EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE AMERICAN'S CREED

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, each year since I have been in Congress I have sent the graduating high school seniors of my district a congratulatory letter and a copy of the American's Creed. I have received many fine letters of response from recipients of this document. I want to share with you and my other distinguished colleagues in the House of Representatives two letters I have just received from two students to whom I sent the Creed. The first is from Mr. James H. Ables, a member of the 1970 graduating class of the Lindsay, Okla., High School and the second from Mr. Steve Hopper, who will be graduated from the Durant, Okla., High School, this spring.

The letter follows:

APRIL 15, 1970.

DEAR MR. REPRESENTATIVE ALBERT: As I look over the words of the American Creed I find out how much each of these words mean to every true American.

But also when I look at the words of the Creed I think of the words of a poem "The Road Not Taken" written by Robert Frost. The first three lines of the poem are:

"Two Roads diverged in a yellow wood, and sorry I could not travel both, And be one traveler long I stood . . ."

Today as a Senior in High School I feel that I am making a decision upon which road to take. And with a Nation as great as ours is today, I see the decision is going to be a tough decision to make.

But which ever road I choose to take, it will be a road in support of our great Nation—a Nation governed of the people, by the people, and for the people.

As the last paragraph of the Creed states: "I do believe it is my duty to my Country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies."

At this time I extend my deepest appreciation to you for the gift of the American Creed.

Thank you.

Most truly yours,

JAMES H. ABLES.

APRIL 16, 1970.

DEAR MR. ALBERT: Thank you for your letter and the copy of "The American's Creed." It will always hang in my room as a reminder of my privileges, responsibilities, and duties as a citizen of the United States.

I am pleased you took time to show your concern for me as a graduate and my future. I hope that I will be able to confront the years ahead of me with the spirit that is contained within your letter.

It is often said that today's youth are tomorrow's leaders and this is certainly true. But as our present leaders are exposed to the negative side of youth, perhaps they hold little hope for the future of America as a strong nation, world power, and example for all peoples.

As for myself, I know of too many of my own age, who, like myself, hold a faith in America and its future that is not surpassed anywhere, be it past or present, to hold a pessimistic view. We are concerned with the direction America is headed, and intend to take an active part in guiding it on the correct path. We are not content to stand by and allow radicals, protesters, and advocators of violent revolution to control the direction of America.

America has proven to be the strongest, fairest, and most compassionate country ever. With our Lord's help, we, the leaders of tomorrow, will continue in the examples set by our forerunning patriots and great leaders, to make America shine forth as the place on Earth where All people are free, with equal opportunity, rights, and honor.

Please continue in your fine work so that we may, when the time comes, take it over and continue in it.

Thank you again for your letter.

Sincerely,

STEVE HOOPER.

THE STRATEGIC BALANCE—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE MELVIN R. LAIRD

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird last week delivered a most important address at the annual luncheon of the Associated Press in New York City. The whole question of defense, particularly at this time with the SALT talks, is very prominent in the minds of all Americans. As Secretary Laird points out, we all hope for the greatest success at these talks and have permitted flexibility with regard to our future course of action. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE MELVIN R. LAIRD

I was particularly pleased when your President, Paul Miller of Gannett Newspapers, called me on a Saturday morning several months ago to invite me to speak to the Annual Luncheon of the Associated Press on the subject of the strategic balance. I told him that I regarded this forum as particularly appropriate to express my views on the need to make available to the American people additional information regarding national security.

When I assumed office 15 months ago, I immediately established as a top priority goal the restoration of credibility in the Department of Defense. Since then we have attempted to follow President Nixon's stated desire to make more information available to the American people.

The editors of the Associated Press and all members of the communications media in this country have a deep interest in this subject. I pledge to you that we shall continue to devote maximum attention to reducing and hopefully eliminating overclassification in the Department of Defense. And, we will provide all the information we can within the limits of national security, consistent with the safety and legal rights of our citizens.

This open news policy has brought about significant progress in at least five major areas where information was previously withheld from the American people.

1. Previous policy was to restrict public discussion of Prisoner of War matters. Present policy is to foster public discussion and to focus worldwide attention on the plight of our prisoners of war in order to gain humane treatment for them and to obtain their release.

2. Previous policy was to withhold from the public information on chemical warfare and biological research matters. Present policy is to keep the public informed about our new policies in these two areas, the reasons for these new policies, and the steps being taken to implement them.

3. Previous practices on reporting the costs of major weapons systems led to a major credibility problem in the Department of Defense. Our new policy of full disclosure on major weapons costs will help to restore the Department's credibility and will assist us in gaining better control of costs and in developing better management practices.

4. For several years, the American people were denied knowledge about our activities in Laos. Today, the American people are being informed about what we are doing and what we are not doing in Laos.

5. In the past, overuse of classification denied to the American people pertinent information on the nature and scope of the strategic nuclear threat. In my view, there is still too much classification, but we have tried and will continue to make more and more information available on this subject which is so crucial for the future security of our country.

In my remarks today I will attempt to shed more light on the crucial subject of the strategic threat. In particular, I want to discuss with you editors the nature and scope of the growing Soviet threat, recognizing full well that, in Vienna, our negotiators have just begun round two of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, commonly called SALT.

I hope for success at SALT. I want to emphasize that point. I also want to emphasize that our top military leadership hopes for success at SALT. Where the security of the United States is involved, it is this objective—insuring national security—which is most important. A lower-cost means to achieve that objective, lower compared to what otherwise may be required—if it can be achieved within tolerable risks—is obviously most desirable to all Americans, civilian and military.

The budget we have recommended to Congress for the next fiscal year demonstrates how deeply the Nixon Administration is committed to progress at SALT. We have called this year's defense budget a transitional budget. It is transitional because in terms of military capability, it is basically a status quo, stand-pat budget. We have postponed basic national security decisions in the strategic field in order to give maximum opportunity for SALT to be successful, and to foster a meaningful beginning for the era of negotiation President Nixon and the American people seek.

The objective of the Nixon Administration is to restore and maintain peace. With regard to SALT, the President's actions and words document this Administration's accent on negotiation rather than confrontation.

In my Defense Report to Congress in February, I expressed concern that the United States, by the mid-1970's, could find itself in a second-rate strategic position with regard to the future security of the Free World.

Today, in keeping with our policy of maximum information, I intend to present additional reasons for this concern.

It is important to discuss the growing strategic threat because it is essential for the

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

American people to understand the complex issues involved, if we are to insure our national security interests through the decade of the 1970's. The American people need to understand the reasons President Nixon is pursuing the course he has recommended in this year's transitional budget.

As Secretary of Defense, I must face the fact that we are taking a risk by postponing hard decisions which the increasing Soviet threat poses for us. I recognize that in the interests of lasting peace, some risks must be taken. But, it is my judgment that as the American people are provided additional information, such as we are discussing here today, they will agree that we are literally at the edge of prudent risk. And the inescapable conclusion will be that if the Soviet strategic offensive buildup continues, the risk to our nation will become too great to sustain without major offsetting actions.

Therefore, what I particularly want to focus on today is the basic asymmetry between what the United States has been doing and what the Soviet Union has been doing in the field of strategic nuclear weapons in recent years.

In a word, for the past five years, the United States has virtually been in neutral gear in the deployment of strategic offensive forces, while the Soviet Union has moved into high gear in both deployment and development of strategic nuclear weapons. In the 1965–67 time period, the United States decided on a level of strategic nuclear forces, including Multiple Independently Targeted Reentry Vehicles (MIRVs), which was deemed adequate to preserve our deterrent posture for the threat of the 1970's which was projected then. No basic change has been made in the force level decisions established in the mid-1960's.

The Soviet Union, by contrast, has engaged in a major effort since 1965 to change the balance of power. The United States then, unlike the situation today, clearly occupied a superior position.

Except for the minimum "hedge" that SAFEGUARD will provide, we have not responded to the Soviet strategic offensive buildup with new deployment programs. We did not respond in past years because the United States deliberately chose to assume that the Soviet buildup at most was aimed at achieving a deterrent posture comparable to that of the United States. We have not responded this year because, as I have said, we fervently hope that SALT can render such a response unnecessary.

As much as we might wish it otherwise, however, we must concentrate our attention on what the Soviet Union is actually doing. In the current situation of a diminishing U.S. deterrent and Soviet momentum, we simply cannot base our plans and programs on what we hope the Soviet Union may do either unilaterally or in SALT. The Soviets have a momentum going both in strategic weapons deployments and in strategic weapons developments. If their strategic posture could be expected to stay at the operationally deployed posture which exists today, I believe we would have a tolerable situation. What must concern us, however, is the momentum the Soviets have established both in deployments and developments and where that momentum may carry them.

Let me explain in more detail the basic problem.

The most crucial aspect of national security is the strategic balance between nations that have competing interests in the world. The strategic balance has a direct effect on relations between the superpowers. It has an indirect effect on other nations both in terms of their own relations with each other and in terms of their relations with the superpowers. As one example, a situation of clear superiority on the part of the Soviet Union would have profound implications for any future political or military confrontation between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. In fact, a clear strategic superiority on the part of the Soviet Union would affect our interests and our obligations throughout the world.

In our continuing debate on defense matters, it has been said many times that the driving force behind the so-called strategic arms race is the "action-reaction" phenomenon. The recent ABM–MIRV discussions in this country illustrate this. The argument is made, for instance, that the deployment of defensive missiles by one side tends to generate increased offensive deployments by the other side.

I certainly agree that one side's actions definitely can influence what the other side does. But just as weapons in themselves are not the cause of wars, neither are a country's actions in weapons deployment—in themselves—the driving force in a so-called arms race. The fundamental driving force in an arms race is what one country perceives as possible objectives of another country's action.

Let me explain it this way. Our goal is a stable peace. Our strategic policy to achieve that goal is deterrence. As publicly stated, the basic rationale for United States weapons deployment in the strategic field has been and remains deterrence. Our actions of the past several years underscore the fact that deterrence is our fundamental policy and that we seek no more than a posture of effective deterrence.

Because we in the United States seek a posture of deterrence to protect our interests and those of our allies, we obviously could recognize as legitimate a Soviet desire for a comparable deterrent to protect its interests.

I know that the actions of the Soviet Union in recent years have raised questions in the minds of some of you editors and others about the true objectives they are pursuing.

As I have said many times, I do not believe that it is appropriate for me, as Secretary of Defense, to attempt to assess the strategic intentions of another country. However, under my responsibilities, I must be concerned about present and potential strategic capabilities.

You representatives of a free press understand fully the national security price an open society must pay when competing with adversaries who cloak their plans in secrecy and attempt to hide both their objectives and their hardware behind the mantle of a closed society. The whole world knows what we in the United States have and what we plan in the national security field. Meaningful essentials are laid bare in an open forum—in official statements, in Congressional hearings, in the give and take of Congressional and public debate and in the reports of a free and competitive press. I would not have it any other way.

Let me emphasize again my conviction that the American people have a right to know even more than has been available in the past about matters which affect their safety and security. There has been too much classification in this country. In particular, too much has been withheld in the past about what has been going on in the closed societies of the Soviet Union and Communist China.

As we all pray for success in Vienna, let me point out that, in my view, the American people will support an arms limitation agreement only if they are confident they have the relevant facts about the strategic balance.

The facts I am about to present are not taken from external Soviet discussions of their strategic forces. They do not come from press conferences in Moscow, from testimony in the Kremlin, from news stories in Pravda, or from published annual Defense Reports by Marshal Grechko.

Rather, the information I am presenting to you is based on our own observations of what the Soviets are doing—and on our belief that this information and these facts should not be withheld from the American people and should be made available to others in the world.

Let us examine what has happened in the past five years to shift the relationship between U.S. and Soviet strategic forces and to provide an accelerated momentum to the Soviets in the strategic field:

In 1965, the Soviet Union had about 220 launchers for the relatively old-fashioned missiles—SS–6's, SS–7's and SS–8's—somewhat similar to our TITAN. We had 54 TITANs in the inventory at that time.

Today, these two forces remain essentially the same. So in this category of old-fashioned multimegaton weapons the Soviets had and still maintain a better than 4–1 advantage.

In 1965, the Soviet Union had *no* relatively small ICBM launchers comparable to our MINUTEMAN. By 1965, we had 880 MINUTEMAN missiles operational and had established that the total force level for MINUTEMAN would be 1,000 launchers. In the 1965–67 time period, the United States finalized plans to convert a portion of the established MINUTEMAN force to a MIRV MINUTEMAN III configuration.

Today, the Soviet Union has over 800 such launchers operational, and a projected force that could exceed 1,000 launchers within the next two years. These launchers include both the SS–11 and SS–13 missiles. Concurrently, flight testing of an improved SS–11 missile continues. Thus, at present construction rates, the Soviets will achieve parity in MINUTEMAN-type launchers within the next two years or so and could move into a substantial lead in this category by the mid-1970's if they continue to deploy these missiles. The previously scheduled U.S. program to MIRV a substantial part of MINUTEMAN continues in progress.

In 1965, there were no operational launchers for the large Soviet SS–9 missile which, in its single warhead version, can carry up to 25 megatons.

Today, I can report to you that there are some 220 SS–9's operational with at least 60 more under construction. Testing of an SS–9 multiple reentry vehicle—the triplet version—continues. The U.S. has no counterpart to this program involving large missiles. So, in this area, the Soviets have and will maintain a monopoly.

In 1965, neither a depressed trajectory ICBM nor a Fractional Orbital Bombardment System existed in either the Soviet or U.S. inventory.

Today, the Soviets have tested both configurations and could have an operational version already deployed. The United States has developed nothing comparable to these systems.

In 1965, the Soviet Union had about 25 launchers for Submarine Launched Ballistic Missiles (SLBMs) on nuclear submarines, and about 80 more on diesel submarines. Most were designed for surface launch only. The U.S. had 464 SLBM launchers operational on 29 submarines in 1965 and Congress had authorized the last of the 41 nuclear-powered submarines in our POLARIS Force in the previous fiscal year.

Today, the Soviets have over 200 operational launchers on nuclear submarines for submerged launch SLBMs and about 70 operational launchers on diesel submarines. In the next two years, the Soviets are expected to have some 400–500 operational launchers on POLARIS-type submarines, and at present construction rates—6–8 submarines a year—could match or exceed the number in the U.S. force by 1974–75. United States POLARIS submarines still number 41 and no increase is projected in current plans. Conversion of 31 of our POLARIS submarines to the MIRVed POSEIDON missile

is planned, and eight conversions have already been authorized by Congress.

In 1965, there was no development underway of a so-called Undersea Long-Range Missile System (ULMS) in the United States and there appeared to be none in the Soviet Union.

Today, the United States is spending relatively small sums in the research and development area on preliminary investigations of such a system. I can also report to you today that the Soviet Union, on the other hand, already is testing a new, long-range missile for possible Naval use.

In 1965, the Soviet heavy bomber force consisted of slightly over 200 aircraft, about 50 of which were configured as tankers. The U.S. heavy bomber force strength was about 780 in 1965.

Today, the Soviet heavy bomber force is slightly under 200, with about 50 still configured as tankers. U.S. heavy bomber strength has declined to about 550 today.

In 1965, we estimated that the Soviet Union had a complex of ABM launchers being constructed around Moscow as well as a number of radars under construction which could provide early warning acquisition and tracking functions for ABM use.

Today, we believe that 64 Moscow ABM launchers are operational together with sophisticated early warning radars and tracking capabilities. ABM testing for new and/or improved systems continues. Today, the first two SAFEGUARD sites have been authorized, but will not be operational befor 1974–75. This modified deployment schedule is considerably behind the schedule Congress had approved in 1967 for the planned SENTINEL area defense, which called for initial capability in 1972, and nation-wide coverage in 1975.

Thus, in the space of five years—from 1965 to 1970—the Soviet Union has more than tripled its inventory of strategic offensive nuclear weapon launchers from about 500 to about 1700—which includes some 200 heavy bombers in both totals—and continues the momentum of a vigorous construction program. In that same period, the Soviet Union has virtually quadrupled the total megatonnage in its strategic offensive force. The United States, on the other hand, in the same time period, made no increase in its established level of 1710 strategic nuclear missile launchers and reduced its heavy bomber strength of 780 by over 200. In that same period the United States also reduced its megatonnage by more than 40%.

To repeat: The United States has taken no action to increase the total of approved strategic offensive delivery vehicles in the past five years in response to the rapid growth in Soviet strategic delivery vehicles. We have, of course, maintained certain options and other steps have been taken to preserve our deterrent in the fact of this increase.

Two programs that have been the subject of intense public discussion are, of course, our MIRV and SAFEGUARD systems.

Let me emphasize that MIRV is needed to preserve our deterrent. Many people do not fully understand why it is necessary for us to continue the previously planned, Congressionally-approved and funded deployment of MIRV systems. The point is made that the current number of strategic nuclear weapons on alert in our force is sufficient for immediate retaliatory use in a crisis. Because MIRVing would more than double the number of deliverable weapons, the conclusion is drawn that this is unnecessary.

This conclusion could be valid if we assumed that the POLARIS, MINUTEMAN, and Bomber forces all would survive a surprise attack and that the Soviet Union would not deploy an extensive ABM system. However, as was pointed out in my Defense Report in February, the rapidly-growing Soviet strategic offensive forces could seriously threaten both the U.S. MINUTEMAN and strategic bomber forces by the mid-1970's.

Assuming we do not take additional actions to offset the expanding threat—and this apparently is what some people urge—I must, as Secretary of Defense, face the disquieting possibility that in the mid-to-late 1970's we would no longer be able to rely on either the Bomber or MINUTEMAN force to survive a surprise attack. In such a situation, we would be left with only the POLARIS/POSEIDON deterrent force in our strategic arsenal for high confidence retaliatory purposes. This would pose intolerable risks for American security.

Thus, the critical choice in the face of that situation is this:

1. Do we rely on the fraction of the 656 current weapons that will be at sea on our POLARIS force if we do not convert to POSEIDON and do not defend our land-based strategic forces?

2. Or, do we continue the previously established program to convert 31 POLARIS submarines to the long-approved POSEIDON MIRV program—which would provide approximately the same number of sea-based retaliatory weapons on alert that we currently have today in the sea-based and land-based retaliatory forces combined, but with much reduced megatonnage?

Pending a successful outcome in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, therefore, prudence dictates that we must continue our approved program to MIRV current forces.

Moreover, as the experience of the past five years demonstrates, it would be dangerous and imprudent to place unquestioned reliance on the invulnerability of any single system for more than five to seven years into the future.

This is why we must also, at the very least, preserve an option to defend a portion of our land-based retaliatory forces. That is a major part of what the proposed minimal addition to the SAFEGUARD Defensive program is designed to do. I will come back to that.

Because we want to give the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks every chance of succeeding, we are deliberately accepting certain risks by postponing hard choices related to strategic offensive weapons. These risks are acceptable only in the context of proceeding with the MIRV deployments that have been programmed and approved for several years and the SAFEGUARD increment we are recommending this year.

A second and equally important reason for MIRV is that it helps preserve our deterrent by increasing confidence in our ability to penetrate Soviet strategic defensive forces which, by the mid-to-late 1970's, also could be quite formidable. In addition to the extensive air defense capabilities they already possess, the Soviets are pursuing a vigorous anti-ballistic missile research and development program designed to improve the present operational system or to develop substantially better second-generation ABM components.

We now have evidence that the Soviet Union is testing an improved long-range ABM missile. They are also expanding their radar surveillance coverage. We cannot rule out the possibility that they have or will give the extensively deployed SA–5 surface-to-air missile system an ABM role. We believe such a role is technically feasible for this system.

With regard to Safeguard, which I mentioned previously, let me say this. In addition to other objectives, the reoriented Safeguard program, initiated last year, is designed to provide protection for our land-based deterrent forces, the Minuteman and Bombers. As you know, the President directed that each phase of the Safeguard deployment is to be reviewed each year to ensure that we are doing as much as necessary but not more than that required by the threat. The increments of Safeguard proposed so far will provide protection for a portion of our land-based deterrent, and permit flexibility with regard to our future course of action.

Without approval by Congress of the Modified Phase II Safeguard protection proposed by the President, we would be forced to recommend going forward this year with other strategic nuclear offensive force programs.

All of my comments so far have, of course, been focused on the more immediate and troublesome threat posed by the Soviet strategic force buildup. The nuclear weapons program of Communist China also concerns us and directly relates to the need for preserving timely Safeguard options as we move toward the mid-1970's. Time does not permit a discussion of this issue and the interrelationship of maintaining adequate strategic offensive and defensive forces to meet both the Soviet and Communist Chinese threats.

Where does all this leave us, and what is President Nixon attempting to do with the decisions he has incorporated in his Fiscal Year 1971 transitional defense budget?

Clearly, this Administration has not accelerated the previously planned deployment of offensive systems during our 15 months in office. On the contrary, we have slowed it down. The only major change we have made has been modification of the previously approved SENTINEL ABM deployment; and that change was a slowdown, not a speedup. We slowed the original deployment plan Congress approved, keyed it to the emerging threat on an annual review basis, and reoriented it to provide more timely protection needed for our land-based deterrent forces.

If the programmed forces established by the last Administration some years ago and approved by Congress were deemed appropriate and necessary for the security of the United States in the 1970's against the then projected threat I am at a loss to understand how critics can claim that the Nixon Administration has escalated the arms race. The record clearly shows that we have not done so. We have chosen instead to defer major new weapons decisions as long as possible pending developments in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. In continuing the MIRV and ABM programs, we are simply going ahead with programs on which our deterrent policy was formulated by previous Administrations, even before the current momentum of Soviet strategic programs became clear.

With regard to the important talks which have just resumed in Vienna, the President has stated that every U.S. system is negotiable. To those who argue that the U.S. should take specific, and perhaps unilateral, action at the start of these negotiations, I would reply that the place to resolve these issues is at the conference table with the Soviets. Let us try to find out at the conference table the meaning of the Soviet Union's increased weapons deployments and let us conduct these important negotiations with full recognition of these continuing Soviet deployments.

My appraisal today has covered some of the available evidence of the Soviet military buildup. I am not unmindful, however, of possible other directions of Soviet policy that could be relevant to our security. There have been reports that Soviet economic problems may place pressure upon their leadership to devote major attention to internal matters, thus reducing the recent emphasis on a continued military buildup.

As Secretary of Defense, I will continue to hope that the shift in national priorities we have instituted in America will be duplicated in the Soviet Union. But until evidence of that shift is discernible in weapons deployment activities, I have no alternative but to base my actions and recommendations on the evidence available, much of which I have shared with you editors today and, through you, with the American people.

SPLENDID ADDRESS

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues an outstanding address delivered by Secretary of the Treasury David M. Kennedy before the annual meeting of the Board of Governors of the Inter-American Development Bank, Punta del Este, Uruguay, last Thursday, April 23.

I felt that Secretary Kennedy's remarks were extremely timely as he reviewed the bank's significance in the last decade; the proposed increase in capital funding; and perspectives for the future.

It was a distinct honor for me to serve as a congressional adviser and to be part of an outstanding U.S. delegation at the meeting. Secretary Kennedy is also U.S. Governor of the Bank, which has assisted the economic development of the Latin American nations since its establishment in 1959.

I trust that when this House later considers appropriating the necessary additional funds, this fine address by Secretary Kennedy will be recalled and carefully considered. It is a pleasure for me to include Secretary Kennedy's address:

ADDRESS BY DAVID M. KENNEDY

The inter-American community is again grateful to the Government and people of Uruguay for providing this beautiful and historic city as the site of our deliberations. Here, where Presidents of the Americas have conferred and contemporary inter-American solidarity has been forged, we have an opportunity this week to give concrete reality to our mature partnership, in the framework of this decade's program of Action for Progress. We are also fortunate to have here with us, for the first time, the Governor for Jamaica, whom we welcome as our newest member.

In this year when we celebrate the first decade of the Bank under the able leadership of President Herrera and the Board of Executive Directors, I have organized my observations around three points: (1) the significance to the Bank of the last decade, (2) the proposed increase in Bank resources, and (3) perspectives for the future.

I. THE BANK'S FIRST DECADE

The world our hemisphere and this Bank have undergone extraordinary changes since the first Board of Governors met in San Salvador in early 1960. Ten years ago, foreign assistance had only recently changed focus from the reconstruction of relatively advanced countries to the development of underdeveloped ones. Advanced countries other than the United States were just beginning to make significant contributions to development assistance. The terms of such assistance were often poorly adopted to the prospective balance of payments situations of borrowing countries. In the multilateral assistance field, there was the World Bank, but its concessional landing instrument, the International Development Association, was untested. Multilateral financial cooperation for regional development was, until the establishment of the Inter-American Bank, non-existent.

Today's contrast with 1960 is striking. Development assistance, its form and its degree of multilateralism have changed markedly. This Bank has emerged as a major element in the inter-American economic structure. It has demonstrated the validity of the idea of multilateral development cooperation at the regional level. And it can justly regard itself as the trail blazer for other regional institutions, such as the Asian Development Bank.

A second contrast can be found in the ability of a regional institution such as the Bank to reach out and mobilize funds in the world capital markets, using for this purpose the guarantee provided by its members. Its bonds are now widely held and its financial standing highly respected. Through its patient efforts in world financial centers the Bank itself has been an important instrument in changing the forms and practices of development finance.

A third difference relates to the kinds of activities in which we now think it appropriate for development institutions to engage. This Bank has led the way in directing attention of development agencies to areas that had been relatively neglected or even considered inappropriate for the attention of international financial institutions. These include education, health and the difficult problems of rural poverty. Lending in these frontier areas of development assistance has gained respectability only within the last ten years. This Bank—supported in the early years, I am proud to say, by the Social Progress Trust Fund provided by the United States—has played a catalytic role in the emergence of new attitudes.

Ten years of experience has made us all more realistic in our approach to development. We have learned that there is no single formula for development applicable to all countries. Each nation is different and each requires a different mix of resources. We recognize more clearly now the importance of a sound framework of fiscal, monetary exchange and investment policies within which development can take place. And we perceive now more clearly than ever that external assistance can only be efficiently utilized where there is an intense domestic will to develop. This must be accompanied by a readiness to commit domestic resources to the development task in the fullest measure.

Thus, the opening of this decade presents new opportunities to the Bank. It can become more selective, both in terms of the types of activities it finances and the quality of economic performance it expects of borrowers as a condition of its lending. With such selectivity, and a continuation of its distinctive Latin and pioneering spirit, the Bank can make the decade of the seventies a fitting and fruitful successor to the sixties.

II. INCREASE IN RESOURCES

The main task of this meeting is to make adequate provision for obtaining the capital resources needed by the Bank in the first half of its second decade of lending. I have been authorized by President Nixon to announce that the United States is prepared to join Latin American efforts in accomplishing this task. In the context of a proposal with full Latin American support, we would be prepared to approach the U.S. Congress promptly for increases in both our Ordinary Capital subscription and our contribution to the Fund for Special Operations. Specifically, the United States would be prepared to seek legislative authority for—

An increase in its paid-in Ordinary Capital subscription of $150 million combined with a $674 million increase in its callable Ordinary Capital subscription, both as our established share of a $2 billion over-all increase in the Bank's Ordinary Capital resources.

A substantial contribution to the Fund for Special Operations as part of an over-all increase in Fund resources which would reflect the progress Latin economies have made these past ten years as well as their commitment to the role of multilateral institutions in development.

Resources should be sought in a magnitude which will cover requirements foreseen for the Bank in a three to five year period. They should permit the Bank to provide half again as much financing per year as the approximately $600 million which the Bank committed to loans in 1969. Moreover, they should ensure funding for new types and directions of activities that are now under preliminary consideration in the Bank.

But provision for the future requires more than money alone. It requires adaptation to reflect new realities in the seventies. It requires new relationships beyond the hemisphere to reflect Latin America's growing integration into the world economy and the world's growing commitment to multilateral development financing.

I have three major areas in mind where beneficial changes could be made. First, the present practice of extending Fund for Special Operations loans on a local currency repayable basis involves the potential problem of excess accumulations of such currencies in the Bank's accounts. A shift to a policy of repayment in the currencies lent, combined with an appropriate easing of repayment terms as necessary, would avoid the problem. This would permit the Fund ultimately to become a revolving source of hard currency financing. I understand that a move in this direction already has widespread support.

Second, our concern for achieving more balanced growth in the Hemisphere suggests that the financial needs of the least developed members should have first claim on the Bank's concessional loan resources. The opposite side of the same coin is that the region's more advanced countries should place relatively greater reliance on Ordinary Capital financing. This could be considered a cooperative contribution on the part of the stronger countries toward self-help in the Hemispheric sense. It would also complement the willingness of the larger members to allow a greater usefulness of their local currency subscriptions to the fund for Special Operations. In this latter connection an expansion of the group of countries allowing this broader use would be widely applauded.

Finally, I believe that multiple benefits would accrue not only to the Bank but to Latin American development in general if other developed countries—regional and non-regional—could be brought within the Bank's membership. Additional Ordinary Capital resources would become available and access to capital markets would be easier. Membership would also elicit additional concessional loan resources more effectively. In the light of experience elsewhere I am confident that these benefits can be obtained without changing the essentially regional character of the Bank. Indeed, it is my confidence in the permanent Latin character of our Bank which permits this judgment. Serious efforts to move in this desirable direction have important and broadening support and steps are needed now to move toward the removal of existing barriers. This is the time to begin. I strongly urge that the Board of Governors take the necessary steps which will lead to opening our doors to Canada and others.

The provision of the resources called for and the adoption of the policy changes recommended entails real burdens and real sacrifices for all of us. Nevertheless—and with full consideration of the intense competing demands for budgetary resources—I offer full assurance of President Nixon's readiness to support these financial and policy measures. I believe such support constitutes solid evidence of our commitment to Latin America and to hemispheric development.

III. PERSPECTIVES FOR THE FUTURE

In reviewing the last decade I came across the following statement made by one of my predecessors, Robert B. Anderson, the first Bank Governor for the United States, at the inaugural meeting of this Board

The creation of the Bank does not in itself solve any of the problems with which we are all so concerned; yet it does provide us with an effective framework in which men of good will can join with the confidence that through the exercise of thought, diligence, and mutual respect they can achieve great benefit for their peoples.

This judgment is still true today and it remains the framework within which we will meet the challanges in the decade ahead. Four challenges to the Bank should be noted.

First, multilateral institutions will undoubtedly assume a greater role in providing financial and technical assistance. Within this hemisphere the Bank is in an excellent position to continue leadership in financing development. But to do so fully will require closer collaboration and coordination with the other bilateral and multilateral financing agencies, and with the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress. This will assure that scarce external funds are being most effectively utilized and that the Bank has access to the best hemispheric judgments on whether or not a borrowing country itself is pursuing proper development policies and programs.

Second, the Bank's internal organization, management and procedures will have to continue to adopt to changing conditions.

Third, the next decade challenges the Bank to participate directly and indirectly in encouraging private initiative and free market forces. While it is clear that each nation must fashion its own policies about the role of public and private sector activities, and of domestic and foreign private investment in its society, the posture of the Bank will be guided I hope, by practical considerations of efficient economic development. In this regard, I look forward with interest to the deliberations of the Board on expanding the Bank's role in assisting private productive enterprise. In particular I hope that it will be possible to employ in this effort the existing extensive framework of banks and other financial intermediaries.

Fourth, the next decade should see more countries advancing toward self-sustained institutional, financial and social growth. This will permit a greater number of stronger member countries to assist the least developed through both technical and economic assistance. And it will contribute to the strengthening of the multilateral character of the Bank.

These and many other challenges of the seventies lie ahead of us. I am confident that the leadership of this great institution, supported by the Bank's capable staff, will effectively meet these challenges with inventiveness wisdom and determination.

The actions we are taking this week to increase the resources of the Inter-American Development Bank make clear our strong support of this inter-American institution. President Nixon, in February, outlined in realistic terms the basis on which we must face this decade of the seventies:

There are no short cuts to economic and social progress. This is a reality, but also a source of hope, for collaborative effort can achieve much. And it is increasingly understood among developed and developing nations that economic development is an international responsibility.

The Inter-American Development Bank is a fine example of a multilateral institution through which this responsibility is effected. The United States is proud to be a member.

WORLD'S FAIR PROJECT OF TOOELE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, it is sometimes assumed that inland America is not interested in and does not feel involved with our relations with other countries of the world.

Of course that is not true. My mail from Utah shows a very large and growing sensitivity toward our relations with other countries and the direction in which our foreign affairs are trending.

I am particularly proud to take note that social studies students at the Tooele Junior High School in my district are about to hold their own world's fair and a crowd of many thousands is expected to attend. Their teacher is Kenneth P. VanOtten, director of social studies at the school. Students have received materials from virtually every country in the world with the exception of North Korea and North Vietnam. With the theme "Make the World Fair 1970," the students will open their exhibition May 7.

The report of this fine American project is made by the Tooele Bulletin:

JUNIOR HIGH PLANS WORLD'S FAIR

With the cooperation of every country in the world, except North Korea and North Vietnam, social studies students at the Tooele Junior High School have organized their own World's Fair.

Planned around the theme "Make the World Fair 1970", their exhibition will open at 7:00 Thursday evening, May 7. A short ceremony will be held in the new Tooele High School Auditorium with the displays being shown in the gymnasium, audio-visual aids room and the cafeteria of the Junior High School.

In addition to items from every nation, some 70 individual cities have also contributed special materials. Displays will include photographs, books, costumes, native music and film programs. For example 400 color slides from Portugal will be shown along with film strips of Africa and France. If it arrives in time, a motion picture depicting life in Red China will also be shown.

Girls from the eighth grade social studies class have edited a cookbook of foreign recipes. The book, now being printed, will be made available to the public.

Kenneth P. VanOtten, instructor of social studies, said the fair is the outgrowth of efforts to introduce into the classroom the history and culture of many nations. He feels that such activities, which are outside of regular text book study, help students to a better understanding of the peoples of the world.

The students hope to have 8,000 people visit their fair and have organized groups to usher, aid in parking cars, and to answer questions.

"We think this experience will be something special to everyone who attends," Mr. VanOtten continued. "If it is successful we would like to make it an annual program."

He believes that this is the first time a program of this magnitude has ever been attempted by any school district. He expressed his appreciation to Franklin Whitehouse, principal of the Tooele Junior High, Lewis Killpack, Assistant Principal and District Superintendent Clarke Johnsen.

"These three men have not only put up with me but have encouraged my experiments. They share my conviction that we can make school fantastically interesing for students. We can create an atmosphere where the kids will be glad to come to the classroom instead of glad to get away from it."

"It's been an exciting project for me," VanOtten continued. "I've never had my students accept any other program with such enthusiasm. And it's the kids who are really responsible for our fair."

Each student in Mr. VanOtten's class has accepted the assignment of "adopting" a foreign country. Through letters they are then encouraged to learn of its tradition, natural resources, language and culture. During the past four years they have collected 15 large cases of foreign mail containing stamps, books, pamphlets, jewelry, posters and other items. Mail arrives almost daily with additional material.

Kings, Premiers, Mayors and other government officials from many lands have written to the students wishing them and the Tooele Junior High School good luck. Their fair project has even been given press coverage in Eastern European Countries.

Speaking about the material they have been receiving Mr. VanOtten stated "We haven't received a lot of propaganda, just letters from friendly, interested people."

IN TRIBUTE TO JOHN FRANK STEVENS

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday marked the anniversary of the birth date of one of Maine's most distinguished citizens, the late John Frank Stevens. Architect of the Panama Canal and one of the pioneers of railroad development in our own Nation, my State is justly proud of this native son, who was born in West Gardiner, Maine, on April 25, 1853.

As a member of the John F. Stevens Hall of Fame Committee, formed in 1969 with the purpose of sponsoring the election of John F. Stevens to the Hall of Fame for Great Americans, I am pleased to note that Maine's Gov. Kenneth M. Curtis proclaimed April 25, 1970, as John Frank Stevens Day in my State. I would like to bring this proclamation to the attention of my colleagues and hereby insert it in the RECORD:

PROCLAMATION OF STATE OF MAINE

Whereas, John Frank Stevens is a native son of Maine and through his endeavors has brought great fame to himself and to our state; and

Whereas, Mr. Stevens has been credited as being the basic architect of the Panama Canal as well as one of the pioneers of railroad development to the West; and

Whereas, Mr. Stevens is so revered by scores of prominent Americans they have formed a Committee of 100 to secure for him a place in the Hall of Fame of Great Americans at New York University; and

Whereas, Mr. Stevens' birth occurred in West Gardiner, Maine, on April 25, 1853;

Now, therefore, I, Kenneth M. Curtis, Governor of the State of Maine, and an Honorary Chairman of the John F. Stevens Hall of Fame Committee, do hereby proclaim April 25, 1970, as John Frank Stevens Day in the State of Maine.

"MY HOPES FOR AMERICA'S FUTURE"

HON. RAY BLANTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, recently I made an inspection trip to South Vietnam on behalf of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

One of the most impressive things to me was the absolute dedication to country, the complete patriotism which our men are endowed with.

This love of country, and willingness to make sacrifices, was apparent in all the discussions I had with dozens of our young men.

The liaison officer assigned to me was typical in his high morale and dedication. Capt. Francis A. Waters of the Marine Corps was with me throughout my visit. He informed me that he won a Freedoms Foundation Award for an essay this year, and I have secured a copy so that my colleagues can share the feelings of a young Marine captain in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I include Captain Waters' essay, "My Hopes for America's Future," in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

MY HOPES FOR AMERICA'S FUTURE

(By Francis A. Waters)

My hopes for America's future are, what I believe to be, the hopes of the mainstream of America. The same hopes that our Founding Fathers in their wisdom had, and for which they had the energy and courage to work and sacrifice.

The energy of America is a well established fact. One has only to look at our farms and factories, homes and shops, automobiles and moon landing space vehicles. We are the model for our allies; the envy of those that choose to be our enemies.

However, what is more important than our admittedly tremendous energy is our courage. The moral and physical courage of our Founding Fathers. From Bunker Hill through Hill 881 our enemies can best attest to our physical courage. What concerns me most at this time is our moral courage.

The right of peaceful and orderly dissent is an essential ingredient in our form of government. What is so disturbing today is that not only is dissent often accompanied by violence, but often reasons for this dissent are suspect. In this regard I cannot help but believe that some dissent evolves from those who lack moral courage: the moral courage to support our country when we are committed to a just and honorable cause, however difficult. This country is presently committed to assist the people of the Republic of Vietnam in their inherent right to select a government of their own free choice. Some who are opposed to this commitment, and many who violently dissent in their opposition, offer little in the way of either realistic or constructive criticism. While much of their dissent is predicated on alleged reasons of morality, the rationale they set forth often rings more of appeasement than morality.

Communism of 1969 is no less a villain to world peace than was Nazism of 1939. Our country learned, at the terrible cost of World War II, that moral courage in the 1930's may well have prevented the holocaust that followed. The reason for moral courage today would, therefore, seem to me to be obvious.

For example, if it were not for the moral courage of this country to meet our commitments in Europe after World War II, that continent would be under communist domination today. If it were not for our moral courage in Korea that country would now be a communist state.

Today, as Americans fight and rebuild in Vietnam, our country seeks once again to prevent the insidious encroachment of communism. Admittedly, the price we and our allies must pay to prevent this latest attempted takeover is a heavy one. However, unless we, as the citadel of freedom, are prepared to stop aggression not only for the moral principle involved, but for the practical purpose of our eventual preservation, we may have to pay a far greater price for our own freedom. If communism is left unchecked we will eventually find ourselves encircled by satellites unified in their intent to achieve their greatest victory—domination of this country.

My hope then is that all Americans realize the purposefulness of our enemies. That as we have in dark periods in our past, recognized our obligations and have the moral courage to face them. I am convinced that this ability for self-recognization is inherent in the character of America, and all Americans—of all political factions—will once again realize it. But this self-recognization must come now, before the price for world freedom becomes even more expensive.

These are my hopes—and my prayers—for America's future.

MARITAL CENSORSHIP

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, when the New York Times feels called upon to defend, even indirectly, Mrs. Martha Mitchell, we know that an issue of great proportions must have been raised.

Such was the case in the recent firing of William Woestendiek, a news editor for educational television station WETA, dismissed summarily simply because his wife, Kay, a competent professional herself, took a position as Mrs. Mitchell's press secretary.

As the Times accurately stated in a recent editorial, this "guilt-by-marriage standard is as silly as it is outrageous." I insert the editorial of April 20, 1970, in the RECORD at this point:

MARITAL CENSORSHIP

Even if this were not the year of women's liberation, there would be a ludicrous quality to the controversy that led to the ouster of William Woestendiek as editor of a news feature program on Washington's educational television station. The station says it feared a "conflict of interest" was created by the decision of Mr. Woestendiek's wife to go to work as press secretary for Mrs. Martha Mitchell, the outspoken wife of the Attorney General. Establishing such a guilt-by-marriage standard is as silly as it is outrageous. Someone ought to educate the educational TV officials responsible in common sense.

PERMIT SENIOR CITIZENS TO EARN MORE

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, constantly today we hear people talking about poverty, and we listen to many plans for removing people from the poverty levels of earnings. Yet ignored in all these plans are a huge segment of our population that we are forcing by law to live in poverty. These are our retired people who are living on social security benefits.

Recently, some of my comments about this situation were printed in the paper published by the National Federation of Independent Business, and subsequently printed by many daily newspapers throughout the Nation. The following are the remarks as printed by the National Federation of Independent Business:

CAN A RETIRED PERSON LIVE ON $1,680 PER YEAR?

Congressman Bill Chappell, Jr. of Florida thinks not, and has a bill before Congress to permit a senior citizen to earn up to $2,400 per year before losing any of his or her Social Security benefits. This is the subject of a poll now being taken among the nation's independent businessmen by the National Federation of Independent Business.

In the past the polls of the Federation have shown that 72 percent of the independent businessmen believe that senior citizens should be permitted unlimited earnings without sacrificing any Social Security benefits.

Now, apparently under the whiplash of the present Administration which believes the $1,680 per year too low, the Social Security Administration has changed its viewpoint.

In a letter to Jerome Gulan, legislative director of the National Federation of Independent Business, Robert Ball, Social Security Commissioner, states in part, "the provision in the Social Security law under which benefits are not paid in full to people under age 72 if their earnings exceed $1,680 in a year . . . generally referred to as the retirement test, should be changed."

He further states, "It is, of coures, not right that people who do additional work or take a job at higher pay are disadvantaged."

The Administration's bill differs both from the Chappell bill for raising the limit, and from the independent business viewpoint of no limits. The pertinent details as explained by Ball are as follows:

"Under present law, $1 in benefits is withheld for each $2 of earnings between $1,680 (the annual exempt amount) and $2,880, but above $2,880, $1 in benefits is withheld for each $1 of earnings. Since benefits are tax free while earnings are taxable, a person may have less in net income by increasing his earnings. Under the Administation's bill, $1 in benefits would be withheld for each $2 of earnings above the annual exempt amount regardless of how high the earnings might be; there would be no point at which $1 in benefits would be withheld for each $1 of earnings. The bill would also increase the annual exempt amount of earnings from $1,680 to $1,800, and would provide for automatic increases in the annual exempt amount as earnings levels rise."

The new position of the Social Security Administration probably illustrates its response to shifting political winds.

For many years the prevalent idea of So-

cial Security was that of an insurance program which provided for retirement benefits, with the employee and employer paying premiums for this purpose.

Over ten years ago, before the United States Supreme Court the Social Security Administration admitted that it was not insurance in the bona-fide sense of the word, and that Congress could at any time stop the program and those who have been forced to pay "premiums" would have no recourse.

More recently Commissioner Ball further exploded the "insurance myth" concerning Social Security still further, in a letter published in the American Medical Association News, in which he attacked an analysis of the system published by the Federation. He stated that the payroll taxes paid by the employer are not credited to any particular employee, but are just thrown into a lump fund.

But the idea sold over 35 years ago that Social Security is a form of insurance lingers on. And as more people qualify for benefits for which they have presumably paid by forced collections from their paychecks, more interest has been generated, especially as inflation has severely eroded the fixed incomes of many older people.

The Social Security law, which at present discriminates against people who must work to supplement their Social Security benefits, does not require any consideration being given to oldsters who have incomes from investments and other nonemployment sources which has resulted in aged millionaires drawing full Social Security benefits.

Neither does the law discriminate against those 72 years of age or more who can draw full Social Security benefits no matter how big an income they receive from employment. However, Federation researchers have failed to turn up many people over 72 who have launched on lucrative new employment careers.

But Federation researchers do receive many reports from members who are still operating their businesses at an advanced age because their Social Security benefits would not permit them to exist, if they closed their businesses and retired. Those who choose to take this course are required to continue paying into the fund at the high self-employed rate, although they never expect to collect any benefits.

My deepest appreciation to the Federation for their views. Let us hope that all our efforts combined will result in the social security recipient having the opportunity to earn a greater amount of money without having his benefits penalized.

POSTAL REORGANIZATION

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, for over a year now, the Congress has been considering postal reorganization. The committee records are filled with testimony from nearly everyone. Additionally, each Member's office has been filled with letters asking if something can be done to improve the system.

Almost every citizen agrees that the system must be changed. The time to act is now. The President has submitted a proposal, carefully worked out between the Post Office Department and the unions. This proposal will permit the Post Office to take advantage of the great technological progress made in this country by business and industry over the past few decades.

Postal reorganization will not only benefit the American public, but will also provide great opportunities to the postal employees.

I hope the Congress will act promptly on this legislation—more talking will not solve the problem.

THE IMPORTANCE OF EARTH DAY

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, April 22, 1970, was designated as "Earth Day"—a national day of reassessment of our surroundings. All over our country there took place a concerted effort to highlight the need for confronting and solving the problems of our environment.

This national issue has drawn many citizens together, from all age brackets, and hopefully this growing consciousness of the quality of our life will continue to produce positive results.

I commend all of the individuals and organizations who participated in the nationwide Earth Day. Also at this time, I would like to praise the news reporting of the Quincy Patriot Ledger for their indepth coverage of the entire range of pollution on the local, State, and National levels. The Quincy Patriot Ledger has done a great service in informing the citizenry of Massachusetts on the entire range of environmental problems—a cause vital to all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I include several news items that appeared in the Quincy Patriot Ledger—all indicative of the ongoing coverage and attention allotted to this crucial subject:

[From the Patriot Ledger, Apr. 21, 1970]

LITTER POLLUTION

The great American slob reads and hears about how man is polluting his land, water and air. He's beginning to worry about it.

But still he continues to litter the land, bit by bit, with his trash: a beer can here, a pop bottle there; an empty cigarette package; a candy wrapper; the contents of his car ashtray; maybe an old tire or inner tube tossed into the woods.

Every so often, someone proclaims a day in which citizens go out with rakes and shovels and baskets and barrels to pick the stuff up. Tons of it are accumulated and hauled off for disposal. For once, the grounds are clean. Then the great American slob goes to work again . . .

Tomorrow is "Earth Day", a dramatization of the anti-pollution campaign, and as a prelude in New York City hundreds of people assembled Saturday in Central Park and the Botanical Garden to clean up the litter.

In Central Park, more than a ton of junk (including 1,000 beer cans and a chaise lounge) were dredged out of the Boating Lake, and another 150 bags of trash were collected from the Botanical Gardens.

Doubtless that much could be picked up on Boston Common, the Public Garden, Franklin Park or the Blue Hills—or you name it. The great American slob is indigenous to no particular region; he'll discard his trash anywhere he happens to be.

And don't think a little talk about pollution or an occasional clean-up day will change his habits. Oh no. In a few weeks, Central Park will be as littered as ever.

The great American slob, you see, doesn't equate the talk about pollution with his mindless disposal of trash.

[From the Patriot Ledger, Apr. 21, 1970]

SENATOR NELSON ASKS GUARANTEE OF DECENT U.S. ENVIRONMENT

BOSTON.—Sen. Gaylord Nelson, D-Wis., said today it would take a constitutional amendment to guarantee every American "the inalienable right to a decent environment."

In remarks prepared for a joint session of the Massachusetts Legislature in observance of Earth Week, Nelson said the environmental crisis demanded the assertion of "new individual rights and responsibilities."

"Establishing environmental right as a fundamental doctrine of this society would mark the beginning of a transition from a nation that pursues bigness and abundance at any price to one that emphasizes the well being of present and future generations," Nelson said.

Nelson said the assault on the country's environment would continue "until the citizen demands the right to go to court and stop the pollution of a public lake, until commuters ask for rapid transit instead of a second car, until the housewife rejects detergents that get shirts clean but dirty the environment . . ."

Nelson urged public support of the constitutional amendment he has introduced that says, "Every person has the inalienable right to a decent environment. The U.S. and every state shall guarantee this right."

[From the Quincy Patriot Ledger, Apr. 21, 1970]

STUDENTS IN AREA COMMUNITIES JOIN CLEANUP FOR EARTH DAY

Activities ranging from sweepins to panel discussions will be held in many area towns tomorrow in connection with the national Earth Day observance.

MANY OBSERVANCES

Observances nationally include everything from marches and demonstrations to mock funerals for the automobile. Clean-ups, teach-ins, nature walks, workshops and lectures are scheduled.

Earth Day grew out of a suggestion made by Sen. Gaylord Nelson, D-Wis., in the wake of last November's antiwar demonstrations.

It was reasoned that if public sentiment could be mobilized over the anti-war issue, then the positive issue of protecting the environment ought to generate even greater support.

In Quincy, the beautification committee of the Quincy South Shore Chamber of Commerce is sponsoring a clean-up of the downtown area starting at 9:30 a.m. According to Bernard C. Moore Jr., executive director of the chamber, some 25 junior high school students are expected to help merchants clean up unsightly spots in the vicinity of the John Hancock parking area and the Ross Parking Way.

Beginning at 1 p.m., the Student Committee on Environmental Control (SCORE), an organization of ecology-minded Central Junior High Students, is sponsoring a clean up of Furnace Brook.

In both cases, the city department of public works will supply vehicles to remove the debris which students collect.

In Braintree, an Earth Day cleanup of Watson Park is scheduled to start at 9 a.m., tomorrow. As part of the activity, trees will be pruned and some 20 new trees will be planted, according to Mrs. Edward Silk of the Braintree Garden Club. She said the gar-

den club and the Watson Park Study Commission, co-sponsors of the activity, hope Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts and neighborhood youths join them.

Also in Braintree, Cadet Troop 427 of the Girl Scouts will undertake a cleanup of the grounds around town hall beginning at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

THAYER ACADEMY

The ecology club at Thayer Academy in Braintree has planned a full day of activities for tomorrow, highlighted by the visit of members of the Harvard University Ecology Club. The Harvard students will show a pollution movie to the student body from 9 to 9:30 a.m., and afterwards conduct discussions on ecology. In the afternoon, members of the Thayer Academy ecology club will distribute information about Boston-wide programs planned for the evening.

