Allies Understated Foe's Gains." The American Friends Service Committee can document this charge from its own experience as far as Quang Ngai is concerned, since the city has more than once since February 23 been subject to night ground attacks that have resulted in an occupation of at least 25% over a period of several hours. Yet, as far as we know, these actions have not been reported by the military briefers.

²³ Quang Ngai, as one provincial capital, for example, has over the past year been regularly infiltrated at night. In the weeks following Tet 1969, heavy street fighting erupted twice around our unarmed and unprotected Quaker compound, which is well within the city limits. Every house in Quang Ngai city has its sandbagged shelter to protect the occupants. This is the situation in a provincial city garrisoned by allied troops. Is this security?

²⁴ Estimates from our AFSC contacts in Vietnam suggest 20% as the maximum support that Thieu-Ky could claim, with 80% in opposition. Some U.S. government estimates use these same figures but in reverse. We find it difficult to understand the basis for the official U.S. optimism on this point.

CONGRESSWOMAN SULLIVAN'S TESTIMONY ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA USURY CEILING ON DISCOUNT LOANS

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1969

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Committee on the District of Columbia conducted a hearing on legislation to permit lenders in the District of Columbia to collect in advance the interest charged to consumers on certain types of installment loans. Many of the leading bankers in the District of Columbia appeared before the subcommittee to urge enactment of the legislation.

Because of business that morning before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, I was not able to appear in person before the District of Columbia Subcommittee, but I did submit to the members of that subcommittee a statement I had prepared in opposition to the legislation.

Although the subcommittee subsequently approved the bill, H.R. 255, I know that many questions are being raised and objections voiced to the philosophy of this bill and that efforts are being made to obtain reconsideration and further study of the implications of the legislation.

Under the circumstances, I believe it might be useful for the Members to know the reasons for my objections to H.R. 255 as given to the members of the subcommittee during its initial hearing on this measure.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I submit herewith the statement which I prepared on this legislation for the hearing on Tuesday, April 29:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, DEMOCRAT, OF MISSOURI, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, BEFORE FUQUA SUBCOMMITTEE, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, ON H.R. 255, AUTHORIZING DEDUCTION IN ADVANCE OF INTEREST ON INSTALLMENT LOANS, APRIL 29, 1969

Chairman Fuqua and members of the subcommittee, as the principal sponsor of Public Law 90-321, the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968, Title I of which is the new Federal Truth in Lending Act, I feel that H.R. 255 is not needed and should not be approved. Legal experts furthermore advise me that, even for the purpose intended, it is "bad law."

First, as to why it is not needed:

The Truth in Lending Act, beginning on July 1, 1969, will require full disclosure to the consumer of all of the costs of credit, itemized in detail and also summarized in total as the amount of the *finance charge*, accompanied by a figure giving the "annual percentage rate of the finance charge." Thus, an 8% discount loan in the District of Columbia (or anywhere else) would be described to the prospective borrower in its true percentage, on an annual basis, of nearly 16%. If credit life insurance were required as a condition of the loan, and the rate were 1%, which is typical, the annual percentage rate of the finance charge would have to be given as nearly 17%. This would be the case whether or not H.R. 255 were enacted.

But it should be noted that under the terms of Public Law 90-321, in Section 111 (b):

"This title does not otherwise annul, alter or affect in any manner the meaning, scope or applicability of the laws of any State, including, but not limited to, laws relating to the types, amounts or rates of charges, or any element or elements of charges, permissible under such laws in connection with the extension or use of credit, nor does this title extend the applicability of those laws to any class of persons or transactions to which they would not otherwise apply."

TRUTH IN LAW DOES NOT ALTER LEGALITY OF PRACTICES UNDER DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LAW

In other words, Mr. Chairman, if the deduction in advance of interest on installment loans in the District of Columbia has been legal and permissible, even when that results in a true annual interest rate exceeding the usury ceiling, there is nothing in the Federal

Truth in Lending Act which would make such a practice suddenly illegal in this jurisdiction. The Federal Truth in Lending Act does not set ceilings on interest rates. Furthermore, the required disclosure of the annual percentage rate of the finance charge in a consumer credit transaction under Truth in Lending is a figure which may or may not be identical with the so-called true annual interest rate.