Journalism students at Randolph High School have organized an "environmental action day" for tomorrow. According to spokesman Pat Pennie, high school students will conduct a poll asking town residents attitudes on what should be done about the environment. Students will conduct the poll door-to-door, and in the shopping area, she said.

In addition, the students are sponsoring a cleanup of all the elementary school playgrounds in town tomorrow, she said. Some 50 high school students are expected to pitch in with this activity.

Two clean-up campaigns are planned in Milton tomorrow.

Milton Youth Resolved in Action (MYRIA) are organizing a cleanup of the Blue Hills area. The activity will begin at 1:30 p.m. at the Trail Side Museum and continue until dusk. The Metropolitan District Commission (MDC) has agreed to cooperate by picking up debris which students collect.

ROCKY KNOLL

Also in Milton, the Rocky Knoll Nature Center of the Massachusetts Audubon Society will be the site of a clean-up campaign beginning at 9:30 a.m. Audubon Society officials are urging neighborhood children to participate in the cleanup of the one acre site.

In Hingham, a panel discussion on ecological problems in the town will be held beginning at 7:30 p.m. tomorrow in the public library. Panelists will be from the school department, the planning board and the board of health. Library officials have invited members of the public to attend.

A slide program on pollution of North River will be held at 8 p.m. tomorrow at the First Parish Church hall, Norwell center in conjunction with Earth Day. An open discussion will be held afterwards.

The evening division of the Women's Club in Marshfield is sponsoring a pickup of roadside litter tomorrow. A truck will be stationed in the parking lot behind the American Legion Hall from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. for deposit of litter which townspeople collect.

Most area colleges also are planning special activities tomorrow in connection with Earth Day. Perhaps the most extensive activities will be at Wellesley College. Scheduled is an address by Prof. Barry Commoner, a Washington University ecologist, panel discussions by students and environment-related talks by several Wellesley professors.

WORLD SURVIVAL

Prof. Commoner, the principal speaker of the week, will talk on "Will We Let the World Survive" at 10 a.m., tomorrow in Pendleton East at Wellesley College. Paul Santimire, college chaplain; Erwin Canham, Christian Science Monitor Editor; and Miss Jeanne Huermstad, class of 1970, will discuss "Does Religion Have Anything to Say on the Ecological Crisis" at 7:30 p.m., Thursday in the Pope Room.

A full week of ecology activities is being held at Bridgewater State College. Public activities scheduled for tomorrow include a talk on population problems by Dr. Lawrence Mish of the biology department at 10 a.m. at Tillinghast Hall. Dr. Maier of the earth science department will talk on new priorities at 1 p.m. at Tillinghast Hall. Activities scheduled for Thursday include an address on environmental geology by Dr. Ira Furlong, professor of earth science, at 1 p.m. at Tillinghast Hall.

At Regis College in Weston Earth Day will begin at 9 a.m. tomorrow in the new science wing with a series of panel discussions on pollution problems. The drama department will present Revue, an ecology play, from noon to 1 p.m. in front of the library.

A film program and several exhibits, all dealing with pollution, will be shown from 1 to 4 p.m. in the new science wings. Rep. Charles F. Flaherty Jr., D-Cambridge, and David Brown, a biologist at the New England Aquarium, will speak in the evening on policy for the environment.

[From the Patriot Ledger, Apr. 22, 1970]

EARTH DAY

(By Gene S. Goldenberg)

WASHINGTON.—The fight to clean up the environment is seen by the organizers of today's "Earth Day" as a natural extension of the anti-war movement.

BATTLE AGAINST CAUSES

"There's a strong philosophical relationship between all protest movements—civil rights, the war, environment," explains Stephen Cotton, a leader of Environmental Action, Inc.

This Washington-based, non-profit group is the driving force behind the "Earth Day" today, a nationwide series of campus teach-ins, protests and community rallies. Action leaders estimate that 2,000 campuses, 2,000 community groups and 10,000 high schools will participate. In addition, at least 19 U.S. senators and five governors will speak.

But Cotton and other Action leaders don't view the fight against pollution as merely a "one shot" protest. "Earth Day" is designed to give groups across the nation an organizational focus for continued involvement in environmental issues.

Cotton, a Harvard law student, sees the clean-up not as a battle against symptoms, but rather against causes. This is the relationship he notes between the "Earth Day" and national protests against the war.

"Look," he explains, "if the war ended tomorrow, the country would still be in a mess."

So Environmental Action is out to reform the decision-making processes that allow major industries, for example, to pollute streams, rivers and the air around us in the first place. Cotton and his colleagues do not merely want to clean things up only to have them get dirty again.

Action as a formal organization was originally set up early in January under the name Environmental Teach-In Inc. But this label was soon discarded because, as Cotton puts it, "we wanted to go beyond students talking to each other." In this goal, Action leaders have been successful, with anti-pollution drives set in several major cities and backed by business executives and civic leaders rather than students.

VOLUNTEER HELP

However, the 15 or so organizers of Action are themselves mostly young—average age is about 23—and mostly college and graduate students who are taking time off from school to put "Earth Day" together. The national coordinator is Denis Hayes, a former student body president at Stanford University and presently on leave from Harvard Graduate School.

Cotton says that some of Action's coordinators were active in the anti-war moratorium and mobilization groups, but he denies that Action is a carry-over of these organizations.

So far, Action's money has come from individual contributions and six or seven grants from small foundations, according to Cotton.

The budget to date—about $100,000—has been supplemented by the volunteer help of hundreds of Washington area students, housewives and businessmen. Cotton estimates that Action will spend about $125,000 in all to set up "Earth Day."

After today, Action's leaders are hopeful that there will be little need for a central coordinating group. Indeed, if "Earth Day" is successful, the seeds of protest will be effectively sown so that Action can leave the rest of the job to its progeny.

[From the Quincy Patriot Ledger, Apr. 22, 1970]

SAFFORD PARK CLEANUP STRIKES OUT

QUINCY.—Safford Park, on Beale Street between Prospect Avenue and Winthrop Avenue, received a spring cleaning last week from neighborhood youngsters hoping to use the park for baseball games.

THREE-DAY CHAMP

About 25 youngsters of elementary school age worked without supervision for three days, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday afternoons, to rake and bag litter and leaves that blanketed the small park.

The park and recreation board, which maintains Safford Park for the city had placed a new sign on a tree at the park, which reads "$50 dollars Fine—No Ball Playing—Police Take Notice" to replace a similar sign that had been painted over and ignored several seasons ago.

The children, believing that the reason for the prohibition was the messy condition of the park, independently organized to clean up the park, even though they aren't the primary litterers.

There are two established playgrounds in the neighborhood, Stony Brae on South Central Avenue, which is fenced and has a summer playground program, and Forbes Hill Playground, a larger playground off Summit Avenue. But, according to Mrs. Norma Gale, 72 Prospect Ave., those parks are dominated by the older children, and since the younger children cannot compete, they customarily play at Safford Park.

"TOO SMALL"

According to Dick Koch, executive secretary to the park and recreation board, the children's efforts, although greatly appreciated, will not remove the restriction. "The park is too small for baseball," Koch said. "It is designed as a beautification park, not a ballpark."

He named the two other playgrounds in the area, besides the basketball courts at the back of Wollaston School, almost opposite the Safford Park, that were intended for rough play.

"I'm not against the youngsters playing in the park, but the park can't hold a ballgame," he said. "Beale Street is busy, and there is a chance that a child will run out after a ball. Mothers take their babies and toddlers there, and sit at the benches."

Nathaniel Safford gave the land on Beale Street to the city in 1873 for the first Wollaston School. When the school had to move across the street for more room, Safford Park was created on the land.

According to Dick Koch, the Wollaston American Legion will be placing and dedicating a granite memorial and flag pole in the park on May 17. The granite memorial will sit in the middle of the park, at the site of a howitzer gun removed during World War II.

[From the Quincy Patriot Ledger, Apr. 22, 1970]

OIL SPILLS SOLUTIONS POOR, SEMINAR AT ENC TOLD

QUINCY.—Some of the deadliest pollutants are not visible, Santo J. Grozzo of the Department of Interior Water Pollution Control Agency, told a group at Eastern Nazarene College yesterday.

DEADLY CHEMICALS

Speaking at a seminar sponsored by Student National Education Association, Mr. Grozzo said that frequently the chemicals used to combat oil on the surface are in reality deadly toxics which sink to the bottom and contaminate shellfish. He said federal agencies no longer use chemicals except in extreme cases where lives and property must be protected.

He said that today oil tankers are being built on a much longer scale than ever before because it is more profitable to the companies to transport oil in one tanker instead of several small ones.

"If a gigantic oil spill were to occur," he said, "we would have no satisfactory solution for it."

However, he said, minor oil spills which used to occur with frequency now get a great deal of attention as we hear about every one that occurs. He noted that the responsibility for prevention of these spills lies with the oil companies and greater and more uniform precautions are needed.

Mr. Grozzo also noted that we are reaching a point where we are using almost all water available to us for purposes of consumption, through increased population demand and increased industry demand. He said we will shortly have to start using the same water as often as two or three times. This water will be treated and restored through various methods.

Richard F. Slein of the state Air Pollution Control District who also addressed the group, said that on July 1 the state will have a more uniform set of standards when it sets up air pollution control districts in Greater Boston, Worcester, Springfield, the Berkshires and Southeastern Massachusetts.

He said that one of the chief problems the state is facing in its attempt to clean up the air is the lack of uniformity in industry. Anti-pollutants can be quite costly to some manufacturers, but the state is taking the attitude that it is better to go in strong now rather than to take halfway measures and have to backtrack 10 years from now.

[From the Patriot Ledger, Apr. 22, 1970]

MUSKIE ASKS "SELFLESS CONSERVATION"

(By Al Gordon)

CAMBRIDGE.—Sen. Edmund S. Muskie, D-Maine, said last night at a Harvard University environmental teach-in that America must "do nothing less than forge a wholesale change in our attitudes and our values" if it is to successfully end pollution.

The senator, who is chairman of the Senate Air and Water Pollution Sub-Committee, was part of a panel that included ecologist Barry Commoner, Harvard Prof. George Wald, George Wiley of the National Welfare Rights Organization, and state Sen. John Moakley, D-Boston. Last night's session marked the opening of a two-day program of environmental study at Harvard, part of the nationwide "Earth Day" observance.

Sen. Muskie said that the nation's present value systems "no longer respond to our needs or fit goals relevant to our future."

He urged that the U.S. abandon efforts to develop the supersonic transport, abandon the ABM, end the war in Vietnam, and curb automotive pollution. The Maine Democrat noted, however, that concern with ecology requires concern about people rather than about trees. "Those who believe that we are talking about the Grand Canyon and the Catskills "but not Harlem or Watts are wrong," he said.

He explained that the challenge of the pollution issue was not just to redirect federal spending, but rather to change public attitudes.

"We have become an industrialized and technologically sophisticated society. Yet we persist in our faith in the old frontier ethic—the belief in infinite expansion and unlimited growth.

"Now," he continued. "All of us face an internal and personal frontier. It is a moral frontier, defined by our willingness to cut back our selfish exploitation in favor of selfless conservation."

Sen. Muskie warned that Americans could no longer live by the traditional phrase "there's more where that came from."

The time is coming, he said, "when there is no more."

Sen. Muskie observed that America's goal had "never been to create a society where human greatness took a back seat to economic growth and technological change.

"If progress means technology that produces more kinds of things than we really want, more kinds of things than we really need, and more kinds of things than we can live with, we had better redefine progress."

Referring to the public's power at the ballot box, at the stockholder's meeting, and at the cash register, Sen. Muskie concluded, "We are not powerless to affect these changes."

[From the Patriot Ledger, Apr. 23, 1970]

EARTH DAY TRASH PATROL CLEANS UP

Earth Day 1970 brought many area individuals outdoors to sweep, rake, and collect trash and debris from highways, alleys, fields and streams.

FUTURE

Those conservationists and ecologists who didn't actively collect trash sat in groups to contemplate the future of Mother Earth.

About 35 Grade 8 and 9 students from Quincy's Central Junior High School's Student Environmental Control Group (SCORE) cleaned up the area around Furnace Brook.

Vincent R. Moscardelli, assistant principal at the junior high, said students, some wading through the brook with hip boots collected enough trash to "fill a city dump truck." Included in the debris was a power mower, a sled, a TV antenna, tires, and "a few thousand beer cans."

While SCORE cleaned the brook, another 28 junior high students conducted a trash patrol in the area of the John Hancock Parking Way and the Ross Parking Way, cleaning the lots and the alleys nearby.

Bernard C. Moore, Jr., executive secretary for the Quincy-South Shore Chamber of Commerce, supervised the clean up in conjunction with the mayor's anti-litter campaign. Similar cleanups are planned for the Wollaston, North Quincy and Quincy Center areas.

A group of 30 Eastern Nazarene College students cleaned up the Wollaston Beach area. The Metropolitan District Commission and the state Department of Public Works contributed the clean up equipment and vehicles for removal of the debris.

The Hingham Public Library sponsored an ecology seminar with townspeople and members of town government and exhibited photos and displays pertaining to conservation and litter.

Speaking at the program were Winthrop Wade, newly elected board of health member; Francis E. Chafe, executive health officer; Edward A. Shields of the planning board; and Samuel Hibbard of the school committee. Moderator of the program was Philip O. Swanson, chairman of the conservation commission.

Mr. Chafe said the town "has begun to put teeth in pollution regulations" concerning auto exhausts, leaf burning, and city trash burning, in order to control what he called "the American slob."

Two Hingham youngsters, Jeff Thompson, 8, son of Mr. and Mrs. Ronald Thompson of 2 Playground Road, and Denis Bustin, 9, son of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Bustin of 383 Main St., spent the day collecting trash at Queen Anne's Plaza and downtown.

Wearing signs on their back that read, "Don't litter," and "Keep Hingham Clean," the boys collected several large trash bags full of debris.

Weymouth High School students held their Earth Day Friday because of school vacation this week. Assemblies were held each period during the school day depicting the problems and solutions to pollution. Members of the conservation club and history and biology classes participated in the assemblies, making displays and speaking.

In Braintree, more than 100 children and adults pruned trees, cleaned up debris, raked dead leaves and gathered rocks in Watson Park.

Members of the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, the Braintree Garden Club, and the Watson Park Study Committee worked to clean up the area.

The Rocky Knoll Nature Center in Milton, operated by the Massachusetts Audubon Society, was cleaned up by a group of children under the direction of Miss Miriam Dickey, an instructor for the Audubon Society.

After cleaning the acre on Maple Street the children asked to come every Saturday to clean the Nature Center, because once was not enough.

A large contingent of students from Milton Academy and the Milton public schools roamed the Blue Hills collecting trash from the trails there.

In Marshfield, the evening division of the Women's Club cleaned the area around the Marshfield Center and filled a containerized trash receptacle to overflowing with the roadside litter.

A teach-in at the First Parish Meeting House in Cohasset was attended by about 40 people, most of them school-age. Mrs. James C. Proctor, chairman of the Scituate Beautification Committee, spoke about beautification programs, and the Rev. Edward M. Atkinson, minister at the church, announced plans to establish in Cohasset a chapter of Environment, Inc., a study group that works on pollution.

In an area in Cohasset bounded by Pond Street, Spring Street and the railroad tracks, a group of 14 children and mothers led by Mrs. Barbara Cook of 28 Pond St., filled four large plastic bags full of rubbish.

EARTH DAY ON THE SOUTH SHORE

Pollution questionnaire is filled out by Mrs. Richard Morrissey, of Quincy at an Earth Day campaign table at the Brockton Public Market in Randolph. Miss Tobey Abner and Miss Marcia Bornstein of Randolph are staffing the table.

Nurses' cleanup—These Quincy City Hospital nurses were among thousands of area residents who participated in Earth Day clean up action at Mound Street Beach yesterday. Jackie Roth, Jackie Skimmer, Ellen Perry, Wilfred Naives and Mary Shea collected a truck full of debris in less than an hour.

First in State—Braintree's newly established air pollution control committee, believed to be the first appointed in a Massachusetts town, held its organizational meeting yesterday at Norfolk County Hospital. William J. Hayden, of 82 Hancock St., was elected chairman. Atty. Steinar Midttun, of 25 Cain Ave., was chosen as secretary with Dr. Donald A. Martin, Norfolk County Hospital superintendent, the third member of the committee.

[From the Quincy Patriot Ledger, Apr. 23, 1970]

FEDERAL OFFICIAL CALLS FOR BUSINESS TO ASSIST IN ENVIRONMENT CONTROLS

BOSTON.—Unless business participates, the job of cleaning up the environment and controlling pollution will not work, warned Russell E. Train, chairman of the recently created President's Council on Environment Quality.

BALANCE NEEDED

Speaking at an Earth Day teach-in yesterday at the Harvard Business School, Mr. Train said business and industry must weigh environmental factors with engineering designs and economic considerations in their over-all production policy.

He told a group of 400 students and professors that pollution abatement policies for most major industries are not always economically feasible, but will have to be a challenge and a commitment on the part of all people to save our world.

Government regulation is necessary to enforce anti-pollution standards and progress is being made in establishing standards for clean air and water and in noise pollution, he noted.

There may be significant problems from international competition not concerned with anti pollution cost factors, but hopefully this will be compensated by levying special tariffs and, eventually, through international agreements as the world market becomes aware that environmental pollution is a world problem, Mr. Train said.

Voluntary participation is necessary on the part of business, particularly in the field of research and development. "Industry must worry about its products after they are sold and must make it its business," he stressed, saying that some products which cannot be incinerated without polluting the air must be reused, others must be returned to the soil.

Mr. Train, who was Under-Secretary of the Interior before he was sworn in as head of President Nixon's new commission on environmental control, stated that all federal agencies must now take environmental characteristics into account in their planning.

By July 1, the impact of environmental trends involving about 40 agencies will be reviewed and evaluated. Decisions will be made after policy and program proposals have been analyzed by the Council and the Department of Interior.

TWO PATHS OPEN

There are two paths to achieve environmental quality he said. One, the short term method is to demand immediate controls which will bankrupt all American business and industry. The other, which requires a "process of accommodation" is the long term cooperation of industry.

He stressed the importance of citizen participation and cited the case of a jetport planned by the Dade County Port Authority near the Everglades National Park. Construction was halted when the Department of Transportation and the President were made aware of the detrimental effects of aircraft on the wildlife there.

Mr. Train acknowledged that the government must take stronger action not only in land use but in other matters to prevent another Santa Barbara oil spill and Lake Erie contamination.

Charles F. Luce, chairman of the board of Consolidated Edison Co. of New York told the group that thermal pollution from all the utility firm's nuclear generating plants is well below government standards. He guaranteed smoke from fuel powered generating plants would be eliminated in a matter of months.

Dan W. Lufkin, board chairman of Donaldson, Lufkin and Jenrette, stock-brokerage and investment firm agreed that pollution control will cost money but predicted a new market where social concern will have priority over profitability. He also observed that there was a whole new market opening in the pollution control business.

[From the Quincy Patriot Ledger, Apr. 23, 1970]

HOLLINGSWORTH, VOSE SPENDING $2 MILLION ON POLLUTION CONTROL

WALPOLE.—The Hollingsworth and Vose Co. is currently involved in a pollution control program which will cost more than $2.2 million in capital expenditures and maintenance costs in excess of $120,000 a year.

Each of the company's four mills receives careful and continuing analyses of its water needs and quality, according to a company spokesman.

The East Walpole mill has been a member of the Neponset Reservoir Co. for more than 75 years. The reservoir is used to increase the river level during the periods when the river is low and the danger of pollution is greatest.

In addition, facilities at East Walpole will be completed late in 1971 to discharge all of the company's effluent into the Metropolitan District Commission sewerage system, thus insuring that it will not adversely affect the quality of Neponset River water.

[From the Quincy Ledger, Apr. 23, 1970]

ARMY ENGINEERS RETURN NEPONSET LANDFILL REQUEST

WALTHAM.—The Army Corps of Engineers has returned an application for landfill in the Neponset River tidelands to Mathewson Corp. of Quincy with the recommendation that the firm "iron out differences" with Mrs. Grace Saphire of Quincy who opposes it.

PARKING LOT

A spokesman said the corps also sent to Mathewson Mrs. Saphir's letter which recommends that the firm build its proposed parking lot on piles to all free flow of the river.

The company proposes to fill a section of the flats, which are exposed at low tide. Mathewson parking area was reduced by landtaking for the new MDC bridge over the Neponset.

Demolition material from the old bridge was to have been used as fill for the proposed Mathewson bulkhead.

The Quincy firm's application has already been approved by the state Departments of Public Works, Natural Resources, and Water Pollution Control.

The Army Engineers has not taken a stand on the issues the spokesman said, but is simply attempting to have questions resolved before the corps acts on the application.

[From the Quincy Patriot Ledger, Apr. 23, 1970]

WESTON.—"The environment can no longer keep up with man, because he is putting too much pressure on it, and the balance isn't being restored," a biologist told a small gathering at Regis College Earth Day activities last night.

David Brown, a biologist at the New England Aquarium in Boston, told the group of students, teachers, and parents how man has altered his environment to the extent that the equilibrium of nature has been upset.

LEGISLATOR'S VIEW

Rep. Charles F. Flaherty, D-Cambridge, also addressed the group, giving the "legislator's point of view of environmental problems.

"The critical ingredient in smog is politics," he remarked.

"There are too many people who are concerned with the next election, not the next generation," he continued.

Rep. Flaherty called for a state-wide environmental policy during his presentation, insisting that the executive agencies of the government use their authority to implement it.

ENFORCE LAWS

He stated there are presently several laws that could curb pollution and these should be enforced before new ones are instituted.

He recommended that all technological improvements be planned as to their future implications regarding permanent environmental changes.

"We should be able to ban technological developments or products harmful to the environment," Mr. Flaherty said.

He also urged that government encourage the study of ecology to help future generations become aware of the problems they will inherit.

OCEAN SUNFISH

Mr. Brown referred to the biological problems created by man's pollution of the earth, giving an example of how far-reaching the effects of pollution have become.

He said that last year an ocean sunfish which normally doesn't come within a thousand miles of land, was brought dying to the Aquarium.

The fish died and was dissected.

Although parasites were attributed as cause of death, a report disclosed the fish's tissues contained enough DDT that it would soon have died from poisoning anyway.

Mr. Brown insisted population growth is compounding the situation, and that population control is as necessary as pollution control.

He said he recently heard that the native of India has a life expectancy of 10 years.

He claimed that India has had its environment so degraded that it would take total extinction of the population and thousands of years for nature to restore the land.

"Every organism has an effect on the environment," Mr. Brown said, "but other organisms have adapted to it. Man has altered it."

[From the Quincy Patriot Ledger, Apr. 23, 1970]

ENVIRONMENTAL BILL OF RIGHTS URGED IN PETITIONS BY COLLEGE STUDENTS

BOSTON.—Ecology-minded college students presented Rep. Michael J. Harrington, D-Beverly, with 10,000 petition signatures yesterday urging Congress to adopt an Environmental Bill of Rights.

ECOLOGY RALLY

Rep. Harrington attended a New England Ecology Center rally at the Government Center to receive the signatures, which he said he would deliver to the appropriate congressional committees in Washington scheduled to hold hearings on the bill filed by Sen. Gaylord Nelson, D-Wisconsin. Sen. Nelson's legislation calls for a constitutional amendment guaranteeing every citizen the constitutional right to a clean environment.

The petitions contained 3,000 signatures of Northeastern University students and more than 5,000 from Harvard University students.

Speakers at the Government Center rally expressed disappointment over the turnout of some 500 persons. Organizers had hoped to attract many more to the talks and booth displays by the Sierra Club and area ecology organizations.

Rep. Harrington quoted figures to indicate the extent necessary for adequate reordering of national priorities to solve pollution problems. "We need $10 billion more for industrial waste treatment facilities alone," he said.

"Just to restore the Merrimack River in my district to its former unpolluted condition would require $371 million. The total federal money for the state water pollution program is $22 million this fiscal year," he compared.

"In addition, we need $350 million more for waste treatment facilities, while only $35 million will be forthcoming under the present plans of President Nixon," he said.

SURVIVAL DEMANDS

One member of the ecology group angered the congressman when he criticized him for planning to take an airplane back to Washington, D.C., from Logan Airport following his appearance at the anti-pollution rally. The man suggested that Rep. Harrington take some form of mass transportation instead.

Students distributed a list of "Survival Demands" which they said would be sent to Mayor Kevin H. White of Boston and Gov. Francis W. Sargent. The two-page list of 29 demands included halting runway expansion at Logan International Airport; legislation to ensure safe noise levels at the airport; banning of the supersonic transport plane from the Commonwealth; and development of a balanced transportation system for the Greater Boston area.

Also called for were better air quality standards; a ban on gasoline containing lead; abortion reform; and a guaranteed annual income of $5,500 per year for a family of four.

The Rt. Rev. Monsignor Mimie Pitaro, chairman of the East Boston Neighborhood Council, criticized the Massachusetts Port Authority for its plans for a third tunnel under Boston Harbor.

Msgr. Pitaro called East Boston unique in the amount "it suffers directly from the excess pollution due to the Logan Airport and the Sumner and Callahan tunnels." The residents of East Boston already breathe in the pollution given off by the 50,000 cars that daily pass through the two tunnels, he said, and cited property damage to paint and noise pollution as additional damage due to the airport and the tunnels.

Msgr. Pitaro targeted the plans of the MPA to develop STOL-ports for short-distanced take-offs and landings as another potential source of pollution.

"As long as the courts are more concerned about dirty plays than dirty air, we have failed," said the Rev. Tom Corrigan, chairman of the Greater Boston Transportation committee.

[From the Patriot Ledger, Apr. 24, 1970]

EARTH DAY

"The land was ours before we were the land's," wrote Robert Frost in "The Gift Outright," a poem of this nation's beginnings.

The message of Earth Day was that Americans have not become the land's—that in possessing the United States we have foolishly and futilely ruled nature with technology as we rule ourselves with government. We have tried to possess the land by plundering it and, in Frost's words, are still unpossessed by it.

Humans have created an environment capable of destroying themselves. Unrestrained and unharnessed, we have advanced in material wealth by vandalizing our natural wealth.

That was the message, but for all the advance publicity, the political promises of environmental help, the predictions of a new awakening. Earth Day was disappointing.

It was primarily a day of student participation. The Silent Majority stayed silent, apparently unwilling to become vocal even about pollution. Other adults, except for bemused smiles, generally ignored the observance.

In metropolitan Boston, there were teach-ins, speeches, parades, picnics, leaflets and more speeches. In the suburbs, there was more of the same, along with actual clean-up efforts by groups of youngsters, students and a few adults. It was a small, however commendable, response to an unbounded problem.

And at Logan Airport there was an unprovoked, disgraceful demonstration of toughness by the Massachusetts State Police. After declaring a demonstration at the TWA counter an unlawful assembly, the police needlessly manhandled the young people just as they were obeying the order and dispersing. Throughout the demonstration, TWA's operations were not hampered.

It was not Harvard Square and the state police acted as though it were. The kids were not radicals and their cause was the supersonic transport (SST), not violence for the sake of violence. There were efforts to check some of the unnecessary roughness. In one instance, a state policeman appeared to restrain a fellow policeman who was vigorously subduing an already subdued youth.

So Earth Day has come and gone, as other observance days have before it and will after it. Essentially it was a peaceful contemplation of a polluted environment that is gaining on us.

Pollution is a legacy we and our forefathers have produced for our children. We must admit it and must not sit comfortably back, as so many did yesterday, and say to our offspring, "Okay, so pollution exists. What do you want me to do? You go out and clean it up if it bothers you so much."

The environment, existing before any of us, belongs to all of us. While Earth Day drew rhetorical attention to the problems, has it done anything to cure them?

We have had the teach-ins, now we need the teach-outs. We have had a day of commitment, now we need lifetimes of commitment. We have had promises of money, now we need to provide money. We have had talk of action, now we need the action. We have had the young confront environmental control, now we need their parents.

The lives we save will be our own, and those of unborn generations.

NATIONAL GIRL OF THE YEAR

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, recently Miss Kathy Bonneau, a junior at Portsmouth Catholic High School and a member of the Portsmouth Girls Club, was chosen as National Girl of the Year at the annual Girls Clubs of America Conference. All of us in the Second District of Virginia are proud of Kathy and her achievement. I am attaching for the RECORD the article from the Virginian-Pilot of April 16 publicizing Kathy's achievements in her community:

GIRLS CLUB MEMBER WINS $400 COLLEGE SCHOLARSHIP

PORTSMOUTH.—Kathy Bonneau, 16-year-old Portsmouth Catholic High School junior and member of Portsmouth Girls Club, returned from New York Wednesday night and the annual Girls Clubs of America Conference with the title National Girl of the Year.

She also brought back a $400 scholarship award to apply toward a college education. Her career ambition is to teach in elementary school, her mother, Mrs. Arthur Bonneau, said.

In selecting a Girl of the Year judges looked for the best all around qualities among contestants.

Among Kathy's talents is her sewing ability which won her a first place award in Region 3, Girls Clubs of America, and a chance at national competition.

Her entry, a four-piece ensemble including a white dress, Scotch plaid jacket and skirt and matching tam-o-shanter designed to be worn interchangeably, was modeled by the Portsmouth contestant during a conference banquet.

Expressing her pleasure over her daughter's recognition, Mrs. Bonneau said: "She's just a typical teen-ager who has had plenty of experience at homemaking."

Such experience, the mother said, "comes naturally when you're the oldest of 12 children."

Kathy puts creativity to work during the summer months and interests younger children in the family and neighborhood in backyard dramatics and fairs.

At Portsmouth Catholic she is pianist for the school glee club.

Her church activity includes working with smaller children in the Sunday school of St. Paul's Catholic Church.

Swimming is her main sport, and Kathy has earned a life-saving badge in instruction at the Churchland Swim and Racquet Club.

HOSPITAL CORPSMAN DAVID R. RAY OF McMINNVILLE, TENN., AWARDED MEDAL OF HONOR POSTHUMOUSLY

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Hospital Corpsman First Class David R. Ray of the U.S. Navy, assigned to the Marines, was recently awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor by the President "for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life and beyond the call of duty."

Corpsman Ray was from McMinnville, Tenn., in the Fourth Congressional District which I am honored to represent in the Congress, and his courageous mother, Mrs. Donnie Ray accepted the Medal at the White House.

This young man made the supreme sacrifice for his country and this Nation will be eternally indebted to him for his dedication and devotion. His magnificent courage and unselfish disregard of his own safety to save other lives as medical corpsman is in the highest tradition of the Volunteer State of Tennessee as well as the military service of our great Nation.

In recognition of Corpsman David R. Ray, I place in the RECORD herewith the Presidential citation which accompanied the Medal of Honor.

The citation follows:

CITATION

The President of the United States in the name of The Congress takes pride in presentnig the Medal of Honor posthumously to David R. Ray, Hospital Corpsman Second Class, United States Navy, for service as set forth in the following citation:

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty while serving as a corpsman with Battery D, Second Battalion, Eleventh Marines, First Marine Division, at Phu Loc 6, near An Hoa, Quang Nam Province, in the Republic of Vietnam, on 19 March 1969. During the early morning hours, an estimated battalion-sized enemy force launched a determined assault against the Battery's position, and succeeded in effecting a penetration of the barbed-wire perimeter. The initial burst of enemy fire caused numerous casualties among the Marines who had immediately manned their howitzers during the rocket

and mortar attack. Undaunted by the intense hostile fire, Petty Officer Ray moved from parapet to parapet, rendering emergency medical treatment to the wounded. Although seriously wounded himself while adminstering first aid to a Marine casualty, he refused medical aid and continued his lifesaving efforts. While he was bandaging and attempting to comfort another wounded Marine, Petty Officer Ray was forced to battle two enemy soldiers who attacked his position, personally killing one and wounding the other. Rapidly losing his strength as a result of his own severe wounds, he nonetheless managed to move through the hail of enemy fire to other casualties. Once again, he was faced with the intense fire of oncoming enemy troops and, despite the grave personal danger and insurmountable odds, succeeded in treating the wounded and holding off the enemy until he ran out of ammunition, at which time he sustained fatal wounds. Petty Officer Ray's final act of heroism was to protect the patient he was treating. He threw himself upon the wounded Marine, thus saving the man's life when an enemy grenade exploded nearby. By his determined and persevering actions, courageous spirit, and selfless devotion to the welfare of his Marine comrades, Petty Officer Ray served to inspire the men of Battery D to heroic efforts in defeating the enemy. His conduct throughout was in keeping with the finest traditions of the United States Naval Service.

RICHARD NIXON.

A YOUNG GIRL'S LETTER

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following letter I received from Miss Nancy Fay Lewis, the contents of which I believe certainly deserve serious thought:

GREENTOP, MO.

Congressman WILLIAM HUNGATE,
Capitol Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am but an eighteen year old high school senior, but I wish to express my opinion now in this letter. Since I am a future adult, I do believe I have the right.

Right now our country is engaged in bringing back three astronauts from their journey to the moon. The Congress took time out of the regular meeting to pray for these men.

Sure everyone should pray for them, but what about the brave men dying for our country?

Soldiers are dying in Viet Nam, Korea, Cambodia, etc., yet Congress never takes time out to pray for them.

I feel that this is definitely wrong! Those three men knew before they agreed to go to the moon that their lives would be in danger. Yet they took that chance.

The men in Viet Nam, etc., have no choice. They go there knowing that they might come back in a pine box. They deserve the silent prayer.

The astronauts deserve prayers also, but the soldiers need them worse.

I hope God has mercy upon these soldiers also, for they need the Holy Spirit far worse!

Sincerely yours,

NANCY FAY LEWIS.

SEAPOWER SUBCOMMITTEE CONSIDERS SOVIET SEA DOMINATION

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the worldwide Soviet naval exercises now in process clearly demonstrate that Russia is making tremendous strides toward her announced objective of world domination of the seas. These facts and others were clearly shown to our Seapower Subcommittee in its specially called meeting last Friday.

They have a ballistic missile submarine on station off the Atlantic coast. They are operating the first worldwide coordinated naval exercise using over 200 ships. The shipbuilding facilities which are furnishing the modern fleet have been growing steadily since World War II, giving them the largest and most modern shipbuilding capacity.

The Soviet ability to put 200 naval ships out in exercises around the globe is a record. There are 55 surface combatants, 50 auxiliaries, 45 submarines, and nearly 50 other intelligence collectors, research ships and naval-associated ships. The exercises are being held in the Barents Sea, Norwegian Sea, North Sea, Sea of Okhotsk, Sea of Japan, Philippine Sea, Mediterranean Sea, Black Sea, and Baltic Sea. There are also Soviet naval forces in the Indian Ocean.

The Seapower Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee in its report, "The Status of Naval Ships," has already drawn attention to the rapidly growing Soviet Navy—which is new and modern compared to the aging and obsolescent American Navy.

The Soviets are constructing new surface vessels which can out-speed and outrange our ships.

Surface ships under construction today include guided missile cruisers, guided missile frigates, submarine chasers, fast patrol craft, and guided missile patrol craft. Similar programs are underway to provide the Soviets with new amphibious and mine warfare vessels. More new classes of guided missile cruisers, frigates, and amphibious ships will be introduced in the next few years.

Submarine construction continues to be the most impressive element of the total Soviet program. They have the largest and most modern submarine building yards in the world, and since the end of World War II the Soviets have constructed some 575 submarines of all types while we have built only 125. Eighty of theirs have been nuclear powered. Although 88 of ours have been nuclear powered, this slight lead will not last through the end of this year. Most significant among their submarines are their nuclear-powered Yankee class ballistic missile units. They carry 16 submerged-launch ballistic missiles, and are similar to our own Polaris-type submarines. More than 10 of these submarines are now in operation, and every month and a half an additional unit joins the fleet. By 1974 we expect the Soviets will have 35 to 50 Yankee's carrying 560 to 800 ballistic missile launchers.

The Soviets have 17 major naval shipbuilding yards with a total work force of over 100,000. These yards are not only the largest but the most modern in the world using procedures and techniques which are keyed to production line manufacture. Their ability to roll modules weighing as much as 500 tons gives them an ability to prefabricate large portions of the ships. This is work that we do largely in outfitting. The Soviets are also able to roll the completed ships wherever they may be desired for work or for launching. It strikes me that we are using procedures for the construction of wood and sail ships while the Russians are using concepts designed for the 1970's.

These recent activities demonstrate the validity of the findings of the Seapower Subcommittee last year in its report on the status of naval ships:

The Soviet Union is devoting major attention to the sea and to modern uses of the sea. It is developing a massive, well-balanced program in virtually all phases of seapower. Such a program presents a formidable challenge to traditional freedom of the world's oceans, assured for years by a substantial American superiority in seapower. This superiority is now eroding by the new Soviet buildup. Further, the Soviets appear to understand seapower at the highest levels of Government, and convey this understanding through the employment of their total seapower as a prime Government instrument, utilizing commercial, experimental, and military components in a total seapower program.

NEWS REPORTER'S SERIES ON UNREST WINS AWARDS

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege to represent the 40th District of New York. The Buffalo Evening News is one of the fine newspapers that includes my district in its coverage. The News has had a long history of able representation in its Washington bureau. Only last week another member of the Washington bureau was recognized for his expertise in the field of journalism.

I am proud to report that the Education Writers Award of the American Association of University Professors was bestowed upon Ronald J. Maselka. I wish to take this opportunity to add my own word of congratulations to Mr. Maselka for this outstanding achievement.

The Buffalo Evening News article covering Mr. Maselka's award follows:

NEWS REPORTER'S SERIES ON UNREST WINS AWARD

LOS ANGELES, April 24.—Ronald J. Maselka, a member of the Washington bureau of The Buffalo Evening News, today was presented the newly established Education Writer's

Award of the American Association of University Professors.

Mr. Maselka receive a plaque at the association's convention in Los Angeles for "outstanding interpretive reporting on higher education."

He was cited for a series of 22 articles on Campus unrest which appeared in The News last fall. They were based on his visits to 10 campuses and his interviews with administrators, faculty and students.

A native of Buffalo, Mr. Maselka was graduated in 1961 from Fordham College and received his masters' degree the following year from Columbia University school of Journalism. He was a general assignment reporter, federal beat reporter and night city editor of The News before being assigned to the Washington Bureau in 1968.

SPEECH BY CHAIRMAN HOLIFIELD DEDICATES OKLAHOMA PLANT

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the people of Oklahoma had the very great privilege and pleasure this week of having one of this body's most distinguished Members, Chairman CHET HOLIFIELD of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Chairman HOLIFIELD was in Oklahoma to make the principal address at the dedication of a uranium processing plant constructed by Kerr-McGee Corp. in Sequoyah County.

In his remarks at that dedication Monday, Chairman HOLIFIELD made some significant observations on the future of Oklahoma, and the future of nuclear energy. I insert these remarks in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN CHET HOLIFIELD

Governor Bartlett, Governor Peterson, Chairman Seaborg, Mr. McGee, Mr. Love, distinguished guests, visitors and friends, it is a great pleasure to me to be present at the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board's annual meeting and to join with you in the dedication of this important facility. The construction of this uranium processing facility is another indication of the vision Kerr-McGee has evidenced in leading the nation into the nuclear age.

I am most pleased to be in the district of my esteemed colleague and a most valued member of Congress, Ed Edmondson. He is a most important member of the great committees of Interior and of Public Works, and, most importantly to me, a distinguished member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. It is most fitting and proper that Congressman Aspinall, the Chairman of the Interior Committee, and the present speaker, Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, be present today to pay our respects to our esteemed Committee member at this most significant event in Oklahoma's and our Nation's future in the atomic age.

Oklahoma and Kerr-McGee have a long record of leadership in the supply of energy for our great Nation. Oil, which has been the black gold of Oklahoma for so many years, will be even more important in the decades which follow. Oil and gas, our highest grade of fossil energy fuels, must continue to supply important energy needs, particularly, for our transportation industry—land, sea and air—and I might add space. Oil is and will also continue to increase in importance in the petro-chemical industry. Of course, this Nation needs every energy source we can develop. We will have need for increasing amounts of all forms of energy fuels—coal, oil, gas, hydro and nuclear. The suppliers of fossil fuels are and will continue to be hard pressed to meet the ever-increasing demands that will be placed on them. In the long range however, it is obvious that we must depend more and more on nuclear energy to meet our needs.

This uranium hexafluoride facility Kerr-McGee is placing into operation provides a significant link in the nuclear energy chain. The addition of this technologically advanced facility is another example of the responsible leadership Kerr-McGee is providing in the energy supply field. The service this facility will provide is important to our Nation's future. This plant will also process material for foreign nations with which we have agreements to furnish nuclear fuel. I might add that the Atomic Energy Commission has already entered into uranium enriching service contracts with foreign nations for terms of up to 30 years, and their value totals $401 million. Since the process to be performed here is the step preceding the Government enrichment process, these contracts will undoubtedly be a source of work at this facility. I understand that a contract has already been entered into with the Japanese to process material at this plant. I might add that the AEC also has contracts with domestic customers totaling $544 million for uranium enrichment services which is an indication of the growing magnitude of the nuclear business. In fact the AEC estimates that in 5 to 10 years the uranium enrichment business will aprpoach a billion dollars a year.

This Nation is deeply committed to nuclear energy for the future. The matter of long-term energy needs has been studied in depth. Much confusion has been injected into the long-range energy supply picture by reference to solar energy, magnetohydrodynamics, tidal power, etc. I think all avenues need to be pursued, and each may make an important contribution, but studies to date indicated rather clearly that, for our long-range basic energy needs, there appears to be no alternative to nuclear energy. I might add that there is a great concern by those in the know in the energy business about getting the next phase of the nuclear power development job done in time to meet our needs. I am referring to the development of the breeder reactor which must eventually take over the energy supply job if this country's needs are to be met. Here again Kerr-McGee's leadership should be mentioned. In addition to its role in the present generation of reactors, Kerr-McGee has built in this great state a nuclear fuel fabrication facility which can fabricate the type of fuel materials needed for the breeder reactor phase. I am referring to the plutonium-uranium fuel facility at the Cimarron facility near Oklahoma City.

Our Nation must be provided with major future increases in electrical energy for the health and welfare of our citizens. Estimates indicate that in the next decade we will have a need for twice the electrical generating capacity we now have, and by the year 2000 the experts estimate we must build an electrical power system of a capacity seven times that which is now serving the American people. More than half of all the people now alive will be customers for this energy in the year 2000.

Today, nuclear energy is only about 2% of the total electric generating capacity. Nuclear energy generating capacity must be and is being added at an ever increasing rate. One third of all generating plants ordered over the past four years has been nuclear. By 1980, it is estimated that nuclear energy will represent about one-half of all the electric generating capacity. But, between now and then—between here and there—is a road full of holes and obstructions that will interfere with the provision of electricity from all types of generating units—not only nuclear. Starting as early as this summer in some sections of this country, there may be some serious brownouts and blackouts. Often from the best of intentions, pitfalls and roadblocks are being thrown into the path of utilities—investor-owned, municipally- and cooperatively-owned—seeking to build and operate generating facilities and to keep them fueled and perking.

Look at the conventional fuel picture today. There is not only a shortage of low-sulfur coal, the type that minimizes the emission of sulfur oxides—an environmental polluting agent—but there is a shortage of all coal; supplies are very low. Gas is definitely in short supply. Oil is doing its best to supplement the central station fuels market. We've got enough nuclear fuel, but the construction and operation of nuclear facilities are being delayed for a number of reasons—including environmental concern.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy recently closed Part II of its very extensive and comprehensive hearings on the environmental effects of producing electric power. We tried to get on the open record all available information regarding the impact on the environment of all types of electric energy generating facilities—not just nuclear. We have compiled data and information bearing on the use of all available energy sources. In my closing statement as Chairman of the Joint Committee I said (and I quote):

"This committee has done its utmost and will continue to do so to provide a solid base of reliable information and data on which well-intentioned individuals and groups can mount well reasoned ideas, recommendations and conclusions respecting the dual need for safeguarding the environment and providing a sufficient amount of useful energy."

Please note that concluding clause—"*the dual need* for safeguarding the environment and providing a sufficient amount of useful energy." Look out for those who would sell the public on a single need. Unreasoning fear and confusion are being stimulated, increasingly, these days by a combination of well-meaning but misguided zealots, professional "stirrer uppers" for money or public spotlight, and assorted individual groups seeking to serve special, and often extremely narrow, interests irrespective of the adverse impact on the public and this country generally.

These people may well be a worse threat to this country than the past rate of environmental degradation—for two reasons: (1) They often distort the problem, and the problem must be fairly well understood if it is to be attacked intelligently; and (2) they interfere with the assembling and mounting of a comprehensive program to deal with the problem in the most effective way and from the overall standpoint of the best interests of all.

But these apostles of fear and confusion are outselling, and they are persuading, many people who are genuinely—and needfully—concerned about the quality of life.

The members of the organizations of recognized scientific experts in the pertinent fields must stand up—and make themselves heard, understood and counted—when individual specialists in other fields sound off in public on matters outside their competence. Many of them lack more than scientific competence because they don't have that most precious attribute of all—for which no college degrees are given—common sense! And the recognized scientists must also speak up promptly and clearly on those occasions—when individuals from their own ranks of expertise step beyond the bounds of carefully, objectively acquired knowledge and sound scientific procedure to try to convince the public with opinions and so-called evidence that are rejected by their scientific

peers. A hundred years ago, an American humorist said (and I quote): "It ain't what a man don't know that makes him a fool, but what he does know that ain't so."

My friends I am greatly concerned about pollution and the need to protect the quality of the environment. And there is an enormous fund of knowledge that we must yet acquire in order to attain a reasonable understanding of the inter-dependence of all forms of life and their relationship with the environment.

In 1965 I predicted that our citizens needed, and would demand, protection from the dangers of pollution to public health. In 1966 I stated in remarks before the Edison Electric Institute that the public would willingly pay more for services if the additional cost was for the improvement of health and living conditions. In 1966, in a speech at the 32nd Annual Southern Governors' Conference, I urged that the problems of pollution be attacked through a comprehensive, systematic program—rather than piecemeal. In 1967, I helped influence the decision by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to initiate an amendment to the Atomic Energy Act to enable AEC's uniquely endowed laboratories to perform work in health and safety fields—including environmental problems—irrespective of any nuclear relevancy. The amendment was enacted into law in late 1967, and these laboratories are engaged in important research and development activities in these areas.

Reason—the best we can marshal—including the engagement of our finest scientific talent—is urgently needed if we are to safeguard the environment and if we are to provide—as I believe we must—a sufficient amount of useful energy. I firmly believe we can achieve both goals. We must strive for both. Energy is an indispensable key to civilized life and the advancement of human welfare. The plant we are dedicating here today—and Kerr-McGee's activities in the energy field—are important steps toward insuring that our energy needs will be met.

Before I close, I would like to make an announcement for the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I think it will be of interest to the membership of the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board. There have been several bills introduced in the 91st Congress to permit individual states to impose standards more restrictive and therefore in their opinion allegedly more protective, than those imposed by the Atomic Energy Commission with respect to the discharge of radioactive effluents from nuclear power plants. As is well known, I have favored reposing in the Atomic Energy Commission the exclusive authority and responsibility for radiological health and safety, and the Atomic Energy Commission has been performing this function with great care—and with excellent results—in accordance with the guidelines provided by the Federal Radiation Council, a specially created statutory body.

I have been concerned that those who traditionally have been strong advocates for states' rights may not fully appreciate that radiological health and safety protection transcends state lines. Competent specialists in this most important field are also limited.

I recognize that consistency, which once was counted a virtue, is these days often regarded by some as the quality of a stagnant mind. My own mind—as well as the collective mind of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—is—I assure you—far from stagnant. I want to take this opportunity to announce that in the near future, possibly toward the end of next month, the Committee plans to hold hearings on these bills and will give due consideration to their substance and them.

In conclusion my friends, I wish to congratulate the Kerr-McGee Corporation for their enterprise and vision in investing in the future of Atomic Energy. I also want to express again my appreciation to the people of Oklahoma for sending Congressman Ed Edmondson to our Nation's Capitol to represent you, and to serve as a valued member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Thank you.

THE ENVIRONMENT IN WASHINGTON

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, as one who has long been concerned with the problem of cleaning up our environment, I am more than pleased to see the continuous buildup of support for antipollution programs. Last week when we observed Earth Day everyone had an opportunity to dramatize the feeling that we must clean up our environment. The ceremonies throughout this country which marked Earth Day were most encouraging.

Because the condition of our environment is on the minds of everyone, I commend to my colleagues in the House an excellent article which appeared in the March/April issue of "All Clear" magazine. It was written by Jack Golodner, the magazine's Washington reporter, and takes an in depth look at what is being done about our environmental problems from here in Washington.

The article follows:

THE ENVIRONMENT IN WASHINGTON

(By Jack Golodner)

The winds of change have a fragrance all their own.

The fumes of our industrialized society have even penetrated the White House, inspiring its occupant to launch new programs for improving the quality of our environment. The impetus for Washington's newly awakened concern may be as near as the fetid banks of the Potomac or as far as the bedroom communities where the silent majority lie gasping in their beds.

A national consensus has been building up for several years to "do something" about our rapidly decaying environment, but until recently it was overshadowed by other more controversial matters—race relations and the war in Vietnam. Although these problems are far from resolved, the American public has signalled its readiness to embrace another cause where perhaps general agreement can be more easily reached.

The delightful thing about environmental issues is their noncontroversiality. Conservatives and liberals, the shaggy-haired young and their perplexed parents, effete snobs and the silent majority are all "brought together" in their common concern over keeping this planet habitable. For a politician, the environmental craze may seem the answer to his most fervent prayers; it's so easy to figure out what side to be on.

Common sense would indicate that the genuineness of the problem and its universal relevance would combine to insure rapid governmental action. Few people would question the validity of Federal involvement in environmental matters. Air and water systems transcend local political divisions and present massize challenges that must be met by coordinated action. Washington is where the money is, and equally important, where the organizational and technological infrastructure exists to cope with what is, in truth, a national problem.

Even though greater federal involvement in quality of environment issues seems necessary and inevitable, there are a number of counter-forces at work. Of overwhelming importance in this election year are political concerns. Democrats who in the past have been associated with Federal antipollution programs are not about to hand over this politically potent area to the President without a fight. In a recent message to Congress, President Nixon outlined a 37-point program for improving the quality of our environment. He included many recommendations which had already been suggested by members of the legislative branch, until now the center of federal interest in conservation matters. The Democrats, not to be outdone, came up with a 50-point program which in traditional fashion called for higher spending and more ambitious federal involvement. If the highest number of points wins, the Democrats are out ahead in the environmental game. The Republicans, however, to use their leader's terminology, have the ball and are running hard with it—while the Democrats, lacking the leadership of a man in the White House, are at a disadvantage in articulating their position.

While it is clear that Nixon is running the ballgame for his party, it is not at all apparent who is calling the signals for the Democrats. After years of trying to chat up a little enthusiasm among their colleagues for federal pollution control programs Senators Muskie and Nelson and Representatives Vanik and Saylor must be a bit startled over the sudden Congressional interest in this neglected area. Suddenly they find themselves in the midst of an intraparty feud for the title of Mr. Clean. Today, it is a rare Congressman indeed who hasn't affixed his name to more than one pending resolution designed to purify something.

As the volume of legislation increases, Committee jurisdictional problems arise. In the House, 11 Committees and Subcommittees consider environment-related legislation, while in the Senate a struggle is being waged between Senator Jackson's Interior Committee and Senator Muskie's Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Public Works Committee. Members of Congress, however, can rest at ease, knowing full well that we have allowed our land resources to deteriorate to such an alarming degree that there is ample opportunity for every Representative to claim his own piece of environmental turf.

The organizational difficulties of launching a clean-up campaign from Washington are not confined to the legislative corridors on Capitol Hill. While the Republicans have no trouble identifying the leader of their band, he in turn is faced with an executive sprawl that makes the players increasingly difficult to distinguish. Six cabinet departments (HEW, Interior, HUD, Transportation, Agriculture and Commerce) plus a host of other federal agencies currently preside over about 90 environmental protection programs. Thirty-eight agencies are involved in some way with protecting this nation's water resources alone. Holding dubious sway over the myriad bureaus, agencies and departments is the newly created Council of Environmental Quality, authorized by the Environmental Quality Act of 1969. This body, composed of three advisors appointed by the President with an authorized budget of $1 million, is almost certain to be the most important of the watchdog groups. President Nixon had previously established a cabinet-level Environmental Quality Council, a Task Force on Air Pollution and a Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality. He has promised a major reshuffling of federal agencies dealing with the environment, but the process promises to be a long and slow one, certain to involve the Administra-

tion in intra-cabinet wrangling as well as partisan battles with Congress.

Economic considerations may also retard the conservation effort. Leading Democrats have already expressed their doubts about the adequacy of the President's proposed funding levels. Not surprisingly, few dollar cost figures have accompanied the President's legislative recommendations. This has already led to partisan snipes about the opening up of a new credibility gap between White House rhetoric and willingness to spend money necessary to do the job. The only specific sums attached to the President's recent proposals presented to Congress were $10 billion for the building of waste treatment plants, (which upon closer scrutiny melted down to a federal commitment of only $4 billion spread over 4 years), a pledge to spend the full amount deposited in the Water and Land Conservation Fund, and a modest increase in federal operation grants to State water pollution control agencies from $10 to $30 million over the next five years. Annual cost of pollution control, including air and water pollution and solid waste disposal are estimated at $13.5 billion simply to hold contamination levels at their present levels. Placed alongside this figure, federal dollar commitment, despite all the talk, remains minimal.

At the heart of the President's water pollution control program is his four-year federal-local partnership in the construction of needed sewage treatment plants. State and city officials are already saying that the $4 billion in federal aid suggested by the Administration is nowhere near the amount required. Governor Rockefeller estimates that the sewage treatment program for his state alone will cost $3 billion. Other local representatives remain skeptical about federal willingness to appropriate the necessary funds to help solve local pollution problems. They point out that the central government has not yet made good on former obligations incurred under the 1965 Clean Waters Act, which provided for a federal contribution of up to 55% of the total cost for plant construction. Local government jurisdictions that went ahead on their own and built these plants are still waiting to be paid the federal government share. Just last year the President requested only $214 million on an authorized $1 billion for sewage plant construction. Congress raised this figure to $800 million, intending that the money be used to pay back local governments which by then were owed $814 million by Washington. The Executive branch, pleading inflationary considerations held back the money for several months and has only recently announced its intention to spend it—not principally to pay off old debts, but rather to encourage states to undertake new projects. Outspoken state and city officials say that this sort of record is not likely to foster intensified efforts at the local level.

Not only have funding levels been criticized as inadequate, but the mechanism suggested by the President for helping local governments raise their share of the construction costs has also come under fire. The President has proposed the creation of an Environmental Financing Authority in the Treasury Department which would purchase state and local bonds with limited interest rates for financing the non-federal share of sewage treatment plant construction. Such an Authority would market its own securities to the public and thus becomes a conduit for private capital to flow into municipal sewage bonds.

The National League of Cities and the United States Conference of Mayors have already expressed their reservations concerning the financing authority, saying that "it would really just mean more delay, just a lot more bookkeeping rather than substance." Transportation Secretary Volpe's testimony before Congress last June in opposition to a similar financing proposal for airport construction was also cited by the mayors. At that time, the Administration opposed the debt-service approach "because it is inflationary, and because it creates a very long-term commitment for the Federal Government."

Politicians with long memories may also recall that in the fifties, President Eisenhower came up with a similar proposal for financing the interstate highway system which was emphatically rejected by the Democratic Congress. A parallel fate may well be in store for Nixon's Environmental Financing Authority.

The President's other proposals to combat water pollution which do not involve large capital outlays will have easier going. Among these are a number previously suggested by members of Congress which should improve their chances of meeting with favorable consideration. They include the extension of federal water pollution control authority to intra- as well as inter-state waters and the setting of precise limits on the type and amount of effluents that industries and municipalities may discharge. Senator Proxmire has suggested an alternative approach which consists of the levying of a federal "effluency fee" of 10 cents per pound for industrial waste emitted into the nation's rivers. The Senator estimates that this system would produce about $2 billion a year, half of which he proposes should be used to subsidize municipal waste treatment.

The Federal program to curb air pollution is still in its infancy but seems to be following the pattern set by water pollution control efforts. This year the Air Quality Act of 1967 comes under review in Congress, and a vast number of amendments have already been proposed by the Administration and by members of the legislative branch. The President's program includes the extension of national air quality standards, with a maximum fine of $10,000 a day for violation, and the establishment of more stringent motor vehicle emission standards. None of the White House proposals call for spending as much money as the measures Senator Muskie is backing, which provide for a federal share of $975 million to be spent on air pollution over the next three years. This is compared to $109 million appropriated in fiscal 1970 for HEW air pollution control programs—and even this amount was more than the Administration requested. For fiscal 1971, the President is actually asking for less money than was appropriated for fiscal 1970.

His requests involving solid waste disposal are equally modest, calling for the spending of slightly more than $14 million in fiscal 1971, a slight increase over the previous year's figures. Senator Muskie's proposals again run into more money—$800 million to be spent over a 5-year period. At this time, the major thrust of the federal role in solid waste disposal lies in research and development, with the President emphasizing the need for more study into techniques for recycling materials and developing packaging which will degrade after use.

After holding back last year on the spending of the Water Conservation Fund allotment for the acquisition of new parkland, President Nixon has proposed full use of these funds in fiscal 1971. Democratic efforts are afoot to provide a minimum annual appropriation authorization of $300 million for the fund, up $100 million from the present guaranteed level of funding. Under the formula introduced by Administration spokesmen, there would be no guaranteed authorization in the following years for the Fund, which makes planning by state and federal agencies for land purchases difficult indeed.

There is no doubt that Democrats have been upstaged by the President's plunge into environmental waters, but they still have a few ideas of their own which have not yet been embraced by the Administration. Among them are:

The Environmental Quality Education Act, sponsored by Reps. Brademas and Scheuer in the House and by Gaylord Nelson in the Senate, to give support to school programs designed to educate Americans about environmental problems.

The Noise Pollution and Abatement Act sponsored by Senator Muskie to provide for studies of the health and welfare effects of noise pollution.

The creation of an Environmental Control Agency, separate from cabinet departments, to administer and watch over government environmental control programs, sponsored by Senator Muskie.

The Detergent Pollution Control Act to ban polyphosphates in detergents by 1972 and to set and implement national pollution control standards on all detergent ingredients by the same date, sponsored by Senator Gaylord Nelson.

It is likely that some of these proposals will be enacted into law during this Congress, especially those combining minimum expenditures with maximum public appeal. The real intent of Congress and the White House will surface during the appropriations process. Democrats may try and put the President in the position of having to at least threaten a veto of anti-pollution legislation for economy reasons, while Nixon would no doubt be equally delighted to be able to blame the Democratic Congress for holding up action in this area on account of its failure to agree on a compromise spending figure. Another Congress-Executive confrontation similar to the recent battle over education funds may well be in the offing.

It is reasonable to hope that new legislation, particularly involving air pollution, will be enacted this session which would give the federal government greater responsibility for environmental concerns and pave the way for increased federal aid in the future—always dependent, of course, on which way the politicians sense the wind is blowing.

DRAFT CALL: ZERO

HON. EARL B. RUTH

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1970

Mr. RUTH. Mr. Chairman, President Nixon has made a historic statement about an important segment of our national life:

After careful consideration of the factors involved, . . . I agree that we should move now toward ending the draft. From now on, the objective of this Administration is to reduce the draft calls to zero, subject to the overriding considerations of national security.

In short, the official view of what constitutes the obligations of citizens of a free society in defense of their country has been drastically altered.

The draft—that began in an emergency and ended as an institution—is to be ended. It has served its purpose. We are now moving into a new era in which we can once more have the traditional American way of national defense as part of our national life. The all-volunteer armed force is a concept which is at once traditional and revolutionary—as have been so many other concepts of this administration. President Nixon's respect

for the past is matched by his understanding of the present and his vision of the future.

This message begins a movement that will someday in the future end with the words: "Draft call: Zero."

STATEMENT FOR CONSUMER HEARINGS

HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, in view of the rise in prices brought about by the present economic situation of inflation, more attention must be focused on the issues and problems by the consumer in the American marketplace.

Cutbacks in consumer programs from the original requests of the former administration cause reason for concern. These cutbacks are an indication that the American consumer is not receiving the attention that he deserves. Cutbacks included an 18-percent cut in funds for the President's Committee on Consumer Interests, a 5-percent cut in meat and poultry inspection programs at a time when the Department of Agriculture was not meeting its responsibilities under the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967, an 18-percent cut in traffic and highway safety funds including grants to States and communities, a 5-percent cut in the Health, Education, and Welfare Department's radiation control program, and a 100-percent cut in the Food and Drug Administration's funds for enforcement of the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act.

The American housewife is becoming more articulate about the problems she faces daily in grocery stores, drugstores, and the large chainstore complexes. She is realizing that to alleviate her difficulties as a captive member of the consumer market she must become organized into a pressure group so that her interests can be protected. Activist consumer groups of low- and middle-class women—black and white—are springing up all over the country and the common denominator that binds these women together is their stand against rising prices and shoddy products. Today, women are refusing to be silent on this issue for they are consistently faced with spending more money and receiving less quality for it. This issue has brought them together in an effort to demand stronger concentrated protection so that the money they spend and the quality they receive are equivalent.

The American housewife who is aware of this need for consumer protection, as are all Americans, has received a great deal of support from Mr. Ralph Nader who has done exhaustive research and studies on the plight of the consumer. He has brought national attention to the extremely high level of 33 percent average fat content found in sausage products and the pumping of water into poultry, perpetrating a fraud of $32 million for all that water.

In addition, Mr. Nader has informed the public of the faulty inspections carried out by Federal inspectors in meat factories, and he has raised considerable questions as to the efficacy of the Food and Drug Administration with specific reference to the research and evaluation of monosodium glutamate, which was being passed off by industry as a nutritional additive in baby food—and is now no longer used by the major baby food companies.

Aside from the food industry, Mr. Nader has also exposed the growing hazards of railroad safety violations and the negligence in the auto industry. Officials of the National Highway Safety Bureau state that between 15 and 20 percent of the vehicles tested have failed one or more safety standards.

Another problem of the consumer which is of utmost concern is that of buying on credit. The Washington Action for Youth Prospectus discusses the "easy credit terms" that are advertised to lure the consumer into the store. Then through high pitched sales talk, the advertised item is ignored, and the consumer is persuaded to purchased an overpriced, often shoddy item under "easy credit terms" which ignore the small print of the credit agreement. Prof. William Pierce of the Michigan Law School, who has expertise in the field of credit, states that if all lending activities were investigated about 75 percent of the loans extended in this country would be illegal.

These few examples are an indication that the consumer is not being protected. For a long time now, there has been talk about the creation of a consumer department which would address itself to the problems of the American houswife and consumer. However, in spite of much rhetoric, no action has been taken in the past that has adequately and directly responded to those problems.

Representation for the protection of the interests of the consumer is a major issue and their needs must receive the priority that they deserve. One way in which this can be effectively achieved is through the creation of an Office of Consumer Affairs which would concentrate its activities on the many problems faced by the American consumer.

This Office of Consumer Affairs would be established with regard for all matters that affect the consumer and would have the primary responsibility for coordinating and supervising all of those Federal programs and activities that relate to the consumer. Even though the creation of this program has the interests of the American taxpayer at heart, many may take the attitude that this is just another social program that is going to cost large sums of money. In reality, this program will cost very little money, because its primary function will be that of a regulatory agency to protect the consumer.

Too many fragmented efforts have been made in the past with the intent to protect the consumer, but there has never been a specific organization that has had the main task of accountability to the American consumer.

Since consumers are the most important people and the crucial element is the economic growth of our country, it seems to me that the creation of an Office of Consumer Affairs is necessary to help minimize the difficulties and outcries of the American housewife and her family. Action in this area would indicate to the housewife and her family that the Government has finally taken a concrete and viable interest in her problems by responding with the establishment of the Office of Consumer Affairs which would give all consumers the needed relief from the negative practices that have caused much alarm in the area of rising prices, shoddy goods and fraudulent advertising.

STATUS OF PRESIDENT'S NEW MARITIME PROGRAM

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, Maritime Administrator Andrew Gibson recently updated the status of the President's new maritime program in a speech to the Southeastern regional convention of the Propeller Club held in Mobile, Ala.

Mr. Gibson and his men have faithfully carried out President Nixon's campaign promise of presenting a comprehensive plan to save our American Merchant Marine. I only hope that this body will concur with the administration's desires to put this vital link in our American economy back on its feet.

Mr. Gibson's speech follows. I hope all Members will give it careful consideration:

REMARKS BY A. E. GIBSON, MARITIME ADMINISTRATOR, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, BEFORE SOUTHEASTERN REGIONAL CONVENTION OF THE PROPELLER CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES, MOBILE COUNTRY CLUB, MOBILE, ALA., APRIL 17, 1970

Wherever I have gone in recent months I have been asked about the status and outlook for President Nixon's new maritime program. Since many in this audience may have the same question, let me briefly fill you in.

As you will recall, the enabling legislation, S. 3287 and H.R. 15424, was introduced last December 23rd. In the interim, the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Senate Commerce Subcommittee on the Merchant Marine have concluded extensive hearings on the legislation. During these hearings the reactions and viewpoints of all major segments of the maritime industry—labor and management—were heard.

While some reservations were voiced about certain provisions of the legislation, the general industry reaction was exceedingly favorable. Additionally, members of both the Senate and House Committees—on both sides of the political aisle—have made it clear that they support the President's program and will promote its passage.

Currently, these committees are evaluating the testimony and suggestions received during the hearings. Present indications are that the legislation will be cleared for floor action in the near future. Passage is anticipated by early summer.

The enactment of this legislation, now appropriately called the Merchant Marine Act

of 1970, will be the most significant legislative achievement affecting the American maritime industry since the passage of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

It will chart a course which will restore the United States as a major and viable maritime power. It will ensure that our merchant marine—now threatened with near extinction by the preponderance of obsolete, World War II vintage ships in the fleet—will be one of the most modern and efficient in the world by the end of this decade.

While the President's program has received a good reception in the Congress and the maritime community, it apparently generated some heat abroad.

In a speech last month one of our British friends raised questions as to the necessity or wisdom of the Administration's maritime program.

He contended that the need for such a program has been grossly exaggerated. He also emphasized that our plan to construct 30 ships a year for the next 10 years could seriously over-tonnage U.S.-foreign trade routes. He went on to state that the frequently cited statistic that the U.S.-flag fleet carries only 5.6 percent of the nation's foreign commerce is misleading, since this refers to the percent of the tonnage movement only. He stressed that U.S.-flag ships carry 22 percent by value of our foreign trade.

As to the allegations that our program is unnecessary or too ambitious, I normally would let such remarks go unanswered, since such claims are not only presumptuous, but inaccurate as well. These remarks are viewed by some as a growing effort to persuade the United States to turn away from its determination to rebuild its merchant fleet . . . to abandon, if you will, the advantages of the American developed technological revolution in total transportation systems. I am here to announce *we will not.*

We will no longer be satisfied with our position as a 5th rate maritime power. We will no longer be satisfied with the crumbs that fall from the European ship owners' table.

Actually, the 5.6 percent figure to which our friend referred is magnificent 6.4 percent, and percent tonnage carried is the only bench mark commonly used in comparing the degree of participation of foreign-flag fleets in the carriage of their nation's international commerce.

As a case in point, our friend in the course of his dissertation on our misleading statistics, noted that ships registered in the United Kingdom carry 36 percent of the U.K. seaborne trade, but he failed to translate this 36 percent weight carriage into the comparable percentages for value and amount of liner cargoes carried in U.K. ships.

Keeping in mind our 6.4 percent participation, it is of more than passing interest to note the extent the major foreign-flag fleets participated in their own nation's foreign trade:

	Percent
West Germany	30
Sweden	30
Greece	31
Norway	43
Japan	46
France	48

Now let us trace the trends in U.S.-flag participation in our foreign trade:

In 1950, U.S. oceanborne foreign trade amounted to 117.5 million long tons. In that year 49.7 million tons, or 42.3 percent, were transported in U.S.-flag ships.

In 1960, our foreign trade movement had more than doubled—amounting to 277.9 million tons. But the U.S.-flag movement declined to 31 million tons—equivalent to 11.1 percent.

In 1968, the latest year for which data is available, our foreign trade tonnage topped 418 million tons. But the amount carried in U.S.-flag vessels had skidded to only 26.8 million tons—equivalent to 6.4 percent of the total.

Thus, between 1950 and 1968 U.S.-foreign trade nearly quadrupled—from 117.5 million to 418.3 million tons. But in the same period the tonnage moved in American ships dropped by nearly half—from 49.7 million to 26.8 million tons, and our foreign friend would try to persuade us that this is a healthy condition for the greatest trading nation on earth

Examining the dollar value of U.S.-foreign trade carried in American-flag ships, we find a similar declining trend.

In 1960, the value of our total foreign trade movement amounted to $24.7 billion. American-flag vessels transported 26.4 percent of this cargo. In 1968, our foreign trade had grown to $41.5 billion, but U.S.-flag participation had declined to 21.1 percent.

The foregoing data clearly show that while U.S.-foreign trade has been undergoing sustained impressive growth, the U.S.-flag fleet's participation in this movement has steadily diminished.

Looking to the future we foresee this nation's foreign trade movement topping 620 million tons by the year 1982.

If present trends were allowed to continue unchecked, it is doubtful that our ships would be carrying 3 percent of our trade by the end of this decade. The Nixon Administration has determined that this will not happen. We believe that as long as our nation generates such an enormous international trade volume, we must have a fleet capable of carrying more than a token share of such commerce.

Even today, although most of our shipping statistics are appalling, there is one bright element in the picture. While most major maritime nations overshadow the United States in the size and quality of their breakbulk, tanker and dry bulk fleets, we are number one in container shipping. Our lead in this field is due to the fact that the development of these highly efficient ships was pioneered and perfected in this country. We have no intention of relinquishing this lead, and, of course, this is what has "thrown the cat among the pigeons."

The latest figures available, covering the second quarter of 1969, revealed that U.S.-flag vessels handled 58 percent of the containerized cargo moving in the U.S.-North Atlantic trades and 64 percent of the U.S.-Far East movement, and most of this was accomplished without subsidy.

The foreign-flag lines obviously have no intention of conceding such a large proportion of high revenue cargo to American ships. They are rapidly building up their container fleets. Great Britain, for example, currently has 800,000 tons of containerships under construction or on order. This can quite possibly narrow our lead in free competition. The leaders of the U.S. maritime industry are quite willing to take their chances. However, I am confident that the implementation of President Nixon's program will enable us to retain a prominent position in this field.

Now let me return to the anguished cry that the United States by building 30 ships per year for its registry is going to overtonnage the world's trade routes. It infers that, although the great majority of our fleet is approaching 25 years of age and the scrap breakers' torches, we are somehow selfish in undertaking a program to modernize and preserve our merchant marine.

I regret that our program may be causing apprehensions in foreign maritime circles. However, it seems to me that the United States is the least likely candidate for the charge of over-populating the world's ocean fleet.

For the past 20 years the deliveries of merchant ships for U.S. registry have been infinitesimal in comparison with other major maritime nations.

Last year, for example, 925 merchant ships totaling 26 million deadweight tons were produced by the world's shipyards. These totals included 449 general cargo vessels aggregating 4 million deadweight tons.

Japan took delivery of 189 ships; Liberia, 95; Norway, 90; the United Kingdom and Russia each took 89.

In terms of general cargo ships, Japan, alone, accounted for 109 vessels; Russia, 66; West Germany, 40; and the U.K., 33.

The U.S.-flag fleet received only 21 new ships, 18 of them general cargo types!

At the beginning of 1969, 2,007 merchant ships were under construction or on order in the world's shipyards. Of this total, 332 were for Russia, 213 for Liberia, 159 for Norway, 153 for the U.K., 144 for Japan, and so on. The U.S. total amounted to a pitiful 57.

To sum up this statistical analysis, annual deliveries to each of the major maritime flags have been running from double to six times our programmed rate of 30 ships per year.

I think you can see, then, why I feel the claim that the President's program will overtonnage the trade routes is totally unwarranted. The 300 ships we plan to build will be spread over a 10-year period.

In sharp contrast, Japan alone took delivery of 357 ships—210 of them general cargo types—in the 2-year period 1967 and 1968. The U.K. in that same period took delivery of 149.

These ships and the remainder of the 1,758 ships delivered to foreign-flag registry during the 1967–68 period apparently have not contributed to any over-tonnaging problems. I find this quite interesting.

Whatever the reaction abroad, *our ships will be built, because they must be built!* If they are not, then this nation must resign itself to maritime mediocrity.

The President has said emphatically that this nation must be restored as first class maritime power. His program is tailored to meet that objective. The prevailing view is that the Congress will enact enabling legislation within the next several months.

Whatever your political persuasions, I believe all in this audience are encouraged and gratified by the forceful and forthright action President Nixon has taken to restore this nation as a first class maritime power. In contrast to the despair, pessimism and insecurity that prevailed within the maritime industry in the past few years, today there is hope, optimism and confidence. Less than a year and a half ago articles on the American merchant marine resembled obituaries. Today they center on the impending revitalization of a nearly prostrate industry.

Richard Nixon, in his campaign for the Presidency, promised to produce a program to remedy the nation's maritime deficiencies. But, refuting the old adage that campaign promises are worthless, President Nixon in his first year in office fulfilled his promise and transmitted to the Congress a comprehensive plan for rebuilding our fleet and the legislation for implementing it.

The legacy of domestic and international problems that President Nixon inherited comprises a rather extensive inventory.

The problems of honorably extricating our armed forces from Vietnam, and the wide range of domestic ills are readily identified by the general public. Few, however, recognize the magnitude of the maritime problems that had to be solved.

It is generally overlooked that our maritime ills and deficiencies have been progressively more critical in the Sixties.

As a consequence, President Nixon had far fewer options in formulating solutions and a shorter time frame in which to implement remedial measures. Additionally, the cost of building the ships needed to replace our overaged vessels has increased significantly.

Many within the maritime industry, in fact, felt that as a result of previous failures to undertake realistic ship replacement

schedules, the required levels of federal funding for rebuilding the fleet were now prohibitive. It was, therefore, reasoned that the only way President Nixon could extricate us from our maritime dilemma would be to predicate his program on the construction of the required ships in foreign shipyards.

That would have been an easy, expedient and economically attractive way out.

But the President, as he has demonstrated many times since taking office, is not a man who seeks easy or expedient measures for resolving problems.

He rejected suggestions that the domestic shipyard industry be exempted from our fleet replacement program. Instead, he made our shipyards an integral element in his maritime program.

The President has made it abundantly clear that he expects the shipyards, as well as the ship operators and their respective labor forces, to attain a far higher level of efficiency than has existed in the past.

In his words, the maritime program he unveiled is both a "challenge and opportunity" for all segments of the maritime industry.

Shipbuilders will be required to develop improved methods to reduce construction costs. The present ship construction subsidy, whereby the government pays up to 55 percent of a ship's cost, is programmed to diminish during the next 5 years to a level of 35 percent. To assist the yards to achieve the necessary cost reductions, the Administration has formulated new procurement procedures. The ships to be built will be consolidated in lots of standardized designs and ordered in quantities that will permit the yards to achieve the economies that result from series production. Additionally, the shipyards will be involved in the development of the new designs, permitting them to eliminate unnecessary cost additive features on the drawing board.

The ships to be built will be among the most efficient in the world. We believe that operating subsidies can be eliminated for many of the high-performance containerships and barge and lighter carrying vessels that we will put in service on our North Atlantic and Far East trade routes.

In making a long-term national commitment to vitalize the American merchant marine, the President has also emphasized that labor stability must be improved if we are to attract the cargoes needed to make our fleet profitable. We are confident that both management and labor will establish procedures for resolving their disputes and grievances without resort to costly work stoppages.

In summary, I believe that as a result of President Nixon's leadership, this nation is about to turn the corner and reestablish itself in a meaningful way on the high seas. The favorable impact of our new program will, I am sure, be particularly noticeable to your thriving port and the related maritime interests in this area.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,400 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

A SIGNIFICANT WEEK IN HUMAN HISTORY

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, last week was a significant week in the annals of history—a week which I have described as "the Earth-Space Week of the Age of Aquarius" in my weekly newsletter "Capitol Comments."

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in these significant events, I place my newsletter in the RECORD:

IN THE AGE OF AQUARIUS: A SIGNIFICANT WEEK IN HUMAN HISTORY

This was the week that was something in Washington and around the world—the Earth-Space Week of the Age of Aquarius.

Aquarius, the sign of the Zodiac and the name chosen by the astronauts for their spaceship, is said to be the astrological age of peace, progress, natural beauty and scientific achievement and knowledge. Many astrologers believe we are entering this new era of mankind and certainly there is great progress and scientific achievement—and a universal yearning for peace coupled with a strong desire to preserve our natural environment.

On Capitol Hill Dr. Thomas O. Paine, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Dr. Werner von Braun, Deputy Administrator of NASA; and astronauts Jim Lovell, Fred Haise and John Swigert briefed the Congress on the Apollo 13 accident and the epic flight of the spacecraft Aquarius which limped through space to a safe splashdown as millions of prayers from around the world reached out to bring these three courageous space sailors home to the planet Earth.

In contrast to attention on space early in the week, a great outpouring of Americans observed Earth Day on Wednesday, demonstrating their concern over the problems and pollution defacing and defiling our cities and countryside on Earth—a spaceship with three billion human passengers who must learn to live together in peace or face terrible consequences.

On the Capitol grounds another historic event occurred as the official Tennessee tree—the tulip poplar—was planted for the first time with appropriate ceremonies. A drizzling rain failed to dampen the event as Tennessee Congressmen paid tribute to Tennessee's first official tree—a tree from Warren County—planted on Capitol Hill. The tree was made available by Mr. and Mrs. Henry Boyd of McMinnville and Warren County who also attended the ceremonies.

Another significant happening in Congress in this unusual week was the filing of a Resolution to initiate impeachment proceedings against Justice William O. Douglas of the United States Supreme Court.

In the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, which your Representative chairs, hearings were conducted on the programs of defense and peacetime uses of atomic energy, including warhead missiles, atomic reactors, raw materials procurement, atomic radiation and problems of the environment. While continuing to safeguard our defense, the Atomic Energy Commission is developing vast programs to use the atom for peaceful purposes—in development of electric power, in controlling pollution, in solving urban problems, and in combatting disease, among others.

The President during the week announced in a nationwide television address his decision to withdraw another 150,000 troops from Vietnam within a year.

And springtime came to Washington.

As the cherry blossoms bloomed in profusion and beauty, the lovely cherry blossom princesses participated in traditional ceremonies and the vanguard of millions of summer tourists visited the Capitol and other historic landmarks in the Nation's Capital.

This was the week that was—a week in which the mysteries and dangers of space shared headlines with problems and progress on Earth: A week in which prayer and scientific achievement and the astrological Age of Aquarius combined to focus attention on the humanity of man and both his problems and achievement.

COMPULSORY UNIONISM FOR POSTAL WORKERS WRONG

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am strongly opposed to compulsory unionism, for postal workers or anyone else. An organization should be able to attract membership on the basis of its own merits and standards, and the individual must be protected in his freedom of choice to either join or refrain from joining a union. The following timely editorial on this subject appeared in the Deseret News, Salt Lake City, last week:

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Deseret News, Apr. 22, 1970]

POSTAL UNIONISM WON'T SPEED UP THE MAILS

As the House Post Office Committee opens hearings this week on President Nixon's plan to set up a new U.S. Postal Service, it needs to keep in mind that the cure must be better than the disease.

That the Post Office Department is long overdue for reform is well documented. Letters mailed to an address fewer than 100 steps away take days to deliver; newspapers and magazines too often arrive days and even weeks after publication date; and packages are often bruised or broken.

In fact, says one postal official, "Airmail was the last major innovation in the Post Office Department, and that was 52 years ago."

One area of postal reform which has aroused considerable concern is the drive to deny postal workers protection against compulsory unionism.

Postmaster General Winton Blount raised a storm of criticism last year when he suggested that the originally-proposed postal corporation be unionized. And he has declared that one of the four essentials for true postal reform is collective bargaining between postal management and employees to determine wages.

Not only that, a provision in House Resolution 4, the combination postal reform and pay raise bill, includes compulsory unionism. The bill includes an 8 per cent increase in wages for postal workers in addition to the 6 per cent already granted to all government workers.

Certainly the Post Office Department must be removed from politics if it is to allow for continuity of management. And it must drastically update its method of mail distribution by better methods and modern machinery.

But no one has yet proved that taking away a government worker's right to either join a union or refrain without coercion will improve his efficiency and make the Post Office Department run smoother.

HORTON CITES WASHINGTON POST ARTICLE ON INCREASING SALE OF GOVERNMENT MAILING LISTS

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, over the past 2 months I have had a considerable amount of correspondence about the policy of Federal agencies regarding the sale of mailing lists. I have conducted an extensive study of this matter and am drafting legislation which will close what I feel is a gap in the Freedom of Information Act.

I feel that this act, aimed at providing the public with access to public records and decisions, is being used as license by some organizations to infringe on the individual's right of privacy.

This problem was spelled out clearly in an article this morning in the Washington Post by Jan Nugent Pearce. Mrs. Pearce points out the problem in a nutshell: There is no Government policy on this question. Agencies releasing and withholding such mailing lists are both citing the Freedom of Information Act as their legislative justification.

I strongly urge my colleagues to read this article:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 27, 1970]

UNCLE SAM PUTS MANY CITIZENS ON JUNK MAILING LISTS

(By Jan Nugent Pearce)

If you have ever wondered just where the deluge of junk mail you receive every week originates, you are probably overlooking one likely source.

Uncle Sam.

Unknown to many citizens, government agencies have been engaged for some time in the practice of selling mailing lists to anyone who can pay for them.

Naturally, most of the purchasers are companies that will use the names for direct mail advertising.

The Federal Aviation Administration, the Federal Communications Commission, the Internal Revenue Service and the Post Office Department are usually cited as the most active sellers.

Recently, Capitol Hill legislators have criticized the practice as a government-assisted invasion of the privacy of millions of Americans.

Rep. J. Edward Burke (R., Fla.) recently introduced legislation to ban all federal agencies from selling mailing lists. Rep. Frank Horton (R., N.Y.), after a confrontation with the Internal Revenue Service on the issue, will soon introduce his own bill to limit these sales.

And at the weekend, Sen. Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.) asked President Nixon to issue an executive order to halt the practice.

In a letter to the President, Javits suggested that names gathered for agencies' internal purposes should not be offered in mailing lists to be used for selling merchandise.

There is presently no governmentwide policy. Some agencies provide the data routinely and others do not. All, interestingly enough, cite the same statute, the Freedom of Information Act, as the basis for their position.

Sen. Javits and Rep. Horton contend that law should not be used to sanction a practice that amounts to an invasion of privacy for the purpose of aiding direct mail advertising.

Here are some examples of information available from various government agencies:

The Federal Communications Commission retains another organization to fulfill requests for information from its large data bank. Among the data routinely offered are the names and addresses of thousands of ham radio licensees at a cost of $55 per computer tape. FCC says it has no idea how many of these have been sold, since all requests are handled by the contracting firm.

The Federal Aviation Administration offers a list of names and addresses of about 680,000 licensed pilots at $678 for the computer printout or $40 for each of the five computer tape reels. During fiscal 1969, FAA received $4,500 from these sales. Among the purchasers were several aircraft companies, Eastman Kodak, Redbook Co., the Board of Tax Assessors in Albany, N.Y. and the Los Angeles Times-Mirror.

The Post Office Department here contends it sells no mailing lists. It routinely provides two services for direct mailing firms: an address correction service at 5 cents per name, and a free "sequencing" service to arrange large third-class mailing in correct order for its carrier routes.

The Post Office Department also fills requests at $1 each, for the new address of any person who has filed a change of address form with his local post office.

Capitol Hill critics contend that some of the 33,000 subcontracting stations make lists of delivery routes available to mailers. A Post Office spokesman here said this was a possibility, but contended "it is not a general practice."

The Internal Revenue Service until recently sold a list of 140,000 names and addresses of licensed gun dealers and collectors for about $140. The agency deleted the names of individual collectors (after making 42 sales) and after receiving a barrage of criticism from Capitol Hill. Among the purchasers were numerous sporting goods companies and a group called Citizens Against Tydings. (Sen. Joseph Tydings has supported stringent gun control legislation.)

The U.S. Coast Guard provides boat registrations for New Hampshire, Washington, Alaska, the District of Columbia and Guam.

Rep. Horton's interest stems from a constituent's complaint that he had received sales solicitations from firearms' companies after registering with IRS.

The New York Congressman noted that the sale of 60 IRS lists could produce 8.6 million pieces of bulk mail if each of the licensees were solicited.

Several agencies routinely offer names and addresses of companies they regulate or issue contracts to. But authorities tend to believe the invasion of privacy factor is minimal here.

Some departments, such as Commerce and Defense, flatly refuse to provide any names and addresses of individuals from their files.

All of the agencies that engage in the practice emphasize that their charges are not "sales" as such, but fees to cover their labor and materials' costs.

Probably the most productive government originators of unsolicited mail are the 50 state motor vehicle departments, all of which routinely pick up some revenue by selling their list of motor vehicle owner registrations. Since these sales are governed by state law, the procedures vary.

Congressman Burke puts the federal issue this way:

"When a citizen must provide information to his government he should not, as a result, subject himself to harassment and solicitation by private concerns using this government-collected data."

ACLU—POLLUTERS OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY, HONOR, AND DUTY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, individual liberty and rule by majority can only be tolerated by that mercenary band of controversials who call themselves the American Civil Liberties Union, so long as it meets their test of conscience.

This is the same ACLU that used its financial wealth to deny prayer—even the right of children in Netcong, N.J., to read prayers from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. But their record is barren on pornography, sex, and subversion being mandatorily taught in the same school. If God were spelled with four letters—the ACLU might then defend prayer as free speech.

The latest hangup and power display of the ACLU is its effort to prohibit religious services as part of military training to our cadets at the Naval Academy at Annapolis. Anything American, traditional, or moral is a challenge for destructive exploitation by the ACLU.

The smog and air pollution in the United States are traceable by many to the ACLU—an organization financed from tax free wealth. In 50 years it has developed a despicable record of antiliberty, antitruth, and denial of the Christian heritage and traditions of our Nation.

Has anyone ever heard of the ACLU using its hired talents and inexhaustive wealth to do anything to preserve the Constitution or conserve the peace?

Any cadet who would permit himself to be exploited as a ploy by the nefarious ACLU organization, against the honor of his appointment is unfit to be an officer and gentleman in the service of his country.

As stated in the U.S. Naval Academy Catalog:

Our country was founded on religious principles, cherished by all faiths, which are the foundations of our ideals of freedom and responsibility. Because we are "one nation, under God," it is most appropriate that the midshipmen who will some day become the leaders of our Navy should regularly attend Divine Worship Services.

Every young man who makes application to attend the Naval Academy has read the catalog and is aware of the curriculum. Surely, if he does not agree with the activities as set forth, no one objects. He merely does not apply for admission to a school that offers a curriculum with which he disagrees. However, if he does elect to abide by its curriculum and is fortunate enough to be accepted for enrollment, then should, during the course of his training, he decide he cannot conform to the requirements, he needs only resign. No one will force him to stay and participate in an activity he does not believe in. If he cannot fulfill the requirements of the discipline as set forth, then indeed he cannot fulfill the requirements

of leadership of our American men in our U.S. Navy.

There are thousands of young men who seek appointment to our Naval Academy each year who would and who could uphold the traditions and the ideals upon which the Academy was founded. Since the number of appointments is limited and many of those qualified young men are denied the privilege of attending, surely those who are being exploited by the ACLU are not worthy of the responsibilities placed upon them.

There is no room in any of our military academies for atheists.

I include the recent news articles discussing the attack on our U.S. Naval Academy, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Apr. 26, 1970]

ACADEMY TRADITION: CHAPEL RULE FACES JUDGE

(By Lance Gay)

Under the weather-beaten green copper dome of the U.S. Navy Academy chapel, two midshipmen stopped to talk to a reporter about the pending suit challenging compulsory chapel services at the institution.

As they stood on the red carpet in the nave of the chapel on that warm spring day, they could see the altar before them, and behind it, a stained glass window depicting Christ walking on the water.

And above the altar, carved into the stone, the inscription:

"Eternal Father, Strong to Save . . ."

It is the opening line of the Navy Hymn.

"Ever since man has gone down to the sea in ships, I guess he'd felt the need to clear it first with God," one of the middles commented. "I think that's what's at stake here."

He referred to the suit which has been brought by six middies at the Navy Academy and one West Point cadet challenging the requirement at Annapolis, West Point and Colorado Springs that future officers take compulsory Sunday religious services as part of their training.

IN COURT TOMORROW

Tomorrow, the suit will be brought before Judge Howard Corcoran of the U.S. District Court here for resolution.

The suit, drafted by the American Civil Liberties Union, was filed here on Jan. 20. The contention of the plaintiffs is that compulsory chapel violates the constitutional guarantees of separation of church and state and freedom of religion.

The government—specifically the secretaries of the three services and the secretary of defense—have argued the requirement is part of the necessary moral and character development aspects of military officer training.

Chapel on Sunday morning has been as much a part of life at the Academy since 1845 as Wednesday dress parades and Saturday football games.

CHALLENGED ON TWO SIDES

But, like other academy requirements which are steeped in tradition, compulsory church attendance has been challenged both inside and outside the school for years.

According to the U.S. Naval Academy catalogue, spiritual training is necessary "to produce an appreciation in its graduates of the spiritual and moral dimensions of military leadership."

". . . An awareness of these varying needs for assistance in time of stress and danger is an essential dimension of effective officership."

Lawrence Speiser, director of the Washington office of the ACLU, commented that "that's an argument in favor of a comparative religion course, not compulsory chapel."

Speiser said he was "surprised at the fanaticism" with which the services have defended this tradition. He said that attorneys had written letters to the military requesting a relaxation of the requirement, but that they flatly refused.

Following four days of hearings in early February, Judge Corcoran ruled that he was satisfied the defendants had exhausted administrative procedures for relief from the regulations before they petitioned the court.

Speiser also said that suits had been filed to enjoin the services from taking "punitive action" against the plaintiffs. Late in January, two judges on the U.S. Court of Appeals—David Bazelon and Spottswood Robinson—issued the order enjoining the service academies after District Court Judge Matthew McGuire had turned down a request for such an order.

Under the present rules, trainees at the academies are required to attend religious services on Sunday morning. A Catholic mass and a Protestant service are held on the academy grounds, and other churches in the Annapolis area provide services for those who wish to worship with a particular denomination.

"But the regulations are clear that you can't change services. If you want to look at other services, you have to change religions," Speiser commented.

Jewish middies also are required to go to Sunday services. Should they wish to celebrate sabbath on Saturday at an area synagogue, they have to do so on their own time and have to attend religious services on Sunday in addition.

In the academy's chapel, above the tomb of John Paul Jones, one of the two middies pointed out the history of parts of the church.

"What would happen if chapel weren't required? I think you'll see a half-empty chapel Sundays."

Does he think that the requirement will be abolished?

"Yes," he replied.

DOMESTIC TRAVEL AND TOURISM

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, today with the passage of H.R. 14714 this body has taken another step toward encouraging travel and tourism within the United States. I am pleased that this Congress has recognized the need for such a measure. I hope that we will continue to meet this need by enacting more comprehensive legislation in this field. Accordingly, I commend to my colleagues H.R. 14685, which amends the International Travel Act of 1961 for the purpose of promoting travel to the United States.

Travel and tourism affects the economic and social well-being of every part of this Nation. We are well aware that American tourist spending abroad causes a steady drain on the U.S. dollar. The National Park Service can alleviate this economic problem by promoting America to Americans and making us aware of our own great resources.

Travel promotion is only the first step toward increased domestic tourism. Legislation must be enacted to enhance and upgrade our present tourist attractions. Beaches, State parks, and camping sites must be made more attractive for travelers. Recreational areas must be improved through better staffed and better equipped facilities, and places of historic interest should be maintained. We will have to answer all these needs if we are to successfully meet the challenges of competing foreign vacation lands.

LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL BANK FOR COOPERATIVE HOUSING

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday I introduced H.R. 17205, the National Cooperative Housing Act, to provide low-cost financing for low- and moderate-income cooperative housing. The bill would subsidize interest rates through the establishment of a national bank for cooperative housing.

High interest rates are driving all but the very richest and the very poorest out of the central cities. This legislation is meant to make the cities again economically inhabitable to low- and middle-income families.

There are currently around 40,000 New York families in cooperative housing who face the prospect of being priced out of their dwellings because of high interest rates. These are largely families living in local government-financed Mitchell-Lama cooperatives which have yet to obtain permanent financing.

Mitchell-Lama is an excellent program which, by utilizing city and State borrowing authority in the State of New York, has gone a long way toward making cooperative living available to many who otherwise would be unable to afford to live in the city. But the program cannot mask the adverse effects of high interest rates.

Many of the Mitchell-Lama co-ops were planned when interest rates were far lower than they are today. The families living in these co-ops thus face the prospect of having to take responsibility for a 40-year mortgage which will cost much more than it would just a few years ago. To the individual cooperator, each 1 percent increase in mortgage rates roughly translates into $4 per room per month in additional costs. This does not include other rising expenses such as repairs and maintenance, which go up as salaries and prices rise. The ultimate cost of this as well as the interest rates must be borne by the individual cooperator.

This legislation would enable residents of lower- and middle-income cooperative projects to be able to remain financially and, at the same time would permit construction of additional cooperative housing for low- and moderate-income families. It would benefit Mitchell-Lama financed cooperatives in New York and similar city and State programs in other cities. It, of course, would also apply to privately financed cooperative housing.

The national cooperative bank established by this legislation would subsidize mortgage interest rates on both tempo-

rary and permanent financing down to 4 percent. It would be authorized to take over permanent financing for housing receiving temporary financing through a municipal or State program.

Eligibility would extend to all families who because of high interest rates could not otherwise afford cooperative housing in today's market. The bank's $1 billion in capitalization would come from the Federal Reserve System. Any co-op built after 1959 would be eligible to receive assistance.

I am most pleased at the initial reactions I have been receiving to this legislation. I believe it fits in well with legislation introduced by Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee to establish a development bank for housing and expands its coverage.

While rent control makes it possible for low- and moderate-income families to afford to live in existing rental housing in New York City, cooperative housing is the only way they can afford to own their own residences. We must save the co-op; for it offers the only way we are going to be able to keep the moderate-income family in the city.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 17205

A bill to establish a National Bank for Cooperative Housing to aid in financing the purchase and construction of low and middle income cooperative housing

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

§ 1. Short title

This Act may be cited as the "National Cooperative Housing Act".

§ 2. Findings and purpose

(a) The Congress finds that there is a vital need for the continuing construction and development of cooperative housing for low and middle income families, as a significant element of the new and expanded housing programs which are necessary to meet expected future increases in housing demands and an important part of the persistent effort which must be made in order to assure that all Americans live in decent, safe, and sanitary housing.

(b) The Congress accordingly declares that it is the policy of the United States and the purpose of this Act to establish a National Bank for Cooperative Housing in order to provide assurances to private and public housing developers that a continual supply of public funds is being and will be made available, at reasonably level rates during periods of high as well as low interest, to encourage the building of low and middle income cooperative housing.

(c) It is the further purpose of this Act to provide a model financing system which might be adopted by States and localities in encouraging low and middle income cooperative housing construction.

§ 3. Definitions

(1) The term "cooperative housing" means housing of the types described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 213(a) of the National Housing Act (including housing financed under a State or local program providing assistance through loans, loan insurance, or tax abatements), and any other housing which is treated under applicable State or local law as cooperative housing.

(2) The term "low and middle income" shall have the meaning given it by or under applicable State law (or by or under applicable local law so long as it is not inconsistent with applicable State law); except that (A) in no case shall such term include any family or person whose income is more than 150 per centum of the average per-family or per-capita income of all the residents of the State, and (B) if there is no such applicable State or local law with respect to any particular housing in any State, such term shall have (with respect to such housing) the meaning given it by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development using the criteria which are applied in determining whether families qualify for occupancy of dwellings supplied under the low- and moderate-income rental and homeownership programs of the National Housing Act.

(3) The term "effective interest rate" means the total amounts paid on a loan for interest, commissions, bonuses, discounts, premiums, or other similar charges.

§ 4. Establishment

There is created a body corporate to be known as the National Bank for Cooperative Housing (referred to in this Act as the Bank). No loan may be made by the Bank unless the borrower is unable to obtain funds on reasonable terms from other sources.

§ 5. Board of Directors

The management of the Bank shall be vested in a Board of Directors consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Labor, and ten other persons who shall be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Of the ten persons so appointed, one shall be an elected or an appointed official of a State government, and one shall be an elected or appointed official of a local government. All of the other persons so appointed shall be from the private sector. Two shall be from among representatives of organized labor, two from among representatives of business and finance, and four from among representatives of organizations dealing with the problems of low-income families. The terms of directors appointed by the President shall be two years, commencing with the date of enactment of this Act. Any director appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired portion of the term. Any director may continue to serve as such after the expiration of the term for which he was appointed until his successor has been appointed and has qualified.

§ 6. Appointment of officers and employees

The Board of Directors of the Bank shall appoint a president of the Bank and such other officers and employees as it deems necessary to carry out the functions of the Bank. Such appointments may be made without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and persons so appointed may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 of subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates. The president of the Bank shall be an ex officio member of the Board of Directors and may participate in meetings of the board except that he shall have no vote except in case of an equal division. No individual other than a citizen of the United States may be an officer of the Bank. No officer of the Bank shall receive any salary or other remuneration from any source other than the Bank during the period of his employment by the Bank.

§ 7. Conflict of interest

(a) No director, officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the Bank shall in any manner, directly or indirectly, participate in the deliberations upon or the determination of any question affecting his personal interests, or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or association in which he is directly or indirectly personally interested.

(b) The Bank shall not engage in political activities nor provide financing for or assist in any manner any project or facility involving political parties, nor shall the directors, officers, employees, or agents of the Bank in any way use their connection with the Bank for the purpose of influencing the outcome of any election.

§ 8. General corporate powers

Except to the extent inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, the Bank shall have the general corporate powers of a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the District of Columbia.

§ 9. Principal office; branches

The principal office of the Bank shall be located in the District of Columbia, and it may establish agencies or branch offices in any city of the United States.

§ 10. Capital stock

(a) The Bank shall have capital stock of $1,000,000,000, subscribed by the United States payment for which shall be subject to call in whole or in part by the Board of Directors.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to, and upon request of the Board of Directors shall, purchase stock in amounts designated by the Board of Directors up to a total of $1,000,000,000.

§ 11. Borrowing authority

(a) The Bank may issue notes, debentures, bonds, and other evidences of indebtedness in such amounts and on such terms and conditions as the Bank may determine subject to the limitations prescribed in this Act.

(b) The aggregate outstanding indebtedness of the Bank under this section at any time may not exceed twenty times the paid-in capital stock of the Bank at that time.

(c) The obligations of the Bank under this section shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed both as to interest and principal by the United States and such guarantee shall be expressed on the face thereof.

(d) In the event that the Bank is unable to pay upon demand, when due, any obligation under this section, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay the amount thereof and thereupon to the extent of the amount so paid by the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to all the rights of the holder of the obligations.

§ 12. Purchase of assets by Treasury

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to purchase from the Bank any asset of the Bank at such price as may be agreed upon between the Secretary and the Bank.

§ 13. Discount by Federal Reserve banks

(a) The several Federal Reserve banks are authorized to purchase or discount any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, secured or unsecured, held by the Bank.

(b) Obligations of the Bank are eligible for purchase by the Federal Reserve Open Market Committee.

§ 14. Investment status of obligations of Bank

All obligations issued by the Bank shall be lawful investments for, and may be accepted as security for, all fiduciary, trust, and public funds the investment or deposit of which is under the authority or control of the United States or of any officer or officers thereof.

§ 15. Function of Bank; loans for low- and middle-income cooperative housing

It shall be the function of the Bank to make and guarantee loans for the purchase or construction of low- and middle-income cooperative housing.

§ 16. Direct loans

(a) The Bank may make direct loans (1) to State and local governments, public agencies, nonprofit private organizations, corporations, companies, partnerships, and individuals for the purchase of low- and middle-

income cooperative housing constructed after 1959, and (2) to developers, contractors, subcontractors, and other persons to finance the construction of low- and middle-income cooperative housing. Except as specifically provided in or under this Act (and, in the case of loans insured or guaranteed under other Federal programs, in or under the law governing such programs), such loans shall be made by the Bank on such terms and conditions as it may determine to be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) The Bank may make loans as described in subsection (a) under the insured and guaranteed loan programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (including the military housing programs under sections 809 and 810 of the National Housing Act), the Veterans' Administration, and the Farmers Home Administration in the Department of Agriculture.

(c) Loans made by the Bank under this section shall have maturities not exceeding 50 years (or 10 years in the case of loans for temporary financing); shall be secured in such manner as the Bank may determine; and shall bear interest at an effective interest rate not exceeding 4½ per centum per annum or the discount rate of the Federal Reserve System, whichever is lower, or such lesser rate as may be established by the Board of Directors of the Bank.