That is because the Truth in Lending Act includes in the finance charge such charges as the following: interest, time price differential, any amount payable under a point, discount, or other system of additional charges; service or carrying charge; loan fee, finder's fee, or similar charge; fee for an investigation or credit report; premium or other charge for any guarantee or insurance protecting the creditor against the obligor's default or other credit loss. In addition, as I said, under certain circumstances, credit life, accident or health insurance, and even, in some circumstances, property damage or liability insurance, may have to be included by the creditor in the itemization of charges which go into the determination of the annual percentage rate of the finance charge. Obviously, much more than just interest subject to the D.C. usury law goes into the determination of the annual rate of the finance charge under Federal Truth in Lending.

HAVE CUSTOMARY PRACTICES VIOLATED DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LAW?

In writing Public Law 90-321, it was our intention that a creditor making charges for credit which are legal under the appropriate State law could not be held guilty of violating State usury laws merely by complying with the disclosure requirements of the Federal law. Therefore, no bank or other lender in the District disclosing the annual rate of his finance charge could be held in violation of District ceilings on interest rates, if his interest charges are legal under District law.

As I understand it, collection of interest in advance on an 8% discount loan in the District has been accepted practice under District law. Therefore, disclosing that the annual percentage rate of the finance charge on this loan is far more than 8% would not change in any way the applicability of the District law.

If, on the other hand, the District authorities have shut their eyes in the past to what may have been an outright violation of the District interest rate ceiling on discount loans, and now feel that because of Federal Truth in Lending disclosure requirements they can no longer ignore such violations, you have two choices, it seems to me:

1. Either call upon the local authorities to enforce the law; or
2. Pierce the present ceiling by *increasing the legal rate* so as to accommodate transactions in which the lender collects \$8 for what amounts to a \$92 loan, at an annual rate, on a 12-month loan, of nearly 16%. If you do that, of course, you are automatically increasing the interest rate ceiling for all consumer credit transactions in the District to the higher percentage, not just the discount loans.

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW NEEDED OF DISTRICT CREDIT LAWS

After thorough study, this Committee and the officials in the District may decide that present D.C. ceilings on interest rates are too low. Undoubtedly, they are lower than in surrounding jurisdictions. But once you open this up, you should be prepared to see pressures mount for vastly higher rates which would increase the cost of borrowing, and hence the cost of living, for thousands upon thousands of low-income families living in the District.

I do not think you can resolve that problem without a comprehensive review of the present credit laws and intensive study by the District Government. I certainly do not

think you should attempt to resolve it in a piecemeal fashion—in this bill intended to give the approval of Congress to a practice which may be in violation of existing District law, and relating to only one type of loan in the District. What about "add-on" loans? Mortgage loans? One-payment loans?

I said at the start that legal experts tell me the approach taken by H.R. 255 is "bad law." That is because, I am told, you would be separating in the D.C. Code the relevant section of law dealing with interest rate ceilings from an important modifying provision appearing elsewhere in the Code, legalizing at one place something which is illegal in another. I am not qualified to speak on that point with any legal authority; I merely pass the thought along.

To summarize, then, I want to express my firm opposition to H.R. 255 on the grounds that it uses the *excuse* of the existence of a Federal Truth in Lending Law, which has no direct bearing on the issue, in order to legalize a practice which may be in violation—and may always have been in violation—of District law.

You do not have to pass this law in order to protect District lenders from the operations of any provision of the Federal Truth in Lending Act. H. R. 255 would have no effect on that law, just as the new Federal law will have no effect on existing District law on interest rate ceilings.