§ 17. Guaranteed loans

The Bank may fully guarantee the entire principal of any loan made by any bank, savings bank, trust company, building and loan or savings and loan association, insurance company, mortgage loan company, or credit union, but only upon a determination that—

(1) such loan will assist in carrying out the purposes of this Act;

(2) such loan has a maturity not exceeding 50 years (or 10 years in the case of a loan for temporary financing);

(3) the effective interest rate in the case of a Federally insured and guaranteed housing loan does not exceed the maximum permanent interest rate ceiling established by law for such a loan or the temporary rate set for such a loan by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Administrator of the Veterans' Affairs, or the Secretary of Agriculture, whichever is applicable;

(4) the effective interest rate in the case of any other loan does not exceed 4 per centum per annum or the Federal Reserve discount rate, whichever is lower, or a lesser rate established by the Board of Directors of the Bank; and

(5) such loan meets such other conditions and requirements as the Bank may determine to be necessary or appropriate.

§ 18. Technical and other assistance

The Bank may provide to recipients of loans or loan guarantees under this Act whatever assistance, technical or otherwise, it considers necessary to protect its investment and to carry out the purposes of this Act.

§ 19. Taxable status

The Bank, its property, its franchise, capital, reserves, surplus, security holdings, and other funds, and its income shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States or by any State or local taxing authority; except that (1) any real property and any tangible personal property of the Bank shall be subject to Federal, State, and local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other such property is taxed, and (2) any and all obligations issued by the Bank shall be subject both as to principal and interest to Federal, State, and local taxation to the same extent as the obligations of private corporations are taxed.

§ 20. Audit by General Accounting Office

The General Accounting Office shall audit the financial transactions of the Bank, and for this purpose shall have access to all its books, records, and accounts.

§ 21. Authorization of appropriations

(a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, to remain available without fiscal year limitation, the sum of $1,000,000,000 for subscription to the capital stock of the Bank.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as many be necessary to pay the difference, if any, between the interest paid by the Bank on its obligations and interest received by the Bank on its loans, and to reimburse the capital of the Bank to the extent of any defaults.

(c) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for payment of $125 a day to members of the Board of Directors of the Bank for each day they are engaged in the performance of their duties to the Bank together with such sums required for travel expenses by members of the Board of Directors of the Bank when the performance of their duties requires them to be away from home.

PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which would make permanent the present authorization for lease, sale, and transfer of peanut acreage allotments. The present authorization ends this year and it is my feeling that permanent legislation covering this subject is most desirable.

Many peanut acreage allotments are small and the opportunity to lease, sell, and transfer allotments is particularly helpful to small farmers. It also achieves more efficient production by permitting consolidation of uneconomic small allotments and, as far as I know, the administration of the temporary authorization has run very well.

The Department of Agriculture in the past has expressed some hesitation to approve permanent authority, but now indications are that Department officials feel that the temporary authority is working well and I feel that they will give the green light to providing a permanent authorization. I believe that it is in the best interest of the Department, the growers, and all other segments of the industry that this legislation be made permanent.

The temporary authority has been used to a considerable extent. In the 1968 crop year there were 10,700 transfers from farms throughout the country and in 1969 there were 14,236. There are approximately 86,000 peanut allotments in the United States, but many of these are small.

We in Virginia are particularly interested in this proposal for permanent legislation as the authority for transfers has been most helpful. We had 227 transfers in the 1968 crop year and 321 in 1969, but the potential is great for even broader use of this provision. We have in Virginia, according to latest figures, 751 peanut allotments of 3 acres or less; 733 from 3 to 5 acres; 853 of from 5 to 7.5 acres; and 739 of from 7.6 to 10 acres. In all, we have 6,246 peanut allotments in our State.

Other States have reported similar interest in this legislation, including North Carolina where there were 1,172 transfers in 1968 and 1,608 in 1969.

I hope that the Department's report on this bill can be secured forthwith and I urge the speedy enactment of the permanent authority.

MEDIA AND DRUGS

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most critical problems our Nation faces today—the increasing use of drugs and narcotics by our youth—is being emphasized strongly by President Nixon and members of his administration.

The President's recent suggestion that the broadcasting industry make a concerted effort to combat the spread of drug usage is an excellent one, which hopefully will be put into effect as soon as possible.

A recent editorial from the Christian Science Monitor discusses the President's suggestion, and specific ways of implementing it which were set forth by Herbert G. Klein, the President's Director of Communications. I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues, and urge their support of this very worthwhile proposal:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 13, 1970]

MEDIA AND DRUGS

President Nixon has asked the nation's radio and television broadcasters to use their tremendous influence to halt the drug trend. One cannot commend this suggestion highly enough.

For their part, the broadcasters seem ready for the suggestion. During the week at the convention of the National Association of Broadcasters in Chicago, they had themselves in many sessions stressed the timeliness and need of a strong antidrug posture.

Specific suggestions of what radio and TV could do were first raised a couple of days earlier in Chicago by Herbert G. Klein, the administration's director of communications. Among them:

Spot announcements like those the networks, and local stations have aired to fight cigarette smoking.

A series "in which the narcotics problem could be covered just as well as any other illness."

Of course, the most effective way for the broadcast media to mount an offensive against drugs is not simply through ads and situation programs, though these could be useful. It is rather by persistent, thorough scrutiny of the drug scene in news and documentary coverage. Nothing will more quickly bring what some experts are calling a drug epidemic under control than to expose the

illusiveness of the euphoria which drugs promise, and the often tragic consequences of giving them a try.

Actually, there already is something of a counteroffensive against drugs going on at the moment. Many school systems around the United States are having former addicts—often still of school age themselves—talk to gatherings of youngsters. The printed media have been exploring the impulse behind the so-called drug culture in America and abroad as well as recording the new monthly estimates of how many drug users there are. This is all helpful.

But the counteroffensive must be as broad as possible and as intense. There persists a tendency—in the media as well as without—to make light of drugs. Drugtaking is often depicted as naughty. Whereas it is in fact insidious.

The administration and the broadcast media have had their differences lately. But they certainly can find common ground in a strong effort to shut off the drug craze.

THE ROUTE TO FOREIGN POLICY

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's skillful handling of foreign policy is being recognized widely, but perhaps not so well known is the carefully constructed method by which he reaches a foreign policy decision.

A recent editorial in the Miami Herald points out that the President's State of the World Message contained a detailed description of the National Security Council and its use, which enables the President "to make sure that he gets the best advice available and a range of choices for action."

Especially significant is the emphasis placed on long-range planning; in the President's words:

The overriding objective of every policy review undertaken, is to clarify our view of where we want to be in the next three to five years.

I insert this editorial in the RECORD:

[From the Miami Herald, Apr. 20, 1970]

THE ROUTE TO FOREIGN POLICY

Reassuring to Americans is a little-noticed section of President Nixon's 1970 State of the World message to Congress. His description of the National Security Council system discloses how he arrives at decisions on foreign policy.

Like a blueprint, the statement isn't racy reading. Still, it adds up to a heartening picture of the structure devised by Mr. Nixon himself to make sure that he gets the best advice available and a range of choices for action.

"I have long believed that the most pressing issues are not necessarily the most fundamental ones," the President said. "We know that an effective American policy requires clarity of purpose for the future as well as a procedure for dealing with the present. We do not want to exhaust ourselves managing crises; our basic goal is to shape the future."

That is why he invested pre-inaugural time in revising the security council setup. Previous Presidents had used this machinery according to their own lights. In some cases the council fell into disuse when a President chose to consult advisers informally. At other times, underlings were expected to compromise their differences and turn out recommendations based on a consensus.

Mr. Nixon's approach is quite different:

"I do not believe that Presidential leadership consists merely in ratifying a consensus reached among departments and agencies . . . Differences of view are identified and defended, rather than muted or buried."

He asks for and gets distinct alternatives, with their pros and cons, implications and costs. Then, finally, he himself makes the judgment, and puts it in writing so that all departments can know the policy and do their part in implementing it.

The council, made up of the President, Vice President, secretaries of State and Defense and the director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, met 37 times last year. Each session drew on exhaustive reviews by interagency support groups.

Foreign policy is Mr. Nixon's strong point, and his technique for handling it reflects the high priority he accords it.

His most meaningful remark in this report, we think, is: "The mandate I have given to the National Security Council system, and the overriding objective of every policy review undertaken, is to clarify our view of where we want to be in the next three to five years. Only then can we ask, and answer, the question of how to proceed."

Looking ahead puts each day in a clearer perspective.

STRIKERS AREN'T "TEACHERS"

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the question of whether or not schoolteachers should have the right to strike has been a subject of wide public debate and we have heard from the teachers, parents, school officials, teacher union officers—just about everyone but the students themselves.

In that regard, I noticed a letter to the editor of the Minneapolis Tribune on April 21, 1970, from Mr. Charles Varone, a student at North High School in Minneapolis, Minn., in which he makes some thought-provoking observations about the lessons which he learned from a strike at his school.

I insert the article in the RECORD at this point:

STRIKERS AREN'T "TEACHERS"

To the EDITOR:

I saw teachers walking around the schools carrying picket signs. My first reaction was, "Hurray, no school." Then I got to thinking that these were not teachers. Teachers are people who teach others. These people were stopping us from what we came to school for, an education. Many of these so-called "teachers" took away records, books, attendance charts, locked up books and maps, and did anything to make it impossible for anyone to teach. They did everything to stop our education so that they could get more money.

Teachers set examples to youth by what they do. From these examples youth can learn four very important lessons:

1. Youth has the right to education, but teachers show that if you want something, regardless of other people's rights, get it.

2. Well, if teachers are going to do anything, including breaking the law, for money, then money must be the most important thing on earth.

3. If teachers break the laws, then laws can't be very important.

4. If the law is nothing, then what makes the law can't be much. The United States is nothing.

Do they know what they are doing? Maybe they don't care. Maybe teachers deserve more money, but they have not the right to do what they are doing.

INTER-AMERICAN PARTNERSHIP

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, as we enter the new decade, the growing interdependence which exists among the nations of the Western Hemisphere emphasizes the need for a strengthened inter-American partnership. If that partnership is to grow, development in our sister republics to the south must be accelerated. When President Nixon set forth his "Action for Progress" policy for Latin America, he stressed the importance of private foreign investment as an indispensable tool of development. Last week in Buenos Aires, Argentina, the Honorable Maurice H. Stans, U.S. Secretary of Commerce, further delineated the roles of trade and investment in the development process.

Secretary Stans' remarks made before the joint meeting of the United States-Argentine Chambers of Commerce follows:

It is indeed a pleasure and a privilege to meet with the business and government leaders of Argentina.

My visit has a single purpose. I come to help carry out one of the fundamental requirements of President Nixon's new Action for Progress policy for the Western Hemisphere.

That requirement is to establish a new sense of community among our countries through close personal ties and continuing communication.

I have come in a spirit of partnership:

To explore new, concrete ways of working together in the achievement of common objectives;

To discuss matters of mutual interest involving travel, trade, investment, and technology exchange; and

To assure you that the principle of "prior consultation" will be strictly adhered to by my government in all matters involving your country's vital interests.

UNDERSTANDING PROBLEMS

On this trip, I also seek a better understanding of the problems involving our two countries so that we may find solutions through close cooperation.

At the same time, I am here to ask your understanding of the changing circumstances of world trade and investment. Today no single country any longer dominates world trade. Competition between the United States, Japan and the Common Market quickens as technology and manufacturing capabilities are more evenly distributed throughout the world. Most trading countries have preoccupations with trade imbalances, balance of payments problems and rising demands for protection from local industries whether they be situated in developed or lesser developed countries. These are problems which affect all our economies, our industries, our working men and women.

Our goal, like yours, is freer trade among all nations as the surest road to economic

progress for all. Certainly we strongly oppose as bad economics and damaging to international amity, the division of the world into hostile trading blocs, ready to engage in trade war. No one would win, and we should surely all lose.

But as we consider our problems and seek your understanding of them, we can assure you in a spirit of partnership that we will keep our commitments to Latin America. We can and will go forward together.

OUR ASSETS

In this Hemisphere, there is an enormous reservoir of material resources, public and private.

There is the greatest accumulation of capital in the world, searching constantly for development opportunities.

There is a limitless storehouse of scientific and technical knowledge which we are adding to every day and which accompanies capital wherever it goes.

There are vast mineral resources that stretch from the frozen Arctic to the windswept Straits of Magellan.

There are untapped agricultural and forest resources that are unrivalled anywhere.

There is a growing transportation and communications network that one day will link every hamlet in the Hemisphere.

There are the grandest, the most beautiful, the most scenic land and seashores on the face of the globe.

Above all, there are the human resources: individualistic, energetic peoples whose pride and love of liberty assure the forward thrust of social and economic progress indefinitely in the future.

Working together, we can utilize these resources to improve the quality of life for all.

PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM

To further our common aims, President Nixon has undertaken new initiatives and commitments, with the principle of "shared responsibility" underlying his entire program. It is a broad-based, inclusive program, touching every facet of economic development.

For example, in his recommendations for our government's fiscal year 1971 budget, the President has included a contingency account of $540 million for international financial institution, a substantial part of which would be for the Inter-American Development Bank. He also has requested $556 million in AID funds for the Western Hemisphere, an increase of 20 percent over the 1970 appropriation levels.

I am especially happy that under the President's program the four areas which hold the greatest promise for the progress of Latin America happen to fall within my jurisdiction. They are trade expansion, promotion of tourism, the sharing of science and technology, and foreign direct investment.

TRADE EXPANSION

In trade expansion, our basic goal is to widen the markets for the goods of working people everywhere, and to better utilize the world's resources for the benefit of all.

We in the U.S. have a vital interest in a three-way expansion of Latin American trade:

Increased two-way trade between my country and Latin America;

Increased trade between Latin America and other countries of the world; and

Increased trade among the Latin American countries themselves.

All are important to the economic progress and development of the Hemisphere and the entire Free World.

For this reason, we are taking positive steps to work with all Latin American nations to expand their trade, expand their export earnings, as one means of supporting their internal economic development.

First, we are pressing vigorously for a general reduction of non-tariff barriers in developed nations, which seriously hamper the free flow of trade. Many of these obstacles discriminate against the products of Latin America, as well as those of my country. On trips abroad, I have made it plain to our trading partners that we in the United States place the highest priority on a reduction of these barriers, which are growing in number and are threatening the whole structure of Free World trade.

Second, we have proposed that the industrial nations adopt a liberal system of generalized tariff preferences for all developing nations, including Latin America. We would like to see a common scheme in force, one with broad product coverage and with no ceilings on preferential imports. Discussions are now in progress on our proposal in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

Third, we seek to support directly your trade expansion efforts. In his 1971 Budget, the President has asked Congress for $15 million for this purpose. Discussions with Latin American countries on how this money can best be spent are underway at the present time. (I might say in passing that $15 million is more than we in the U.S. government have available for our own export promotion efforts!)

Fourth, we will support the establishment of regular procedures for advance consultation on trade matters in the Western Hemisphere. As President Nixon has stressed, U.S. trade policies often have a heavy impact on your countries, and the time to consult with you on policy decisions is before they are taken, not afterward.

TOURISM

Hardly less important than trade expansion for Latin America is the increased development of tourism.

Here, President Nixon has taken two important steps.

First, he has determined that the dream of a Pan-American Highway linking our two continents shall become a reality. As you know, a 400-kilometer stretch between Panama and Colombia—the Darien Gap—still remains uncompleted.

The President has given his support to a $100 million plan to bridge that gap. In his 1971 Budget Message, he announced a $20 million request as a first step toward completing the project.

Tourism alone did not inspire the President's support, of course, since the completed Pan-American Highway will have many other benefits for the Americas. But there will be few benefits greater than the stimulus this great land link will give to inter-American tourism development.

A second step the President has taken on behalf of tourism is a budget request of $20 million for promotion and establishment of essential facilities.

This move was greeted enthusiastically by Latin American tourist officials at a meeting in Lima last month. There, the Regional Commission for the Americas of the International Union of Official Travel Organizations sought Hemispheric cooperation to establish a permanent Americas office of IUOTO. One of the office's first assignments would be to act as a coordinator for Latin American Tourism Year in 1971.

Our U.S. Travel Service, which comes under my jurisdiction at the Commerce Department, has pledged its assistance in making that year-long tourism event an outstanding success.

NEW OFFER

In this connection, I would like today to make a new offer of assistance, not just for your Tourism Year in 1971, but as a permanent project. Our Travel Service will pool its resources with yours to interest travel wholesalers in other parts of the world in packaging multinational tours of this Hemisphere. Our Service also stands ready to sponsor joint familiarization tours for retail travel agents and travel writers and to develop a series of equal partner promotional ventures, such as joint travel trade briefings abroad, cooperative film evenings in foreign countries and joint travel missions to Europe and Asia.

I believe that such a joint promotional effort to "Discover the New World" could have a tremendous appeal overseas. Our Travel Service stands ready to launch this effort jointly with you in time to have maximum impact in 1971. I am confident we will get a favorable response to this offer throughout Latin America, and a member of my party will be glad to consult with your appropriate officials about it.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

No less important than trade and tourism are science and technology. As President Nixon said in his address before the Inter-American Press Association, these twin forces of progress increasingly hold the key to our national futures.

The President pointed out that in the Consensus of Vina del Mar, the United States was asked for an unprecedented effort to share our scientific and technical capabilities. And he said:

"To that request we shall respond in a true spirit of partnership.

"This I pledge to you tonight: The nation that went to the moon in peace for all mankind is ready, ready to share its technology in peace with all its nearest neighbors."

This pledge will be honored in several different ways.

First, we have taken steps to identify and make available U.S. Government-owned patents that might be useful to technological development in Latin America. In connection with patents generally, I would urge that all Latin American countries participate in the Patent Cooperation Treaty which will be negotiated in Washington beginning May 25. This treaty would be of great potential benefit to countries in this area by helping to solve the problem of evaluating the patentability of inventions filed with their respective offices.

Second, our Commerce Department's Office of Invention and Innovation is assisting the Organization of American States with the development of a "Technology Bank" and a "Technological Diffusion Center" in Latin America. Both these institutions will strengthen the technological capabilities of Latin American enterprises and national services.

Third, our Department's Environmental Science Services Administration is assisting in developing improved weather forecasting and oceanographic capabilities of Latin American services.

Fourth, President Nixon has set aside $20 million in AID funds to support science and technology efforts in the region.

NEW PROGRAM

Finally, it is with particular pride and pleasure that I announce today the establishment of a new program whose technological benefits will constitute a basic foundation stone for the industrial progress of this entire region.

We in the Commerce Department, jointly with the Agency for International Development, are creating the "Industrial Standards Fellowship Program for Latin America."

Under this Program, ten Latin American scientists and engineers will be trained each year in standards techniques at our Commerce Department's world-famous National Bureau of Standards in Washington, D.C.

As we all know, standards—a basic, agreed-upon system of uniform measurement—are

the absolutely indispensable prerequisite for industrialization.

They are indispensable to any nation that wants to sell its industrial products in the world market.

They are indispensable to the regional integration of national economies.

And they are indispensable to mass production, mass distribution, and mass consumption, the trio of modern economic phenomena which add up to a rising standard of living for all.

In my country, it is estimated that more than 20 billion measurements are made each day—in science, industry, commerce, and everyday life.

In support of these measurements, the Nation has an investment of about $50 billion in instrumentation and research and development related to measurement.

The headquarters of this basic activity is our Commerce Department's National Bureau of Standards, the greatest repository for standards know-how in the world. Every year scientists and engineers from many countries come there for training in standards techniques.

But we have not had enough from Latin America to assure the industrial progress that you want and need—and that we in the U.S. want to work with you to achieve.

That's why I am confident that this new "Industrial Standards Fellowship Program for Latin America" will receive your enthusiastic endorsement. A member of my party is ready to discuss this new program with your appropriate officials right now. We want to move ahead with it just as soon as possible; we are looking forward to having the outstanding scientists and engineers from this region with us at our National Bureau of Standards. I can assure you that they will receive a most cordial reception and the finest training in standards techniques available anywhere in the world.

DIRECT INVESTMENT

This new program also will help further the transfer of science and technology that accrue to your benefit through direct private investment. Your increased standards expertise will enable you to adapt more readily for other industries the new technology which accompanies such investment.

There are, of course, serious problems in this area—we all recognize these. President Nixon pointed to them in his comprehensive statement on U.S. foreign policy on February 18.

"Foreign investments," he said, "are the most exposed targets of frustration, irrational politics, misguided nationalism. Their potential for mutual benefits will only be realized through mutual perception and tact. The nations of this Hemisphere must work out arrangements which can attract the needed technical and financial resources of foreign investment. For their part, investors must recognize the national sensitivities and political needs of the 1970's. There is no more delicate task than finding new modes which permit the flow of needed investment capital without a challenge to national pride and prerogative."

We in the United States know first hand what foreign capital can mean to a country's development. From the beginning of our Republic, we have sought to provide foreign businessmen with profitable investment opportunities.

U.S. POLICY

As early as 1791, Alexander Hamilton, our first Secretary of the Treasury, stated the policy we would follow toward foreign capital.

"Instead of being viewed as a rival," he said, "it ought to be considered as a most valuable auxiliary, conducing to put in motion a greater quality of productive labor, and a greater portion of useful enterprise, than could exist without it."

We know what such a policy can mean to a country's development because in the 19th Century we were an underdeveloped nation. Foreign capital came in and built much of our original transportation network—roads, bridges, canals and railroads. It was attracted to our shores from the great financial capitals of that day—London, Paris, Amsterdam—because we offered investors the advantages of political stability, full legal protection of property, and the unlimited right to repatriate earnings or withdraw capital.

Later, foreign businessmen started making direct investments in manufacturing in our country, a happy development which still continues to grow year after year. It is one that we continue to encourage because it increases competition and brings us the benefits of foreign technology and managerial techniques.

The benefits of foreign direct investment are especially needed in your countries here in Latin America, if you are to step up the pace of your modernization programs through the transfer of technology.

FREE MARKETPLACE

But as we all know, investment capital enjoys a free marketplace in the world. It is attracted by the legitimate profit incentive. It will go where there are prospects for a fair return without undue risk. It will flee from conditions which threaten its freedom and security.

These are inexorable facts. If a nation is to attract private capital and enjoy the benefits that it offers, conditions must be favorable for its long term investment.

It is to every nation's benefit to create these conditions. Each nation is competing against every other country for the scarce resources—capital and know-how—that foreign investment provides, and it will go to the country that offers the most hospitable climate.

For example, U.S. manufacturing investment has a wide choice of areas for investment where the returns are comparable. In 1968, the annual rates of returns for our manufacturing investments abroad were 12 percent for Latin America, 11 percent for Europe, 20 percent for the Middle and Far East, and 8 percent for Canada.

But despite the lack of special profit advantage in Latin America, U.S. firms have continued to increase their investments in this region. From 1965 to 1968, U.S. direct investment in Latin America increased more than $1.6 billion, reaching a total of some $11 billion.

These vast investments provide jobs, raise living standards, increase export earnings, and permit import substitution. And just as important as the transfer of new technology is the managerial and technical training provided your people. Local nationals are employed in about 92 percent of the managerial positions, 97 percent of the technical and professional positions, and more than 99 percent of all jobs in U.S. manufacturing enterprises in Latin America.

CONCLUSION

In all these areas of development—travel, trade, investment and technology exchange—the primary challenge is to our capacity for cooperation. We have all the tools in abundance—managerial ability, manpower, capital, physical resources of every sort. But can we develop the sense of community, the idea of oneness, that will enable us to bring these skills and resources together for our common benefit?

I know this: Partnership cannot be developed by waving a magic wand. A commonality of spirit and purpose are not the products of committee resolutions. Mutual trust and understanding find little nourishment in the soil of inflated rhetoric.

Rather all these things can be developed only by working together, by solving problems together, by achieving together, by reaching common goals together, by sharing together the joy of accomplishment.

They are what build a people into a nation. And they are what can build nations into a community of mankind.

NEED A RADICAL SPEAKER? CALL THE LOCAL LECTURE BUREAU

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in his column appearing in the Washington Post on April 23, 1970, Art Buchwald points out beautifully the lunacy of college administrators and other college and university officials around the country who seem to have a masochistic compulsion for inviting speakers to their campuses—speakers who then proceed, in the most foul type of language, to lambaste and berate the host school, the Federal Government, the so-called establishment, the police, and, indeed, the entire structure of our society and form of government.

I am not aware of the budget situation at the Washington Post but they would be doing a real service if they were to reprint Mr. Buchwald's column and send it to all the colleges and universities in the country.

I include the column in the RECORD at this point:

NEED A RADICAL SPEAKER? CALL THE LOCAL LECTURE BUREAU

(By Art Buchwald)

The most popular speakers on campus these days are the student revolutionaries, black militants and those advocating the legalization of drugs.

And anyone convicted of a crime and out on bail can write his own lecture ticket.

I was at the offices of the "Up Against the Wall Lecture Bureau" the other day and the phone didn't stop ringing.

"Hello, Up Against the Wall Lecture Bureau. Who's this? . . . Harvard U. What can we do for you? . . . Nope, we're sorry the Chicago Seven are booked up through 1976. But we have some great speakers for you. How would you like 'Mad Dog Faucet?' . . . You know, the one who wrote the book on student revolution titled 'Mother Is the First To Go.'

". . . Right. Fifteen hundred dollars and expenses . . . Sure he takes off his clothes at the end . . . What kind of lecture do you think he gives? . . . Thank you. I'll send the contract. . .

"Hello . . . What's that? you're booking speakers for Columbia U this fall? . . . Let's see . . . Here's one for you . . . Ruben Ruben . . . Yeh, that's right. He's the one who hijacked the Goodyear Blimp to Havana . . . Uh huh. He's out on bail now . . . No, he'll be available . . . Even if he's convicted this summer he'll appeal . . . You don't think he's a draw?

"What about Abbie Satchel . . . You know, the guy who set fire to the elephant house at the Bronx Zoo during last week's antiVietnam demonstrations . . . He's a beautiful person . . . two thousand bucks . . . Of course he'll get the students fired up. He spoke at Simpson Tech last week and they burned down the library during the question period . . . Right on. He'll be there.

" . . . Up Against the Wall Lecture Bureau . . . Berkeley? What can we do for you? . . . You're having a lecture series in American history and you'd like someone who is an expert in the field . . . I have just the speaker for you . . . Ziggy Rumfield . . . himself! . . . The fellow who blew off Theodore Roosevelt's nose with dynamite on Mount Rushmore . . . He's very knowledgeable about explosives . . . That's right, he shows the kids how to make a bomb right on the stage . . . No, no, the only time it ever went off was at the University of Wisconsin . . . Believe me, its safe . . . Look, if anything happens you don't have to pay . . . Right. Thank you."

The man hung up and I had a chance to interview him. "You seem to be really busy."

"You better believe it. Kids today want speakers they can relate to. None of this education or political baloney. They want gut speakers that will tell them how rotten it really is. Look at this. I have 32 requests from universities who want to hear from anyone who has killed a cop. He doesn't even have to be a big name.

"And every white school in the country wants a Black Panther to speak to them. How many Black Panthers do they think there are in this country? And look at these requests for speakers convicted of pushing drugs. I tell you, these college kids know what they want."

"At least they're interested in the world around them," I said.

"If I could get one mass murderer, I could make a fortune," he said wistfully.

"What other speakers are in demand at the moment?"

"Well, I can get $3,500 for any priest who spilled blood on draft board records. There is also a big market for the people who blew up the buildings in New York City, though I have to book them at out-of-the-way schools in case the FBI gets wind of them."

"Is there any student demand for prominent men in public life?"

"Are you kidding? Why should they listen to someone like that when they can hear from someone who has cut sugar cane in Cuba?"

TRIBUTE TO SECRETARIES

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in the field of business and industry, in the professions and in government, the successful operation of an office is based on the skills and attitudes of its secretaries. National Secretaries Week, a period set aside to recognize the essential function of secretaries as the backbone of management, has just ended.

I am sure my colleagues will agree that they could not function nearly as well without the unselfish and professional assistance which their secretaries provide daily. I would like to say thank you and congratulations to the secretaries on my staff: Nel Talbert, Karen Corey, Alice Smith, Danna Thomas, Judy Mandell, Ann Ramirez, Tina Schable, and Elizabeth Blas. The mature office skills, initiative, judgment, and loyalty which they bring to their work each day are exceeded only by their hard work and spirit of helpfulness and cheer.

HEROES

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most Members read the editorial in today's Washington Post and that many will be moved to insert it in the RECORD.

I believe it should be inserted and am moved to do so not because it will secure special notice but because I believe those whose names are contained therein deserve to be enshrined somewhere. Having won the Congressional Medal of Honor they deserve, at least, a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 27, 1970]

HEROES

On one day last week the Letters space on this page was wholly taken up with readers caught in a common quandary, struggling to express a common anguish. They had watched and prayed with the rest of us as Apollo 13 limped home and they were unreservedly proud and grateful for that. And yet they were deeply disturbed by the national trauma that attended three men in trouble in outer space because they could not reconcile it with what seemed to them, by contrast, to be an almost callous indifference to the fortunes of the hundreds of men who face greater danger daily in a war on earth.

They spoke in different ways of distorted values and disordered priorities, and of the 141 Americans who died in Vietnam in the week of Apollo 13's ordeal, and of how you square the two. They wanted to take nothing away from the astronauts—only to give something more, somehow, to the unknown, unseen, unsung victims of Vietnam.

We have no way of knowing whether this was in some part a group inspiration or the spontaneous reaction of individuals. But it doesn't matter; the quandary is real. There is no escaping some sense of misplaced values—of inequity if not injustice—in the events, both public and private, of the past ten days.

Publicly, there was Apollo and the aftermath. Congress decreed a moment of silence and the President declared a day of prayer. Business of state was set aside—including, ironically, a presidential report to the nation on Vietnam. Entertainment was cancelled at a White House state dinner. The President flew off to Honolulu to welcome back the astronauts personally. The House voted more money for future space exploration than the administration had proposed.

Privately, out of consideration for those concerned, there was another event. Last Monday afternoon, while President Nixon was still out at San Clemente after "the proudest day of my life" with the astronauts, Vice President Agnew filled in for him at a ceremony in the East Room of the White House at which 15 posthumous Medals of Honor were awarded to the next of kin of 13 marines and two navy corpsmen. It being a closed affair, with no picture-taking, this event was worth a few words on television and about seven inches of type on an inside page of this newspaper. The names of the men were listed, there was a brief description of the ceremony, and that was that.

Perhaps it is idle to seek significance in this discrepancy—the frenzied adulation of one set of heroes and the relative anonymity of another—because mere fame is not the point. What is more, a war and a moonshot are in no way strictly comparable; one is a brief and brilliant adventure, with all the thrill of exploration, the other a grim business, at best a prolonged agony and, in this case, uniquely unglamorous. But *awareness* does matter, in striking balances and fixing a set of values and making judgments. For this, it isn't necessary, let alone possible, to know as much about Vietnam's heroes as Apollo's. What matters is for us to understand how much there is that we are *not* always aware of, how much we cannot see and therefore do not know. To that end—and with no intent to denigrate the cool courage of our space explorers—we would like to tell you something more about the men who were quietly honored at the White House last week.

Their average age was 22. Only one was married. Three were black. They came from 13 different states, North, South, East and West; Massachusetts, Illinois, Texas, Missouri, California, Florida, New York. All were enlisted men. Their citations begin the same way—"For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty . . ." And they continue on, not in glorification of battle or celebration of war, but in one tribute after another to the human spirit.

Oscar, P. Austin, Pfc, USMC: ". . . as he neared the casualty, he observed an enemy grenade land nearby and, reacting instantly, leaped between the injured marine and the lethal object, absorbing the full effects . . . he saw a North Vietnamese Army soldier aiming a weapon at his unconscious companion. With full knowledge of the probable consequences (he) resolutely threw himself between the casualty and the hostile soldier, and, in doing so, was mortally wounded."

Robert C. Burke, Pfc, USMC: ". . . Private Burke then fearlessly moved from one position to another, quelling the hostile fire until his weapon malfunctioned. Obtaining a casualty's rifle and hand grenades, he advanced further into the midst of enemy fire. . . ."

Wayne M. Caron, Hospital Corpsman Third Class: ". . . again hit by enemy fire, this time in the leg, (he) crawled the remaining distance and provided medical aid . . . again struck by enemy small arms fire, courageously and with unbelievable determination (he) continued his attempt to reach the third marine until he himself was killed by an ememy rocket round."

Ronald L. Coker, Pfc, USMC: ". . . as he began to drag his injured comrade towards safety, a grenade landed on the wounded marine. Unhesitatingly, (he) grasped it with both hands and turned away from his wounded companion. . . ."

Thomas E. Creek, Lance Corporal, USMC: ". . . an enemy grenade was thrown into the gully where he had fallen . . . fully realizing the inevitable results of his action (he) rolled on the grenade and absorbed the full force of the explosion with his own body, thereby saving the lives of five of his fellow marines."

Robert H. Jenkins Jr., Pfc, USMC: ". . . a North Vietnamese soldier threw a hand grenade into the friendly emplacement. Fully realizing the inevitable results of this action, (he) quickly seized his comrade, and pushing the man to the ground, he leaped on top of the marine to shield him from the explosion."

Ralph H. Johnson, Pfc, USMC: ". . . Suddenly, a hand grenade landed in the three-man fighting hole . . . realizing the inherent danger to his two comrades, he shouted a warning and unhesitatingly hurled himself upon the explosive device. . . ."

Larry L. Maxam, Corporal, USMC: ". . . too weak to reload his machine gun, (he) fell to a prone position and valiantly continued to deliver effective fire with his rifle. After one and a half hours, during which he was hit repeatedly by fragments from exploding grenades . . . he succumbed to his wounds,

having successfully defended nearly one half of the perimeter single-handed."

Lawrence D. Peters, Sergeant, USMC: ". . . (he) continued firing until he was critically wounded by a gunshot wound in the chest. Although unable to walk or stand, Sergeant Peters steadfastly continued to direct his squad in spite of two additional wounds . . ."

Jimmy W. Phipps, Pfc, USMC: ". . . realizing that his assistant and the platoon commander were both within a few meters of him and the imminent explosion could kill all three men, (he) grasped the hand grenade to his chest and dived forward . . ."

William R. Prom, Lance Corporal, USMC: ". . . unable to continue his own fire because of his severe wounds, he continued to advance to within a few yards of the enemy positions. There, standing in full view of the enemy, he accurately directed the fire of his support elements until he was mortally wounded . . ."

David R. Ray, Hospital Corpsman Second Class: ". . . while he was bandaging and attempting to comfort another wounded marine, Petty Officer Ray was forced to battle two enemy soldiers . . . (his) final act of heroism was to protect the patient he was treating. He threw himself upon the wounded marine, thus savings the man's life when an enemy grenade exploded nearby."

Dewayne T. Williams, Pfc, USMC: ". . . reacting instantly to the alert, he saw that the grenade had landed close to where he was lying and without hesitation, in a valiant act of heroism, he rolled on top of the grenade as it exploded . . ."

Alfred M. Wilson, Pfc, USMC: ". . . fully realizing the inevitable result of his actions, (he) shouted to his companion and unhesitatingly threw himself on the grenade . . ."

Kenneth L. Worley, Lance Corporal, USMC: ". . . in a valiant act of heroism, (he) instantly threw himself upon the grenade nearest him and his comrades . . ."

". . . He gallantly gave his life for his country."

DIRECT ELECTIONS ARE NOT THE ANSWER

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last fall the House passed what I believe to be an unwise measure in the form of a constitutional amendment to provide for the direct popular vote for the President. The intensive debate in the House was not reflected in the final vote. However, the Senate has had additional time to study the measure and I trust that the complications in the direct popular election system would be evident to the Members of that body. The Chicago Today in its Monday, April 20, edition carried the following editorial which is of a very timely nature:

DIRECT ELECTIONS ARE NOT THE ANSWER

A bill to junk the electoral college and have President chosen by direct popular vote faces an important test Friday, when the Senate judiciary committee votes on it. In advance of the test opponents are mustering all the strength they can to defeat this move—and much as we'd like to see the creaky electoral system reformed, we hope they do defeat it, either in Congress or after the change is submitted to the states for approval.

Direct popular election of Presidents is a simple, dramatic idea. It seems thoroughly democratic, and it has the appeal of a quick solution—slashing thru the knot instead of patiently untangling it. Unhappily, it is likely to produce snarls many times worse than the present system ever did.

For all its clumsiness and opportunities for abuse, the electoral college serves many purposes. It nails down election results quickly and beyond doubt. It spreads out voting power more evenly between heavily populated and less populated states, so that candidates must consult all the nation's voters, not just concentrate their appeal for votes on a few metropolitan centers. It safeguards the character and influence of minority groupings of all kinds, instead of dumping everybody into an undifferentiated mass in which nothing counts but arithmetical totals.

Finally, if you've ever gone thru the messy experience of vote challenges and recounts even on the precinct level, you can imagine the chaos and nervous suspense of days-long, nationwide recounts of Presidential votes—something likely to happen in a direct election every time there was a numerically close vote.

We agree there's got to be a better system than the electoral college as it stands, but direct popular election is not it. Congress should keep looking.

SANTA BARBARA RIOTS ANALYZED

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the recent violence and destruction at the University of California in Santa Barbara, the latest in a long series of student "unrest" and dissent, stunned much of the Nation. Americans in all walks of life want to know why this happened, who is behind such wanton acts of violence, and what can be done to prevent future outbursts. The following article by Robert Betts of Copley News Service explores the background of dissent on that campus and the question of whether this was a spontaneous expressing of student dissatisfaction or planned destruction by a small hard-core group:

[From the San Diego Union, Mar. 29, 1970]

SANTA BARBARA RIOTS ANALYZED: COMMUNITY BEWILDERED OVER DESTRUCTION BY STUDENTS

(By Robert Betts)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The February riots at University of California, Santa Barbara, were shocking in themselves but actually they were a manifestation of a broader movement aided by Communist revolutionaries. "Santa Barbara" and all its related aspects is examined in a series of four articles. This is the first.)

"I don't understand it," said one of the "silent majority" as cleanup crews hauled away debris from Santa Barbara's bout of smashing and burning.

The scene was not unfamiliar. It had all happened before, in Berkeley, Columbia, Chicago and other places.

But in sunny little Isla Vista?

This community—two square miles of apartments with a few small stores and offices, a couple of gasoline stations and a bank adjacent to the University of California's Santa Barbara campus—had felt the fury of student protest.

At least, the "silent majority" still thinks of it as student protest.

Verne Johnson who owns the Isla Vista Market, surveyed his smashed windows and said: "I thought I had good relations with the students. They're my main customers and I've always treated them fairly, as well as contributing and helping them with their various causes. Now they've done $350 worth of damage to my store. I don't know what to make of them."

Similar bewilderment was expressed by one of the sheriff's deputies, still patrolling the area where for three nights rioters had battled with police, hurled rocks and fire bombs, burned a patrol car and set more than 50 fires, including one which destroyed the local Bank of America branch.

THE ODD RADICAL

"I thought I understood them until this happened," he said. "We can talk to most of the students around here, except the odd radical who calls us 'pigs' and refuses to rap with us. Sure, a lot of people have grievances they feel like demonstrating about, and that's their right. But violence doesn't solve anything." (Casualties included 32 lawmen, treated for wounds ranging from cuts and bruises to serious head and internal injuries.)

The Rev. Bob Donoghue, a pleasant young priest who has close contact with students and invites them to his St. Mark's University parish center with catchy posters like "Students for Peace—Where Are You?" gave his views.

"Sheer temper, that's what it is," he said, leaning back from his desk in his cassock, legs crossed, smoking a cheroot. "We're reaping the harvest from seeds sown by the prophets of permissiveness. From babyhood, today's youngsters have been demanding and getting their way. If they didn't get it at first they threw a tantrum, and it generally worked. Now they're doing the same thing—in a bigger way."

The campus was articulate with similar theories. Administrators, professors, students talked of pent-up frustrations from a variety of causes—the war, the Establishment, exorbitant rents charged for Isla Vista apartments, dissatisfaction at the growing complexity of the educational process and the general push for more student involvement in running the university.

More recently there was the unpopular dismissal of a professor who failed to meet tenure standards, indignation over the Chicago riot conspiracy trial, and the visit of the Chicago defendants' attorney, William Kunstler, whose speech was blamed for arousing more passion.

Some students spoke of "constant police harassment." Over what?

"Oh—drugs, and things like that," said one barefooted student. "They should stick to real crimes, man, like burglary and murder, and leave us alone. Drugs is something personal and private—like sex."

WELL-KNOWN FACT

Another spokesman for the radicals, Gregory Knell, a vice president of the Associated Students at UCSB who also has been active in the Students for a Democratic Society and was arrested in a previous disorder said, "It's a well-known fact that sheriff's deputies get their kicks by beating up young people in Isla Vista.

"When things get dull," he added, "they go in and rough up anybody in sight."

Vice Chancellor Ray Varley pointed out that the number of students involved in the Isla Vista rioting was small, but said they are "influenced by responsible radical elements."

He agreed that "the present troubles have been building up for a long time, and the activists—students and nonstudents—let their pent-up frustrations and emotions take over."

PLANNED OPERATION

While all except a few hotheads condemned the violence, few on this campus viewed it as anything more than a spontaneous outburst by a bunch of unruly dissidents.

Others more familiar with the evolving pattern of subversion and the accompanying growth of violence across the country, connect it with similar incidents of arson and bombing in and around other campuses.

They see it as an operation planned, organized and directed by internal enemies who are out to bring down not only the educational, but the entire American-system.

"It is obvious to us that the thing was organized, and with outside help," said Sheriff James Webster. "We could smell trouble brewing for a long time."

The usually placid Santa Barbara campus has been called the "country club," "the surfboard and beach bunny college," and "the campus by the sea" because of its lovely setting on cliffs overlooking the Pacific Ocean, far from the hustle and bustle of the big city.

But the left-wing liberal ideas and seeds of dissension which have spread out from Berkeley to pervade the whole of the University of California had been putting down their roots here too.

The first hint of trouble came in January, 1968. A complaint filed by a professor against a student for using obscenities led to an "obscenity rally," held by radical Students for a Democratic Society and the Black Studies Union. Sheriff's deputies appeared at the campus radio station and requested a tape of a meeting at which obscenities were allegedly used. The request was refused and no more action was taken.

RADICAL DEMANDS

The issue of student "rights" already had been settled at Berkeley in December, 1964, when the University of California capitulated to the radical demands of the Free Speech Movement, which also campaigned for "filthy speech."

The acceptance of a faculty resolution "that the content of speech or advocacy should not be restricted by the university," opened the campuses up to political activity.

In October, 1968, Negro students protesting discrimination at UCSB—there were 175 Negroes among 12,634 students—seized the computer center and held it for 9½ hours. Sheriff's deputies again arrived but were withdrawn at the request of Chancellor Vernon Cheadle, who appointed a committee to look into grievances.

Early last year the UCSB "New Free University" announced an "experimental" class to be held titled "On the tactics and practice of guerrilla warfare at UCSB and in the Santa Barbara community." Students were to learn "how to hold a building against police attack, conduct hit-and-run missions, defend yourself from police harassment, sabotage military-industrial-police functions, and get community involved through terrorism." The class reportedly was called off following an investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

A few weeks later a fire bomb made from a gallon jug of flammable liquid burst in the patio of the faculty club, killing a campus caretaker. Police questioned several students but the culprit was not found.

More trouble erupted last January when members of the Radical Union marched to the administration building to demand an open hearing for Prof. William Allen, an assistant anthropology professor whose contract had not been renewed.

Windows were broken and the disorder grew until law enforcement agencies were called in to help the campus police restore peace. They stayed two days.

Demonstrators called for a strike, but it had little effect on classes.

JOINED MARCH

Next came a visit by Angela Davis, the self-proclaimed Communist professor at UC's Los Angeles branch. She spoke at a rally and joined a march of dissidents around the campus.

Things quieted down until the afternoon of Feb. 24, when police stopped to question two youths in Isla Vista, where about 9,000 students live. A crowd grew to several hundred demonstrators, who roamed the streets setting fires and breaking windows. Law officers were so outnumbered that for hours they avoided a confrontation.

The violence gained momentum the next night after a campus appearance by Kunstler.

Student leaders denied that Kunstler's appearance had anything to do with the rioting. They said it was the culmination of general discontent with the university and life in Isla Vista where, they said, realty firms "gouge" students on rentals.

Among those against whom criminal complaints were filed was Allen. He was charged with malicious mischief and unlawful assembly. Dist. Atty. David Minier described the professor's acts as "outright vandalism" and accused him of "fanning the flames of riot."

PROVOKED TO VIOLENCE

According to Prof. Richard Flacks of UCSB's sociology department, youths were provoked to violence by "demagogic governors, anti-intellectual regents, rigid and frightened administrators and faculty, rent-gouging realtors, brutal police officials and all the others who use their power to block peace, equality and personal fulfillment."

Flacks, reportedly a founding member of SDS, which has been behind much of the campus unrest across the country, caused controversy when he accepted a position as associate professor with tenure for life at UCSB last year. He chose this job rather than accept a similar position with the University of Chicago, after experiencing active faculty hostility there toward this political philosophy. He had been a constant supporter of student protest there.

Although he admits to being a long-time friend of the defendants in the Chicago conspiracy trial, as well as being acquainted with their defense attorneys, he denied having anything to do with the decision of the UCSB Associated Students to invite Kunstler to speak on the campus.

Santa Barbara also is the seat of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. An offshoot of the Fund for the Republic, it consists of a small but influential group of scientists, philosophers, writers, lawyers and other intellectuals who meet regularly and invite outside speakers to discuss issues that "deserve the attention of citizens."

SUBSIDIZING CITED

The center disclaims political activity and spokesmen deny any leftist leanings. The leftist bias and emphasis on revolutionary and radically militant politics is, however, plain in its many pronouncements issued in publications and tapes which have wide circulation among teachers, students, lawyers, church and labor leaders, editorial writers and government officials.

One writer who has made a long study of them concludes that the center is "subsidizing and giving logistic support to violent radicals with whom senior fellows are afraid to go along but are willing to promote and foist upon the American people."

GEN. DANIEL JAMES, JR., ADDRESSES THE ARNOLD AIR SOCIETY

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, our newly appointed Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, Brig. Gen. Daniel James, Jr., U.S. Air Force, addressed the Arnold Air Society at Anaheim, Calif., on Tuesday, April 14, presenting a highly knowledgeable discussion of the equal opportunities and challenges open to our young people in the Armed Forces today.

General James also discussed our obligation and desire, as individuals and as a nation, to remember our prisoners of war and their families in these trying times.

I believe my colleagues will find this address of much interest and I submit it herewith for reprinting in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY BRIG. GEN. DANIEL JAMES, JR.

I want to tell you what a great personal satisfaction and sense of pride it gives me to make my first public address as a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense to this group of outstanding young Americans, the Arnold Air Society.

I want to make this first speech on the subject of people. In my view, no subject is more important to our national defense than people. And as we look to the challenges of the future we must depend on the steadfast dedication and devotion to the cause of peace and freedom by young people such as yourselves.

When Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird first informed me of my new assignment at the Pentagon, he discussed his particular concern about the need to inform the American public more fully about the progress—and also the problems—of the Department of Defense Human Goals Program.

At my swearing-in ceremony just two weeks ago, Secretary Laird charged me with additional responsibilities related to the plight of our prisoners of war, missing in action, and their families.

So in these brief remarks today, and in my informal discussions with you throughout the day, I want to give primary emphasis to these two priority matters:

1. The equal opportunities and challenges open to all young people for service and advancement in the Armed Forces, and

2. Our solemn pledge not to forget our prisoners of war and their families.

As you know, some of the men who are now held prisoner by Hanoi and who are being denied the humanitarian rights provided them under the Geneva Convention, were my former flying comrades.

You members of the Arnold Air Society will recognize the importance of the Human Goals Program which has been initiated throughout the Department of Defense by Assistant Secretary for Manpower Roger T. Kelley, from Holy Cross, with the full endorsement and continuing support of Secretary Laird, from Carleton College, and Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard, from Stanford University.

These three leaders and all of us in the Department of Defense have a strong and deep belief in the vital importance of our ROTC programs to national defense and what it has meant to the citizen-soldier concept in our nation.

When I was on flying combat assignments in Korea during the early 1950's and more recently in the war in Southeast Asia, the majority of my fellow pilots were products of the ROTC program. Today, the services obtain about 50% of their officers from ROTC units in all 50 states.

As an F-4 pilot in Southeast Asia and later as a base commander in Libya, far away from Washington, I was perplexed by the attacks being made on our ROTC activities. Now in my office at the Pentagon, I am no less perplexed and surely as deeply troubled by these attacks—some of them including vandalism and destruction—which are being made against the ROTC on a limited number of campuses.

No matter how hard I try, I cannot understand how people who oppose the draft, who want to make military service strictly volunteer, can at the same time try to deny some college students the freedom of opportunity to choose a career as a professional military officer.

I cannot understand in this day when the draft is still a fact of life and when many university students will see military service, why these students do not want some of the officers who might command them to be chosen from their peers as products of the civilian-educational environment. I cannot understand how students and some faculty members who espouse freedom of choice can at the same time attempt to prevent military recruiters from visiting certain campuses.

As a citizen, I count highly the need for the officer ranks in our Armed Forces to be manned with a mixture of Service Academy graduates, ROTC graduates, and men who have come up through the ranks from our Officer Candidate Programs. That's the American way.

In our country, we want no military elite coming from any single source. What we want and what we need in the services in our Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps are men and women from all walks of life, with varying backgrounds, and with a unified dedication to maintain the strength which is necessary to preserve peace and freedom.

Thus, you members of the Arnold Air Society stand in a great tradition of service.

As many of you look ahead to service in the Air Force, I think you would want to know about our human goals program. Let me spend a moment and tell you about it.

Shortly after he assumed office at the Pentagon, Secretary Laird, who served in the Navy in World War II, directed the establishment of Project Volunteer. He named Assistant Secretary Kelley, also a Navy veteran, to give urgent attention to the need for enhancing the attractiveness of voluntary military service. Our objective in the Department of Defense is to reduce draft calls to zero as soon as feasible.

Project Volunteer, with its primary focus on attracting and retaining outstanding young men and women for military service, covers a wide range of problem areas. These include the need for military pay reform, the need for changes in certain promotion procedures, and the urgent need to improve housing facilities for our people in uniform and for their families. As a former base commander, I am most pleased with the Defense Department's proposal to Congress to double the number of family housing units for the next fiscal year.