If the fear is that the disclosures required under the Federal Truth in Lending Act will prompt consumers to question the legality under District law of charges on discount loans in the District, then wouldn't passage of H. R. 255 be an acknowledgement that such loans have not been legal right along? This bill pretends that an 8% discount loan is at the rate of 8%, and it is not. If the borrower receives \$92 but pays back \$100 in 12 monthly installments, his annual rate is 15.75%. That is the rate the bank or lender will have to disclose under Truth in Lending (higher, if added charges are made, such as for compulsory credit life insurance). Nothing in H. R. 255 could change that reality. I think this subject deserves far more study than the bill before you has received.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as freedom-loving Americans we have a spiritual kinship with Poland as can be seen from a reading of that Nation's Constitution of May 3, 1791. In that great document it is written:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

That historic document symbolizes the spirit and hopes of the brave Polish people. It adopted the principle that all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people; the similarity to our own Constitution as the charter of our own Government is clear.

We in the United States also have strong and lasting ties with Poland. From our earliest colonial days the sons and daughters of Poland have been a strong force in the building of America

and of the United States. Polish blood has drenched every American battlefield and we shall never forget what Pulaski and Kosciuszko did for us in 1776. In my own State of Maryland, one of our very important roads leading from the city of Baltimore northeastward crossing the historic Mason and Dixon line is appropriately called the Pulaski Highway which is part of U.S. 40.

We shall never forget that great hero Thaddeus Kosciuszko for his role in our young Republic's victory won by our Continental Army at Saratoga. No wonder his name is used for streets in some of America's greatest cities.

In the field of music the name of Paderewski, a son of Poland, will long be remembered. Not only was he one of the world's greatest pianists, but also a statesman of renown.

In science, Madam Curie is always associated with radium and her name is still a household word. Poles everywhere can be justly proud of this great woman.

In fact, in practically every field of human endeavor the lasting contribution of the genius of Polish people and their descendants can be seen and are freely acknowledged.

The United States became the great country it is in large measure because of the work of the various peoples who came to these shores. Polish immigration grew by leaps and bounds and today Polish American citizens can be counted in the millions. We are very proud of them as our fellow Americans.

At the beginning of my remarks I spoke about the Polish Constitution of 1791. Unfortunately that inspired document was in effect but a short time because an important concept in Russian foreign policy was to have a weak Poland on its western border.

Ostensibly to destroy the Polish Constitution of 1791, but in reality to annex part of Poland for herself, to present Prussia with another part, and to reduce the remainder to a vassal state, Catherine the Great, ruler of Imperial Russia, ordered her Russian armies to invade Poland on April 8, 1792. Finally on September 23, 1793, Poland was partitioned and thus came an end to the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791.

Notwithstanding the demise of that great document, its spirit lived on and actuates the minds and hearts of all Poles to this very day. Polish people have sought to exercise their love of freedom and democracy but have been prevented from doing so by many unfortunate circumstances, particularly the actions of the U.S.S.R.

The flame that flickered in Poland in 1791 was an inspiration to people the world over. We take a dim view of the domination of that land by the Communists who are the largest colonial masters in the world enslaving millions of innocent people. The Reds stand indicted by the supreme court of world opinion.

We shall never recognize the Soviet domination of all of Eastern Europe. I am certain that Poland will someday be free for the spirit of the Polish national anthem will prevail in the end; it proclaims "as long as you live, Poland lives."

As long as we here in America live, Poland also lives. As long as we maintain our strength, as long as we identify ourselves with the cause of independence, with the cause of liberty and justice for ourselves and others, we can help do for Poland, in some measure, what Kosciuszko, Pulaski, and other great heroes of Poland did for us in 1776.

The spirit of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, goes marching on until Poland will one day join the community of really free and independent nations and we support the aims of the people of Poland.

COMMUNIST MASS MURDERS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, more than 800 bodies of the victims of Communist aggressors have now been unearthed in Hue, South Vietnam. An estimated 2,000 people were savagely killed in the Hue offensive last year—one of the most brutal Communist atrocities of the war in Vietnam, thus far.

This type of terrorism is standard procedure for Communist troops, who are known to carry "blacklists" of assassination targets for executions during their infiltration phase of warfare. The "blacklist" usually contains selected names of teachers, ministers, civilian leaders, and others who do not cooperate with their subversion, and are, therefore, marked for liquidation.

It is truly unfortunate that greater exposure has not been given the American people of this unrelenting brutality, basic to all Communist tactics. It is as common an occurrence today as when performed by the Soviets in the Katyn Forest massacre at the start of World War II.

Perhaps this sordid truth about communism is suppressed from the American people because of the concern it might create should our people come to realize that systematic massacres will be the order of the day if free men permit Communists to emerge victorious.

I insert a May 5 report from Hue, Vietnam, and a column by Mrs. Edith Kermit Roosevelt following my remarks:

[From the Washington Post, May 6, 1969]
HUE VIETCONG VICTIMS NUMBERING 350 GIVEN MASS FUNERAL

(By Robert G. Kaiser)

HUE, May 5.—Three hundred fifty nameless citizens of Hue were buried here today in small red coffins. They were victims of the worst Communist atrocity of the war in Vietnam, but only about 30 mourners attended the funeral.

The mourners were joined by hundreds of others—soldiers, distinguished guests, old women selling soap, boys selling ice cream and important local officials. The funeral was planned by the local officials, who also organized two other mass burials in recent weeks.

Mass burials have become regular events in Hue. More than 800 bodies have been found so far in makeshift graves that are little more than a year old.

The graves, more accurately ditches, were dug by the Vietcong early last year during their occupation of Hue, which lasted nearly a month. Perhaps 2000 people were murdered in that month; at least that is the number of residents still unaccounted for since the 1968 Tet offensive.

The victims were murdered on the edges of the ditches that volunteers have been uncovering for the last six weeks. Many were shot in the back of the head. Others were beaten to death. Every principal bone of one skeleton found two weeks ago was broken. Some of the bodies showed no signs of any injury and presumably were buried alive.

Many were South Vietnamese soldiers and minor government officials. Officials here believe that the names of the dead appeared on Communist blacklists. But this cannot account for the women and children who were slain.

"Some may have just got caught up," Maj. William Johnson speculated today. Fewer than half the bodies recovered have been identified, so the precise pattern or terror remains a mystery.

TRUCKS BEAR COFFINS

Today's funeral began with a mass procession down Le-loi, a principal street of Hue that parallels the Perfume River. Policemen in jeeps led the procession. They were followed by 2½-ton U.S. Army trucks decorated with wreaths and flowers.

Each truck carried eight to 12 coffins made of American plywood painted red. Every coffin was numbered and on its top rested a small bouquet and sticks of burning incense.

It took nearly an hour for the procession to reach the burial ground several miles out of town. This was the second cemetery selected for the murder victims. The first chosen before officials realized how many bodies would be found, was in a rich rice paddy south of Hue. It has since been decided that this productive land should not be turned into a huge graveyard, so a more barren site was found.

The trucks arrived in a clamor of horns and clouds of dust. The teenage boys and girls riding on them—members of the Peoples' Self-Defense Forces—unloaded the red boxes. They set the coffins beside the graves, and the field looked like a table covered with hundreds of carefully spaced red dominoes.

Later, while the coffins were being lowered by hand into the graves, a religious ceremony began 20 yards away. The service and some speeches were broadcast over a tiny public address system which ran on current from a portable generator that hummed in the background.

The sun was bright and hot. People milled about; boys hawked popsicles to soldiers who had come as an honor guard. (Other soldiers in armored personnel carriers provided security for the ceremony from behind a ridge half a mile away.)

BETTER ORGANIZED

The ceremony ended quickly. ("The first funeral ran 5½ hours; I thought it would never end," an American official commented. "They've gotten better organized.")

The important guests, who had come with Gen. Hoang Xuan Lam, the South Vietnamese commander in the Hue area, started back for their helicopter. Most of the others also started to leave and the trucks began rumbling down the road.

But about 30 women remained, bowing, bending and wailing before the makeshift altar, mourning in the Buddhist fashion. They lingered, tossing handfuls of dirt onto many of the graves.

They had decided that their missing relatives must have been among this batch of bodies, though they could not identify them.

There will be more mass funerals if more bodies are found, but many American offi-

cial here want to stop looking. "We've made the point," said one adviser. "We need to spend more time on the problems of the living."