But it seems to me that what really counts the most is the basic philosophy which underlies the human goals program of the Department of Defense. At the root of this approach is the concept that each person must be treated as an individual. . .

Because this program is so important to me and because it will have an impact on so many young Americans, I would like to share these human goals with you:

To attract to the defense service people with ability, dedication, and capacity for growth;

To provide opportunity for every one, military and civilian, to rise to as high a level of responsibility as his talent and diligence will take him;

To make military and civilian service in the Department of Defense a model of equal opportunity for all regardless of race or creed or national origin, and to hold those who do business with the Department to full compliance with the policy of equal employment opportunity;

To help each serviceman at the end of his service in his adjustment to civilian life; and

To contribute to the improvement of our society, including its disadvantaged members, by greater utilization of our human and physical resources while maintaining full effectiveness in the performance of our primary mission.

Our concern for the individual nowhere is manifested more deeply in our thoughts, in our actions, and in our prayers than in the situation which confronts our prisoners of war.

Let me repeat: We will never forget these men or their families. We will be ceaseless in our determination to do all that is possible to obtain for these men and for their families the rights which are due them under the provisions of the Geneva Convention, to which North Vietnam is a signator.

The callous disregard by Hanoi for basic human rights must be called continuously and relentlessly before the court of world opinion. It is cruel and inhuman that today there are some thousands of wives, parents and children who do not know whether their husbands, sons or fathers are alive in a prison camp or are dead. There are women who do not know if they are wives or widows. This is because the regime in Hanoi, the Pathet Lao in Laos, and the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong in South Vietnam refuse to release lists of men who are prisoner. The prompt release of such lists through official channels is a strict humanitarian requirement of the Geneva Convention.

Medical supplies are denied to our prisoners. The regular flow of mail, for which the Geneva Convention, is blocked. No provision has been made for returning the seriously sick or wounded.

In no previous war in which this country has been involved have American servicemen been held captive as long as they have in North Vietnam. Some of our men being held as prisoners are now in their sixth year of imprisonment.

The North Vietnamese count themselves as members of the civilized community of nations and in 1957, they acceded to the Geneva Convention which provides for the treatment and protection of prisoners of war; 120 countries are parties to this Convention.

I want in this, my first public address in my new office, to salute not only those men who are captured or missing, but also their gallant wives and families.

I know that each of you in the Arnold Air Society will do what you can to inform our fellow citizens on this issue and will help us make it crystal clear that these men and their families will never be forgotten.

In closing, let me tell you again what a great privilege it has been for me to represent the Department of Defense at this 22nd National Conclave of the Arnold Air Society and through you to be able to speak to Air Force ROTC men and Angels on 162 college and university campuses throughout the United States and Puerto Rico.

I look forward to the opportunity later this evening to meeting and chatting with many of you personally. For this will give me an opportunity to hear your views, to learn what you believe we in the Department of Defense should be doing. Secretary Laird and Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, Dan Henkin, have placed high priority on the need for strengthening two-way communications with college students throughout the country.

During the past year, at the specific direction of Secretary Laird, our senior civilian and military people have made it a particular point to meet with high school and college students throughout the country—not so much to talk at them as I have been doing at you this evening. Rather what we want, and I shall be doing later this evening, is to talk things over, to strengthen the free-flowing communications link from the Pentagon to our young people. For when all is said and done, you are and remain our most precious asset.

And so in closing let me remind you that you are preparing to take up one of the most important and sacred trusts ever handed to a segment of mankind—that of a contributing citizen of the United States of America, the greatest nation on earth. We, as the preceding generation are prepared to hand you this trust. In accepting it we only ask that you accept fully and well the responsibility to protect and develop it and hand it to your succeeding generation and your children in even better condition than we handed to you. You can only do this by taking part in exploring the positive avenues of honest endeavor and achievement. You can do this by participating in and defending your government and your country against all enemies, foreign and domestic . . . so help you God.

AMERICANISM AS A RESPONSIBILITY

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, in this age of turmoil and questioning it is refreshing to know that our youth are seeking a better understanding of just what it means to be an American. In the days of Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, and George Washington the fundamentals of our democracy were debated and discussed by every citizen. Today, our youth learn by example from us and through discussion in our schools and homes.

One excellent forum for this process in the Buffalo area is the Annual Americanism Essay Contest sponsored by the Buffalo Evening News and the Erie County American Legion and Auxiliary. This year the contest was conducted for the 41st time. One of the winners in this contest was Miss Valorie DuBois. Miss DuBois attends East High School; Mr. Melvin A. Bass is her teacher. I am including Miss DuBois' essay in the RECORD with my congratulations and those of my constituents:

AMERICANISM AS A RESPONSIBILITY

(By Valorie DuBois)

America is my homeland, a land that I love. Her founding fathers visualized and sought to establish a nation which would provide life, liberty, and happiness to all her people. But despite all the good aspects of the American way of life, evils also emerge. America is plagued by internal turmoil, crime, social injustice, drug abuse, pornog-

raphy, and immorality. Yet I, as a citizen, can help make America better. Her ideals have not been attained fully, but her case is not hopeless. Amid America's strife, I must keep a cool, level head. I must assert my individuality and use my own judgment in moral and civil matters.

My contribution to the improvement of my country depends on my love for her. Everyone respects, admires, and protects anything he loves. I can prove my love, and dedication to my country by obeying her laws, guarding her freedom, and being true to the ideals set forth by her forefathers.

I must make full use of the privileges and accept the responsibilities offered to me by my country. I can help America find peace needed so desperately. I can help America return to religion and prayer; to be aware of her moral conduct; to seek good in all men; and to face and live life completely. I must be a personal ambassador in my home, community, and city by exemplifying the American way of life. I must be a symbol to the world of a true American. I must display an understanding attitude toward others, and through education learn more about others and their way of life. I must help others to realize that human beings all over the world have similar desires and aspirations.

It is my individual responsibility as an American to understand her way of life, to help sustain it, to conduct myself at all times as a true American. I have to try to transmit this spirit to others around me and to future generations.

America will be better if I, and all Americans, build upon rather than try to destroy the solid foundations laid by our forefathers.

DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Daughters of the American Revolution convened for their 79th Congress here in Washington, D.C., last week and judging from the meager coverage, it was practically a "secret" meeting.

The members of the DAR threw no bombs, carried no Vietcong flags and did not threaten Congress nor attempt to burn down the city. So, the DAR Congress was not newsworthy. Patriotic organizations which plot only for the good of the country and constitutional government are not "mod" and are presently out of step with both the "new" aristocracy and the "new" revolutionaries.

To the credit of these dedicated and fearless ladies, they have not been taken in by the new internationalism. Out of respect, they are feared because they know truth from fantasy, and facts from public relations distortion.

Howbeit, the various resolutions passed by the DAR are evidence to all Americans that these grand ladies are actually in tune with the problems of the times and are well versed in the threats against our Republic.

We, Members of this House, are aware of the strict interpretation on the prohibitions governing tax-free groups as to lobbying and yielding political influence. Yet we hear nothing concerning similar prohibitions affecting COPE, the National Council of Churches, the UNO Society, the NAACP, or similar "educational" foundations financed by Ford, Rockefeller, and the like. Nor is the DAR held in as high esteem, by some, as Martin Luther King, Dr. Abernathy, the Chicago Seven or Stokely. So, the DAR was prohibited by the laws of our country from sending us their pro-American feelings as evidenced by their resolutions.

I am confident that many of our colleagues will be interested in actions that were taken at this "secret" meeting. I include the DAR resolutions of the 79th Congress in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 24, 1970]

RESOLUTIONS, 79TH CONTINENTAL CONGRESS, NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, APRIL 20–24, 1970

REDEDICATION

Whereas this Nation, founded by God-fearing people who dared to dream of liberty for all individuals, who "wearied not in well doing" (Gal. 6:9) through trials and suffering whose faith and courage made this dream a reality; and

Whereas upheld, sustained, and guided by a never faltering faith in Almighty God, they bequeathed to us a government of law—a written Constitution—that allowed each individual to worship God freely as he chose and to pursue his life unhampered by tyranny in any form, disciplined through this law by responsibility, duty, and respect for the rights of others; and

Whereas on this foundation of spiritual and moral principles, the United States of America became the greatest Nation the world has ever known—truly a "land of the free and the home of the brave"; and

Whereas this foundation has been weakened by forces introducing doubts not only of the presence of God, but also of His very existence—doubts that destroy all moral codes, turning liberty into license, ignoring the fact that only moral men can be free; and

Whereas "God grants liberty only to those who love it and are always ready to guard and defend it" (Daniel Webster);

Resolved, That the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution dedicate itself to rekindling in the hearts and minds of men a staunch determination to preserve and to perpetuate the priceless heritage of freedom and liberty bequeathed to us by our Founding Fathers.

VOLUNTARY SCHOOL PRAYER

Whereas there are children in many public schools expressing the desire to hold voluntary prayer before classes begin each day; and

Whereas many of these children have met by themselves and read a prayer each day from the Congressional Record; and

Whereas these actions have been challenged as being against the ruling of the Supreme Court; and

Whereas our national tendency to rely upon the power of prayer is evidenced by the suggestion from our Senate for all of us to pray for the safety of the Astronauts;

Resolved, That the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution support these children who wish to hold voluntary prayer;

Resolved, That the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution urge proper steps be taken to clarify the ruling of the Supreme Court in order that all children, who so desire, may participate each day in a voluntary prayer before the opening of school.

MARXIST-SOCIALIST-COMMUNIST MANIPULATION OF YOUTH

Whereas the United States of America is subjected to an intensified revolutionary Marxist-Socialist-Communist movement to overthrow the country; and

Whereas this movement is waged through youth, through colleges and through religious and welfare organizations, also through loss of parental control and through college and court permissiveness, and a crime-led society which can destroy the younger generation; and

Whereas the program of corruption involves:

Street demonstrations masking as peace movements, but led by militant activists dedicated to the violent overthrow of our government and destruction of our society;

"Rock Festivals" characterized by music of hypnotic rhythm and subtle lyrics tending to break down moral restraints and to expose the young to the dangers of communal living and illicit sex;

Experimentation with drugs leading to moral, mental and physical deterioration and often to addiction and crime;

Rebellion throughout school systems attended by acts of violence against administrators, destruction of records, costly damage to buildings and serious disruption of education for the majority of students; and

Permissiveness at all levels of education, depriving students of the control and leadership essential to effective preparation for life, abolishing moral standards and developing hedonism as the new life style, destruction of draft records and also teaching young men how to avoid the draft;

Whereas the costs of these activities are inestimable in terms of damage to property, destruction of moral purposes and loss of spiritual values;

Resolved, That the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution urge that citizens make themselves fully aware of the dangers to the individual and to the nation inherent in such activities and exercise their responsibilities in training and leadership;

Resolved, That the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution regard as imperative that parents, legislators, courts, and colleges and other authorities exercise more strict moral and fiscal control over their youth, associates and activities, that as individual taxpayers they force stronger college standards of admission and rejection and stress educational emphasis on the great moral, spiritual and historical values of this country.

"TOTAL ENVIRONMENT"

Whereas the real problem of pollution of our environment is being distorted by emotional declarations and by intensive propaganda; and

Whereas many of the underlying sources of pollution exist because of the demands of the public for modern products and conveniences—not to mention individual thoughtlessness and neglect; and

Whereas antagonism directed toward American industry as the cause of pollution in spite of the fact that it is upon that industry that American strength depends; and

Whereas the correction of the problem of pollution of our environment is not beyond the power of our technology to solve; and

Whereas the new Council on Environmental Quality may be the vehicle through which the Federal Government will assert vast new powers over our personal habits and create added controls over the individual; and

Whereas consideration of the factors involved in pollution of our total environment completely ignores the most dangerous aspect of them all—pollution of the mind.

Resolved, That the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution call upon our policy makers to urge the Federal

Government to refrain from adopting unnecessary and harmful control programs which the Nation would later regret;

Resolved, That the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution suggest personal responsibility of the individual citizen be emphasized as one of the most effective ways of decreasing pollution;

Resolved, That the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution recommended that the Council on Environmental Quality direct attention and emphasis to the dangers of pollution of the mind in its considerations and studies of the dangers and threats to our total environment.

GENOCIDE CONVENTION

Whereas Article VI, Section 2, of the Constitution of the United States of America provides that "all treaties . . . made under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land" and treaty law may, therefore, be used to supersede the Constitution; and

Whereas contrary to general opinion, the United Nations Genocide Convention or Treaty is directed largely toward individuals rather than nations and opens a new concept of international law whereby domestic crimes would be converted to international crimes by treaty law; and

Whereas from the scope of the definition of genocide as contained in Articles II and III of the Convention, it is apparent that this Nation's handling of a broad field of internal matters such as civil rights, education and equal opportunity legislation would be subject to review by the International Court of Justice; and

Whereas the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court in disputes relating to "the interpretation, application or fulfillment" of the Convention would be without benefit of any reservation whatever; and

Whereas the dangers inherent in the Genocide Convention are greatly increased because the accusation of genocide now is raised so freely that the word can no longer be fully or accurately defined;

Resolved, That the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution affirm that the Genocide Convention constitutes a threat to National Sovereignty and to the freedoms thus far secured by the Constitution of the United States.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Whereas the chance for real success in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) are minimal and the risks of improvident agreement so great as to threaten national disaster, since there is no evidence that the Soviet Union will relinquish its ambition to achieve a global military capability; and

Whereas the Secretary of Defense has reported that the Soviet Union is pulling abreast of this Nation in many areas of military strength and is already ahead of the United States in others; and

Whereas our need for additional Safeguard Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) defense is dictated by the Soviet Union's growing arsenal of massive nuclear warheads which already threaten land-based missiles and nuclear bomber bases in the United States, and also our cities; and

Whereas a new nuclear strategy for America is now being urged which would include an expanded sea-based nuclear force to provide greater mobile safety against sneak attack;

Resolved, That the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution warn that Strategic Arms Limitation Talks may end in disaster for the United States; support a more sophisticated strategy which would offer greater protection to the United States and favor a massive effort which would restore the United States to full nuclear superiority.

REPUBLIC OF RHODESIA

Whereas the United States has not only joined Britain in backing the United Nations sanctions toward friendly Rhodesia, but has closed the United States consulate and ended diplomatic relations with Rhodesia; and

Whereas the United States makes no objections to other nations aiding the Viet Cong with continued shipments to the enemy; and

Whereas these sanctions, imposed without public knowledge or approval, penalize a friendly nation, are inimical to American defense and economic interests, and give an extraordinary price monopoly to Soviet Russia on a vital commodity, chrome, thereby rewarding the Soviets who are the chief source of supplies to the forces killing American men in South Vietnam;

Resolved, That the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution support the economic and strategic interests of the United States of America and urge the immediate establishment of diplomatic relations and resumption of trade with the Republic of Rhodesia.

INTERNAL SECURITY

Whereas the decisions of the Supreme Court in the past ten years nullified the treason and sedition laws of the United States, thereby allowing communists and saboteurs to infiltrate our defense facilities, including ports, harbors, ships and other installations thus impairing internal security; and

Whereas defense-related industrial plants and laboratories are and have been a prime target for communist espionage, subversion, and possible sabotage and adequate safeguards are not possible if subversives are not screened from these sensitive installations; and

Whereas official investigating committees have served as powerful weapons in protecting the United States against subversion by listing subversive organizations as an important guide in hiring government personnel, which listing has proved to be an effective tool in exposing disloyal aspects of various organizations; and

Whereas there is mounting evidence that members of violence prone organizations have been permitted to work for sensitive governmental agencies, in part, because such groups are no longer designated as subversive by the Attorney General.

Resolved, That the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution approved a personnel program of checking individuals in sensitive positions and urge the restoration of loyalty oaths for employees in defense plants, ports, waterfront facilities, and on merchant marine vessels.

Resolved, That since the principle of exposure is the most effective weapon against communism, the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution urge that all official investigating committees reinstate and update the listing of subversive and radical groups.

SUPPORT OF OUR ARMED FORCES

Whereas the many brave men and women of the Armed Forces of the United States of America in the fulfillment of their military duties, are under fire not only from the enemy abroad but also from dissident groups within this country; and

Whereas serious accusations have been leveled against the conduct of certain soldiers on the battlefield and irresponsible news coverage has virtually convicted them without benefit of formal trial; and

Whereas there is evidence of Marxist penetration of the Armed Forces through various organizations and by determined revolutionaries; and

Whereas many of these revolutionaries have joined the Armed Forces with the expressed purpose of demoralizing and sabotaging the military establishment;

Resolved, That the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution support the loyal and courageous members of the military who are performing their duty in the defense of our country in spite of the limitations imposed upon them and the subversive influences directed against them.

POPULATION CONTROL AND IMMIGRATION

Whereas it is predicted the decade of the 1970's will be known as the Era of Ecology—in which to survive, we must prevent the further pollution of our environment; and

Whereas pollution increases in proportion to the growth of our population—the current crisis in housing, schools, welfare, unemployment and crime being the outcome of the "population explosion" of one hundred million persons in the past fifty years in the United States of America; and

Whereas there are now proposals to limit our population by scientific or even compulsory measures, implemented by subsidies for birth control or by fiscal restrictions on larger families—to be under the newly established "Commission on Population Growth and the American Future"; and

Whereas these proposals are negated by requests to increase immigration into this country from the present 130,000 to 380,000 by 1974, on a "first come, first served" basis;

Resolved, That the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution advocate a reexamination of these critical but conflicting proposals;

Resolved, That the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution recommend first and foremost a substantial curtailment of all immigration until such time as corrective measures have solved our environmental dilemma and improved conditions for those now resident within our national confines.

TAXATION AND GENERAL WELFARE CLAUSE

Whereas the "promotion of the general welfare," mentioned in the Preamble of the Constitution of the United States of America, would seem to mean the welfare of the people as a whole—and not the welfare of any particular segment at the expense of the rest; and

Whereas influential citizens have adopted the socialist philosophy of taxing the productive Middle Class (to which the majority of our population has belonged) to the point of confiscation of earnings and savings—and for the specific benefit of the less productive; and

Whereas these influential citizens now talk of releasing any theoretical surplus left from de-escalation of the Viet Nam War or use in a specific order of local welfare priorities; and

Whereas history proves that confiscatory taxes for the benefit of any ever-increasing unproductive segment of a nation destroys the Middle Class upon whom the stability of the national economy ultimately depends and results in the destruction of the nation itself; and

Whereas any such theoretical surplus used to reduce the national debt would relieve the general population by slowing down and eventually stopping inflation and at the same time equally serve those in need of welfare;

Resolved, That the National Society of Daughters of the American Revolution deplore the distortions of the general welfare clause and urge our national leaders to keep in mind the danger of weakening by excessive and relentless taxation that vast Middle Class—the target of international socialism—upon whose existence the general welfare of this Nation depends.

THOUGHT CONTROL

Whereas throughout this entire century, collaborating Fabian Socialists and others are indoctrinating large groups of people to accept socialism under any name or guise as a way of life, and to discard as outmoded and useless such virtues as hard work and the love of God and country; and

Whereas the unswerving goal to change the unique values of a free nation upon which this country was founded is being foisted upon an apathetic and uninformed citizenry through scientifically proved techniques which have been adopted in every phase of theology, education and economics; and

Whereas an interlock of innumerable powerful organizations, corporations and various agencies pursues in every way the original intention: Thought Control through methods of brain washing in all areas of communication and publishing: text books for all ages, film, radio, T.V., with emphasis on ETV, advertising, drama, the arts and sciences; and

Whereas the progress of this design to destroy the United States of America is evident through the increasing acceptance of the semantic changes of the English language, of sensitivity training in its variety of forms, of sex aberrations and education, the growing use of drugs producing hypnotic states, and overt cries of "Revolution" all with increasing rejection of moral and religious principles declared in the Bible;

Resolved, That the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution plead with its members to inform themselves fully of the clear and present dangers to this Republic, and to take the leadership in exposing these "Masters of Deceit" and thwart their plan.

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

Whereas unknown numbers of servicemen have suffered long terms of imprisonment or the ambiguous status of "missing in action" in North Viet Nam and other parts of Northeast Asia; and

Whereas apparently nothing stronger than the usual words and platitudes from United States officials and United Nations headquarters has led Hanoi to the belief that in its treatment of American prisoners it has nothing to fear from the United States of America; and

Whereas it is known that numerous members of the Armed Forces of the United States of America have been murdered or allowed to die from malnutrition, disease or wounds; and

Whereas the North Vietnamese have stated that all captured Americans are regarded as war criminals and they will be tried by the "Peoples' Court"; and

Whereas it is known that Hanoi is showing a complete disregard for the welfare of prisoners of war as outlined by the Geneva Convention and, with the enemy action increasing, more servicemen are in danger of capture;

Resolved, That the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution express grave concern for the treatment and fate of United States prisoners of war;

Resolved, That the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution believe that we must take all necessary steps to obtain the release of these American prisoners of war and in no circumstances abandon these brave men.

EDUCATIONAL TRENDS—THE DECLINE OF QUALITY

Whereas perceptible declines in educational achievement and standard proficiency norms are reported by major school systems, despite massive federal programming initiated in the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act or Head Start programs; and

Whereas the quality of education, which should be a primary national goal, has been ignored in proliferating or duplicating programs, misspent funds, and by bureaucratic preoccupation with costly bussing or arbitrarily calipered ethnic ratios; and

Whereas literary standards, verbal comprehension and historic content are sacrificed to innovative ideas of dubious merit; and

Whereas the climate of learning has been impaired in many schools by a lack of discipline evident in needed armed protection for teachers, by the drug cult increase, assaults, rape, and rampant vandalism; and

Whereas education has not benefited by student attempts to dictate course contents, free time programming or to assert authority, nor by a determined down-grading of American institutions by some disloyal teachers or young revolutionaries;

Resolved, That the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution find that federal preemption of education has been a massive failure for which proposed new billions of taxes will provide no basic cure;

Resolved, That the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution recommend that control of schools be restored to states and localities; and that effective disciplines be re-established at local levels for students, curricular contents, and loyalty standards, so as to improve educational climate and achievement norms.

THE U.S. SPACE PROGRAM

Whereas the successes of the United States Space Program have advanced the world's scientific and technological understanding of the universe and have provided the expanding of the universe and have provided the expanding population with a wide array of new products and inventions which represents an investment for present and future generations; and

Whereas the frontiers of the 20th Century lie in the hostile environment of outer space and under the sea where the Nation's defense, and even survival, compel leadership in exploration;

Resolved, That the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, taking pride in the American creative genius which makes possible these historical achievements in space exploration, recognize and emphasize the national defense potential of the space program;

Resolved, That the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution extend deep admiration and gratitude for the valor of the astronauts and the courage of their families.

THE ELIMINATION OF CONSCRIPTION

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I heartedly concur in the draft reform recommendations made by the President. He is not suggesting measures which are utopian or fiscally irresponsible. They are practical steps which can be taken within existing budgetary limitations to achieve a vital goal: A truly volunteer armed force, and—in the interim—a truly equitable draft system.

The realities of the world situation dictate the size of the military force we must maintain, but they do not dictate the means by which we shall recruit our Armed Forces. For years, the draft operated as it had always operated. The voices of reform—mostly youthful voices—went unheeded. But the voices grew louder and the justice of the cry became more apparent. Finally, we have before us concrete proposals which are carefully designed to accomplish what so many young people have advocated for so long: The ultimate elimination of conscription.

The President's message today is one further indication of his commitment to reform. I share that commitment and am proud to endorse his recommendations.

A LETTER TO THE WORLD FROM JERUSALEM

HON. CHARLES W. SANDMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following is "A letter to the World of Jerusalem." This was written by a boy who went through school in my district. He is a very close friend of an esteemed constituent of mine.

After graduating from college, the author of this letter, who is about my age, went to Israel. There he became a leading TV commentator and newspaper editorialist on an English-language newspaper in Jerusalem. His father was a Hebrew teacher in Atlantic City.

This little letter, I think, reviews clearly the history of the Jewish people and their attachment to Jerusalem, and to the land of Israel.

Following is the letter:

A LETTER TO THE WORLD FROM JERUSALEM

(By Eliezer Ben Yisrael)

I am not a creature from another planet, as you seem to believe. I am a Jerusalemite—like yourselves, a man of flesh and blood. I am a citizen of my city, an integral part of my people.

I have a few things to get off my chest. Because I am not a diplomat, I do not have to mince words. I do not have to please you, or even persuade you. I owe you nothing. You did not build this city: you do not live in it; you did not defend it when they came to destroy it. And we will be damned if we will let you take it away.

There was a Jerusalem before there was a New York. When Berlin, Moscow, London and Paris were misasmal forest and swamp, there was a thriving Jewish community here. It gave something to the world which you nations have rejected ever since you established yourselves—a humane moral code.

Here the prophets walked, their words flashing like forked lightning. Here a people who wanted nothing more than to be left alone, fought off waves of heathen would-be conquerors, bled and died on the battlements, hurled themselves into the flames of their burning Temple rather than surrender; and when finally overwhelmed by sheer numbers and led away into captivity, swore that before they forgot Jerusalem, they would see their tongues cleave to their palates, their right arm wither.

For two pain filled millenia, while we were your unwelcome guests, we prayed daily to return to this city. Three times a day we petitioned the Almighty: "Gather us from the four corners of the world, bring us upright to our land; return in mercy to Jerusalem, Thy city, and dwell in it as Thou promised."

On every Yom Kippur and Passover we

fervently voiced the hope that next year would find us in Jerusalem. Your inquisitions, pogroms, expulsions, the ghettos into which you jammed us, your forced baptisms, your quota systems, your genteel anti-semitism, and the final unspeakable horror, the holocaust (and worse, your terrifying disinterest in it)—all these have not broken us. They may have sapped what little moral strength you still possessed, but they forged us into steel. Do you think that you can break us now, after all we have been through? Do you really believe that after Dachau and Auschwitz we are frightened by your threats of blockades and sanctions? We have been to Hell and back—a Hell of your making. What more could you possibly have in your arsenal that could scare us?

I have watched this city bombarded twice by nations calling themselves civilized. In 1948, while you looked on apathetically, I saw women and children blown to smithereens, this after we had agreed to your request to internationalize the city. It was a deadly combination that did the job: British officers, Arab gunners and American-made cannon.

And then the savage sacking of the Old City: the willful slaughter, the wanton destruction of every synagogue and religious school; the desecration of Jewish cemeteries; the sale by a ghoulish government of tomb stones for building materials, for poultry runs, army camps—even latrines.

And you never said a word.

You never breathed the slightest protest when the Jordanians shut off the holiest of our holy places, the Western Wall in violation of the pledges they had made after the war—a war they waged, incidentally, against a decision of the UN. Not a murmur came from you whenever the legionnaires in their spiked helmets casually opened fire upon our citizens from behind the walls.

Your hearts bled when Berlin came under siege. You rushed your airlift "to save the gallant Berliners." But you did not send one ounce of food when Jews starved in besieged Jerusalem. You thundered against the wall which the East Germans ran through the middle of the German capital—but not one peep out of you about that other wall, the one that tore through the heart of Jerusalem.

And when the same thing happened 20 years later, and the Arabs unleashed a savage, unprovoked bombardment of the Holy City again, did any of you do anything? The only time you came to life was when the city was at last re-united. Then you wrung your hands and spoke loftily of "justice" and the need for the "Christian" quality of turning the other cheek.

The truth is—and you know it deep inside your gut—you would prefer the city to be destroyed rather than have it governed by Jews. No matter how diplomatically you phrase it, the age old prejudices seep out of every word.

If our return to the city has tied your theology in knots, perhaps you had better re-examine your catechisms. After what we have been through, we are not passively going to accommodate ourselves to the twisted idea that we are to suffer eternal homelessness until we accept our Saviour.

For the first time since the year 70 there is now complete religious freedom for all in Jerusalem. For the first time since the Romans put the torch to the Temple everyone has equal rights. (You preferred to have some more equal than others.) We loathe the sword—but it was you who forced us to take it up. We crave peace—but we are not going back to the peace of 1948 as you would like us to.

We are home. It has a lovely sound for a nation you have willed to wander over the face of the globe. We are not leaving. We have redeemed the pledge made by our forefathers: Jerusalem is being rebuilt. "Next year"—and the year after, and after, and after, until the end of time—"in Jerusalem!"

HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE UNREST AMONG OUR YOUTH

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago, a group of 22 Republican Members, under the leadership of BILL BROCK of Tennessee, visited over 50 colleges and universities throughout the United States to talk with students, faculty, administrators, and other officials on the problems confronting higher education and the unrest among our youth.

In our report to President Nixon, outlining our findings and recommendations, we noted, "The problems confronting higher education are so complex that no study or analytic effort yet mounted can really claim to be comprehensive. We recognize the need for continued indepth research."

On Sunday, April 26, the results of such an undertaking were released. Shortly after our report was issued the American Council on Education appointed a Special Committee on Campus Tensions, headed by Sol M. Linowitz. The committee undertook an 8-month investigation which generally confirmed much of what our task force had found.

The committee's indepth insights into the problem and its recommended solutions are evidence of the time and effort which went into this study.

The conclusions and recommendations should be thoroughly reviewed and considered by each of us. The full text of the committee's recommendations follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION'S SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS TENSIONS

Chairman of the committee was Sol M. Linowitz, former chairman of Xerox and more recently the U.S. ambassador to the Organization of American States. With him on the panel were:

Morris B. Abram, former president of Brandeis U;

Ralph S. Brown, Jr., professor of law at Yale U and president of the American Assoc. of University Professors;

George Bunn, professor of law at the U of Wisconsin;

Robben W. Fleming, president of the U of Michigan;

William T. Gossett, last retiring president of the American Bar Assoc.;

Alexander Heard, chancellor of Vanderbilt U;

Vivian W. Henderson, president of Clark College;

Harriett Inskeep, a trustee of Indiana U;

Bill D. Moyers, publisher of Newsday;

Charles Palmer, president of the U.S. National Student Assoc.;

Joseph Rhodes, a junior fellow of Harvard U;

John Searle, professor of philosophy at the U of California at Berkeley;

Patrick Shea, president of the associated students of Stanford U;

M. Brewster Smith, professor of psychology at the U of Chicago;

Richard L. von Ende, a graduate fellow and vice-chairman of the university executive committee at the U of Kansas;

Charles E. Young, chancellor of the U of California at Los Angeles;

Whitney Young, executive director of the National Urban League.

The higher education community cannot realistically hope to solve all the problems that create campus tensions. It cannot alone stop war, eliminate poverty, rebuild cities, or expunge racism. It cannot afford to be indifferent to these problems, however, if only because campus turmoil is not likely to cease unless genuine progress is made toward curing the glaring social ills.

The war in Vietnam and the draft system, in concert, contribute heavily to campus unrest. Until the nation ceases to force young men to fight in a war they believe unjust, a major source of campus tensions will remain.

For the campus to be a haven for those who wish to avoid military service is an inequity of the draft system and a perversion of educational purpose.

Through educating decision-makers, conducting research, diffusing knowledge, and proposing solutions to social problems, our colleges and universities can have a considerable, if not decisive, influence on the decisions that affect the nation's quality of life. In each of these roles, colleges and universities serve society best by giving prime allegiance to truth.

CENTERS OF FREE INQUIRY

Truth-seeking, in turn, requires conclusions openly arrived at, the discard of useless orthodoxies, and the receptivity of new ideas. First and foremost, then, our colleges and universities must be centers of free inquiry.

Efforts to politicize colleges and universities risk public reprisals with consequent restrictions on free inquiry. Legislative moves in this direction, at both state and federal levels, are already deeply disturbing.

Likewise, demands made on campus through intimidation or violence are inimical to the spirit of free inquiry. The search for truth is the first casualty.

Political exploitation of campus problems by some public figures has become one of the sources of polarization on the campus. Public officials and others having the public's attention should gauge their response to campus disruption in the light of the fact that repressive and provocative pronouncements by those in authority may have the same inflammatory effect that extremist rhetoric has on the campus.

Campus violence already threatens some colleges and universities with repressive forces that could cripple their freedom for many years to come. Even so, this committee is mindful of the dangers in laying out inflexible guidelines about unacceptable conduct or in specifying the precise moment when the hazard to the institution is such that civil authorities must be called upon.

BAR ASSOCIATION STUDY

The questions have been studied in detail by the Commission on Campus Government and Student Dissent of the American Bar Association, which issued its report in February.

What, then, in view of their limited powers, can colleges and universities do about problems arising from campus tensions?

At the outset, let it be noted that campus tensions are not necessarily harmful to higher education. It is the responses to tensions that lead to constructive or destructive outcomes. As one committee consultant put it, "If there were no tensions on campus, there should be a committee established to create some, because a campus without tensions is intellectually moribund."

OPPORTUNITY AND IMPETUS

Present campus tensions, therefore, provide an opportunity and an impetus for some overdue reforms in higher education. As the discontents of students, faculty, administrators, and trustees make clear, almost everyone agrees that change is necessary in higher education.

It is equally clear that these four groups are not of one mind about the nature of campus problems, how to solve them, or who should solve them.

Trustees are commonly assumed to stand firmly for order and against disruption, undisturbed by pressures until things seem to be getting out of hand. Reform proposals intended to alleviate student and faculty malaise seldom take account of trustees' worries about scarce resources, or even acknowledge that such worries exist.

Faculty members, on the other hand, appear to be more directly involved in the internal issues besetting the campuses. Nevertheless, there is considerable difference of faculty opinion about steps to resolve controversies.

In academic matters the interests of junior and senior scholars often conflict. Many of the former desire both participation in decision making and a redress of the balance between research and teaching. Though some faculty want to add colleagues having different political and social outlooks, others oppose strenuously what they regard as a political test for employment.

Students on their part are also becoming increasingly divided, between those who are heavily involved in political issues on or off campus and those who resent interference with their professional and vocational preparation.

This committee's recommendations cannot reconcile all the conflicting values and viewpoints. Nevertheless, we believe these recommendations respond to legitimate concerns; if given wide campus support, they can mitigate unrest by improving the conduct of the educational enterprise.

CERTAIN PRINCIPLES

Their adoption and, more important, their effectiveness once adopted, presuppose that the entire academic community must share and abide by certain principles—among them fair play, civility, concern for the individual, care in interpreting evidence, respect for privacy, equity in administering penalties, and faith in rational discourse.

The recommendations deal first of all with the roles and responsibilities of students, faculty, administrators, and trustees, then with general matters of governance and institutional goals.

Students

Colleges and universities exist primarily for the education of students. Society assigns to these institutions no task more important than providing students the opportunity to ripen their intellectual and creative capacities, learn from the heritage of the past, and develop themselves as responsible citizens.

Student critics object to the current emphasis on a "manpower" perspective. They object to being shaped for slots in a less than ideal social order. Our institutions indeed must prepare trained manpower for a complex society.

All the same, greater weight should be given to educating young people to realize more fully their own potentials on their own terms, and to help them find new solutions to the urgent social problems of our times. Here education, not just training, is clearly at issue.

REAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Educational institutions foster the development of responsible adults by assigning real responsibilities to students to the extent of their capabilities and willingness to assume responsibility.

They may hamper and retard that development by following policies of *in loco parentis* in regard to practical rules (now on the wane) or policies that "the faculty knows best" in regard to the curriculum and other matters central to the institution's purposes (much less effectively challenged).

For colleges and universities to provide effective educational environments for the development of competence and maturity, new policies are required.

In wise balance, these policies give young people a more responsible role in the educational decisions affecting them, while at the same time acknowledging greater adult competence and greater investment in institutional continuity on the part of the faculty and administration. The wise balance called for is, obviously, not easily identified or achieved.

RESPONSIBLE COMMITMENT

Although forceful measures are sometimes unavoidable when campus disruption goes to intolerable extremes, the use of force is basically undesirable. Punitive measures tend to foster—when they work—dependent compliance rather than responsible commitment.

Firmness of policy needs to be balanced by openness and flexibility. If students are to be held accountable for their actions, they should have a voice in determining the permissible limits of their actions.

1. Students not only should be given substantial autonomy in their non-academic activities, but should also participate in matters of general educational policy, especially in curricular affairs.

Since increased participation will contribute to effective institutional decision-making and is also of educational benefit, students should serve in a variety of roles on committees that make decisions or recommendations.

In some non-academic areas students should have effective control; in some general educational policy matters they should have voting participation; in other matters, they should act in an advisory or consultative capacity.

Effective student representation will not only improve the quality of decisions; it will also help to ensure their acceptability to the student body.

2. As institutions give up policies of *in loco parentis* in response to students' educationally valid wishes for independence, students must know that they cannot be effectively shielded from the consequences of their behavior, especially when it violates the laws of society at large.

The abandonment of parietal rules, however does not relieve institutions of the need to have effective self-government. The more effective the self-government, the less frequently and abrasively will police and other agencies of the society intrude on the campus.

3. Colleges and universities should regularly review, with legal counsel, their practices regard such matters as the confidentiality of information about students and the privacy of student living quarters.

They should also review their provisions for due process in disciplinary proceedings.

These proceedings need not have, in every case, the formal, adversary aspects of a courtroom trial. But the option of formal proceedings should be open to any student whose future could be seriously affected by the outcome of a disciplinary decision.

4. Students who want to propose changes in institutional practices or policies (as differentiated from asking redress of particular grievances) should be given the opportunity to learn in advance the institution's decision-making process that applies to their proposal.

They should also consider thoroughly the evidence and arguments supporting their proposal and anticipate questions that will be raised by others, including fellow students. A well-considered proposal often grows out of preliminary discussion with faculty and administrators.

5. Students must recognize and respect the rights and privileges of their fellow students as they seek rights and privileges for themselves. These include First Amendment rights of free speech and peaceable assembly, the right to pursue without hindrance one's course of study, and the privilege of experimenting with ways of thinking, both conventional and unconventional.

Threats, violence, coercive disruption of classes or lectures, and similar acts that tread upon the rights of others are intolerable.

6. To a very great degree institutional functioning depends upon the voluntary self-discipline of the students.

On the other hand, in several institutions, overt threats of violence and personal injury to students and others by individuals on and off campus have had destructive effects upon disciplinary proceedings as well as the process of internal self-discipline.

In those circumstances where internal mechanisms fail, a new kind of juridical authority may be required.

7. Students rightly expect administrators to exercise leadership, to take the initiative in proposing educational changes suited to a changing clientele and a changing society. But just as students are entitled to acceptance of their rights and responsibilities, so are administrators.

Students should recognize that the administrator is responsible to widely divergent campus groups and is accountable to the board which legally governs the institution.

Within these limitations, he must have freedom to initiate, guide, negotiate, and make decisions, if the institution is not to remain static. Attempts to circumscribe this freedom will either reinforce the status quo or create chaos.

Faculty

All the constituent groups share concern over the appropriate role of the faculty. Their chief criticism is that the professorial role—particularly in major universities—has become so distorted in the direction of research and scholarly achievement that many faculty seriously neglect their teaching function.

That this is a real problem is substantiated by considerable evidence. In national surveys, for example, students complain repeatedly about lack of contact with faculty and faculty indifference to student needs. These complaints are especially common in major, research-oriented universities.

Studies comparing the environments of universities with those of smaller colleges reveal among the former a comparative lack of student and faculty interaction in the classroom, an impersonal relationship between teacher and students, and a feeling on the part of students that the institution lacks concern for their individual development.

It is significant that the major universities have been the prime targets of violent and disruptive protest.

DEMAND FOR RESEARCH SERVICES

The research commitments that draw professors away from teaching are upheld in a variety of ways. One factor is the strong demand for research services from both government and business. Another is the prestige accruing to institutions that employ distinguished research scholars.

Many institutions find the temptation of instant departmental prestige and large research grants and contracts to be irresistible. Since the research-oriented faculty tend to recruit, screen, and train their replacements, the system is self-perpetuating.

The imbalanced emphasis on research, away from teaching, is also supported by the lopsided competition between the institutions and the scholarly discipline for the loyalty and concern of faculty members.

Both teaching and research figure among a faculty member's contributions to his institution (though formalized procedures for evaluating teaching are rare, and public evidence is far more readily available on research competence).

So far as the faculty member's standing

in his discipline is concerned, however, with only rare exceptions—such as the authorship of innovative text books—it is solely published research that counts.

THE SCHOLAR'S PRESTIGE

Published research is what establishes the scholar's prestige among his peers in other colleges and universities. In the university world, therefore, it is also the main source of his economic value in the academic marketplace.

No ambitious young faculty member can afford to neglect his disciplinary standing as determined by his published research. His movement from one institution to another is heavily influenced by the time and support he will gain for his research efforts.

Of course, many research-oriented faculty in universities teach graduate students as part of their research activity. Indeed, in many fields of graduate study, the laboratory is the classroom.

Prestigious professors who are not accessible to undergraduates may be very accessible to graduate students to whom they have their basic teaching responsibility. It is not the committee's purpose to suggest that all professors dedicated entirely to research, or to research and graduate teaching, should now teach undergraduates.

The problem lies with overemphasizing research at the expense of undergraduate teaching.

This committee does not think it desirable, even were it possible, to devalue the contribution of scholarly research. Such research may, in fact, contribute to the solution of social ills about which students and others in the academic community are actively concerned.

What deliberate policy can do is introduce compensating influences to redress the balance. Specific suggestions are put forth in the recommendations that follow.

1. Effective teaching deserves greater recognition in hiring, promoting, and paying, specially in the major institutions. Explicit methods must be developed for assessing teaching competence, improving the learning process, and systematically reviewing the adequacy of the curriculum.

Quality of teaching must be given greater weight in tenure decisions. Faculty scholarship, research, and public service should relate more closely to teaching; indeed, they can enhance teaching.

Both individual institutions and national professional organizations should establish fitting rewards for exceptional teachers. The committee urges the learned and professional societies to explore other ways of giving more status to teaching and improving its quality, especially at the undergraduate level.

2. In matters affecting teaching—*e.g.*, new faculty appointments; the awarding of tenure—new courses, departments, or interdisciplinary arrangements—faculty committees should seek the counsel of students who have had direct experience with the matter to be decided.

The faculty, by virtue of its earned competence, is in the best position to have main jurisdiction over academic matters. But students, as the consumers of higher education and as young people with important perceptions about our changing society, have a right to be heard on matters affecting the educational program.

As was pointed out in an earlier recommendation, participation by students could strengthen the quality of the decisions made and help to ensure their acceptability to the student body.

In this connection, faculty should welcome the development by student organizations of formalized and objective procedures for evaluating faculty teaching of undergraduates in all important courses. Too often, student evaluations of teaching are fragmentary and are not available to the teacher, who might improve his teaching if he were aware of students' criticisms.

3. Tenure policies—concerning a faculty member's right to hold his academic appointment until retirement once competence has been demonstrated (except when extreme malfeasance has been established by due process)—need to be reappraised.

The justification for tenure is the crucial protection it gives to academic freedom. Professors who espouse unpopular views must be free from reprisal. Tenure was not devised in the spirit of trade union systems to guarantee job security. But it has come to serve this function too, at a cost.

It sometimes has been a shield for indifference and neglect of scholarly duties. At a time when an increasing number of teachers, especially in community colleges and state colleges, are organizing for collective bargaining, the committee recognizes that a challenge to the present concept of tenure is no small matter, that the issues involved are complex and difficult to resolve, and that a satisfactory solution must maintain effective safeguards for academic freedom.

Nonetheless, we urge the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges (co-sponsors of the basic 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure) to join with representatives of other educational organizations that are concerned with tenure, including the American Federation of Teachers, the National Student Association, and constituents of the American Council on Education, to re-examine existing policies.

Standards for awarding tenure—a matter of institutional autonomy—need broadening to allow greater consideration of teaching ability. Scholarly communities must be protected as effectively as tenure now protects individual professors.

4. A climate of open discussion must be created in which risks for trying new approaches are minimized. Faculty members should respect the educational freedom of students in the classroom to raise questions and to discuss freely issues arising from their course work.

To encourage innovations in curriculum, in degree requirements, and in standards for assessing faculty competence, institutions should seek resources to alter the reward system.

Innovation can also be encouraged on our giant campuses through subdivisions with greatly dispersed authority, budgetary autonomy, and architectural settings that encourage informality and intimacy.

In many institutions, the hierarchical structure of institutional management and departmental authority needs to be altered. Rigid hierarchies tend to shield the decision-makers from the discontents and constructive ideas of students and younger faculty members.

5. Renewed attention must be given to long-standing questions about the established standards for the Doctor of Philosophy degree. Either Ph.D. programs should be reformed to provide more adequately for the majority whose careers will in fact center on teaching rather than on the conduct of research, or increased recognition should be given to alternative programs for those who will be primarily teachers.

One important issue is the nature of the dissertation. Generally the dissertation is supposed to be a work of original research, but this standard is not uniformly applied and is inappropriate for many graduate students.

Another issue is the role of graduate students as teachers. Although some are excellent teachers, graduate students tend to pursue their teaching assignments without adequate supervision in a system which treats assistantships primarily as a form of subsidy to students and a source of low-cost instruction.

Supervised experience in teaching, as well as participation in decisions on departmental policies, ought to be important parts of the learning experience, especially for those graduate students planning academic careers.

6. Faculty needs to take a more active role in re-examining institutional goals and in guiding change, instead of simply responding to reform proposals from other quarters. Too often, in fact, their authority on educational matters has been used to disguise complacency and unwarranted conservatism, and as an excuse to avoid making reforms.

Many have resisted changes designed to meet the varied needs of a heterogeneous student body because they conceive their own role narrowly and selectively, as simply the trainers of an intellectual elite. Faculty need to re-examine critically both their role and their procedures for handling innovative ideas.

Administrators

It is altogether proper for the other constituent groups to hold administrators accountable for their actions and their inactions—but only within the limits of their roles and responsibilities and their power to act.

When their responsibilities are ill-defined or their power to act is unduly circumscribed, serious barriers exist to the resolution of campus tensions.

1. Administrators are often properly blamed for their institution's shortcomings in organization and governance. Other members of the college community, however, are typically uncertain about what administrators are expected to do and how their performance should be evaluated. Accordingly, institutions must define explicitly who is responsible for what.

Moreover, administrators often have responsibilities in certain areas but do not have the power to take major action without approval from higher authority or endorsement from a faculty committee. These limitations, too, should be clearly spelled out.

2. Especially at the presidential level, responsibility must be accompanied by the necessary authority. Trustees, faculty, and students need to consider the possible ultimate consequence to them of weakening the president's authority.

Institutions should have constitutions or bylaws which clearly define the responsibility and the authority of the president. In this connection, the nature of the presidency deserves rethinking. For example, fixed terms of office, renewable or unrenewable, might relieve some pressure on presidents, and also ensure institutional vitality.

Fixed terms, or a system by which to review administrative tenure, might be preferable to the present system in which some presidents stay long beyond their real effectiveness or are sometimes sacrificed after one major incident.

A division of authority—between "outside" concerns and "inside" ones, for example—might be considered where the burdens of the presidential office have grown too large for one man.

3. Colleges and universities, also need to reassess the roles and responsibilities of other administrative officers. Their performance should be subjected to periodic review and evaluation. Additionally, the roles of administrative offices should be re-examined.

For example, on some campuses the dean of students serves as adviser to students and overseer of student organizations, while also serving as prosecutor (and sometimes as judge and jury) in disciplinary matters.

These responsibilities may conflict with one another and call for differing talents, and, where feasible, should be separated—the advisory responsibility assigned to one office, and judicatory responsibility to another.

4. Presidents and other administrators have an especially urgent responsibility to ensure that avenues of communication are open. Some presidents are cut off by overconscientious aides or secretaries; others are seldom seen on campus and never talk with students and seldom with faculty. How to keep the channels open will present a different problem on every campus.

Nevertheless, it should always be possible for a student, faculty member, trustee, or layman who has a message to get through to the president. Accessibility, moreover, is not the whole answer. Presidents and other administrators must take positive steps to explain their plans and policies to the appropriate constituencies, through such devices as newsletters, annual reports, "town meetings," or position papers on particular issues.

They must also provide students, faculty, and others with information sufficiently in advance to enable them to make meaningful contributions to decisions.

5. To communicate effectively administrators must be open and candid in giving reasons for decisions and actions. There are instances when the release of information would needlessly injure individuals. But the withholding of information on such occasions will be better understood and accepted if, at all other times, communication is candid.

Here, also, continuing efforts are as important as those during crisis. Administrators should meet frequently with faculty and student groups, not only to listen but also to make known their thinking on basic issues.

6. The ability of presidents and other administrative officers to devote the time required for the communications we consider desirable is dependent on adequate institutional staffing.

Highly effective administrative organization, procedures, and personnel to conduct the heavy administrative business of the institution, are needed to support presidents and other administrators as they devote themselves to the varied and time-consuming responsibility of modern institutional governance.

7. The rules by which colleges and universities govern themselves, and the defining of appropriate responses to infractions, are matters on which students, faculty, administrators, and trustees should seek agreement. But it is an administrative responsibility (if only by default) to see that these rules and procedures receive continuing assessment. Rules need to be tested for clarity, fairness, and adequacy to meet foreseeable circumstances.

In many institutions administrators need to initiate a rulebook "housecleaning": to eliminate (or draw to the attention of those empowered to do so) rules that have outlived their usefulness, or are unrelated to institutional objectives, or that duplicate public laws and carry unwarranted additional punishment.

8. Administrators need to develop with civil authorities, especially law enforcement agencies, plans for handling campus disturbances that would require the presence of civil authorities. The plans must define the division of responsibility between campus and civil authorities, provide effective channels of communication between the two groups, and ensure due restraint in the handling of those causing the disturbance.

The entry of large numbers of off-campus police during disturbances can heighten tensions rather than relieve them. Physically punitive action, however provoked, that can be interpreted as "police brutality" adds fuel to the flames.

Inaction, on the other hand, can result in substantial property damage, danger to members of the campus community, and extended interruption of educational function, as well as reduced respect for the administration

Trustees

As most informed critics of academic governance have concluded, the lay board, despite its shortcomings, is still preferable to other methods of control. The reform of board organization and procedures should be undertaken even though no mere redefinition of trustee roles will eliminate existing frictions.

Failure to make lay boards more effective participants in the total enterprise, however, is certain to increase the tensions now disturbing much of higher education. The effectiveness of trustees is not measured by the depth of their involvement in the day-to-day business of the institution or the firmness of their control.

It is measured, rather, by the extent to which they are well-informed on educational issues, judicious in the exercise of their powers, and protective of the prerogatives of all members of the academic community.

1. Every institution should have carefully framed bylaws, subject to periodic re-examination, that set forth the board's essential authority and responsibility and define its procedures. Periodic review of the bylaws will benefit from outside counsel and from attention to what other institutions are doing.

Even such basic matters as the board's mode of selection and appointment, size, composition, term of office, should be reexamined. For example, switching to popular election of boards might dissuade men of detached viewpoint from applying, but self-perpetuating boards of lifetime members have faults as well.