KATYN FOREST REVISITED (By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—The recent discovery of mass graves showing Communist atrocities against South Vietnamese citizens near Hue, South Vietnam is a grim reminder that the same form of mass murder was committed by the Communists against our Polish allies in the Katyn Forest in the Soviet Union at the start of World War II.

An investigator of the House Select Committee on Communist Aggression which in 1952 investigated the Katyn Forest Massacre, said in a House speech that he is struck by "the tragic similarity between the methods used by the Communists in the Katyn Forest in 1940, and the methods and techniques used by the Communists against the South Vietnamese in Hue."

A reading of the committee's testimony showed that the victims at Katyn, as in Hue, were killed with a single shot in the back of their heads while their hands were tied behind their backs. They were pushed into mass graves, in some cases while they were still alive. Young American soldiers too were murdered in this way in North Korea during the Korean war.

In referring to the mass executions at Hue, what he called "the whole business of Katynism," he predicted ominously that these systematic massacres will be the order of the day in South Vietnam if the Communists should emerge victorious.

The bizarre discovery of the mass graves near Hue was made by two South Vietnamese Army noncoms who were captured by the Vietcong during the 1968 Tet offensive. The two noncoms, Sergeant Chau and Corporal Doi, managed to escape and thus were able to lead South Vietnamese authorities to the graves. Diggings are now underway and to date as many as 350 victims, men and women, have been dug up for identification and proper burial. Cpl. Doi said there are additional mass graves along the seashore. Local authorities are proceeding to investigate them.

The 15,000 Army Reserve officers who were massacred in the Katyn Forest were Polish lawyers, educators, doctors, ministers and businessmen. These were, for the most part, the intelligentsia, the people who would have led the resistance to Communist aggression. The Communist troops methodically picked Poland's intellectual leaders and imprisoned them when the USSR invaded Poland on Sept. 17, 1939, so they would not be around when the Reds overwhelmed Poland and destroyed her free institutions.

In South Vietnam too, leaders of the resistance are being singled out for murder. The discovery of the mass graves at Hue is dramatic evidence that the Communists have on their drawing boards the blueprint for another Communist cordon sanitaire of captive nations in Southeast Asia, identical to the cordon sanitaire of captive nations that now remain in Soviet bondage in East Central Europe.

Yet the past has failed to warn us. Government spokesmen have treated the Hue discoveries with meager attention. The New York intellectual community which plays such a dominant role in forming public opinion is curiously silent. We have the right to ask where are the voices of the great defenders of human dignity in denouncing these brutal mass atrocities?

The same conspiracy of silence took place in 1940, when the Polish government in exile tried to sound the alarm about Katyn. The Washington Administration and its collaborators outside government allowed the Soviets to win propaganda victories from

their false charge that the Nazis were responsible for the horrible crime. In 1945 an American officer, Col. John H. Van Vliet Jr., who had visited the scene of the graves, submitted a documented report on the Katyn massacres to the head of Army Intelligence (G-2), Gen. Clayton Bissell. Concerning the fate of that report, the House Select Committee on Communist Aggression stated, "The Van Vliet report was either removed or purposely destroyed in Army Intelligence (G-2)."

The Office of War Information and the Federal Communications Commission even went so far as to silence foreign language broadcasters after these commentators reported facts that pointed to Communist guilt in the Katyn massacre. Stations broadcasting in Russian, Polish, Czech, Croat and other languages had to defer to the gag because of the FCC's control over renewal of radio licenses.

Had the American people known in time the full facts about the Katyn Forest massacre, the course of U.S. diplomacy in the postwar period might have been different. Today, the President has the opportunity to look at these mass graves in Hue, and marshal the forces of indignation against this form of genocide. The Hue massacre makes it clear that any settlement of the Vietnamese war should ensure that the South Vietnamese be unequivocally the masters of their own destiny as a free people.

VIETNAM: "CONTROLLABLE LEVELS" REACHED IN DIVERSION OF U.S. SUPPLIES

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. J. W. Cohn which appeared in the March 5 edition of "Women's Wear Daily."

The article clearly details steps taken by the Agency for International Development to bring the diversion of U.S. supplies in Vietnam under "controllable levels."