Institutions with the latter system should consider that fixed terms for trustees would preserve detachment and continuity, while at the same time ensuring periodic rejuvenation of the board.

2. Students, faculty, and others need to be well informed about how decisions are made in their institution and the reasons for policies that are decided.

The bylaws of the trustees should be accessible to all members of the academic community and to concerned outsiders, as should agenda of each meeting.

When major decisions are made, boards should promptly issue reports which explain reasons for the actions taken. Boards must have well-publicized rules governing the submission of petitions, and adequate procedures for prompt consideration of them.

3. Boards should make more effective use of special committees and other mechanisms through which they and representatives of students, faculty, staff, and alumni can communicate more readily.

4. In the matter of finances, ways must be found to re-examine institutional priorities so that there will be both wider opportunity for involvement and a greater sharing of responsibility among students, faculty, staff, and others.

5. Delegation of responsibility and accountability does not absolve trustees of the need to be well-informed about the institution's programs and to be serious students of higher education generally.

Presidents and others who influence heavily the content of the board agenda should focus it more on educational issues and less on fiscal and housekeeping chores.

6. Although anything resembling a quota scheme of representation in board membership should be avoided, there should be greater diversity of age, occupation, and other salient individual characteristics that might broaden horizons and present other points of view.

Some boards of trustees may wish to consider adding student and faculty members from their own institutions; other boards, desiring to avoid the possible conflicts of interests that may arise from such participation, can achieve broadened viewpoints by adding members drawn from other institutions.

Ultimately, the evolving nature of higher education may require re-examination and reassessment of the authority and functions of trustees in the governance of the university, along with reappraisal of a need to delegate some of their authority to other groups on the campus.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Governance

In certain basic areas of governance and decision-making, many institutions have considerable autonomy to chart their own course. It is in these areas that the diverse interests of the members of the academic community are most likely to be reconciled. These include:

Criteria for admissions;

Criteria for recruiting, hiring, and promoting faculty and staff;

Curriculum requirements;

Performance standards and rewards for faculty and staff;

Standards of conduct for members of the academic community;

Academic performance standards for students, including criteria for grading and certification.

The committee believes that campus conflict sometimes arises from a confusion of three questions:

The substance of a particular policy: What is it?

Its validity: Is it a good policy?

The process by which it was made: Who decided it?

To view campus tensions in terms simply of "Who decides?" rather than of "What gets decided?" is to regard institutional decision-making as a power struggle rather than as a means of improving the educational environment.

Validity is, of course, one important consideration, and educational decisions are most likely to be valid if alternatives have first been subjected to a complete airing and analysis by the parties concerned.

The need for thorough study of alternatives relates closely to the problem of communication. All four constituent groups cite inadequate communication as a major cause of tension.

Decisions made without adequate study or simply presented as *faits accomplis* not only create resentment and hostility, but also run the risk of being wrong. This is particularly true with decisions on strictly educational matters (curricular requirements, for example), where students, faculty, and others directly affected are likely to have valuable insights to contribute.

Although improved communication does not eliminate problems, it usually results in sounder educational decisions and fosters governance by consensus rather than by force.

1. The processes of academic governance, especially those that determine and establish institutional policies, must be seen by all major groups concerned as essentially *fair*. Due process must be enlarged to include broad participation in the deliberations on important issues.

If any part of the academic community feels that its own interest in a proposed new institutional policy has not been fairly presented and heard, the new policy is likely to be challenged.

2. Every attempt must be made to establish effective communications, so that policy questions and grievances can be aired by the campus community. A number of institutions have had success with such communications methods as:

Centralized files of important institutional records accessible to campus constituents;

Rumor centers, especially during periods of campus turmoil, to which members of the community may telephone for accurate and up-to-date information;

Ombudsmen to hear grievances, speed up communications, and unsnarl red tape;

"Official" campus newspapers, in which texts of important reports and other documents of wide interest to the campus community can appear.

Members of the campus community should recognize, however, that improved channels of consultation may render decision-making procedures slower and more cumbersome.

3. As an aid to effective decisionmaking, joint administrative-faculty-student committees should be established, whenever possible, to assist in resolving the problem and attaining the objective. More institutions should experiment with permanent legislative assemblies composed of administrators, faculty, and students.

Some issues are better dealt with by faculty assemblies, some by student groups, and some by the president and his administrative staff; but each group's decision making processes can benefit from inputs from the other groups.

There are, additionally, issues of concern to all three groups which should be dealt with by a governance system in which all are recognized as legitimate participants.

4. The effective functioning of a college or university depends in large measure upon a shared commitment by members of the campus community to the principle of institutional self-governance and an assumption of the responsibilities that such a commitment implies.

For example, in disciplinary proceedings all must be willing to provide testimony and to serve as triers of fact.

It must be possible to conduct hearings without fear of disruption or retaliation against participants; there must be willingness to respect the finality of decisions.

Institutional goals

The committee's recommendations rest on shared views about the appropriate roles of colleges and universities in an unstable and troubled world. The problems of colleges and universities, like those of society at large, rule out as untenable a comfortable policy of "business as usual."

As society gropes to discover and realize more humane, just, and viable patterns of life in an age of advanced technology on a crowded globe, colleges and universities need to develop mechanisms of "self-renewal," in John Gardner's phrase, to keep them in position to make appropriate contributions to society.

In their educational function, colleges and universities need renewal to enhance their ability to prepare young people to cope with the kind of world that they will actually encounter.

1. Everywhere there is need to reexamine existing disciplines and to allocate resources for the design of new forms of intellectual inquiry; interdisciplinary programs which break down departmental rigidity provide one example of an appropriate response.

2. Faculties and staff of colleges and universities should be drawn from more diverse social and vocational backgrounds. The vocational experiences of artists, writers, diplomats, government officials, and others can enrich and enliven the discourse on the campus and help to reduce the tendency toward academic provincialism.

3. Colleges and universities must respond, more effectively than they have in the past, to the educational desires of women. Wherever discrimination because of sex exists, it must be eliminated.

4. New curricula and resources are needed to further the self-development of students in ways traditional curricula have failed to do.

More institutions should seek the resources to experiment with alternate modes of learning: cluster colleges, experimental education, work-study, community involvement for academic credit, and other living-learning arrangements.

5. Institutions should create centers for educational research and innovation to encourage the development of new approaches to education and the implementation of innovation in education—both in teaching techniques and in new courses, and to foster a continual questioning of conventional and traditional means of promoting the expansion of our frontiers of knowledge.

6. The American society overemphasizes the value of the traditional college degree. Further encouragement should be given to the development and support of new directions in post-secondary education.

7. Novel admissions practices should be tried by some institutions, both to extend access to higher education and to provide a broader population in which to test the quality and effectiveness of education programs.

8. Most collegiate institutions in the past have been heavily oriented to the purposes of the white majority. More attention must be given to the needs of ethnic minorities.

Ethnic studies programs, however, should ultimately be incorporated into the regular academic programs so that the white majority will learn more about the history and needs of minority groups.

9. Institutions should recruit more students, faculty, and staff from minority groups that have been under-represented in the campus population.

Other institutions should not be "raided" for minority personnel and students; rather, though it will take time, the pool of eligibles must be enlarged and recruitments made from among those who would not normally expect to attend college or to have academic careers.

10. Many reforms in higher education are expensive. But if we are to have them, institutions must be given greatly increased funding from all sources—especially the federal government—to increase financial aid to students, to develop new kinds of educational programs, and to permit students as well as faculty to launch innovative research and teaching projects.

11. Trustees, administrators, and faculty have as great a stake in effecting institutional change as do students. Reform of the college is a shared responsibility requiring attitudes that encourage educational change by all of the campus constituents.

12. Institutions should resist the distortion of their research efforts because of outside sources of funds. We urge the federal government to support research and instruction in ways that will respect the autonomy of institutions, enhance scholarly innovation, and improve students' educational opportunities, and we also urge institutions to emphasize these principles in developing their research.

CONCLUSION

Unrest on the nation's campuses is only part of the mosaic of problems in American society: the poverty amid affluence, the continuing racial strife, the poisoned environment, the decaying cities, the apparent decline in the whole quality of life.

These problems affect all of society, not simply colleges and universities. It is ironic that some seek destruction of the colleges and universities and that others within them remain averse to all constructive change.

These institutions hold our greatest hopes: as places of objective inquiry, for the solutions of society's problems; places of unfettered thought, for the debate of sensitive issues without fear of intimation or reprisal; centers of teaching and learning, for the education of tomorrow's problem-solvers and leaders.

Just as those who compose the academic community must rise to the defense of colleges and universities as vital and enduring social institutions, so must they recognize that these institutions must be responsive to the needs of the times.

A college or university should be flexible enough to accommodate change, aggressive enough to promote change, and wise enough to anticipate the consequences of change. It must strive as never before to become a bastion of high purpose, a goad to the public conscience, an implacable enemy of the false, the inhumane, and the unjust.

And in doing so, it must defend the use of reason as the means of moving toward its own and society's goals.

The survival of our system of higher education and its long-term contribution to society depend upon rationality and civility, shared concern, and mutual respect among the members of the academic community. Students, faculty, administrators, trustees—all must recognize their necessary interdependence.

THE PLIGHT OF THE SOVIET JEWS

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the Soviet Jews calls for a reaction of the world's conscience. Three million Jews live in the Soviet Union today and ask only for the right to live in peace as Jews. The Russian Government, however, has acted to deny them this right. Instead, the few remaining freedoms of the Russian Jews are being increasingly circumscribed. Once again the Soviet broadcasts and publications are filled with loudly proclaimed anti-Semitic policy statements.

Harassment of the Jews proceeds because such activity has been granted official support. Jews are being dismissed from their jobs for no other reason than their religion. Although the Soviet Union claims to be an atheistic and egalitarian society, the Jews are being singled out for special abuse. Here is the clearest display of Soviet hypocrisy. Numerous other cultural and religious groups have been permitted to retain their identity. They have been permitted to worship. Jews instead are being repressed.

The Soviet Government starts with the faulty premise that a person cannot be a loyal Soviet citizen and a Jew. Therefore, synagogues and religious schools have been closed by the Government. Only 60 synagogues remain open today. Educational and cultural facilities have been dismantled. Each Jewish congregation must exist in isolation from other congregations although other religious groups are permitted some centralization and some central council. Jews are denied Bibles and basic religious articles.

There appears to be a direct correlation between the militancy of the Soviet policy in the Middle East and the growing anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. Formerly disguised under a veil of propaganda, anti-Semitism is becoming more and more obvious. The veil has been lifted until the Soviet Jew is being attacked as pro-Zionist and is looked upon as an actual or a potential Israeli spy making him a disloyal Soviet citizen. It

is but a short step from classification as a Jew to classification as a potential Israeli spy. Yet the step is a dangerous one. No defense is adequate when an individual is suspect because of his birthright. The argument becomes a reductionist one, and the consequences offend human dignity.

Today the plight of the Jew has grown worse. He is being denied the right to leave the Soviet Union in order to find freedom. Instead, he is required to suffer the growing repression—in most instances silently.

The few letters that have left the Soviet Union speak for themselves. One letter, signed by the 18 Jewish families wishing to leave the Soviet Union, states, "It is incomprehensible that at the end of the 20th century it is possible to forbid people to live where they wish."

It is inconceivable and yet these people are the victims. They have refused to give up their Jewish identity. Rather, in the face of Soviet action, they have given it new meaning. In the words of one woman to the United Nations: "Is devotion to one's own people a crime? Are feelings of human and national dignity forbidden feelings? Has a man no rights to defend himself from insults? Can the reason the Soviets will not let my son leave be cruelty in principle?"

From still another Soviet citizen we hear: "My cup of sorrow has overflown, 19 years without work in my profession, 19 years without an assured piece of bread, 19 years of jeering and insults. And the joyless childhood of my children. Don't prevent me from departing the borders of the Soviet Union and don't drive me to madness by another refusal."

The condemnation of the Soviet Union on this issue must become the official policy of the United States. World pressure on the Russian Government is the only way to reverse the present Soviet policy of repression.

The interminable delays, obfuscation, and false promises must not continue. The plight of the Soviet Jews is all the more immediate and touching at this time of Passover, when Jews all over the world celebrate the freeing of the Jews from ancient Egypt. Yet, Jews cannot truly celebrate when many of their brothers are still the victims of calculated anti-Semitism. I say it is time that the Russian Jews be set free.

PENNSYLVANIA SOLDIER KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce the death of another of our brave fighting men, Sp4c. Vinture Sciarretti, of Greenfield, Pa., who was killed in Vietnam.

We owe a profound debt of gratitude and appreciation to our dedicated servicemen who sacrificed their lives for this great country. In tribute to Sp4c. Sciarretti for his heroic actions, I wish to honor his memory and commend his courage and valor, by placing in the RECORD the following article:

SP4C. VINTURE SCIARRETTI

Sp4c. Vinture Sciarretti, 21, son of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel C. Sciarretti of 226 Kaercher St., Greenfield.

Sp4c. Sciarretti, an Army machine gunner who had been in Vietnam four months, was killed near Song Be, during an enemy mortar barrage.

He had not been happy when assigned to Vietnam, his sister said, but he realized the obligation to serve his country.

Prior to being drafted last April, he had graduated from Bishop-Boyle High School and attended Triangle Technical School—hoping to become an industrial draftsman once out of the service.

Aside from his parents, he is survived by three sisters, Teresa, Judith, and Susan, all at home.

CALL ON CITIZENS TO END GANG KILLINGS AND THEIR ACTIVITIES

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago South Suburban News is a weekly newspaper oriented to the black citizens in the Chicago area. It is also a publication noted for its spirited editorial commentary and colorful news coverage. In a front-page editorial in its Saturday, April 11 edition, the Chicago South Surburban News carried a very direct and forceful commentary urging black communities to end the gang activities that have arisen to plague them:

CALL ON CITIZENS TO END GANG KILLINGS AND THEIR ACTIVITIES

A crisis prevails in most Black communities throughout Metropolitan Chicago, because of criminal gang activities and the lack of concern or fear by most Black citizens.

According to statistics released by various law enforcement agencies county, state, federal and local police, during the past 13 months 675 persons have been victims of gang related shootings and 84 have been killed. Most of these shootings and killings are the result of gang warfare, extortion and stepped up gang recruitment. In Black communities with most victims being Black youths.

Last weekend the following three youths were killed as a result of gang related activities. April 3, Byron Harris, 15, of 6948 South Wallace was killed by Maurice Luckie, 15, of 6952 S. Normal, on Sunday at 4:00 p.m. Luckie in turn was shot and died of wounds in St. Bernard's Hospital at 2:00 a.m. on Monday morning. On Saturday, April 4, Richard Mixon, 14, was shot at 4:00 p.m. He died at 11:30 p.m. in St. Bernard's Hospital.

Now, I ask everyone, if these youths were your children, how would you feel? And what would you do about it? Bury your head in the sand as most Black parents and citizens have done or would you take your pistol and go out and shoot those responsible for the killings? Who are responsible? Our answer, we all are, by allowing youth to belong to destructive gangs. Every gang member must sleep and eat some place every day, with some adult being in that house. It is a parent's responsibility to give proper supervision. Those who do not have youth belonging to gangs, must assist mothers where no father is in the home. If we do not, we are less than men.

Every Black disc jockey, newspaper writer, editors and publishers must start an all-out campaign to stop gang killings, shootings, extortion, rapes, gang recruiting, brutality and all other destructive practices committed by our Black youth.

Most Black communities are not safe for people to live in today, due to the destructive practices of gang members, some corrupt police, syndicated white and Black hoods, all of whom must be eliminated from Black communities.

All Black citizens must become aroused and act immediately. Black leaders, teachers, lawyers, doctors, laborers, politicians, parents, ministers and others.

The warm weather is upon us and more youth are on the streets exposing themselves to more violent gang activities, unless we all do something constructive to stop senseless killings and other gang related violence.

Daddy-O-Daylie, disc jockey at Radio Station WGRT is currently carrying on a campaign to stop the violent gang activities. Every black citizen in Chicago and suburbs must also join in a concentrated effort to end gang violence. We do not have time for rhetoric or semantics about the causes for youth being gang members. If we act positively we will be dealing with causes. We do not have all of the answers as to how we can deal with eliminating violence in our communities and we are aware that wholesale arrest of gang members will not be the solution. But this we know, if all citizens become aroused, united and act positive, then gang violence in Black communities will end.

We urge youth to disassociate themselves with any gang and pledge to work for positive Black action and improvement in their own community. The dumbest animals on earth refuse to destroy their own homes and environments. We believe our youth to be wiser than they have been.

NEW YORK CITY PHONE SERVICE GETTING WORSE

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the people of New York City have been crying out for the past 3 years about the deteriorating telephone service in New York City. Yet they have met repeated denials by officials of the New York Telephone Co. who insist that any troubles are localized and temporary. None other than the president of the New York Telephone Co., when asked in a Life magazine interview last November if he would admit there was a crisis or breakdown, stated:

Absolutely not. We've had some pockets of trouble in some critical areas, but that's about all. No question about it.

Well there is lots of questions about it. And today's New York Times gives ample evidence that the telephone users, not the company officials, have been right all along. The paper, in a front page article, reports that the Federal Communications Commission, as part of its first national survey of telephone service, has compiled vast new evidence which indicates that telephone service in New York is not only the worst in the Nation but that it is getting worse. This evidence is based upon reports filed by

the phone companies themselves and measures service quality against standards the industry itself established. The article stated that although there are major telephone problems in cities throughout the country, New York City had such bad telephone service that it makes the others look good by comparison.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot expect the high quality of interstate long-distance telephone service to remain high if local networks are falling apart at the seams. The Federal Communications Commission must shoulder the responsibility of enforcing nationwide quality standards with respect to telephone service, right down to the local level. The separate jurisdictions of the FCC and State regulatory bodies has proven inadequate to maintain the high standards and low rates we have a right to expect.

Furthermore, the new evidence cited in the New York Times article should be ample for the New York Public Service Commission to rescind the interim rate increase of $137.4 million granted by the commission pending a determination of whether the increase is justified. New Yorkers should not have to pay higher rates for telephone service which is the worst in the Nation, and which, according to the FCC evidence, is still declining in quality.

I am including at this point the full text of the New York Times report:

FCC PHONE STUDY FINDS SERVICE HERE WORST IN U.S.

(By Christopher Lydon)

WASHINGTON, April 26.—The Federal Communications Commission, making its first national survey of telephone service, has compiled voluminous new evidence that the New York City phone system is the worst in the country—and getting worse.

Reports from 20 large cities serviced by the Bell Telephone System indicate that failure to satisfy the industry's own service standards is now the rule, not the exception.

Although the New York City statistics made most of the other big city systems look good, the commission's survey indicated that degeneration in service is a general problem. Chicago and Boston, for example, are only slightly better than New York with respect to the speed of new phone installations, and Miami is worse than New York in volume of service complaints and delay in making repairs.

Still unknown are the service levels in independent, or non-Bell, systems. The commission inquiry was also directed to seven of the larger independent phone companies, but their responses are still incomplete.

The survey showed that during the last winter a New Yorker had only two chances in five of getting a new phone installed within the "standard" five days after order.

Two years earlier, by contrast, the chances were three to one in favor of beating the five-day deadline in New York. And even now, the Bell System phone companies in such cities as Omaha and San Francisco manage to install about 95 per cent of their new orders on time.

The F.C.C.'s discouraging picture of phone service in the nation's largest city is hardly news to phone users there, to New York's State Public Service Commission or to the New York Telephone Company, which last summer announced emergency measures to upgrade the vast city system.

Yet the commission's data, part of a continuing study, give fresh statistical proof of mounting deterioration. And they may yet prompt the first Federal enforcement of quality standards, which have traditionally been left to state regulators and the Bell System itself.

A spokesman for The New York Telephone Company said last night that since he had not seen the survey he could not offer immediate comment.

The New York City system scores the lowest marks in the country in almost all the categories that the Bell System has established for measuring service.

As of January, 1970, the last month for which the F.C.C. had figures, the rate of service complaints in New York had for the first time exceeded 8 per cent of the subscribers each month, which meant that the average New Yorker with a phone would need repairs once a year. At the same time, the figures indicate, the speed of repair service is slowing down.

Two and a half years ago, less than 8 per cent of those who complained about service had to call a second time to get satisfaction in January, 1970, more than 13 per cent of the service calls got results only after a second complaint.

ALL-TIME LOWS

In three other measures of how well the system works—the time it takes to get an operator, the time it takes to get a dial tone and the percentage of blocked calls—the New York system appeared to be the worst in the country and also reached its own all-time lows last January.

When people dial "operator" in New York, the chances are one in five—compared with one in 10 two years ago—that they will wait more than 10 seconds for a response.

Picking up the phone to make a call, one in seven New Yorkers waits more than three seconds to get a dial tone—compared with one in a hundred two years earlier.

Even with the assistance of an operator on person-to-person or collect calls, New Yorkers confront a busy circuit or a recorded message that "Your call did not go through" nearly 5 per cent of the time—which is more than twice the national rate and triple the New York rate of two years ago.

The only general category in which New York fared relatively well involved direct distance dialing, in which long-distance calls are placed automatically without operator assistance.

In the so-called "DDD" category, about 3½ per cent of New York's outgoing calls and about 2½ per cent of the incoming calls hit blockages or went astray. Those figures are 50 per cent higher than the DDD failure rate of two years earlier. However, the performance of direct distance dialing in New York is now roughly the same as in other big cities around the country.

Deterioration of service within the Bell System, a source of profound embarrassment to the nation's dominant telephone carrier, has also created a dilemma for the commission.

Strictly speaking, the regulatory responsibility of the F.C.C. covers only the interstate system, to which Bell technology has brought new efficiency and steadily declining toll rates.

SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Until a year ago, local regulatory agencies bore the brunt of most service complaints, while the F.C.C. happily shared some of the credit for the reduced long-distance charges. Though most of the service problems appeared to be local in origin, the Federal agency's service inquiry, which began last August, noted that the problems were beginning to have a significant impact on the interstate phone network.

Bernard Strassburg, the staff chief of the F.C.C.'s Common Carrier Bureau, observed in an interview last week that "for a long time we were pretty relaxed about the quality of interstate service."

"We were complacent, perhaps, but the service was generally good," he said.

Mr. Strassburg, who initiated the service study, has reluctantly become a severe critic of the Bell System's performance. He is convinced, for example, that in such intangible categories as the courtesy of telephone operators, phone service "isn't what it used to be."

At the same time, he makes allowances for rapid and continuing expansion, and he expresses an obvious sympathy for the damage to image that service problems have inflicted. Mr. Strassburg said of Bell executives: "For Bell people, service problems are the very worst sort of thing to be associated with."

"Over the years," he continued, "if nothing else, they've been concerned about service. I don't think that at any level of management, you'll find a 'public-be-damned' attitude at Bell."

RUSSIAN INTRIGUE DETAILS BARED

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, for years now some naive Americans have viewed themselves as Soviet experts after a quickie trip to the U.S.S.R. With a trust born of ignorance or misinformation they have generally concluded that the Soviet Union would not open its doors to the outside world if its system was as repressive as claimed in some circles. In contrast, individuals who have taken the time and effort to learn about the Soviet system have, in general, not been deceived. For those who are contemplating a trip to the U.S.S.R. forthcoming testimony by a former member of the Soviet KGB, Yuri Krotkov, might make them reconsider the worth of such a trip. The veteran newsman and columnist for the Chicago Tribune, Willard Edwards, in his April 25 column reports on the testimony of Krotkov, which should soon be available to the public. In describing the Krotkov story, Mr. Edwards states:

It will chill some of the hundreds of American educators, writers, scientists, and politicians who have come back from visits behind the iron curtain to enthuse about the prospects for cultural exchanges and development of freedom in the intellectual community there.

I insert at this point in the RECORD the Edwards column entitled "Russian Intrigue Details Bared":

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 25, 1970]

RUSSIAN INTRIGUE DETAILS BARED

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, April 24.—A human document, 1,000 pages long, more absorbing than many a fictional spy thriller and twice as revealing in its exposure of espionage and propaganda techniques, awaits publication by the Senate internal security subcommittee.

This transcript of secret testimony by a Russian defector, who worked for many years under the direction of the KGB, the soviet secret police, is so far-reaching in some of its segments that a question of the subcommittee's jurisdiction has arisen.

The internal security of nations other than the United States is affected by its disclosures. This information is already in the hands of the countries involved, some of them partners in the North Atlantic Treaty organization. Prominent foreign personalities are involved.

The subcommittee, as its name indicates, is confined to inquiries involving the security of the United States. Its chairman, Sen. James O. Eastland [D., Miss.], and members face a delicate problem in deciding how much may be published without injury to international relations.

If some deletions are necessary, the transcript will not lose its impact as the freshest revelation of Russian intrigue to come into the subcommittee's hands.

It will chill some of the hundreds of American educators, writers, scientists, and politicians who have come back from visits behind the iron curtain to enthuse about the prospects for cultural exchanges and development of freedom in the intellectual community there.

Most of them were in the hands of KGB agents from start to finish. They were trapped, if possible, into compromising positions with attractive Russian women, becoming potential blackmail victims. They were presented a completely false picture of soviet conditions by the warm and friendly companions who greeted them as fellow intellectuals.

One of these greeters was Yuri Krotkov, now in his fifties, an author and playwright of some repute in Moscow, who acted as a "steerer" or "roper" of intellectuals from foreign lands.

Krotkov, according to his testimony, worked for the secret police for 17 years. He was, and is, a cultured man of pleasing appearance, a linguist who could converse on familiar terms with French, English, German, Spanish, and American visitors, charming them with his liberal attitudes. He scored some sensational successes in luring men of prominence into the toils of the KGB.

When he was sent abroad by the KGB, Krotkov posed as a correspondent for Tass, the soviet news agency. His reputation as a dramatist, author of an anti-American play based on the life of Paul Robeson, gave him entry into all social circles.

He eventually became nauseated by his role. His play, he said, was "propaganda of the purest water—cheap, primitive pamphleteering," but the Moscow critics raved about it. He enjoyed having his suits made by a fashionable tailor and "taking good-looking girls to expensive restaurants," but he felt like "a cog in a huge machine," grinding out propaganda.

In 1963, after first transmitting to microfilm copious notes on his spying experiences, he fled to England, where the British seized his evidence and impounded it under the official secrets act. Thus, most of his evidence will be published for the first time by the subcommittee. He is now in the United States under a pseudonym and has been given permanent residence here.

The Senate this week voted 5 million dollars for free trips to Russia for 1,000 elected United States officials and their wives. The goal is better understanding between Russia and the United States. The Senate may want to reconsider this action after reading the Krotkov manuscript.

DRAFT REFORM

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1970

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, for many years our young people have been urging Congress to reform the draft as a first step toward its ultimate abolition. The President has today proposed a course of action which will do exactly that. He has recommended concrete, prudent, fiscally responsible steps to implement the excellent report of his Commission on an all volunteer armed force and he has proposed actions to make the existing draft more equitable during the interim before an all volunteer force becomes a reality.

Free choice is the essence of a free society. Fully implemented, the President's recommendations will give our young men the right of free choice in making career and educational plans. No longer will the uncertainty of the draft hang over the lives of millions of young men. This is a major reform—one of the most significant since the present Selective Service System was established—and a reform which cannot be implemented too soon.

BART, THE BAY AREA ENVIRONMENT, AND ECOLOGY

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit district is pioneering a system of transit for the new city complexes.

Because of the great interest today in pollution and its affect on our environment, the people in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, and the city of San Francisco are doing something about it. This is a matter of great concern to not only the inhabitants of that area, but BART officials.

May I commend to the reading of my colleagues a recent release from BART relative to the bay area, environment, and ecology:

BART, THE BAY AREA ENVIRONMENT, AND ECOLOGY

Leaded gasolines, industrial smog, noise pollution, freeways, destruction of downtowns and urban sprawl all relate to the environment—and they tend to relate negatively.

More directly, they relate to transportation and to the automobile culture. They relate to a society that is "on the move," vigorous and loves its cars because they permit varying degrees of personal mobility. To many, automobile transportation is in itself a form of quality of daily life.

Rapid transit also is a form of transportation. It differs from auto-oriented mass transit because it uses a separate right-of-way. It does not produce lead. It does not produce smog—at least if it is electrically-powered rail rapid transit. It does not demand oil from the channels of Santa Barbara.

BART trains will carry 30,000 seated passengers per hour on a single track, in one direction. This represents five lanes of freeway capacity for each track at the so-called peak travel hours in early morning and late afternoon.

BART was not designed to do away with the automobile. Far from it. Much of BART's patronage will come from commuters who drive their cars to outlying BART stations. About 19 miles of BART's 75 mile network will lie in the middle or alongside freeways.

What BART was designed to do—and will do—is minimize the demand for additional freeway lanes.

What BART was designed to do—and will do—is permit access to central business districts without the need to pave them over with concrete and asphalt. It was with BART in mind that the City and County of San Francisco two years ago adopted a policy of discouraging downtown parking and downtown parking lots. It was with BART in mind that the same city and its developers have erected huge downtown buildings within two or three minutes walking distance of BART stations.

What BART was designed to do was to help preserve the topography of the bay area—the water, the hills, the scenery.

BART was designed to join outlying areas with downtown areas—helping to control urban sprawl, helping to minimize freeway construction, and helping to save the important downtown areas of our cities.

For those who use BART—and we expect enormous usage which simply cannot be predicted by conventional estimating methods—there will be another, very personal benefit. Trains that are comfortable, air-conditioned and quiet may be the commuter's answer to noise pollution. In other words, he can count on 10 to 20 to 30 minutes of a kind of tranquility before work, and again after the hustle and bustle of a day of work.

The automobile will not and perhaps cannot go away from the American scene, or from the bay area. We accept it, even though we may wonder about the consequences of the internal combustion engine. But the automobile in the bay area will be supplemented by a rail rapid transit system—33 stations joined by 80-mile-per-hour trains run by totally automatic systems.

It was the environment issue that gave birth to BART, and BART will do something for the environment in return.

POWER IN THE HOUSE

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, discussions of reform of the House of Representatives are attracting more and more interest. Few realize, or at best most overlook the fact that the strict seniority system as we know it today is not the creation of House rules. Rather, it is a belated reaction to Cannonism—the period during which Speaker Joe Cannon ruled with an iron hand until 1910 when he was deposed.

Many of my colleagues in this body have argued that strict adherence to the seniority system is the only alternative to another Joe Cannon. But after the House revolted from the rule of Mr. Cannon seniority was not the sole basis, as it is today, for leadership in the House of Representatives.

During the interim years 1911 to 1920, which one historian has characterized as that period when "King Caucus supersedes Czar Cannon," the ingredients of experience, ability, geographical equity, as well as length of service, were determining factors in committee assignments. A study by the Democratic Study Group shows that between 1911 and 1920 seniority was followed 676 times and violated 224 times. A determination on the part of a majority of the majority party—in this case the Democrats—to

govern nationally was of paramount importance in making policy decisions. And it worked, as the legislative record of those years demonstrates.

I would like to call the attention of the Members of this body on both sides of the aisle to an excellent historical treatment of the events of the period immediately following the revolt of 1910. The following chapter titled, "Woodrow Wilson: The New Freedom and W.W." is excerpted from the book, "Power in the House," authored by a distinguished Member of this body, RICHARD BOLLING, well versed in the subject of reform. Mr. BOLLING has been an outspoken critic of the present operations of the House, but at the same time he has given us the experience of the past coupled with solutions for the future.

The article follows:

WOODROW WILSON: THE NEW FREEDOM AND W.W.

Cannonism as an issue remained politically potent. It helped propel Democrats into control of the House after the 1910 Congressional elections, which came eight months after the Cannon revolt.

During the campaign, the Democrats had coupled Cannonism and the high-duty Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act into one decisive issue. They claimed credit for the House upheaval. This claim found warm response among voters. The resulting political harvest was a bountiful one. A forty-four-seat Republican plurality in the Cannon House was converted into a sixty-five-seat Democratic plurality in the new Sixty-second Congress. For the first time since 1893, the Democrats controlled the House.

Conversely, it was an election disaster for many of the Republican Old Guard. Before the election, Nicholas Longworth of Ohio, a future Speaker and a Republican regular, had publicly stated that he would no longer support Cannon for leader. He further had predicted that, if the Republicans were returned as majority party and all Republicans attended their organizing meeting, "Mr. Cannon can not again be elected Speaker." Cannon survived the election. Returned to the House, Cannon was assigned to the Appropriations Committee he had chaired before becoming Speaker. Only this time he was placed last among Republican's on the Committee. Six of his committee chairmen from the last Congress went to the political scaffold in their campaigns for reelection. The six included Tawney, Appropriations Chairman.

In the spring of 1911, the Democratic caucus nominated Champ Clark, minority leader in the last Cannon House, for Speaker in the Sixty-second Congress. His selection was unanimous. Of course, Clark's nomination was the equivalent of election in the Democratically controlled House. The caucus selected Oscar Underwood of Alabama as both majority floor leader and chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, positions which Polk, Fillmore, and McKinley each had occupied before becoming President.

In organizing the House, Democrats set out to redeem a plank of their 1908 national platform. At that time, they had pledged support for adoption of "such rules and regulations to govern the House of Representatives as will enable a majority of its members to direct its deliberations and control legislation." This pledge was not made out of some abstract inclination toward democratic parliamentary procedure. It was a means of getting the country moving again. The Democratic party supported statehood for Arizona and New Mexico, popular election of Senators, publication of campaign expenses, and altering the existing protective tariff to one for revenue only and at rates that "will not destroy fair and honest competition in the home market." The Democratic party in the House performed radical structural surgery through the party caucus, an apparatus also effectively used earlier by Republican Aldrich of Rhode Island to regulate his party's affairs in the Senate.

The change took place through the party caucus, where confronted by Southern sectional strength, policy could be adopted only by a two-thirds vote. The Democratic caucus met in executive session, but its proceedings were entered in a public journal. Democrats, as the majority party in the House, voted to strip the Speakership of its power to appoint members of both majority and minority parties to most committees and to name the chairmen. With exceptions, the power of appointment had been a tightly held and cherished one ever since the First Congress more than 120 years before. The Speaker, under the newly adopted plan, did retain authority to name members to select committees and to appoint a chairman when the House sat as a Committee of the Whole House. The Democrats' new method of appointment vaguely resembled one suggested by Godlove S. Orth of Indiana thirty years earlier. The immediate proposal, however, was apparently the work of four Democratic members, Representatives Shackleford of Missouri, Hughes of New Jersey, Hay of Virginia, and Cordell Hull of Tennessee.

The new design worked this way. The Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee would serve as a committee on Committees. They themselves would have been previously elected to Ways and Means at the party caucus. The committee on Committees, in turn, would make nominations for assignment to other standing committees, including Rules. These nominations would be submitted to the party caucus for approval and ratification. After that, the Democratic nominations would be brought to the floor, along with the Republican ones made under a different procedure. There the House members, Democrats and Republicans, would vote for the nominees of both parties and select the committee chairmen. Of course, such an election was a bit of a farce. When the Democratic party was the majority party, for example, its members would supply the necessary votes on the House floor to elect the nominees of their own party "and they would not interfere with the nominations of the minority." As it developed, the Speaker, when a Democrat, was not excluded from consultations about standing committee appointments.

An analysis made of the first post-Cannon Congress, the Sixty-second, shows a reshuffling of Democratic committee assignments with seniority often ignored, as well as many of the Republican members who had been favored in the previous Congress. There were at least forty transfers of Democrats from previously held assignments on seventeen major committees. In the Sixty-third Congress, there were at least fifty-eight such transfers. Thirty-nine of fifty-six committees were chaired by Southerners. Despite the new method of appointment, ranking on committees included the factors of experience, ability, geographical equity, as well as length of service.

A glimpse of the effort behind the transfers is given by a future Secretary of State, Cordell Hull of Tennessee. Hull in his memoirs writes about the work of the Democratic Committee on Committees, which consisted of fourteen Democrats, including Hull.

We were determined to strip each committee of every possible vestige of special privilege and so to mold such committees as those on Agriculture, Labor and the Judiciary that they would join in securing maximum recognition by legislative actions for classes of American citizens who had been long neglected or discriminated against by numerous policies of the government. . . .

If we had the least doubt about a prospective member's attitude we sent for him beforehand, cross-examined him and pledged him unequivocally to do teamwork. We turned down William Sulzer as chairman of the Military Affairs Committee because he was extravagant. Edward Pou of North Carolina was removed from the Ways and Means Committee and Claude Kitchin, from the same state, substituted for the reason Pou had once voted for a tariff on lumber [Pou recovered to become Chairman of Rules in 1917 and 1931–1934]. All this was a tremendous job, but we accomplished it in good time, and thus made up the committees of the House. The result was an effectively working organization along progressive lines.

In sum, it had been decided that a majority of the majority party, in this case, the Democrats, should be allowed to govern. It was a paramount policy decision. Republican committee assignments were also reshuffled by the new appointing authority, Minority Leader Mann.

In the new Sixty-second Congress, the House Rules Committee was enlarged by one to eleven members, seven from the majority and four from the minority. In keeping with the Norris reform, the Speaker was deprived of a seat on Rules, a privilege he had held for more than fifty years. Furthermore, his power of recognition was circumscribed. As the majority party, the Democrats were able to get their new committee plan, the revised rules of procedure, and alterations in the Rules Committee adopted by the full House. In addition, Calendar Wednesday was changed and made a more reliable protective device against a domineering Speaker. The unanimous-consent calendar, established two years earlier, was retained. This provided two days a month when bills, minor in scope but often important to individual members, could be called up for floor action without the sponsoring members having to obtain recognition by the Speaker.

A parliamentary bypass in the form of a *discharge petition* was established to enable a public bill to be brought to the House floor for discussion and a vote if it were being blocked in committee. A committee was to be discharged from jurisdiction over the bill if a specified number of members signed a petition. Today, 218 signatures are required. At other times, far fewer have been required. Procedures under which the full House acts on the discharged bill, however, are cumbersome. Furthermore, many members hesitate to sign a discharge petition because this offends powerful committee chairmen in whose eyes the device is considered a vote of "no confidence" in themselves. Therefore, the hopes for the discharge petition have been unfulfilled. Since its establishment in 1910, more than 820 petitions have been filed, but only twenty-three bills have been consequently discharged, and, of these, only two have become law: the 1938 Fair Labor Standards Act; and a 1960 pay-raise bill for Federal employees. Occasionally, however, a bill has suddenly been moved from its pigeonhole as the tally of signatures neared the required number.

The Clark-Underwood rebels with a cause had created a new power base in the House. At the top, stood the quietly strong Oscar Underwood of Alabama, a leader in the fight against Cannonism. Underwood's base rested upon three pillars—he was Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Chairman of the Committee on Committees, and legislative floor leader for his party. It had become customary for the Chairman of either Ways and Means or Appropriations also to be majority floor leader. For example, Thaddeus Stevens of Pennsylvania and Cannon each had served as majority floor leader, as well as Chairman of Appropriations. As late as the 1930s, a majority floor leader, Democrat Henry T. Rainey of Illinois, also held an

active major committee assignment, though not the chairmanship. In recent years, this practice of wearing two hats has been abandoned, with occasional exceptions. One such occurred in 1967 when Majority Leader Carl Albert of Oklahoma took a trouble-shooter assignment on the Education and Labor Committee because its combative Democratic members were badly divided.

Underwood, not the Speaker, was the most influential man in the House. An observer of the period thought Underwood now held a "semi-ministerial" position, drawn from British parliamentary life. Underwood himself had incorrectly predicted that, under the new arrangement, the chairman of the altered Rules Committee would become majority leader. During Underwood's period of House leadership, six future Speakers were sitting in the House: Republicans Frederick Gillett of Massachusetts and Nicholas Longworth of Ohio; and Democrats Henry Rainey of Illinois, Joseph Byrns of Tennessee, and two Texans, John Nance Garner and Sam Rayburn.

Despite the competition, Underwood may have been the best Democratic legislative leader in this century. He combined, Claude Bowers wrote appreciatively, conciliatory leadership . . . [and] unflinching courage. When the powerful industrial forces in Birmingham [Alabama] protested against his proposed reduction in the tariff schedules, he met them courteously but firmly with a simple reiteration of his principles; and when a great plant of the United States Steel Corporation was in process of construction in his home city and work was suspended, the implied threat was disregarded, and soon the officials of the corporation were busy with explanations and apologies.

Similarly, Underwood fought the Ku Klux Klan and legislation prohibiting the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages. Underwood was also his own man. Both he and Clark opposed repeal of a treaty clause that exempted coast-to-coast domestic shipping which used the Panama Canal from paying tolls. Wilson, under pressure from Great Britain, had proposed it.

Underwood gave life to his authority. The House, with its revised committee assignments, combined with a comfortable Democratic margin, must be ranked as one of high accomplishment. Inexplicably, *The New York Times*, under C. R. Miller, then a conservative paper, called the Sixty-second Congress a "fussy, excited and confused body." A successful constitutional amendment was proposed to the states for the direct election of Senators. A parcel post system was established. A measure was approved to implement the soon to be adopted Sixteenth Amendment to the Constitution authorizing a Federal income tax—a net income of 100,000 dollars incurred a tax of slightly more than 2,260 dollars. Also enacted were improvements in pure-food laws and the establishment of an eight-hour working day for those employed under government contract. New Mexico and Arizona were admitted to the Union as the forty-seventh and forty-eighth states. A separate Department of Labor was established. The Interstate Commerce Commission was given authority to make fiscal valuation of railroad properties, a step toward determination of equity of fares. It was a productive performance.

Underwood held his own even when an activist President of the same political party entered the White House in 1913. Woodrow Wilson didn't like Speaker Champ Clark anyway. They had taken each other's measure while competing for the Democratic Presidential nomination the year before. Wilson thought the House Speaker "a sort of elephantine smart-aleck." Clark reciprocated.

Wilson, the first Democratic President in this century, believed in Presidential leadership. His supporters expected his New Freedom program of domestic improvements to curb concentrations of wealth, dissolve economic injustice, and improve social conditions. Their expectations were partially fulfilled. Their children would grow into the voters that supported the New Deal in a later harsh time.

Wilson, twenty-eighth President of the United States, addressed a joint session of Congress in April, 1913, the first to do so since John Adams. He favored such House allies as Underwood, whom he respected. The feeling was mutual. They were good legislative collaborators. The accomplishments of the House illustrate this: the historic Underwood-Simmons Tariff Act, the first general revision in the direction of lower duties since 1846; the Clayton Anti-Trust Act; the Federal Reserve Act; and the establishment of the Federal Trade Commission.

An impressive aspect of the Wilson legislative program was the promptness with which Administration requests were acted upon, and this occurred at a time when the House had just been increased to its present size, 435 members.

In 1913, the Federal Reserve legislation was introduced in June and signed into law that December, six months later. The tariff bill was proposed to the Sixty-third Congress in March, reported from the Ways and Means Committee in April, cleared the House in May, and was signed into law in early October, seven months later, an astoundingly brief span of time considering the historically controversial nature of tariffs. The proposal for an eight-hour work day for railroad employees was sent to the Congress in a special message on August 16, 1913. It became law seventeen days later.

In mid-January, 1914, Wilson proposed legislation in the area of monopolies and trusts. Within ten months, Wilson had before him the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Anti-Trust Act, both of which he signed. All these were disputatious measures that affected major economic interests, but Wilson's legislative leaders moved them promptly through the Congress.

One reason for the swift-moving progress was a temporary revitalization of the Democratic caucus. The Democratic caucus rules, adopted in 1909, had emphasized unity in matters of "party faith or party policy. . . ." Any Democrat not abiding by the caucus rules "shall automatically cease to be a member of the Caucus." On party matters, members were bound to abide if a policy of legislative position was assumed by a two-thirds vote, if that vote represented a majority of all Democrats in the House. There were escape hatches. A member was not bound if he had "made contrary pledges" to his constituents prior to his most recent election or if the matter involved "a construction of the Constitution," or he had contrary instructions from the party organization in his district.

In April, 1911, the Democratic caucus adopted a position by which members "endorse the bills presented by the Ways and Means Committee . . . pledge ourselves to support said bills in the House . . . with our votes, and to vote against all amendments, except formal committee amendment, to said bills and motions to recommit, changing their text from the language agreed upon in this caucus." The party caucus journal records show that the Democratic caucus also instructed the Rules Committee as to content of the special orders it issued.

George Galloway in his *History of the House of Representatives* describes the period from 1911 to 1920 as one where "King Caucus supersedes Czar Cannon." In support of this characterization, the 1911 *Caucus Journal of the Democratic Party* carries an entry about an adopted resolution offered by Underwood. It states that the committees, Democratically controlled, "are directed not to report to the House during the first session of the 62nd Congress, unless hereafter directed by this caucus, any legislation except with reference to the following matters."

Wilson approved the revitalized caucus:

The Caucus is meant as an antidote to the Committees. It is designed to supply the cohesive principle which the multiplicity and mutual independence of the Committees so powerfully tend to destroy. . . . The caucus is the drilling-ground of the party. There its discipline is renewed and strengthened, its uniformity of step and gesture regained.

This has not been the case in recent times, where flaccid leadership and autonomous committee chairmen control the House Democrats.

In 1915, Underwood moved to the Senate, where he eventually also became Democratic floor leader. His successor in the House was Kitchin, who also was both majority leader and Ways and Means Chairman.

During the 1915–1917 sitting, there were additional legislative gains for the Wilson Administration: a child labor law, establishment of the Tariff Commission; rural credits; greater autonomy for the Philippines; and additional naval expenditures. Kitchin, however, articulate and alert, grew to oppose publicly Wilson's foreign policy exercises in respect to the warring European powers. President Wilson tried to convince Kitchin personally; he did not succeed. For example, Kitchin fought the naval building program proposed by Wilson. Kitchin believed it would lead to further involvement in European rivalries. Consequently, defense bills were handled by Rainey of Ways and Means, rather than by Kitchin. Criticism of the antiwar majority leader grew. Demands mounted for his resignation after he had made a well-tailored midnight speech on the floor of the House against our formal entry into World War I on the side of France and Great Britain:

. . . Let me at once remind the House that it takes neither moral nor physical courage to declare a war for others to fight . . . and I have made up my mind to walk it, if I go barefooted and alone. . . . Half the civilized world is now a slaughterhouse for human beings. This Nation is the last hope of peace on earth, good will toward men. I am unwilling for my country by statutory command to pull up the last anchor of peace in the world. . . .

A few hours later, at about 3 a.m. on April 6, 1917, the House approved by a vote of 373 to 50 a declaration of war resolution. Kitchin was one of 50 members voting nay. Yet the following month Kitchin energetically advanced a revenue bill, including a controversial increase in second-class mailing rates to finance the war he opposed. On several occasions, he felt himself obliged to chide members who had voted for the war resolution but balked at approving heavier imposts for funding the war.

Kitchin weathered the heavy storm, including a steady drumbeat of newspaper criticism. An admiring biographer, Alex M. Arnett, makes a reference to Kitchin's "turning of the floor leadership over to some other member when differences between him and the President reached a crisis." Kitchin had raised the point with himself as to the wisdom of the official party leader in the House leading opposition to a President of the same party. Records of the period, however, indicate no formal abdication of his leadership position. Nevertheless, during America's direct participation in the war, Wilson took a greater degree of control as the party's legislative leader in the Congress. He often dealt directly with committee chairmen of both House and Senate. Wilson also maintained a liaison with Garner, a rising Democrat whom he respected. Clark continued as Speaker. He, too, had his legislative troubles with the President; for example, Clark opposed the military draft—"nearest to a convict's life," he labeled it.

In 1919, Democratic loyalists, calling themselves "the reorganization committee," sought to punish Clark for differing with Administration programs. Their efforts to remove Clark from party leadership fizzled, however.

Meanwhile, the Republican party in the House continued in a disorganized condition, although Theodore Roosevelt gave it continual pep talks from as far away as Africa. The 1916 Congressional elections seemed to give Republicans a thin edge: 213 Republicans, 212 Democrats, and 7 members of minority parties. Despite the plurality of one, however, the Republicans did not organize the Sixty-fifth Congress when it opened in April, 1917. Thomas Schall, a blind member from Minnesota and a Progressive, made an emotional speech in which he urged that a Democratic President should have a Democratic House and Senate. Until that time, there had been nine other occasions since the Civil War when there was "divided government," that is, one party controlled the Congress and another the Presidency. In the balloting five of the seven "others," including Schall, supported Clark for Speaker. The vote was 217 for Clark; 205 for Republican Mann, a brusque, capable figure; 2 for Republican Gillette, who would become Speaker two years later; and 2 for Republican Progressive Irvin Luther Lenroot of Wisconsin. Two members voted present.

During this period, House Republicans appeared to be of two minds in respect to the caucus, or *conference,* as they called it. Norris, for example, regarded the caucus as an evil. A biographer, Richard Lowitt states that Norris looked forward to the time "when the progressive, patriotic sentiment of the American people will drive the caucus and the political boss and the political machine out of business." Norris, Lowitt continued, wanted Republican members free to offer amendments on the floor without being bound by a caucus position. Their party caucus decisions were made not binding.

Shortly before the opening of the Sixty-fifth Congress in 1917, the House Republican caucus established a seventeen-member Committee on Committees to make assignments. Since 1911, committee assignments had been made by the party officer Minority Leader Mann. He became chairman. Currently, this Committee on Committees, unlike that of the Democrats, is composed of a member from each state that has a Republican in the House. Each committee member casts as many votes as there are Republicans in his state delegation. In addition, in 1917, a five-member *advisory committee* was established, with Mann also as its chairman. As nearly as can be determined, it had party housekeeping responsibilities and made policy suggestions. Apparently the Republican Steering Committee evolved from the advisory committee.

Between 1919 and 1925, House Republicans maintained a policy that their Steering Committee should not include any ranking member of a major committee and that no ranking member should be placed on the Rules Committee. Later, the Steering Committee became a "policy committee" that included party officers. The Steering Committee may have met daily in the Sixty-fifth Congress. At those meetings, the committee members would summon Republicans on the legislative committees to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of legislation from the viewpoint of the overall position of the well-being of the party. Sometimes, the Chairman of Rules was invited to sit in when the Republicans were the majority party. Coordination, however, was less than ideal, at least on one occasion, when, during a Republican administration, Rules approved a rule covering one Republican's resolution to investigate an executive branch department. The Republican Speaker Gillett was not then a member of Rules. At the outset he was not even a member of either the Committee on Committees or the Steering Committee of his own party. Later, he did attend sessions of the Steering Committee. Thus, the Republican structure of party leadership reached as diffused a condition as that of the Democratic one.

Republicans quarreled. Mann was unpopular within his own party. In 1919, with Republicans now in the majority, he sought to be his party's candidate for Speaker in place of Gillette. This antagonized Longworth and other Republicans. As a result, they sought to oust him as chairman of the Republican Committee on Committees. They failed, however, Mann, minority leader since 1911, did not step up to majority leader in the Republican House. Instead, Frank Mondell of Wyoming, schooled in the Cannon style of leadership, was elected. Two years later, in 1921, Mondell also became Chairman of the Steering Committee and the Committee on Committees.

Changes in the structure of each party were widely discussed. The altered method of committee appointment attracted comment. In 1937, Norris, then a Senator, expressed a view that overall changes to the party structures were beneficial because these changes had made the parties more responsive to voters.

This view, however, was not unanimously shared. Both during and after the 1930 revolt, some House members and interested observers were dubious about the new improvements. Regardless of party affiliation, they sensed that, under the new order, power would ultimately be dispersed so widely that there would not be a sufficiently integrated institution, the House, to make the policy effective. Others felt that there had simply been a trade-in of a Speaker-dominated, five-member Rules Committee for a ten-member committee dominated by six members of the majority party. They noted that two of the five members on the discarded Rules Committee were renamed as members of the revised committee and that no insurgent Republicans were named to it. *La Follette's Weekly* commented that basically it meant little except "the temporary humiliation of an old man of bad eminence."

On the other hand, Victor Murdock of Kansas, insurgent Republican, favored even more decentralization. Murdock was one of the nine insurgent Republicans who had supported the Burleson motion to depose Cannon. He wrote in the September 22, 1910, *Independent:*

Popular disbelief in the adequacy of major laws, popular doubt of the willingness of Congress to pass effective law, has naturally bred a conviction among many that Congress is naturally not responsive to public opinion, and that, consequently, any major action by Congress must be forced not merely by means of agitation, but by prolonged and mayhap threatening agitation.

The executive branch, Murdock continued, reaped the benefit. The Presidents "veer away from the constitutional function of advising with Congress, and advance, at the opening of a new Congress, with a legislative program which an aroused and sympathetic public opinion demands shall be carried out."

Murdock thought additional changes beyond the Clark-Underwood alterations should be made in order that (1) Congress might become a more responsive representative body; (2) Congress might regain its status as one of three coordinate branches of the Federal government; and (3) "a new type of Congressman" might develop, "one who insists upon effective legislative action and assumes individual responsibility for legislation." This point dovetailed with the insurgents' philosophy. In one sense, they tended to be antiparty. They believed, in Cooper's words, that the "party has no claim which exceeded the conviction of individual members since the party rightfully only existed to the extent that agreement existed." Nevertheless, many persons were quite certain the 1910 business, carried to an extreme of decentralization as Murdock and other Progressives seemed to desire, would breed ill.

A Republican House leader, John Dalzell of Pennsylvania, a supporter of Cannon, chided the Democrats: "Gentlemen of the Majority you are on the back track. Your reforms are all shams and fraud. You have taken the power away from the Speaker. But you put it all in the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. Instead of Cannonism and Reedism and Crispism, you have today, Underwoodism."

George Rothwell Brown in *The Leadership of Congress,* sensed the problems that would arise to plague the political parties and the House because of the new internal machinery:

An analysis of the fundamental spiritual difference between the old system and the new is essential to an intelligent understanding of the difference in the manner of operation of the two systems.

Despite all the faults inherent in the system which Reed had inherited from Colfax and Blaine and from Henry Clay, and had improved, and had passed on to his successors, and which Cannon had made into a perfect piece of political mechanism, it at least had this to commend it to the people, that it had the courage of its convictions, was honest and stood four-square, and was at all times in the open, exposed to the pitiless glare of publicity. Every action it committed was instantly known throughout the country. The oligarchy demanded power commensurate with its responsibility, but the people could always hold it to that responsibility. The names of those who constituted the oligarchy were matters of public record. [Brown reported it difficult and sometimes impossible, for example, to know the names of members of the Republican Steering Committee and the Republican Committee on Committees. The existence of the Steering Committee, he said, was even denied for a time.] The name of the Speaker was known, and it was known to everyone that he stood at the head of the House, the creator of the committees, having the power of appointment and of removal, that therefore if a committee refused to report a bill which the country demanded the Speaker as the master of that committee was responsible. The names of the members of the Committee on Rules were known. Aside from the Speaker, the chairman, there were only two of the majority party, and in Mr. Speaker Cannon's time, and in Mr. Reed's time, their names were household words. With the exception of the committee chairmen, who were the Speaker's lieutenants, and the Floor Leader, who was the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, there were few other members of the inner circle. Not only were these responsible leaders of the House up to the 62nd Congress [when Clark's Speakership began, that is] thus indicated in public documents, but they took pride in distinguishing themselves among their fellows by a peculiar badge which they wore. This was a red carnation, and that small flower in the button-hole meant that men served as leaders of the House unafraid and unashamed. It was a touch of grim sentiment.

The new order became a system of secret government in the House of Representatives, and in this lies its chief weakness and greatest menace. It does not operate in the open, but under cover. It does not stand four-square to all the winds that blow, nor does it court publicity. It avoids the light and suppresses all mention of itself. The names of the gentlemen constituting this system are nowhere of public record except with respect to the Speaker, the chairmen of committees of the House, and where they appear in the list of Representatives. The Floor

Leader is known simply by that title and by none other.

The members constituting the committee on Committees and the Steering Committee are not a part of the organization of the House, but of the caucus; they are not responsible to the House itself, or to the American people, but to the caucus [Democratic] or conference [Republican, as it is styled]. Not being responsible they can not be held to accountability. Under the old system if a bill in which the people were interested could not pass for the reason that it could not be brought before the House the Speaker and his Committee on Rules could be arraigned at the bar of public opinion. Under the new system if a bill in which the people are interested can not obtain consideration nobody can be held responsible for the reason that nobody knows that anybody is responsible. The Speaker can not be thus held, since it is notorious that the Speaker has no power, and the Floor Leader cannot be held to account, since the House openly has clothed him with no power.

Obviously, there is a responsible power somewhere in the House, for the country from time to time has evidence that certain bills are put forward, and that others are held back. Where then has gone the power that Reed and Cannon used to wield? That is a question of vital concern. . . . Previously the country could see the wheels go around. Now it can not. Brown's viewpoint is not an isolated one. Luce, discussing his House experience, wrote:

The reformers believed they had put an end to dictatorship. Yet that some few men continued to guide is not to be questioned. What was really accomplished was to lessen the public knowledge of who those men were. Congressmen might know, but since 1910 the public generally has not known who should be rewarded or punished. Irresponsibility has been increased . . . the benefits of the change have not been conspicuous enough to impress anybody as important.

Other Congressional scholars agree. W. F. Willoughby of the Brookings Institution suggested that the primary objections to the discarded leadership system was that the powers were concentrated in the hands of one individual, not that the concentration was in one location. He therefore suggested objections could have been met by enlarging the Rules Committee or by a caucus committee.

As it turned out, the faults in the newly developed structure of the Democratic party were not particularly grievious during the Administrations of the strong-willed Wilson. The *laissez-faire* mood of the 1920s further postponed the crisis. The blighted condition of the House and the fragmented House Democratic party made their bruising impact only when political leaders of a nation beaten to the ground by severe economic depression during the 1930s, sought to meet the neglected agenda of unmet national needs.

It is a political truth easily defined that an elected majority should be permitted to govern until the voters speak again. This truth has been violated so often in the House it has been forgotten. Edmund Burke has written:

For my part, I find it impossible to conceive that any one believes in his own politics, or thinks them of any weight, who refuses to adopt the means of having them reduced into practice. It is the business of the speculative philosopher to mark the proper ends of government. It is the business of the politician, who is the philosopher in action, to find out proper means toward those ends, and to employ them with effect.

PEACE CORPS

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, Joseph Blatchford, Director of the Peace Corps, has been attempting to make service in the Peace Corps more meaningful and correct some of the problems which have resulted in the past from lack of screening. For instance, he has terminated 12 volunteers and one staff member in four countries who insisted on abusing the right of expression and demonstrated publicly. Furthermore, initiation of a policy of recruiting different types of volunteers, people with more maturity, greater experience and training such as skilled technicians from the ranks of labor, farmers, professional people in fields of engineering and architecture is having a significant effect. I think that the enclosed article regarding possible directions of the Peace Corps was most interesting:

OLD IDEA, NEW VOICE

Ever since Gen. George C. Marshall began promoting it at the end of World War II, the idea that the Nation's youth be required to serve their country in some field of national service, not necessarily in the military, has been tossed around with some regularity. Latest disciple of it is Joseph Blatchford, new head of the Peace Corps.

Blatchford indicated recently that he has already discussed the subject with Defense Secretary Melvin Laird, and implied that Laird's only major objection at the moment is the continuing need for draftees for Vietnam. In effect, Blatchford suggested, U.S. disengagement from Vietnam would make the idea feasible. Essentially, Blatchford's rework of an old idea would be offering young men as an alternate to military service work in a Peace Corps or VISTA-type program for one or two years.

This is just one proposal that has grown out of Blatchford's office stepping back and taking a look at where the Peace Corps has come in its 8-year existence, where it ought to be headed. The volunteer national service idea is based in part on Blatchford's conclusion that such an appeal has worked in the Peace Corps and would work just as well in the Nation.

Without waiting for high-level public approval of this, however, Blatchford already plans to steer the Peace Corps in new directions which may help achieve the national service idea, anyway. While worldwide response to the Peace Corps—"A mobile expression of the American ideal to help underdeveloped countries," says Blatchford—has been strong, the Corps now needs more experienced, more professional, skilled people. Yet, the Corps has gravitated to mostly young, recent college graduates.

"Country needs are changing," Blatchford says. "Where once there was an emphasis on education, now there is a need for people who can teach skills, help the natives do jobs. Otherwise, the countries fear they may be educating their own revolution." In other words, just as in the U.S., giving a person a secondary education, then having no job available for him upon graduation creates political instability.

With its volunteer spirit, its people-to-people contact, the Peace Corps "has filled a vacuum in foreign assistance," claims Blatchford. So much so, he says, that today just about every European country has its own Peace Corps. Out of these trends are coming several Peace Corps moves. Among them:

The Corps is beginning to recruit personnel from the country itself, hopes soon that 50 percent of the Peace Corps' overseas staff will be native, serve as the nucleus for building the country's own Peace Corps organization. "We've found, for the Peace Corps to work well," reasons Blatchford, "the country has to feel the Corps belongs to them as much as to the U.S."

The Corps is now permitting families to go overseas, sending 200 overseas this year, in fact. Idea is to encourage higher-skilled persons to volunteer for a Peace Corps tour.

The Corps is changing its present "lily-white" by encouraging minority groups, the black man and others, to join.

Blatchford is pushing for a United Nations Peace Corps, hopes to establish through bilateral talks (already with the Swiss, Swedes and British) the beginnings of such an international group; backing that up by seeking Peace Corps personnel exchanges with other nations carrying on the same kind of program.

Blatchford is hoping to set up some kind of arrangement where returning Peace Corps volunteers, instead of being brought back and dropped at the shore line, are funneled into U.S. ghettoes and depressed areas like Appalachia. "The problems are the same. And we want to put out of mind this concept of rich nations and poor nations, address instead the problems of poverty which are everywhere."

As part of that, he hopes to invite overseas volunteers to come to the U.S. "to help us so they'll have the same kind of insight when they go back to their countries that our volunteers have when they come back to the U.S."

Will it work? Probably, if the Peace Corps track record is any clue. From a high of 14,000 volunteers in 1966, applicants dropped off at the rate of about 1,000 a year, but have leveled off now. Moreover, the number of skilled applicants has jumped in the past few weeks. And "even with the drop in applicants, we still have more volunteers than we have openings."

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE DRAFT

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1970

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in his message proposing an end to the draft, the President said:

Ultimately, the preservation of a free society depends upon both the willingness of its beneficiaries to bear the burden of its defense—and the willingness of government to guarantee the freedom of the individual.

In those few words, the President makes clear it is a "Free Society" we are trying to preserve.

He has reminded us that no matter how affluent we are, no matter how much we have in the way of material goods, we all bear the responsibilities as well as share in the bounties of freedom.

Finally, he reminds us also that the Government guarantees—not grants or offers or delegates—but guarantees the freedom of the individual.

These are factors I hope we will all remember as we consider the President's message.

SOUTH CAROLINA TERCENTENARY

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker on the occasion of the participation of the Anglican Church in the tricentennial of the founding of South Carolina, the Right Reverend and Right Honorable Robert W. Stopford, bishop of London, delivered the sermon at the Citadel Armory at Charleston.

The bishop's inspiring address was also a historic document, indeed worthy of the occasion. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of attending this service and of meeting this distinguished churchman. I consider it an honor to insert in the RECORD this magnificent creation by the representative of the original Mother Church of my State and of this part of America:

SOUTH CAROLINA TERCENTENARY,
CHARLESTON, APRIL 19, 1970

Henry Compton, who was Bishop of London 300 years ago, gave all the help and encouragement he could to the building up of the work of the Church of England in America and, not least, in the new State of Carolina. He, and his successors, could not be away from the work of the diocese of London for the many months which a visit to America then involved, but the successive Bishops of London were anxious to give all the pastoral care they could to the clergy and people, even though it had to be exercised from Fulham Palace many thousands of miles away.

Henry Compton could not have foreseen that at the Tercentenary of the State it would be a Diocese of an independent Province of the Anglican Communion which invited his successor to be present. It is therefore for me a great honour and privilege to be with you in these celebrations and to bring you the greetings of the diocese to which you belonged three hundred years ago, and of the Church of England from which you had your origin.

To-day the links which bind together the Episcopal Church and the Church of England, and this diocese of South Carolina and the diocese of London are stronger than they ever were when they depended on legal rights of jurisdiction. We are held together by a common inheritance—by that temper of mind which is the distinguishing mark of Anglicanism—an attitude, rooted in the Catholic faith yet sensitive to the evangelical emphasis of the Reformation, which sets a high value on intellectual integrity and moderation of judgement. We try to be open always to the leading of the Holy Spirit as, together with the other Provinces of our Anglican Communion, we make our contribution to the growing unity of the whole Church of God. We know that friendship based upon mutual respect can hold us together as nothing else can do.

This Tercentenary is indeed an historic occasion. In the record of the past 300 years there are many events and movements of thought upon which it is tempting to dwell—but I must exercise self-denial and emphasise only a few which illustrate my theme.

In 1696 Bishop Compton sent out the Reverend Samuel Marshall to Carolina—that is three years after the Commons of Carolina, elected by popular vote, had gained the right to initiate legislation. In 1701 the Legislature passed an ordinance which made the Church of England the established Church of Carolina. Was this the result of the work of Samuel Marshall and his colleagues? Or did it come from something deeper—an English conviction that Church and State should not—and could not—be separated from each other? Hooker, the great Anglican theologian in the reign of Elizabeth the First expressed that belief in these words: "There is not any man of the Church of England but the same man is also a member of the Commonwealth, nor any man a member of the Commonwealth which is not also of the Church of England". The Founding Fathers of the United States, for very cogent reasons, made the separation of Church and State a fundamental part of the Constitution. In England the Establishment of the Church of England has been greatly modified but is still under constant attack. Was the action of the Carolina legislature in 1701 just an error—or did it embody a principle from which we can still learn in these secular days.

It was not long before it was made clear that this ordinance of 1701 did not mean that the State could control the Church. The legislature tried to set up a lay court with power to dismiss clergy, and had its action disallowed. But it was equally clear that the Church had no desire to override the views of the laity. Bishop Secker of Oxford, when preaching in 1740 at the Annual Service for Subscribers to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel which contributed to the Church in Carolina no less than 54 clergymen between 1701 and 1759, expressed the Society's policy in these words "We have obtruded the service of the Church of England nowhere: we have settled no clergyman anywhere without the inhabitants requesting it and contributing to it: we have sent no successor upon a vacancy without their renewing their request."

The records show that the jurisdiction exercised by my predecessors from Fulham palace was essentially pastoral. In spite of the immense difficulties created by the slowness of communications and the months which had to elapse before a reply could be received to a letter or an inquiry, they tried to secure the peace and orderly development of the Church in America. And they gave not only encouragement but also substantial financial help to the charitable Companies which promoted emigration to America. One such Company was that which in 1732 received a Charter from George II to colonise lands between the rivers Savannah and Attamaha. There is a strange little link between this Company and the diocese of London for General Oglethorpe, among his multifarious activities, was partly responsible for building the first bridge over the Thames at Fulham at the bottom of the garden of Fulham Palace where I live, and my predecessors have lived since the 7th Century.

When the War of Indepedence broke the direct connection with the Church of England the Church in South Carolina was one of the seven which formed the first General Convention in 1785. Some of your predecessors must have been among those responsible for the Preface to the first American Prayer Book with its generous reference to "the Church of England to which the Protestant Episcopal Church in these States is indebted for her first foundation and a long continuance of nursing care and protection."

In that spirit we in the Church of England and in the diocese of London enter fully into your thanksgiving in this Tercentenary year. With you we praise God for what He has enabled the Church here to be and to do throughout the 300 years of its history. With you also we look forward to the future. History is important because it has made us what we are: it is no less important for its influence on what we shall be. It is essential that on an occasion like this we should look forward for if we do not do so the observance of past events can become little more than sentimental piety. We stand at the meeting point of past and future where history is being made. To change the metaphor, while we must thank God for the strength of our foundations we must also pray that we may build worthily upon them.

As we look forward to the problems and opportunities which will face the Church of God in the next decade or two. we are tempted to think that our tasks are harder than those which the Church here in its early days had to fulfill. 300 years ago there were hardships enough to make men's hearts fail them for fear. There was little material security, there was moral laxity—and in the 18th Century there was the theological confusion which the Deists caused—and the Protestant Episcopal Church came into being at the time when the atheism of revolutionary France was affecting the Western world. Our predecessors here lost neither heart nor faith—and their continuing faithfulness gives us our own starting point as the Church to-day grapples with the opportunities and problems of the age of secularisation. We see spiritual poverty in the midst of material affluence: We see the nations which long for peace locked in the apparently insoluble problems of international affairs. The problems of race defy easy solution. In the United States they come from the slave trade for which Britain bears a heavy responsibility. In Britain they come from the attempt to substitute a Commonwealth for an Empire. On both sides of the Atlantic, though your problems in America are far greater than ours in Britain, the crisis of race may take more than one generation to overcome. Many young people in Europe as in America no longer have any trust in the society into which they were born and seek to escape from it by permissive morality; by drug-addiction, and by a violence which seems linked with anarchism. In this world of to-day—confused, uncertain, and desperately sick—what is the responsibility of those who dare to call themselves Christians?

Here I come back to the words of Hooker which I quoted earlier in this address. Hooker rightly saw that Church and State are inextricably intertwined, and this remains true when Church and State as organisations are legally separated as they are in the United States. If a man is a Christian he is also a citizen and he cannot opt out of his citizenship.

In the face of so many apparently insoluble problems of society, the individual Christian, and the Church which is the company of all faithful people, are alike tempted to withdraw from the impossible world and take refuge in some ivory tower—Because it seems that society is incapable of being saved; they are tempted to cut themselves off from it and concentrate on a round of religious activities in the hope of saving at least their own souls. To-day there are voices within the Church of England which bid us make an end of all organised religion and join in small groups, unrelated to each other and unconcerned with society as a whole.

This temptation we must, at all costs, resist. It does not fit in with what we know and believe about the God and Father of mankind. When mankind had abused the freedom of will which is the distinguishing mark of humanity, and the world needed

salvation, God's way was to save it from inside. He sent His Son to become a human being, to show how human beings should live—to show that it is only by serving and caring, and—if need be—by dying that men can be reconciled to each other and to God. We have just been thinking about this during Lent and Holy Week, and we have the Easter reassurance of the resurrection as the proof that Christ's way is the right way. The Incarnation was God's way then: It is God's way still, and as St. Paul has told us we, to-day, have been given the ministry of reconciliation; the task of carrying on the work of the Incarnation. The Church—that is all of us who call ourselves by Christ's name—will not be the Body of Christ as it claims to be if it is not itself incarnate in all the agony of the world. We cannot opt out and still be Christians: We cannot make Sunday worship a comfortable retreat from a week-day world which baffles us and confuses us. If we do we shall be denying our Lord. The Church, if it is the Church, must be at the heart of all the problems of contemporary society.

We in England assure our brethren in the Episcopal Church and our other Christian brethren in the U.S.A. of our prayers for you as you care and serve society in difficulties more intense than those we face in Britain. To be involved in this turmoil of society is dangerous. To seek at the same time for longer term solutions of the problem of racism and for short term remedies is dangerous. The Christian has no monopoly of wisdom and the Church throughout its history has made many grievous mistakes. But to do nothing is far more dangerous, for it is to cut oneself off from God and Christ. As to-day we give thanks to God for the example of fortitude and courage of those who built up the Church here over three centuries, may we all pray that we may have the faith to go on reconciling, caring, and serving the world, knowing that if God has called us to this service He will give us the strength of His Holy Spirit to go on—and on— and on.

SOMEBODY TURN OFF THE PUBLIC RELATIONS MACHINE

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the administration's public relations machine in recent weeks has produced a welter of optimistic, if often confusing, interpretations regarding the state of the national economy. Almost every morning, press reports emanating directly or indirectly from the White House have indicated that the economy was simultaneously moving upward, downward, and sideways in the right direction toward a stable economy in 1970. Several weeks ago, the House minority leader emerged from a White House meeting to assure the Nation that the problem of inflation was indeed solved, and that economic stability was in sight.

All this would be welcome news if the public relations machine were programed to the facts of the matter. But clearly it is not. The key economic indicators show that the battle against inflation is far from won, and that economic stability is not on the horizon.

An article in yesterday's Washington Post by its respected business and finance editor, Hobart Rowen, sharply defines the situation we face today. Prices are soaring, wage demands go higher and higher, interest rates are back on the upswing. At the same time, unemployment is rising more rapidly than it has in a decade.

As Rowen sums up:

We are experiencing, simultaneously, higher unemployment and high prices—recession with inflation—and that sort of double economic jeopardy hasn't been suffered since 1957–1958 during the Eisenhower years.

Rowen emphasizes that the administration's policies of monetary and fiscal restraint are not working. He suggests that the refusal of the administration to deal directly with the price-wage spiral may be heading the Nation toward an even worse dose of inflation than we are now experiencing.

Mr. Speaker, nearly 1 year ago, I wrote to the Secretary of the Treasury, David Kennedy, urging that the administration introduce a policy of wage and price guidelines and selective credit controls to beat inflation. I am convinced more than ever today that this is still the only real solution to our problems of inflation.

The administration must turn off its public relations machine and face the realities of the economy. Inflation cannot be talked away. Direct action on prices and wages is required, and now. The administration is not fooling the public. It must act responsibly, and stop fooling itself.

Rowen's article follows:

NIXON POLICY SLOWS DOWN ECONOMY, BUT NOT INFLATION

(By Hobart Rowen)

Presidential press Secretary Ronald Ziegler told reporters the other day that the Council of Economic Advisers was "somewhat encouraged" by a slight decline in the pace of inflation in March.

Baloney.

The fact is that throughout the Administration, the whopping advance in the consumer price index was greeted with shock and dismay. The index rose 0.5 per cent (or 6 per cent at an annual rate), the same jump as in February.

The "slight decline" to which Ziegler alluded represents a so-called seasonal adjustment, which is probably meaningless. Even on that basis, the rise for the month was 0.4 per cent (4.8 per cent annually), or still far beyond the level of increase that anyone in the administration had expected at this stage of the game.

The consumer price index stands more than 6 per cent higher than it did when Mr. Nixon took office—and the peak hasn't yet been reached.

The plain fact of the matter is that after making all possible allowance for time "lags," prices should have yielded more than they have to the Administration's combined fiscal and monetary curbs. And so should have interest rates, which actually are starting up again after receding from peaks.

Although economic growth has been slowed to a crawl—the real Gross National Product rate in the first quarter of this year dropped back to the level of the second quarter, 1969—prices still storm upward. The best that can be said is that the pace in the last few months has been fractionally less hectic.

Meanwhile, the slow-down in GNP growth has resulted in a sharp increase in unemployment. The seasonally adjusted rate in March, 1969, was 3.4 per cent; in March, 1970, it was up a full point to 4.4 per cent, representing a jump in the jobless total of 900,000 persons—from 2.7 million to 3.6 million.

The implication of all of this is painful for Mr. Ziegler and other Administration officials to acknowledge: economic policy has slowed down the economy, but hasn't slowed down inflation. We are experiencing, simultaneously, higher unemployment and high prices—recession with inflation—and that sort of double economic jeopardy hasn't been suffered since 1957–58 during the Eisenhower years.

To Wall Street, it is all very clear: sharply lower first quarter profits, combined with continued inflation and revelation of war involvements in Laos and Cambodia have accelerated the tailspin in the stock market. Moreover, the President's dilution of his originally stated strong fiscal policy has led to fears that the Federal Reserve will not be able to ease tight money to any significant degree.

When the President released his fiscal 1971 Budget proposals February 2, it was evident that the $1.3 billion surplus was too skinny to be a certainty; there were too many debatable assumptions underlying the surplus—and that fact was pointed out here and elsewhere.

At least, though, Mr. Nixon's intention was firm; he wanted a credible surplus. But since then, in part due to questionable decisions, and in part due to circumstances beyond his control, the budget plan has disintegrated. The proposed postal and general federal pay raise; the unfreezing of state and local construction; and the dimming chance of significantly lower interest rates will more than wipe out the surplus—unless the President does the unexpected and takes a big new whack out of Pentagon spending. Moreover, some Washington experts think that the cooled-off economy makes 1971 revenue estimates suspect (the stock market drop does not help at all).

Since Wall Streeters now believe that there will be a deficit in the federal budget next year, instead of the planned surplus, they wouldn't be surprised by a turn-around in Fed policy, aborting the easier money trend.

There were rumors last week that the banks, which just lowered the prime rate, may decide that lending rates must be boosted again to keep pace with market developments. This was part of the reason for the slide in stocks.

Critics of Administration policy have been saying for many months that reliance on fiscal and monetary policy—and nothing else—wouldn't do the job: if the screws were turned tight enough to crack down on inflation and high interest rates, a serious recession and sagging business profits would result. But if the policy were tempered to prevent a disaster on the jobs and profits side of the equation, not much progress would be seen in the cost of goods and money.

The answer, as many observers have seen it, is to supplement a cautious fiscal-monetary policy with other measures to dampen excessive wage hikes, price rises and interest rates. This would require reliance on selective controls, and Congress has given the President authority to apply them.

But Mr. Nixon shrinks from this strategy, although it has been pressed on him by respected Republican politicians as well as Democrats.

Businessmen and the public, faced with the evidence of persistent inflation, appear willing to try some version of controls. Labor officials, of course, are not anxious, but they would have no choice if controls restrained prices and interest rates as well as wages.

Valuable time has already been lost. In view of the widespread concern being heard in many Government departments, one wonders whether it is getting through Mr. Nixon's tight inner White House circle to the President himself.

Basic policy of exclusive reliance on broad monetary and fiscal policy should be reconsidered; for if we have many more consumer price boosts of the kind Mr. Ziegler says is "somewhat encouraging," we'll all be in the soup. That includes Republican congressmen running for re-election.

PROFESSOR TESTIFIES BEFORE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Kenneth P. Davis of the Yale University School of Forestry appeared before the Interior Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on April 17. His testimony centered on management of our forests, with particular emphasis on clearcutting techniques.

I believe Professor Davis' remarks should be a matter of general record, and I am happy to be able to call them to the attention of my colleagues:

STATEMENT BY KENNETH P. DAVIS

My name is Kenneth P. Davis of New Haven, Connecticut. I am here today as President of The Society of American Foresters of over 17,500 members. It is the one professional organization of its kind in the United States and represents all segments of the profession; public and private practitioners, research, and education. My specific authority is the statement "Forest Policies of the Society of American Foresters" adopted by vote of the entire membership. A copy as of 1967 is attached and in it I have marked passages having particular bearing on the subject of these hearings. I should also say that my appearance here was approved by the Council of the Society.

In my private capacity I am the David T. Mason Professor of Forest Land Use, School of Forestry, Yale University. My credentials include:

Eighteen years with the U.S. Forest Service in national forest administration and research. Of this, about 12 years was primarily in forest management research including being Chief, Division of Forest Management Research in the Washington office.

Twenty-five years in university work in forest management teaching and study in three institutions, the universities of Montana, Michigan and now Yale. I have also served as department chairman and Dean.

I am author of the text book *Forest Management: Regulation and Valuation,* now in its second edition and widely used in the U.S. and around the world; several bulletins and many other publications in the forest management area.

I have had long and continued contacts and field study with public and private forestry organizations, including considerable consulting work with both. Currently, I am a consultant to the Public Land Law Review Commission on a study and analysis of multiple use concepts and land use decisions on the public lands.

The matter I wish to present here today centers on methods of managing forests with particular reference to even-aged management and clearcutting methods as applied by the Forest Service. Present concern seems to center on clearcutting as applied on the Monongahela and Bitterroot National Forests of West Virginia and Montana, respectively.

At the outset, I should like to make it clear that I am not here on behalf of the Society of American Foresters or on my own judgment to defend any and all applications of clearcutting by the Forest Service, or by other public or private organizations, all of which apply the method. Like most anything else, clearcutting can be misapplied, and I do not question that there are instances of this, past and present. The same is certainly true of other forest management practices.

I do wish, however, to defend clearcutting as a proper and ofen necessary method of managing forests in many situations, and to support the view that it should not be arbitrarily stopped on the national forests, or elsewhere, because of certain alleged, or in fact, misapplications.

CRITICISM AND ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING CLEARCUTTING

We all recognize that a number of things have been said about clearcutting and other methods that confuse and mis-state real issues. This is particularly true in this present time of active public concern about environmental quality in which forested lands are extremely important. Clearcutting has drawn its share of allegations, and I have been struck by the lack of fact or discrimination in many of the criticisms made. Let me give a few of these allegations to help focus on questions of substance. It has been alleged:

Allegation: That clearcutting violates the Multiple Use Act, including the very important provision for sustained yield. There is no necessary relationship whatever here. Timber is certainly one important forest use and overcutting of the sustained productive capacity of a forest unit *can* be done by any method.

Allegation: That clearcutting is destructive to the soil, causes erosion, upsets normal stream flow, etc. These can result from too extensive use or application on unstable soils, etc. These results could also result from improper road building or logging practices. None of these results are inherent to the clearcutting method.

Allegation: That clearcutting is undesirable from the standpoint of wildlife. There in an old and true saying that "deer follow the axe." Forest regeneration necessitates opening up the tree stand, and the resulting more open conditions stimulate shrub and herbaceous growth, increasing wildlife food supply, most of which has to be close to the ground to be available. In dense and mature forests, coniferous particularly, there is little wildlife food. There is a better balance in actively managed forests, that includes all stand conditions from reproduction to mature trees.

Allegation: That clearcutting is bad aesthetics, unsightly, etc. To some people it does look like forest devastation. But so do nature's frequently crude methods of windstorm, fire, insect epidemics, and others. If areas on which the forest cover has been removed—either by nature or by man—are not too large, or unduly concentrated, and are promptly restocked, the net effect is not objectionable from any reasonably balanced viewpoint. To many people, any tree cutting is bad. But these same people want homes which require wood in large quantities, and also use large quantities of paper in their daily living.

Allegation: That clearcutting should be replaced by "selective cutting," or variation on this theme. This idea has been around for years. The term "selective cutting" is essentially meaningless because it all depends on who "selects" what trees, in what way, and for what purpose. The results can be good or bad. In the past, the term has been often used to cloak very destructive cutting practices of "selecting" only trees that are merchantable and leaving the remaining trees vulnerable to damage from natural forces.

METHODS OF ORGANIZING A FOREST FOR CONTINUED MANAGEMENT

It should be clear that the current issue centers on the choice of forest management, or silvicultural, methods. All are predicated on keeping the forest growing and getting reproduction when needed. There are several centuries of accumulated professional experience, worldwide, on silvicultural methods. The U.S. Forest Service has spent millions of dollars over the years on silvicultural research. Forests in the U.S., as elsewhere, are highly variable so that no one method is generally applicable. Which method is best for a given situation depends on the purposes of management and the characteristics of the tree species in the forest.

To reduce to essentials, forest areas can be organized for continuing productivity using either even-aged or uneven-aged management.

An even-aged stand on an area is one in which most of the trees originated at about the same time and grow up together. Such a stand accordingly has a beginning and an end in time; it originated, is tended, and several intermediate cuts may be made. It is eventually removed, new trees are established, and the process repeats. The time interval between removal cuts is called a forest rotation.

An uneven-aged stand, as its name implies, has no beginning nor end in time. Trees are of different ages and under such management this age mixture is continued. There is no definite rotation.

Even-aged management is by far the method most widely applied both in the U.S. and around the world. Essentially, it follows Nature's most common method. Contrary to much popular belief, natural forest stands, area by area, are much more even-aged than casual inspection would suggest. This is due to local catastrophes of fire, storm, insects, and disesaes. This is particularly true of most coniferous (softwood) forest types in the U.S. It is also true in more hardwood (or deciduous forest types) than is generally recognized. A large forest area usually includes trees of all ages but by forest treatment units—that is stand by stand, area by area—even-aged conditions commonly prevail.

Even-aged management is also, in most situations, much more efficient and economical to apply than maintenance of uneven-aged conditions, stand by stand. In fact, application of a true selection system that maintains uneven-aged conditions by individual areas is relatively rare in the U.S., as is true elsewhere.

The above is the basic argument for application of even-aged management. It is natural, efficient, economic, and in general produces forests most useful to man and not only for timber production. I am not speaking here of wilderness or natural areas where as nearly as possible natural conditions prevail whether even- or uneven-aged stands.

Considering even-aged management specifically, there are three commonly recognized methods, each with variations. They are:

1. *Shelterwood Method.* Here, as a stand approaches some desired level of maturity, one or more fairly heavy cuttings are made to open up the stand and bring in new trees, normally by natural seeding. When these new trees are adequately established, the remaining parent stand is removed. It is a very natural method, usually effective for getting tree reproduction but often not of desired species. It is also expensive to apply.

2. *Seed Tree Method.* With this method only enough trees of desired species are left to reseed the area. When this is accomplished, these seed trees are removed. The method has been applied to some extent in the past but little in recent years. The major reasons are frequent ineffectiveness in establishing a new stand of desired species, mortality loss of seed trees, and frequent difficulty of economically removing them.

3. *Clearcutting, followed by planting or direct seeding.* By this method the existing tree stand is cut, normally at maturity. Following such cutting, the area may naturally regenerate, as is usually true of hardwoods, or the ground must be sufficiently clear to permit planting or direct seeding. Clearcutting is usually necessary to regenerate desired conifer species. Properly applied, the method is prompt, effective, productive, and economical when all costs and returns of alternate methods are considered. The method permits and is, in fact, the only general means of using genetically improved tree planting stock. It should also be recognized that clearcutting in many, but not all, forest situations is applied primarily as a timber production measure. Other slower and less efficient methods could be, and are employed, if maintaining a forest cover for recreation and watershed purposes is the prime objective.

APPRAISAL OF CLEARCUTTING METHOD

As stated, clearcutting is effective, economical, and widely applied by both public and private agencies in the U.S. and elsewhere.

It is not possible here to explore the many forest situations where clearcutting is the most practicable method and others where other alternatives could and should be considered. The forests of the U.S. are exceedingly diverse as are purposes of management. Generalizations are not safe other than to recognize that clearcutting is an effective and necessary method to use where needed.

Regarding the Forest Service, it is not denied that the method may have been overapplied or mis-applied on occasion. In this connection, I can well remember around thirty years ago when some form of selective cutting, wherever possible, was general Forest Service policy. There were reasons behind this position at the time. Clearcutting, accompanied by prompt regeneration, was not generally established as a tool of continuing forest management. There were many examples of undesirable clearcuttings essentially on private lands.

On national forest lands, planting or seeding was done primarily on areas that had not become adequately restocked following fire or cutting. On the national forests of the eastern U.S., which were mostly acquired from private ownership, there were very large areas in this category. There were also large areas of burned-over lands in the West. Natural reseeding was more generally employed than planting following cutting on national forest lands.

The Society of American Foresters has not made any systematic and professional investigation of present clearcutting practice so I cannot speak quantitatively on this point. It is proper to point out, however, that it is the regeneration method that most readily can be systematized and applied according to a defined procedure. In this respect, it can become a habit, a convenience, that tempts application without adequate discrimination. To the extent this may be so, there is no adequate professional defense. It should also be said that, to the degree clearcutting may be overemphasized as a response to national timber needs, question can be raised as to a desirable balance of forest uses and management methods under the concept of multiple use on public lands. This is a matter of fact and considered judgment to determine.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Society of American Foresters recommends that no moratorium on clearcutting be placed on specific national forests, or on the national forests generally. To do so would place an unwarranted and disruptive restriction on using a proper and in many situations a necessary method. It would also constitute a backward step professionally. The duration of any such moratorium, and the conditions for its lifting, would be difficult to define. With public opinion tending to be critical of cutting of any kind, it would be difficult to reestablish the method following a moratorium. Further, such action could well set a precedent extending to other public lands and to private owners.

2. The Forest Service should be directed promptly to initiate continuing study of silvicultural cutting methods, including clearcutting, and report to the Congress as may be required. Forest study teams are now at work in West Virginia and Montana. What is done is done, and further significant clearcutting, justifying valid criticism would seem very unlikely.

SMALL AIRLINES DO A BIG JOB

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, staff writer Eugene L. Meyer had a story in last Thursday's Washington Post concerning 11 small airlines that are providing a valuable service to people in nearby States whose business brings them to Washington frequently. As a member of the Small Business Committee and as a supporter of small business initiative, I find the story of these small airlines most encouraging, as well as interesting. I hope that similar services will soon be forthcoming in other parts of the country also. The story follows:

ELEVEN SMALL AIRLINES PART OF REVOLUTION IN U.S. AIR TRAVEL

(By Eugene L. Meyer)

They fly small twin-engine craft but they are a part of the air travel revolution nonetheless. They come from places like Hagerstown, Md., Monmouth County, N.J., Reading, Pa., Binghampton, N.Y., and Lynchburg, Va.—from Middle America to Megalopolis.

They are the operators of 11 small airlines, with more than 100 pilots and about 40 planes, that provide direct service between small-to-medium-sized cities and the nation's capital.

Despite their proliferation—there was only one in 1959—and their predominant use now of turbo-prop jets rather than piston planes, there remains an aura of adventure about them.

They seem part of an earlier era of aviation, a time of seat-on-one's-pants flying and treacherous mountain flights to deliver the mail.

Their pilots, mostly retired military men, regard their craft as anything but bush planes, however. "It's a pretty classy operation," said Capt. David Werrett, of Ransome Airlines, resting between flights at National Airport, "We have very good equipment."

And the passengers are mostly businessmen, whose attache cases mark them as part of the daily commuting-by-air age.

Like Herbert Thornton, Spring Lake, N.J., they are attracted to the small lines by convenience. "They're close to home and there's no waiting," Thornton said, as he arrived on a Monmouth Airlines flight.

"It's a little adventurous," he admitted. "Sometimes you wonder if they can take the strain the big airplanes can. You wonder if the wings will hold up in a bumpy ride."

The planes carry from five to 19 passengers. There are three Otters and one Eyelander, both STOL (short takeoff and land) craft, as well as more traditional planes.

Most have flights to places other than Washington. Monmouth and Airspur Airlines, for example, also fly to JFK International Airport in New York.

The airlines range in size from Suburban, with seven planes and 25 pilots, flying here from Red Bank and Trenton, N.J., and Reading, Pa., down to Travelair, with a single plane and four pilots coming from Elkins and Charleston, W. Va., by way of Baltimore.

The boom here started 11 years ago, when East Coast Airlines began making runs from Maryland's Eastern Shore with two five-passenger planes.

Three years ago, a handful of lines banded together into the Commuter Airlines Group. Its present eight members share a ground crew of 11 that sells tickets, checks baggage, and loads and unloads planes.

(The nonmembers, Commuter [not the group], Monmouth and Altair, must fend for themselves, with pilots doing everything. The Commuter pilots even sell tickets.)

When the group was formed, it carried 2,600 passengers monthly. Now it hauls an estimated 6,000, according to station manager Randolph H. Smith.

The planes range from 20 per cent full on Altair, the youngest, to 60 per cent on Commuter, Smith said. More than 50 per cent is needed to break even, he said.

Not all of the lines thrive. Two months ago, two lines flying from Virginia and central Pennsylvania went out of business.

The commuter airline planes formerly parked at Page Airways Terminal, for general aviation, and had only a small hallway counter. However, in February they took over the old Military Air Transport area, vacated last June.

The Commuter Airlines Group spent $10,000 to spruce up the spacious terminal, installing multicolored plastic seats and a wall-length ticket counter. The nonmembers also use the facility.

The pilots earn between $5,200 and $12,000 per year, slim pickings next to the major airline's pay scales of up to $60,000 for captains.

Age precludes most of these pilots from moving up to the big airlines, which want 30 years service out of pilots before they retire at age 60.

Between military pensions and salary, most of the pilots manage. Albert W. Noel, a retired Army colonel flying for Cardinal, draws more than $19,000 annually between the two.

Commuter airlines personnel enjoy comparing their operations favorably with those of their bigger brothers. Says Smith, "Requirements for safety, insurance and standards are at least as high as the regular airlines. That's to get these 'fly-by-nighters' out of the sky."

Acting out of concern with the safety record of commuter airlines and privately chartered air taxis, the Federal Aviation Administration instituted higher pilot standards April 1 requiring bi-annual testing. Of the 11 small airlines, Smith said, only one, Commuter Airlines, Inc., has had a fatal accident. On March 22, three persons were killed and eight injured when a twin-engine plane crashed on take-off from Binghamton, N.Y.

Says pilot Werrett, "It's as professional an operation as the larger airlines, except we use smaller planes. We have found a niche. We can operate small planes profitably, which the big airlines can't.

"I like the convenience," adds Werrett, who lives in Doylestown, Pa., close to Ransome's home base, North Philadelphia Airport. "We get home every night and don't work on weekends."

SPACE SPINOFFS

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1970

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the action being taken by the

gentleman from Florida (Mr. FREY) to bring before this House and the people the benefits being derived from our national space effort.

I join with LOU FREY in bringing this matter home to the general public.

Rather than specifics, I would like to talk to the matter of space benefits to society in general.

These benefits represent a broader view of space returns and must necessarily deal with qualitatives and intangibles; for example, the real value of the human lives saved because a meteorological satellite spotted Hurricane Naomi last fall in time to permit advance warning and evacuation of the danger zone cannot be measured.

The improvement in safety and comfort for transatlantic airline passengers, due to the current satellite meteorology photographs of the plane's route now available to all pilots, is real but intangible.

The recent deployment of flood emergency teams in California was successfully planned from weather satellite pictures; Navy ice reconnaissance patrols have been reduced by 50 percent because of satellite coverage.

The returns from scientific research in space are unique in that they cannot be achieved on the ground: direct exploration of the planets, atmosphere-free astronomy, space environmental measurements—all require space systems, and all have been successfully initiated. The data flowing back from these space experiments, however, are very much part of the earth-based scene. The space program provides opportunity and capability for research; it is the subsequent impact of scientific understanding upon society that is the real return.

We have a better educated generation in school now than we could have had 10 years ago, before the Van Allen belts were known, the Moon and Mars photographed, the magnetic-field interactions of Sun and Earth observed. We have a better qualified academic community today than ever before; they have taken advantage of the space age to explore and understand new phenomena, which then feeds back through their classrooms and publications to the general expansion of human knowledge.

The exciting engineering sciences taught today are those of the aerospace and nuclear age, fostered and in some cases even invented by the requirements of the NASA program.

An educated nation in a technological world society is a requirement for progress; research and technology make it possible.

GALLANT AMERICAN PFC. DEWAYNE T. WILLIAMS

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, April 20, Mr. and Mrs. Howard C. Williams, of St. Clair Township, from Michigan's Eighth Congressional District, came to our Nation's Capital. It was, I am sure both a very proud but yet a sad moment as they appeared at the White House to accept the Medal of Honor, posthumously for their son, U.S. Marine Pfc. Dewayne T. Williams.

Vice President SPIRO T. AGNEW made the presentation. It was not possible for me to be present as I had accompanied Secretary of the Treasury David M. Kennedy as a member of the U.S. delegation to the Inter-American Development Bank's annual meeting in Uruguay. I want to take this opportunity, therefore, to add this further recognition to a young man whose bravery and dedication to his buddies and to his country truly defy description.

It would be my sincere hope that all Americans, as I have already done so, would benefit just from learning of the bravery displayed by Dewayne Williams as he gave his life by falling onto a hand grenade to save the lives of fellow Marines. This 19-year-old man has, as well described by a following editorial, left a "heritage of honor" for all.

To his parents I add my condolences and my gratitude. A fine young American has left his mark that few can equal—none can surpass.

I submit for inclusion at this point several newspaper articles on the award:

[From the Times Herald, Apr. 22, 1970]

SHARING IN A PROUD HERITAGE

We were not personally acquainted with U.S. Marine Pfc. Dewayne T. Williams, of St. Clair. And we would guess that some of those who did know him, including many of his recent schoolmates in St. Clair and Capac, didn't realize the caliber of man within him.

The whole community knows him now, however, and recognizes the service he has rendered. The Congressional Medal of Honor, awarded posthumously to his family this week in Washington, reflects honor to the whole area which he called home.

Private Williams had not really seen much of life. It was on his nineteenth birthday, Sept. 18, 1968, that—already severely wounded—he used his own body to shield his patrolmates from a grenade. Yet we submit that what he had been and learned in 19 years, in his home life, in his school associations and in his community, was enough to lift him to heights of compassion and valor.

The practice of flinging oneself onto a hand grenade to save the lives of fellow Marines is a tradition in the corps. During World War II, 26 Marines were awarded the Medal of Honor for that reason. And 13 Marines in Korea earned the medal in the same manner. Figures are not yet available for those so honored in Vietnam, but obviously the dedication that prompts such total sacrifice is still there.

Some people, including some in high office, insist on calling this an immoral war. The American statement of purpose in Vietnam is called delusion or fraud, depending on the credulity of the critics. But against them stands a growing list of American sacrifices as witness to the intentions we have in that country, and to the service that our young men do in furthering those honorable intentions.

Private Williams' name will remain high on that list.

The Times Herald joins with the community in extending a combined sentiment to his family—condolences for the loss of so fine a son and brother, and congratulations and gratitude for the heritage of honor he leaves.

[From the Times Herald, Apr. 20, 1970]

ST. CLAIR MARINE GIVEN NATION'S HIGHEST AWARD

ST. CLAIR.—Marine Private First Class Dewayne T. Williams was awarded posthumously the Medal of Honor today in ceremonies at the White House.

His parents, Mr. and Mrs. Howard C. Williams, 6485 Rattle Run Road, accepted the nation's highest award from Vice President Spiro T. Agnew in ceremonies in Washington today.

Private Williams, who attended St. Clair and Capac High Schools, was killed in action Sept. 18, 1968, his nineteenth birthday, while serving in Quang Nam Province, Vietnam with "H" company, Second Battalion, First Marine Regiment, First Marine Division.

He enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps in December, 1967 and was assigned duty in Vietnam in June, 1968.

William's citation read: "Although severely wounded in the back by close intense fire, Private First Class Williams, recognizing the danger to the patrol, immediately began to crawl forward toward a good firing position. While he was moving under the continuing intense fire, he heard one of the members of the patrol sound the alert that an enemy gernade had landed in their position.

"Reacting instantly to the alert, he saw that the grenade had landed close to where he was lying and without hesitation, he rolled on top of the grenade as it exploded. . . . He saved the other members of his patrol from serious injury and possible loss of life."

Private Williams also possesses the Purple Heart, the National Defense Service Medal, the Vietnam Service Medal with two bronze stars, and the Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal.

In addition to his parents, he is survived by five sisters, Mrs. Penny Ann Meinhardt, Emmett, Misses Joyce Marie, Beth, Mary, and Lorainne Mary Williams, all of St. Clair, and a brother, Howard, St. Clair.

[From the St. Clair County Independent, Apr. 23, 1970]

POSTHUMOUSLY AWARD D. WILLIAMS MEDAL OF HONOR FOR GALLANT ACT

ST. CLAIR TOWNSHIP.—Marine Private First Class Dewayne T. Williams was presented the nation's highest award, The Medal of Honor, posthumously Monday, April 20, in ceremonies at the White House.

Accepting the award from Vice President Spiro Agnew were his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Howard C. Williams, 6485 Rattle Run Road.

The Marine was killed in action on his 19th birthday, Sept. 18, 1968.

His citation reads as follows:

"For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty while serving as a rifleman with the First Platoon, Company H, Second Battalion, First Marines, First Marine Division in action against communist insurgent forces in the Quang Nam Province, Republic of Vietnam.

"Private First Class Williams was a member of a combat patrol sent out from the platoon with the mission of establishing positions in the company's area of operations, from which it could intercept and destroy enemy sniper teams operating in the area.

"On the night of 18 September 1968, as the patrol was preparing to move from its daylight position to a preselected night position, it was attacked from ambush by a squad of enemy using small arms and hand grenades.

"Although severely wounded in the back by the close intense fire, Private First Class Williams, recognizing the danger to the patrol, immediately began to crawl forward toward a good firing position.

"While he was moving under the continuing intense fire, he heard one of the members of the patrol sound the alert that an enemy grenade had landed in their position.

"Reacting instantly to the alert, he saw that the grenade had landed close to where he was lying and without hesitation, in a valiant act of heroism, he rolled on top of the grenade as it exploded, absorbing the full and tremendous impact of the explosion with his own body.

"Through his extraordinary initiative and inspiring valor in the face of certain death, he saved the other members of his patrol from serious injury and possible loss of life, and enabled them to successfully defeat the attackers and hold their position until assistance arrived.

"His personal heroism and devotion to duty upheld the highest traditions of the Marine Corps and the United States Naval Service.

"He gallantly gave his life for his country."

The Medal of Honor is the highest award for bravery that can be given to any individual in the United States.

It was the first military decoration formally authorized by the American government as a badge of valor and was originally for enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps. It was authorized by Congress and approved by President Abraham Lincoln Dec. 21, 1861. The medal for the Army and Voluntary Forces was authorized July 12, 1862.

The medal is awarded "in the name of the Congress of the United States" and for this reason is often called the Congressional Medal of Honor. It is only on rare occasions, however, that Congress awards special Medals of Honor.

The Navy Medal of Honor is made of bronze, suspended by an anchor from a bright blue ribbon, and is worn about the neck. The ribbon is spangled with a cluster of 13 white stars representing the original states. Each ray of the five-pointed star contains sprays of laurel and oak and is tipped with a trefoil.