Mr. Cohn is a veteran foreign correspondent for Fairchild Publications with over 30 years of service. As Far East director, he has been to Vietnam eight times in the past 2 years. He will accompany the Secretary of Commerce May 9 to 18 on the Secretary's trade swing in the Far East.

I commend the following article to my colleagues' attention:

IN VIETNAM

(By J. W. Cohn)

SAIGON.—The diversion of United States supplies and equipment in Vietnam—for headline purposes usually lumped under "corruption"—is at what Agency for Industrial Development officials refer to as "controllable levels."

There is no question that the situation has improved greatly from the worst days some three years ago when the truly shocking conditions were first revealed in these columns. Unfortunately, the curing of corruption is never as dramatic a story as the discovery of the evil, so that the progress made by United States officials with the cooperation of the present Government of Vietnam has not been well publicized.

It should also be pointed out that this progress has been made in the area of United States aid to Vietnam. Frequently in the public's mind the diversion of United States supplies given under the AID program is confused with the black marketing of PX merchandise.

It can be reported that there has been little, if any, improvement in the black market situation in PX goods.

Basically, there never has been a solution to the impact of the PX system on a merchandise-deprived economy. The same situation prevailed at the end of World War II in Europe and Japan and in Korea during the Korean War.

The situation here has been further complicated by the opening of the PX to certain categories of civilians and to members of the Free World Forces stationed in Vietnam. The Korean troops here alone would create a PX scandal. The purchase of hard-to-get goods at the PX and their resale on the local market is a not inconsiderable part of the Korean soldiers' base pay.

The effect on the economy and morale of Vietnam is not good. People are spending money they cannot afford on goods they do not need.

However, AID supplies have been of a different category basically what is needed for the people of Vietnam to exist and to improve their capability for self-sufficiency such as foodstuffs, fuel, agricultural supplies and equipment, construction supplies, basic industrial machinery, etc.

The United States AID program in Vietnam reached its peak in fiscal 1967 at \$730.4 million. In the current fiscal year, ended June 1969, it is expected to total \$498 million. For the next fiscal year it is expected to rise to about \$550 million and then settle down to a steady rate of about \$500 million a year.

There have been all sorts of estimates of how much of this was diverted from its proper channels into illegal areas. Even AID officials here in 1966 and 1967 admitted it was running at 10 per cent, an estimate undoubtedly on the conservative side. At its worst, it probably topped \$100 million a year.

AID officials now estimate it is down to 0.5 per cent, or about \$2.5 million a year. There is no reason to doubt that this figure is fairly accurate.

There was a period of six to nine months during late 1966 and early 1967 when the distribution of AID supplies got completely out of hand, due largely to the congestion in the Port of Saigon. At one time there were 1,300 merchandise-laden barges tied up in Saigon harbor because of lack of warehousing.

At the same time inflation was threatening to disintegrate the Vietnam economy completely. AID officials believed it was imperative to bring in imports to block the inflation at any cost. The cost in diverted goods and supplies was high but inflation was kept under some sort of control.

"Today the loss rate at the Port of Saigon is comparable to that at the Port of New Orleans," a top AID official told this correspondent.

Principal reasons for the improved situation in the distribution of AID supplies in Vietnam are:

AID now has six commodity analysts who check all applications for import licenses. In addition, a computer operation has been installed which compares the details of all applications made to the Government of South Vietnam with similar applications made to AID to make certain that all details agree.

Six officers on loan from the U.S. Customs Service are working in the Port of Saigon spot checking incoming AID shipments. Another U.S. Customs team is working with the

GVN customs, advising and training their personnel.

AID now has about 30 auditors checking the logistics of AID supplies between the initial and secondary receivers.

AID has helped GVN to set up an in-country auditing system to check on the distribution of AID supplies at the province and district.

A basic change in philosophy by the GVN. Previous Vietnam governments had followed the French colonial system which more or less regarded kickbacks, bribes and general corruption as a way of life that supplemented the new salaries of Government officials. Quietly, the present Government of Prime Minister Tran Van Huong has waged war on corruption, including the removal of between 40 and 50 province and district chiefs. AID officials say that when they now complain to the GVN about a corrupt official they get action. Nothing very formal happens but the official suddenly disappears.

One of the most invidious aspects of the large-scale diversion of AID supplies in 1966-1967 was the wealth of evidence showing that a considerable quantity of the diverted goods was going to Viet Cong sources. AID officials are considerably encouraged because the large caches of enemy stores recently turned up by Allied troops show a very small quantity of American-made equipment and supplies. The largest percentage of American supplies found in any cache has run between 8 and 10 per cent while the average rate has run from 2 to 3 per cent.

Of course, part of this is due to the fact that enemy forces are much better supplied today than they were three years ago. The North Vietnam Army, which has taken over a large share of the fighting in the South, including the operations of the VC, is completely self-sustaining with supplies from Russia, Communist China, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, East Germany and even France infiltrated South.

This is not to imply that all the leaks to the VC have been stopped. Only recently a woman in a sampan was apprehended on one of the local waterways and found to be transporting a fairly large supply of AID-financed drugs and medicines to the VC. It was said to be a large enough quantity to supply an enemy company for a month.

Upon questioning, the woman admitted she was a VC agent. She said she had been given a list of the required medicines and had simply gone into Saigon and picked up the supplies by shopping from drugstore to drugstore. It was a difficult operation to stop, except where it was stopped, by actual apprehension in transport.

There is also undoubtedly some black marketing being done in AID goods given to refugees from enemy-infiltrated country. This involves such items as cooking oil and flour. For example, country people in Vietnam do not use as much cooking oil as city people. So the evacuees take their surplus cooking oil to the black market and trade it either for other goods or money. The overall quantity involved is not large and the practice is almost impossible to stamp out.

THE 178TH ANNIVERSARY OF POLAND'S CONSTITUTION OF 1791

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with our distinguished colleague from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) in observ-

ing the 178th anniversary of Poland's landmark Constitution of 1791.

It is fitting that we should mark the anniversary of this historic document because it embodies even today the traditions of liberty and liberalism which characterize the legacy of Americans of Polish ancestry.

Poland's first democratic constitution is as old as our own and was conceived by men who shared many of the same democratic ideas which motivated the authors of the U.S. Constitution.

The Constitution—which established a parliamentary and constitutional monarchy—was approved by the Polish Diet 178 years ago. It provided for a strengthened executive, a cabinet system similar to the American model, and a bicameral representative legislature. In addition, the Constitution broke down long-established economic barriers between the nobels and bourgeoisie, reestablished the political and judicial autonomy of townsmen, opened the Diet to representation from the cities, and extended the protection of the law to the peasants.

Unfortunately, the Polish experiment in democracy did not last long. Barely 2 years after the 1791 Constitution was adopted, Poland was partitioned, and in 1796 it was again partitioned by Austria, Prussia, and Russia. The country did not regain a democratic form of government until after World War I. That period of democratic institutions was also short lived, for with the close of World War II came the Communist regime, and democracy in Poland was again extinguished.

However, the present administration has been unable to squelch the determination of the freedom-loving people of Poland to regain a democratic form of government. Three groups in particular—the church, the intellectuals, and the students—have persisted in their demands for a relaxation in the repressive measures of the State and the reestablishment of representative forms of government. The persistence these and other groups have shown in the face of constant harassment and persecution attests to the strong democratic strain which to this day characterizes the Polish people.

The anniversary of the 1791 Constitution cannot be celebrated in Poland, for it is banned by the Polish Communist Party. However, we can pay tribute to the splendid concepts embodied in that document, and we can take this opportunity to salute Americans of Polish descent who have contributed so much to the building of our Nation. Although the Constitution which reflected democratic liberalism in Poland was soon overturned, its ideals ignited the fire of liberal European political thought which has burned bright throughout the years. We are indebted to the Polish people for their commitment to these principles and their enduring belief in human dignity and freedom and for the contributions made by our citizens of Polish origin to our own democratic experiment. Let us hope on this 178th commemoration of the Polish Constitution that those ideals will soon be a reality for all the people of Poland.