Standing in bas-relief, circled by 34 stars representing the 34 states in 1861, is Minerva, who personifies the Union. She holds in her left hand the fasces, an ax bound in staves of wood, which is the ancient Roman symbol of authority. With the shield in her right hand, she repulses the serpents held by the crouching figure of Discord.

The reverse of the medal is left blank, allowing for the engraving of the recipient's name and the date and place of his deed.

Dewayne T. Williams was born Sept. 18, 1949, in Brown City. He attended Bell Elementary School, St. Clair, 1954–1956; St. Clair elementary, intermediate, and high schools, 1956–1966; and Capac High School, 1966–1967.

Dec. 18, 1967, he enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve and was discharged to enlist in the Regular Marine Corps. Jan. 2, 1968.

He completed recruit training with the 3d Recruit Training Battalion, Recruit Training Regiment, Marine Corps Recruit Dept., San Deigo, Calif., in March, 1968; Individual Combat Training with Company "Y", 3d Battalion, 2d Infantry Training Regiment, Camp Pendleton, in April; and Weapons Training, Weapons Company, Basic Infantry Training Battalion, 2d Infantry Training Regiment, at Camp Pendleton in May, 1968.

He was promoted to Private First Class June 1, 1968. Upon his arrival in the Republic of Vietnam later that month, he was assigned duty as Automatic Rifleman with Company "I", 3d Battalion, 27th Marines, 1st Marine Division (Rein), FMF, and served in this capacity until August, 1968. He was then assigned duty as an Anti-Tank Assault Man.

A complete list of his medals and decorations includes the Purple Heart, the National Defense Service Medal, the Vietnam Service Medal with two bronze stars, and the Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal.

Prior to entering the Marine Corps Jan. 3, 1968, in Detroit he worked as a press operator in the forging department of Mueller Brass Co., Port Huron, and held a part-time position with Barbe's Gas Station, Marysville.

Besides his parents, Williams is survived by his sister, Mrs. Penny Meinhardt, 18, Emmett, Joyce, 16, Dianne, 13, Janice, 11, and Loraine, 10, and a brother, Howard, 14, who live at home with his parents.

Their father is employed by the Mueller Brass Co.

The family returned from the presentation ceremonies Tuesday.

[From the Detroit News, Apr. 21, 1970]

YEARNING TO FARM, HE DIED A HERO

(By David Jackson)

Dewayne T. Williams bought a small farm shortly before he enlisted in the Marine Corps but he never got the chance to till the soil.

The life of the 19-year-old St. Clair marine was cut short in Vietnam after he purposely fell on an enemy grenade to protect his buddies.

For his act of heroism, Pfc. Williams has been presented the nation's highest award for bravery—the Medal of Honor.

Although his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Howard C. Williams, of St. Clair, beamed with pride yesterday when they returned from accepting the award in Washington, their eyes revealed the tragedy of losing a son.

His parents described Dewayne as a quiet, reserved boy who believed in working hard.

"He always worked two jobs and had just bought a 13-acre farm in Emmett before going into the service," his father recalled.

"He planned on getting married and farming the land when he got out."

"Dewayne was always a good boy," his mother added. "He was always putting someone else before himself. He was just that type of boy."

The Williamses, with their six children and a son-in-law, accepted the medal from Vice President Spiro T. Agnew Monday in White House ceremonies.

A big, strapping boy who loved the outdoors, Dewayne was killed Sept. 18, 1968, on his 19th birthday while serving in Quang Nam province with the 1st Marine Division.

The White House ceremonies, which included posthumous awards to 12 other marines, brought to 39 the number of marines awarded the nation's highest military decoration for valor in Vietnam.

Williams is a shear operator at Mueller Brass Co., Port Huron, where his son worked before enlistment as a press operator. Dewayne also held a part-time job as a gas station attendant.

Before entering the Marine Corps on Jan. 3, 1968, Dewayne attended St. Clair and Capac high schools.

His citation reads in part:

"Although severely wounded in the back by the close intense fire, Pfc. Williams, recognizing the danger to the patrol, immediately began to crawl forward toward a good firing position.

"While he was moving under the continuing intense fire, he heard one of the members of the patrol sound the alert that an enemy grenade had landed close to where he was lying and, without hesitation, in a valiant act of heroism, he rolled on top of the grenade as it exploded, absorbing the full and tremendous impact of the explosion with his own body."

CUSTOMS' CRACKDOWN ON DRUGS

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the Government is deeply concerned over the unprecedented influx of illicit narcotics and dangerous drugs into the United States. As you may know, the Bureau of Customs of the Department of the Treasury has received a mandate from this administration to exert every effort to halt the smuggling of narcotics.

Last December Congress passed a supplemental appropriation of $8.75 million which gave Customs authority to undertake a major campaign against narcotics smuggling. The appropriation permitted Customs to hire an additional 307 inspectors and 378 investigators, and to add more aircraft and other surveillance equipment.

An article which appeared in the March 15, 1970, edition of the New York Times clearly presents the problems of the Bureau of Customs as it seeks to expedite the inspection of returning travelers while trying to halt the entry of contraband drugs and narcotics.

Recognizing that every American should be concerned about the flow of narcotics into this country, I am inserting into the RECORD this article for everyone to read:

CUSTOM'S CRACKDOWN ON DRUGS MAY FRAY U.S. WELCOME MAT

(By Paul J. C. Friedlander)

WASHINGTON.—Coming back into the United States during the coming spring-summer peak travel season is not going to be as easy, as informal and as quick as it had become in the last couple of years. The people to be blamed for this forthcoming change are not the United States Customs inspectors, who will, of course, take much of the off-the-cuff abuse from weary travelers delayed at piers and airports; rather, they are the international suppliers of narcotics and the domestic peddlers of dope. Last year, inspectors made 3,425 separate seizures of incoming drugs, collecting 54,818 pounds of heroin, opium, hashish, marijuana, cocaine and other narcotics.

Precisely what changes are to be made in tightening up the customs inspection procedures in order to shut off the flow of narcotics into this country have not yet been decided, but 378 new inspectors are now being added, along with 307 investigators. In an interview in his office here, Myles J. Ambrose, who was appointed Commissioner of Customs last August, declined tactfully to predict the changes that will be undertaken and exactly how they will affect the tourist. All the procedures are still under study, he said.

CHANGES ON THE WAY

But there will be changes soon, and incoming pleasure travelers, law-abiding tourists and dope peddlers all will find themselves being studied more carefully, and their baggage poked and prodded more intensively in the months ahead. In the tightening up, the one-stop, accelerated customs inspection program, which has been working with some success at Kennedy International Airport, and at Washington's Dulles Airport, Boston, San Antonio, Seattle and Miami, may be subjected to change on very short notice.

Under the one-stop system, all passengers present their passports, health certificates and customs declarations to the first inspector they all meet; he could be a customs man, an Agriculture Department agent or a Public Health Service man. He may or may not poke into the passenger's hand baggage and, if he thinks he has an honest man and an honest declaration, he has the authority to clear him immediately without further inspection of the remaining baggage. If not, he directs the passenger to a thorough secondary examination of all his luggage by a customs inspector.

This system, when it worked properly, did speed passengers through the compulsory triple inspection—health, immigration and customs—and, when Kennedy Airport was peaking at 20,000 passengers a day on busy weekends last summer, it helped to ease the congestion at the Arrivals Building. The casual, rotating assignment of agents of the three Federal departments to the preliminary inspection booths led to some interdepartmental rivalry, with the customs union claiming that immigration and health inspectors were doing customs work, and vice versa.

The Customs Inspectors Association has officially proposed to the Customs Bureau that tighter enforcement can be achieved by stationing customs men like roving linebackers behind the preliminary posts of the one-stop set-up. If an inspector saw someone coming through who aroused his suspicion, the association argues, he could flag him down for a thorough secondary inspection.

PLUGGING THE FLOW

The customs men claim that their experience, plus their long-developed extrasensory perception in spotting smugglers, will plug the flow of narcotics.

Pre-clearance stations, where United States Customs men stationed in foreign cities perform customs inspections before passengers board their airplanes, are also being restudied. Pre-clearance posts in Montreal, Toronto, Vancouver, Bermuda, the Bahamas and St. Thomas, V.I., are under scrutiny because of the cost of maintaining inspectors in foreign posts (a $10,000-a-year inspector costs, in addition, about $20,000 for home and maintenance at foreign posts) and because some such inspections are reportedly quite perfunctory. This convenience to the traveler might possibly be eliminated under the tighter enforcement program.

All this talk of stricter enforcement, more complete baggage inspection and tightening up of entry formalities is a complete reversal of the long-range trend toward opening up frontiers and simplifying border crossings. American customs procedures have become much more civilized in the last half-dozen years than they were formerly. The official attitude toward returning citizens and incoming foreign tourists had changed, under pressure from irate tourists, the travel industry and the press, to one of smiling welcome and, sometimes, an apologetic diffidence in baggage examinations.

But this country still had not yet achieved the high standards of Sweden, Britain and more recently France in adopting the honor system for baggage inspection. Stockholm and London have had two well-signed lanes marked off in their customs enclosures. One is labeled "Nothing to Declare," and the other lane is reserved for passengers with "Something to Declare."

Reports from Europe indicate that the current growth of narcotics smuggling, which formerly was not a serious problem in Scandinavia, Britain and even in France because narcotics were so little used in those countries, has led to a re-evaluation of their free-entry procedures. The United States was formerly the major target country for smugglers, and, while it still holds that unenviable position, Western Europe is finding that it, too, has a smuggling problem.

The current attempt to shut off the flow of narcotics into the United States, which has to be done at the ports of entry, since hard drugs do not grow nor are they usually manufactured here, is based on White House directives.

Commissioner Ambrose noted that the Nixon Administration has given the Customs Bureau attack on dope smuggling a first order of priority. He described the Customs Bureau approach as simply this: "Our plan is to interdict the flow of narcotics at every port of entry."

The law-abiding traveler is bound to be inconvenienced by this attack on smugglers; he will inevitably find customs inspection taking longer than it used to and longer than he would like. Ambrose invites the tourists' sympathetic understanding and cooperation because of the seriousness of the nation's drug problem.

Only a decade ago, dope smuggling was a neatly organized, highly professional big business operated by international rings that relied on professional couriers, and also heavily upon seamen, to smuggle dope into the United States.

In those days, most of the big interceptions made by customs inspectors and the bureau's special criminal agents were made on tips from overseas informers. A highly placed customs official told this reporter some years back that he believed that fully 90 per cent of all dope interceptions then were being made on tips. The Customs Bureau pays informers handsomely, depending upon the size and value of the catch.

SMOOTH-SHAVEN SMUGGLERS

In the past few years, amateurs and young college students and graduates—not hippies, but the smooth-shaven clean-cut-looking ones—have gone into the smuggling business. Today, more and more of the interceptions of dope are being made on suspicions aroused in the minds of experienced inspectors, by the discovery of double-bottomed suitcases, which can be found only by poking into the baggage itself, and by inquiry into bulging clothes and into over-stuffed brassieres and girdles.

A strange noncatch at Kennedy Airport a few days ago was the case of a tweedy, professorial-looking young man who brought home 100 opium pipes. Close inspection proved that they were new and had never been smoked, and the inspector had to let them into the country. If they had been used and had contained opium residue, they could have been barred.

Ambrose warns young tourists that attempting to carry hashish from North Africa into Spain en route to market in the United States is not a smart thing to try. At present, about 30 young Americans who might have been classified as tourists when they disembarked from ferryboats and planes in Spain are languishing in Spanish prisons under convictions of smuggling dope into that country.

Spanish law, Ambrose explained, provides that anyone possessing one-half pound or more of hashish is ipso facto held to be a dealer in narcotics. The mandatory minimum sentence for this offense is six years and one day in a Spanish jail. None of them are described as rest cures or even comfortable havens of rehabilitation. State Department officials are reportedly suffering from pressure from parents to help spring these young American citizens, most of whom are said to be between 20 and 30 years old.

BUREAU'S NEW RECRUITS

The Customs Bureau is now enlisting another type of young American citizen to build up its staff of customs inspectors and criminal investigators in its fight on narcotics. An $8.75-million supplemental appropriation made available in January—this is above the bureau's $123-million budget for fiscal 1969—will permit the hiring of 378 new inspectors and 307 criminal investigators whose prime pursuit will be dope smugglers.

These recruits will be scattered around the 290 official ports of entry on the periphery of this country. While more inspectors added to the nearly 3,000 inspectors already on duty would normally mean less delay while awaiting inspection, their concentration on smuggling can be expected to result in more intensive, hence slower, inspections.

Recruits fresh out of college start at a minimum of $6,176 a year, but the bright boys—those ranking in the top third of their graduation class—start at $7,639. A journeyman inspector's top pay is $15,000, and a supervisor can rise financially to a peak of $28,000. The Customs Bureau trains its inspectors at a special school on the Hofstra College campus in Hempstead, L. I. Its criminal investigators learn their shooting and pursuit of criminals at other locations.

The Customs Bureau's new commissioner is a man versed in law enforcement. Ambrose, the youngest commissioner (43 years old when he was appointed) to head the bureau, was assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury for Law Enforcement from 1957 to 1960, and from 1960 to 1963 he was executive director of the Waterfront Commission of New York Harbor. He has been active in the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL) and in international narcotics enforcement organizations.

Shortly after Ambrose took office, traffic between Mexico and the United States came almost to a standstill for several days. This was during Operation Intercept (later renamed Operation Cooperation to show that both countries were working jointly for the common good) last autumn, when almost every vehicle and traveler coming out of Mexico was searched for marijuana. This jammed the Texas and California border stations, and Kennedy Airport as well, because full inspection was conducted of every arrival from Mexico.

Such dramatic interceptions of the flow of tourists are not likely to be repeated, since the political and diplomatic points already have been made. But the 1970 tourist should prepare himself to be resigned to small, undramatic delays and searches in the months ahead.

THE POPULARITY OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I include the following remarks which I made at the kick-off program for Indiana University's Earth Day observance:

THE POPULARITY OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE

With astounding alacrity, we have all become environmentalists.

In recent months, it has become almost impossible to look at a newspaper, a magazine or watch television or even talk to a stranger without encountering the subject of the natural environment.

Leading newspapers like the New York Times, the Christian Science Monitor, the Washington Post have run series after series on auto pollution, solid waste disposal, environment litigation, Lake Erie.

Television commercials—one of the more impressive art forms of the 1970s—seek to persuade us that great oil companies have long been leading the fight for a clean environment.

Steel, chemical and smelting companies are issuing glossy four-color brochures with

accounts of what they are doing to control pollution.

Almost daily, industries are establishing environmental control departments as if to seek expiation for their sins and convince us all that like the white knight of old, full and fair upon his charger, they will lead us into battle—against the forces of dirt, waste, debris and evil.

New organizations have sprung up like the flowers of spring. In recent months, my office has received, almost daily, notice that a new group has been established.

Even the President—who knows a political trend when he sees one—has become an environmentalist.

And every politician—and I'm afraid your speaker is no exception—has tried to persuade his constituents that he has seen this problem coming for many years and has been leading the fight almost single-handedly in Washington to clean up the environment.

The environment is a politician's delight.

In these days of exploding birth rates, and groups like ZPG, even motherhood—the time honored "safe" issue for the politician—is suspect. But—not the environment. Everyone is for clean air, clear water and tall forests.

Members of the Congress, who probably could not define ecology a year ago, are dropping into the legislative hopper bills as thick as text books, proposing solutions to our environmental problems.

The Gallup public opinion poll tells us that 73 percent of our population is willing to pay additional taxes in order to improve their natural environment.

And from the 9th Congressional District in Southeastern Indiana not usually identified as among the liberal districts in the nation—a postal patron questionnaire shows 80 percent of the people wanting to spend more federal dollars on pollution control.

And tomorrow on Earth Day all of this interest reaches a pinnacle, as 2,000 colleges and universities and 7,000 high schools participate.

Anything that can move without sound and smoke will parade down 5th Avenue.

Margaret Mead will talk about mismanaging the planet.

Folk singers will decry dirty rivers.

Professors will tell us about the perils of phosphate and pesticides.

Lawyers will tell us how to sue polluters.

The robot will breathe in cigarette smoke and dirty city air as people watch his glass lungs turn black.

Students will conduct a mock trial in Washington convicting a car of polluting the air.

Blacks from St. Louis will dramatize their problems of rats in the ghetto, poisonous lead paint on the walls, treeless streets.

High school students will collect contributions to finance law suits against polluters.

Commuters coming off the train in the big cities will be handed leaflets about the need to contain the population explosion.

Posses will be organized to pick up cans, bottles, and trash along the Potomac.

And amidst all the enthusiasm for the quality of the environment, allow me to interject a note of caution—even skepticism—about this rising tide of concern and protest.

Obviously, the alarm needs to be sounded.

But the alarm, by itself, doesn't put out the fire.

We must be sure that as we embrace the cause with passion and fervor that the cause does not die from the embrace.

MAGNITUDE AND NATURE OF THE TASK

In spite of all the protests, meetings, commissions, speeches, legislation, organizations, in spite even of the enormous political popularity of the issue, I am not fully persuaded that we have begun to grasp the dimensions of the environmental task.

As politicians talk, existing laws are unenforced and underfinanced.

As the oil companies run slick and expensive television commercials, they fail to put $1000 storm chokes in ocean rigs, in defiance of existing Federal regulations, polluting vast areas of the sea.

As cities cry for monstrous sums of money from Washington, they push high rise apartments even higher, allow more shopping centers to be built, pave highways, and intrude in innumerable ways on the environment.

As students bury a new car to show their passionate commitment to a clean environment, they invade the beaches of Florida at Easter leaving behind an incredible quantity of beer cans, paper and debris.

Barry Commoner says:

"We have been living with a vast and potentially fatal illusion: That we can enjoy the enormous benefits of modern technology without risk to the integrity of human life and the environment."

COST

I am not sure we have begun to grasp the cost of cleaning up America. Vast Federal expenditures will be necessary—probably 20 to 25 billion dollars a year over present expenditures. Today we are spending just over $1 billion dollars on anti-pollution measures.

This nation must make the same kind of commitment to environment preservation that we make to building a massive war machine.

The federal experts on cleaning up the nation's waters, tell us that an approach that is satisfactory will take many years and many billions of dollars.

The cost of cleaning up Lake Michigan alone has been expertly estimated as high as $10 billion. The ultimate cost of cleaning up the nation's waterways is out of sight—somewhere beyond a hundred billion dollars.

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development in Paris recently said that it would take about 4 percent of GNP for the industrialized nations to hold the line against pollution. That's $40 billion dollars annually in the U.S. and many times that will be needed to clean up the damage from the past.

Although 85 percent of the people in a Gallup poll were concerned about the condition of the environment, 62 percent said they would not accept a monthly increase of $1 on their electric bill.

Our words about ecology are urgent but our desire to spend the money to clean it up is not.

COMPLEXITY

I am not persuaded that we have begun to see the complexity of the tasks of cleaning up the environment.

A. Some of us don't see the interrelatedness of the environment—that any action that alters one aspect of the environment may have a potentially disastrous impact on man's health.

That pesticides, for example, help plants grow, plants absorb DDT, plants are eaten by animals, which in turn are eaten by other animals.

B. Some of us think there can be quick and easy solutions to the problems of the environmental crisis. A creek can be cleared of junk and beer cans, but it is no easy task to return a river to an unpolluted state when the pollution is fertilizer draining from the surrounding farms, and when the farmers, if required to halt the use of fertilizer, will face insolvency.

We are not going to restore the environment quickly no matter what the crescendo of attention on Earth Day, April 22. It will happen bit by bit, piece by agonizing piece, victories will come slow and seldom, until we reverse the gradual process by which the present state of deterioration came about.

C. Some think that pollution can be totally eliminated—that America can be restored to preindustrial purity.

These persons seem to say that our population should not grow, our economy should not produce, our technology should not modernize.

But the headlong retreat from technology and economic growth would bring casualties heavier than many suppose.

D. Others simply accept pollution. A mayor of a small midwestern city recently told a citizens group, "If you want the town to grow, it's got to stink."

E. Some of us expect the impossible.

You can not take the oily, chocolate brown Cuyahoga River in Cleveland, which burst into flames not long ago nearly destroying two railroad bridges, and expect to turn it into a trout stream.

F. Some of us see only one problem at a time.

One well-meaning and passionate fighter for the underdog said the other day, "Hungry people don't care about the environment."

That's exactly the kind of thinking that got us into this mess.

Singleminded pursuit of any goal, even a very worthy one—like feeding the hungry—is bound to produce undesirable side effects on the environment.

We are accustomed to dealing with life in segments and pieces. The advantages of this are obvious and it has enabled us to be most successful in dealing with most of our problems.

The Highway Department has a specific job to do. Its task is to build and maintain roads at the least cost. It will rip up the neighborhood, rape the landscape, violate the natural course of drainage to get the job done.

The Sanitation Department must dispose of the garbage. It may tow it off shore and dump it. If the refuse washes back upon the beaches and into the wetlands, that's not their problem.

The town may burn its trash at the own dump. The garbage man gets rid of it, but he pollutes the air.

Taking one problem at a time just doesn't work in the environment.

G. Some of us want to blame somebody else—and almost in anger we lash out:

Greed is to blame;

Man, the dirty animal, is to blame;

Technology is to blame;

Capitalism is to blame;

The poor are to blame, and

The establishment is obviously to blame.

A law school senior said to me the other day that he would not defend a client who was a polluter, suggesting that even law school seniors may have something to learn.

The fact is, of course, that all of us are polluters and all living Americans are big polluters.

The wastes that foul our land are produced in the course of fulfilling widespread wants that are, in the main, reasonable and defensible.

We didn't get into this environmental mess entirely through vices—but we got here also because of our virtues—our unbalanced and our uncoordinated strengths.

The flaws are bound up with the virtues of modern society. They are part of science, democracy, individuality, diversity and prosperity.

Concern over the environment, obviously, has a grave moral content but I am disturbed with the tendency to present the issues in the form of a TV horse opera with some guys wearing the black hats and some the white.

Environmental decision-making is a technical, subtle, intricate process. As environmentalists, we must bring, not only passion, but also competence to our cause. Passion without competence (as John Gardner tells us) will only lead to confusion.

POLITICAL

I do not believe we have become sufficiently aware of the political complexities of the environmental task.

The issues of the environment are shot through and through with power politics of a high order. Action by the politician to match his words may be suicidal. Profits and crucial political support are not always on the side of the environment.

We in the Congress have already heard the voice of the steel and chemical company officials warning us against the overzealous and sometimes uninformed persons who insist upon high quality air standards, who become emotional over the issues, who are not conducive to "realistic" pollution control programs.

No politician has failed to note that large contributions often come from industries that often pollute. The choice between a fat campaign chest, in the days when money often wins elections, and an angry but pollution-free local industry is difficult.

We are being warned, too, about the tremendous cost to business of installing the devices to control pollution in order to meet the standards.

The cost, which a big company and an efficient plant can absorb, may become insupportable for a small company and an old plant. It may mean unemployment, especially in small towns where a plant is the principal employer. Pollution control may mean short term competitive disadvantage.

We have already seen this situation arise. In Duluth, a 50 year old US Steel Plant employed 2500 people. It was under orders from the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency to install smoke abatement equipment. US Steel said that the compliance would cost $5 million and would price the facility out of the market. The ony alternative, if the State insisted on compliance, was to shut the plant down.

Will the voters in Duluth and elsewhere really support a politician who supports tough pollution controls when it may mean fewer jobs in this community?

I am persuaded that the most formidable problems we will encounter as we seek to manage the enviornment are political and that politics, not science, is the key to whether or not we succeed.

We have the wealth and the power and the knowledge to achieve a better environment. I am not sure we have the wisdom and the political will to do it.

MANPOWER

I am not sure we have begun to grasp the critical need for manpower to help with our environmental task.

As we look ahead, we see the need of 10s of 1000s, of men and women who can handle environmental material from several natural sciences in combination with material from several of the social sciences. They will have to be integraters, dealing with broad questions of human values and purposes and laws that lie beyond the sciences.

The university which has given us so many specialists, who with their amazing analytical capabilities have taught us how to take the world apart, must now train men who will take the lead in putting it back together again.

We simply don't have enough lawyers, ecologists, engineers, and other professionals working for the environment.

ORGANIZATION

In government, I am not persuaded that we have fully recognized the organizational problems of government in our task.

We have a veritable jungle of governmental groups dealing with the problems of the environment: 11 federal departments, 16 independent agencies, 13 congressional committees, 90 federal programs, 26 quasi governmental bodies, and 14 interagency committees.

Government must straighten out this maze of conflicting environmental responsibilities.

The federal government must avoid the hopeless fragmentation of present anti-pollution programs. HEW is in charge of air pollution and solid waste disposal.

Interior is in charge of water pollution. The AEC is in charge of radioactive discharges and other departments have authority for such areas as auto and jetcraft emissions and stream pollution.

Government must also guard against the well known tendency of departments and regulatory agencies to become identified with the interests of the industries with which they deal.

Some of us urge the establishment of a new agency in which would be concentrated authority for all anti-pollution programs, and a joint congressional committee to maintain an oversight on environmental policy.

The Federal Government must put its own house in order.

The Corps of Engineers must justify their depredations of the land. The Department of Agriculture must not encourage farmers to misuse pesticides and drain vital marshlands.

The Department of Transportation must strike a better balance between highway construction and public transportation.

All agencies and departments must do their environmental homework before projects are approved.

LIFE STYLES

I am not persuaded that we fully realize the changes in life style that an effective attack on the environment requires.

We simply can not dedicate ourselves so zealously to infinite growth on a finite planet.

Are we willing to pay more taxes, higher utility bills, accept lower profits and fewer dividends, organize efficiently, inconvenience ourselves by not using an automobile?

Do we want a lower airplane fare in a polluted atmosphere or a higher fare on an emission free plane.

Do you want a more expensive, but lead free gasoline that produces fewer miles per gallon?

Will we buy a $100 pollution control kit for our cars?

Will we pay costlier water bills and restrict our consumption of it?

Will we limit the size of our families?

Will we allow more and more Government control of land use?

Will we accept a drastically modified automobile, limit its use, and pay more for it?

Will we allow curbs on our insatiable demands for electricity?

Will we give up our no-return Coca Cola bottles and our indestructible beer cans?

We are almost certainly headed for disruption of industry, higher bills for consumers, and considerable inconveniences for all of us in adopting a less wasteful style of life.

Squandering and spoiling resources is not a luxury, but a threat to luxury. The "good life" syndrome is deeply ingrained in most of us, but it must give if we are to meet the challenge to our future existence.

The environmental crisis will force us into a profound revision of our national priorities. We simply will not solve it until we are willing to confront that basic fact.

If survival of the species is really at stake, there can be no item placed higher on the nation's agenda than the quality of the environment—and that includes poverty, and hunger and inflation and crime.

STEPS TAKEN

I'm not sure anyone can be truly optimistic about our prospects.

Barry Commoner says that "Once you understand the problem you can find it is worse than you ever expected."

But there has been much progress recently, and we might be forgiven a little optimism.

We have a cascade of Federal legislation.

This legislation is piecemeal and underfinanced, with only about 25 percent of the authorized amounts for pollution control actually appropriated, but it does represent a significant national commitment.

Internationally, there is growing interest and action. The United Nations is convening a World Conference on the enviroment in 1972, NATO has adopted a goal of improved environment, London and Paris have had smoke and noise cleanup campaigns. DDT has been banned in Sweden, Denmark and Germany.

Some States are beginning to act aggressively. Michigan has impounded the salmon from Lake Michigan because of excessive DDT and Maryland is requiring all utility lines in new construction to be underground.

The Federal Government has acted administratively to cut back the use of pesticides and cyclamates have been banned.

Jet planes and autos are scheduled for partially effective emission control devices by 1972.

Industries and foundations also show encouraging, if sporadic, signs of activity.

Environmental law is emerging as a new field of law and numerous court tests are underway.

YOU AND THE ENVIRONMENT

But let me suggest that while we welcome all these steps, we view it all with skepticism and enter the fray ourselves.

We are not going to find any angels to do it for us. It is a responsibility we can't delegate. We have to do it ourselves.

Environmental action is up to us. Our task is to keep the environment from becoming just another issue—to be replaced soon by another issue.

And there are important steps each of us can take.

1. We can ask the right questions. Every community needs people who are asking the right questions:

What is desirable?

Does it bring serenity, beauty, quiet, or does it bring noise, clutter, pollution, congestion?

Every community needs people who ask questions before a swamp is filled; a stream dammed; a road built; an airport sited; or a powerplant constructed.

2. We can watch for the right actions.

—meaningful expenditures to clean up the air and the water

—corporations absorbing an important share of the social cost

—tough, but fair, state and local law enforcement on major industrial polluters

—a real revision of the national priorities

3. We can keep the heat on politicians and officials.

We can keep them from stalling; from wasting money on military nonsense and to apply it to the environment; and we can encourage them to see the environment, not as a social problem but as a survival problem.

We can contribute money and time to politicians who support our environmental concerns. We can help poll and canvass the voters on his behalf.

We must be aware that environment speeches, and even the mere introduction of bills mean little. We must scrutinize the various legislative proposals at least as critically as the special interest groups do—and really know who our friends are among the legislators.

We should not despair if the environment becomes a political issue. At least it will be a political issue with competition in good works and the country will benefit.

4. We must not feel that we are impotent to effect change, because there is much we can do.

We can work for:

Community wide planning and strictly enforced zoning ordinances;

Effective pollution control measures;

Modern methods of solid waste disposal;

Attractive playgrounds, parks and recreational areas;

Protection of water courses and wildlife;

A trail system for walking, hiking, and jogging;

Environmental Education in your local schools;

Underground utility lines; and

Proper maintenance for public places.

We can get these things done by:

Join a group that works for a better environment;

Urge our organizations to undertake an environmental project;

Lead a youth group with environmental goals;

Conduct ourselves by a rigorous code of environmental ethics;

Promote coverage by your local newspapers and radio stations on environmental projects;

Speak before local clubs and schools in support of good environmental policy;

Start an environmental conference;

Organize a community cleanup campaign and beautify our homes;

Appear before or serve on city councils and zoning boards and support environmental goals;

Let your elected representatives know that you strongly support bond issues and tax increases where necessary to improve community environment.

Our work many not make the headlines, but it will make a better world.

It is important for you and me to believe that we can restore the balance between man and his natural environment.

We can have in this nation, clean air, clear water, fertile land, abundant forests. Your efforts and mine can tip the balance.

Nothing must deter us in our efforts to enhance the quality of life for people today and for generations to come.

(5) We can keep the concern for the environment alive and be alert for new and unknown kinds of intrusions into our environment.

The rising tide of concern, and the prevalence of it, should not make us think that the war for a clean environment has been won. It has only begun.

When the hoopla and the shouting die, the flags no longer wave, and Earth Day has come and gone, our task will be to persevere.

So join the fray—if you don't who will?

"THIS IS YOUR LIFE," ARTHUR PIUS HOUSER

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a delightful "This Is Your Life" of an outstanding senior citizen from my home district. In the early 1900's, Arthur Pius Houser became one of the first residents and certainly one of the finest citizens of Emmaus, Pa.

The members of the Emmaus Rotary Club, No. 2251, bestowed on Mr. Houser one of their highest honors—the Emmaus Rotary Man of the Hour Award—for having attended every club meeting since their charter began in 1926. Mr. Houser is, and has always been, a leader in the community, as is evidenced by his 44 years of membership in the Rotary Club. I am certain that the following testimonial, which appeared in the Emmaus Trumpet, the official publication of the Emmaus Rotary Club, can indicate far better than I the exceptional life of an exceptional man.

The people of Emmaus have a great deal to thank Mr. Houser for, not only in terms of his efforts in building the community, but also for the example he has set for them in defining the meaning of a truly dedicated citizen.

The text of Mr. Houser's "This Is Your Life" follows:

THIS IS YOUR LIFE

Carved into the outer wall of the Court House in Santa Barbara, California, is this sentence: "God gave the land, the skill of man built our town."

When I read these words two weeks ago I immediately thought of Arthur P. Houser, for it was, to a large degree, the skill of man, who "built our town."

William Dunbar, philosopher-poet, wrote this about the builder:

"They go to the forest for palm or pine,
the stuff for the humbler homes;
The mountain gives up its valued gifts,
for the stately spires and domes;
But whether they work with marble or sod,
The builder is hand in hand with God."

Arthur, we are told, you were born February 13, 1887, in Hanover Township, Lehigh County, son of Richard Solomon and Emma Lavina (Bobb) Houser, and as a young boy you lived with your parents on a farm which is now the Northwest runway at the A.B.E. Airport.

While on the farm, you worked twelve hours a day, and for this same amount of labor a hired man at that time would receive $1.10 per day plus meals.

You left Hanover Township School (now Catasauqua) at the eighth grade level, and your first employment was at the Mertz Bakery in Allentown.

In 1904 you were confirmed in Schoenersville Lutheran and Reformed Church by Reverend John Guth.

In 1907 your parents moved from the farm to East Catasauqua, and you were hired as an apprentice carpenter by Goldsmith & Son (General Contractors).

Enrolling in the Scranton Correspondence School you soon learned to draw plans and understand them and specifications as well.

Although you liked Catasauqua and recognized it as a nice place to live, you were not satisfied with its progress.

You boarded a train for Emaus and, carrying your tool box, you walked from the railroad station in Emaus to a builder of houses (Emaus Land Improvement Co.) at Ninth and Chestnut Streets and decided that Emaus was to be your home.

In 1913 you became the husband of Pronella Hensinger of South Second Street, Emaus, and in 1914 you were, and you still are, the proud father of a daughter Rachel, now the wife of Gordon Falkenau. They are the parents of three of your grandchildren, Ranelle, Larry, and Robert.

In 1917 your first wife, Pronella, died. Unfortunately your grandson, Robert Falkenau, we sympathetically recall, died this past December 6, 1969, while serving his country as a Lieutenant in the Armed Forces in Vietnam at the age of twenty-five years.

Shortly after you arrived in Emaus, the School District asked for bids for the construction of the Jefferson Building on North Street and, although you were only twenty-seven years of age, with the help of your former employer, you were awarded the contract for this project in 1914, your first contract job, fifty-six years ago and the building is still standing and in daily use.

At this same time you built your own home at 106 Macungie Avenue, Emaus, where you have continuously resided to date.

In 1920, Hattie Ott, a widow, became the second Mrs. Arthur Houser, and in 1929 your daughter, June Marie, was born.

June and her husband, Robert N. Swinehart, for many years an Emmaus Rotarian, have four charming children—Karen, Lisa, Kurt and Heidi.

As a result of being the successful bidder on many jobs since the building of the Jefferson School in 1914, you constructed practically all the manufacturing and industrial plants in the Borough, the Town Hall, several bank buildings in the area, the modern Merritt Lumber Co. office, approximately eight hundred homes and five of our area Churches. You supervised the building of twenty-five to thirty Churches within a twenty mile radius of our Borough.

The building of Churches recalls Robert Lewis Stevenson, who wrote:

"I never weary of great Churches.
It is my favorite kind of scenery.
Mankind was never so happily inspired as
when it made a Cathedral."

Active in the work of St. John's United Church of Christ in Emmaus, housed in the beautiful edifice constructed by you, you served many terms on its Consistory and as an officer of the congregation. As a result you were elected "Elder Emeritus" for faithful and devoted service to the work of your Church.

Additions to Kutztown and East Stroudsburg State Colleges, Brookside, Lehigh and Berkeley Country Clubs and all the new constructions at the Lehigh Valley Club, Allentown, were made under your supervision as General Contractor.

As one of the founders of Security Trust Co. in Emaus in 1919, you became a member of its Board of Directors. Security Trust later constructed the building in which First National Bank of Allentown, Emmaus Branch, is now located since the Bank merger in 1951.

Having been connected with banking since 1919, you were elected a Director of The First National Bank of Allentown in June 1951 and you are serving in that directorship at the present time.

In the field of community service you also held the office of President of Emaus Board of Trade, which later became Emaus Chamber of Commerce, now Emmaus Area Chamber of Commerce.

Largely due to your activity and community interest, several industries settled here. Fred Kalmbach, Sr. brought his industry from New York—General Machine & Foundry—as did the Rodale Brothers, giving employment to many.

You hold membership in, and are a Director on the Board of General Contractors Association of Lehigh Valley, Inc.

In 1969 you turned over the Presidency of Arthur P. Houser, Inc., General Contractors, to your capable son-in-law, Robert N. Swinehart, although you still remain active in the contracting firm.

All of the Emmaus Fire Companies and Macungie Fire Co. and Mercantile Club of Emmaus have your name on the membership roster.

In 1910 you became a member of P.O.S. of A; 1913, Unami Fish & Game Association Lehigh Valley Motor Club; 1916, Emmaus Odd Fellows Lodge; 1917, you became a Mason, joining Edward G. Martin Lodge #689, where you are now a Life Member.

Thereafter you rapidly became a member of the various Masonic bodies—a 32° Mason, Shriner—Jester—member of Lehigh Valley Club and Shrine Club.

Since becoming a charter member of Emmaus Rotary in 1926 you have served 25 years as its Treasurer until your resignation from that office this past year.

In attending more than twenty-five Rotary International conventions in all parts of the world as the ambassador extra-ordinaire of our Rotary Club, you have, by your distribution of the Emmaus Rotary Banner in the many countries in which you attended Rotary, given recognition to our Club.

We in Emmaus Rotary are, as we know you are personally, very proud of your forty-four years of perfect attendance.

You have an admirable record in this and your many other fields of endeavor.

Because we in Rotary are cognizable of this enviable position you hold in Rotary, we present to you a testimonial of our esteem.

We believe it to be a fitting gift for you—*"Emmaus Rotary Man of the Hour"* with forty-four years perfect attendance from the date of our charter, 1926 to 1970, a record fot Emmaus Rotary and one we pray will be made still greater by your continued unbroken attendance.

This is presented to you with the very best wishes of your fellow Rotarians and the hope that every hour in the years ahead will be filled with sixty minutes of good health, happines and continued success.

We joyfully think of tomorrow, your eighty-third birthday and we all join in wishing you, in song, a Very Happy Birthday.

STEADY ECONOMIC GROWTH

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1970

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, regretfully, we in the Congress seldom are reminded of the accomplishments of the present-day Greek Government and the Greek nation. We hear much criticism, some from sources which want Greece to have a socialist government like a number of the north European nations. I am more impressed with the fact that the Greek Government is friendly to the United States and to NATO, and is anti-Communist. It is well to note, also, that it does not give asylum to traitors from the United States or deserters from our Army.

I submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some specific information about the stability of the Greek economy and the progress which is being made by that country in education, social welfare and public health, communications, mineral resources, merchant marine, and agriculture. All of these serve to illustrate the fact that there is a need for the Congress to hear both sides of the story.

The information follows:

STEADY ECONOMIC GROWTH WITH CONTINUED PRICE-STABILITY

The adoption and the implementation of the Five Year Plan of Public Investments (1968–1972) is an important step forward in the economic field.

This is the first public investment plan of its kind in the economic history of Greece. It gives great impetus to regional development and aims at bridging the existing gap between urban and rural areas.

In the monetary field, the Greek drachma, which underwent a crisis between 1966–1967, is today acknowledged to be among the ten "hardest" currencies of the world. The rate of increase in liquidity has been held down in spite of heavy public investment and the substantial growth of incomes.

A striking increase in the volume of personal savings illustrates vividly the confidence that the Greek people place in their economy today. The sum total of savings deposits rose to an unprecedented total of 2.5 billion dollars in 1969, at a net gain of half a billion dollars or 23.7% over similar figures for 1968.

Another significant increase appears in the rise of deposits in foreign exchange made by Greeks who earn their living abroad. Thus the net total of foreign exchange deposits in Greek Banks and Savings Institutions doubled during 1969.

Steady economic growth was coupled with price stability. This was accomplished in spite of the rise in personal incomes and accelerated investments in the public sector. Over the two year-period between 1967–1969 the general price index rose 2.8% only, as compared to a 6.8% increase between 1965 and 1967. In fact, according to figures provided by the European Organization for Economic Development and Cooperation, Greece rates first amongst member-states in economic price stability (1967–1969).

The balance of payments gap, a chronic ailment of the Greek economy, has also been considerably narrowed. The latest figures available (January 1970) provide proof of a strong balance of payments situation.

In January, 1970, the net increase of exports (57.4% over January 1969) and a relative decrease in imports (2.6%) reflect an improvement in the competitiveness of Greek products, a direct result of the successful policy of development.

In this aspect, while the importation of consumer goods decreased, net imports of machinery and other equipment during 1969 rose by 28.4%. This inflow of capital goods was facilitated by low or no import duties and generous financing by the Government which has set, as one of its primary aims, the industrialization of the country.

A steady increase was also noted in the "invisibles" sector. Invisible earnings rose from $57 million in January 1969 to $58.6 million in January, 1970, reflecting a steady increase in tourist earnings, emigrant's remittances and earnings in the merchant marine sector.

Finally, private foreign investment continued to flow steadily, exceeding $308 million during 1969. This figure represents an increase of more than $70 million over 1968 and reflects the confidence of foreign private capital in the continued well-being of the Greek economy.

EDUCATION

Fully aware of the fact that education constitutes a basic prerequisite for progress, the Greek Government has spared neither effort nor expense in providing for the necessary infrastructure at all levels of instruction.

During the past two years a vast program for the construction of school buildings has been carried out. A total of approximately $20,000,000 was allocated during the two years 1967–1969 to new constructions as against $2,000,000 for the same purpose between 1965-1966.

A field to which the Government attaches particular importance is that of university education. This special interest is reflected in its efforts to meet the needs of Greek higher education both in personnel and in infrastructure.

In this context a loan of $50,000,000 was recently granted to the University of Athens, earmarked for building the Athens University Town, which when completed will concentrate in one campus all the faculties of that institution which are presently dispersed in a wide area of the Greek capital. Other substantial grants were made to the Universities of Ioannina and Patras, and to the Panteios School of Political Science.

The appointment of 3,986 additional university assistants (corresponding to assistant professors in the United States University system) more than tripled the number of the teaching personnel at Greek universities, providing better opportunities for education to Greek youth.

On the secondary and primary level school level 2,013 additional teachers were appointed. In this field it is the intention of the Greek Government to raise, in the near future, compulsory education from today's minimum of six years to a total of nine years.

Vocational training is also receiving due attention, since it constitutes one of the cornerstones of the policy of industralization of the country. This is a sector which has been ignored in the past, although graduates of vocational schools are in great demand by the growing Greek industry.

Probably one of the most important steps was the complete abolishment of tuition fees, at all levels, realizing for the first time, the ideal of "free education".

Along with tuition fees, school manuals, books, laboratory training and other similar items are now given free of charge to every Greek pupil and student.

Student loans, at very low interest rates, have become available and now Greek students can obtain financing for their needs while studying.

The number of scholarships has also been greatly augmented so that worthy young men and women are provided with the means of furthering their education.

SOCIAL WELFARE AND PUBLIC HEALTH

These are two sectors to which the present Greek Government attaches the foremost importance since they concern the well-being of the Greek people.

Today, more than 95% of the population is covered by health insurance and enjoys pension benefits. For the current year the total expenditure in the sectors of health and social welfare in general (pensions, unemployment benefits, etc.) amounted to an unprecedented total representing 14% of the gross national revenue.

For the first time the concept of a "minimum legal pension" was established so that every Greek "senior citizen" would have a guaranteed income. Pensions both for farmers and persons enjoying social welfare were substantially increased.

Public housing is another sector where the government has been focusing, for the last three years, a great deal of attention. Its goal is to see that all Greek families acquire eventually a house of their own. This goal, which envisages construction of 500,000 new dwellings for lower income families, is to be reached within a period of ten years. To this date a total of more than 100,000 homes have been constructed and turned over to their new owners.

In parallel with the public housing program which is carried out by governmental agencies, and as an added initiative for the construction of new low cost housing, the government, through the Bank of Greece, released substantial funds which were in turn made available to certain categories of the population in the form of mortgages for the construction or improvement of habitations. It is to be noted that this is the first time that mortgage loans were made to such a great number of persons.

In the sector of public health the Government has drawn up an extensive five-year plan to build large hospital units of a total capacity of 10,000 beds. These hospitals will help provide high quality medical service to all who may be in need of hospitalization.

COMMUNICATIONS

During 1969 large sections of the National Road System totalling more than 500 kilometers, were either built or completed. In addition to that, infrastructure projects (earth works and other structures) on a network of about 800 kilometers were completed.

The ambitious five-year road construction program aims at the following objectives:

(a) To link the major urban centres of mainland Greece and of Crete by expressway.

(b) To provide road circuits in the developing tourist areas.

(c) To connect eastern with western Greece and thence directly with the countries of the common market.

Significant progress has also been made in the development of harbour facilities and airports to cope with the ever increasing passenger and tourist traffic and to keep up with rapid developments in the technology of sea and air communications.

In addition to large projects carried out in the ports of Piraeus and Thessaloniki, harbour facilities were constructed in the ports of Corfu, Alexandroupolis, Herakleion, Rhodes, Kalymnos, Kos, Raphina, Syros, Agia Galini (Crete), Halkis, Mytilene, Volos and Laurion. Large-scale facilities were also completed in the airports of Athens, Thessaloniki, Herakleion, Corfu, Kavalla and Andravida.

A program for the improvement of the State Railways has also been drawn up. In 1967–1968 the government financed railway development projects with 841 Million Drachmae ($28,000,000.) compared with 614 million Drachmae ($20,500,000), between 1965 and 1966. The purpose of this was to make this basic means of transport an economically self-sufficient and fully modernized instrument in the service of the country's communications.

MINERAL RESOURCES

Substantial progress has also been made in the systematic exploration of the Greek subsoil with the aim of determining existing mineral resources. Thus, within the scope of the five-year mining survey program, to which $17,000,000. have been allocated during the last two years, geological, hydrogeopogical, geophysical, surveys and mineral deposits explorations, studies, mapping, etc., were carried out, using every means made available by modern technology. As a result of this intensive activity, the following mineral resources were discovered:

(a) Ferronickel deposits in Central Euboea, with probable reserves amounting to tens of millions of tons.

(b) New nickel-bearing deposits at Laryna.

(c) New copper deposits in considerable quantities at Stavros, Halkidiki.

(d) Bauxite deposits in East-Central Greece.

The government has also initiated a project which aims at ascertaining the quantity and quality of uranium-bearing deposits in the country.

In another related field an agreement has been signed with Texaco, which will invest $7 million in a quest for hydrocarbons (oil and gas) in the gulf of Thessaloniki.

MERCHANT MARINE

The Greek Merchant Marine comprised in December 1969 a total of 2072 ships (approximately 11 million tons). This number represents a net increase of 297 vessels (approximately 2,731,000 tons) since April 1967. This rapid growth is a direct result of well planned measures conceived and implemented by the present Greek Government.

Various steps have also been taken aimed at protecting Greek seamen and providing incentives for the Greek merchant marine industry.

The primary goal of the Government's policy is to attract to the Greek flag vessels of Greek ownership, which, mainly because of favourable tax conditions, are presently under foreign registry. This policy has been, to a large extent, successful and by the end of 1969, 189 companies, operating previously abroad, had already established their headquarters in Piraeus.

The increase of vessels under Greek flag has brought about a substantial rise in the employment of Greek seamen.

Incentives were also provided for the expansion of the ship-building industry. Generous financing, in certain cases up to 80% of total cost, coupled with low interest rates, have provided the necessary impetus.

Presently, one of these industrial complexes, that of the Skaramagas shipyards, is capable of constructing ships (bulk carriers) up to 36,000 tons gross weight. All shipyards employ local skilled labour.

The Government has created a number of schools for vocational training which will provide the industry with skilled technicians.

The Merchant Marine has always contributed substantially to the invisible earnings which cover the chronic gap in the Greek balance of payments. As a result of the Governmental policy outlined above (incentives for the attraction of vessels to the Greek flag, the creation of new jobs for Greek seamen, the expansion of a ship building industry) the contribution of the merchant marine in the balance of payments has increased during 1967–1968 by more than 32% over the period between 1965–1967.

AGRICULTURE

Government efforts were channeled toward:

(a) The provision of the necessary infrastructure.

(b) The improvement of the marketing and processing of agricultural products.

(c) The development of livestock breeding.

(d) The protection of crops from pests and plant diseases.

(e) The development of fishing.

Thus:

1. Important projects were implemented including the establishment of plant health control centres, packaging units for fruit, vegetables, grapes and edible olives, cold stores, phytopathologic stations, research institutes, regional agricultural research experimental stations, model livestock breeding centres, etc.

2. Considerable work has been done throughout the country towards:

(a) The harnessing of torrents.

(b) The construction of forest roads.

(c) The development of woodlands at Drama, Litochoron, North Pindos and Acheloos.

These will supply timber to the wood processing industries to be established in these districts.

3. Important projects have been started for the overall development of mountainous districts aiming at the full utilization of the resources of these backward regions on a national basis.

4. Fish-receiving centres have been created in an effort to support the fishing industry. Five large fishing jetties with auxiliary facilities have been built at Patras, Piraeus, Thessaloniki, Kavalla and Halkis.

An important effort has also been undertaken in the field of land reclamation.

In 1967–1968 a series of land reclamation projects were financed by a total of 3,727 million Drachmae, compared with 2,667 million Drachmae in 1965–1966. ($125,000,000 and $80,000,000 respectively).

Completion of these basic projects will ensure irrigation for 250,000 hectares, drainage for 200,000 hectares, flood control for 120,000 hectares, and will claim 40,000 hectares of new arable farm land.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, April 28, 1970*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Joseph Long Perry, Jr., minister, Reformed Church of Linden, Linden, N.J., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, in a world of loud voices and violent spirits, give us the cool to think clearly, and the courage to act decisively. Where we are right, confirm us, and, in our deliberations, grant us the grace to be true to ourselves, honest with our neighbors, candid with Thee, and alert to truth in whatever form it may confront us. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4145. An act to provide for disposition of estates of intestate members of the Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, and Seminole Nations of Oklahoma dying without heirs;

H.R. 10912. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to liberalize the conditions under which the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is required to effect recoupment from disability compensation otherwise payable to certain disabled veterans;

H.R. 13106. An act to extend for 4 years the period of time during which certain requirements shall continue to apply with respect to applications for a license for an activity which may affect the resources of the Hudson Riverway, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13183. An act for the relief of the heirs at law of Tomosuke Uyemura and Chiyo Uyemura, his wife;

H.R. 13959. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the many contributions to the founding and early development of the State of Texas and the city of San Antonio by Jose Antonio Navarro; and

H.R. 14896. An act to amend the act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 915), establishing a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4869. An act to further the economic advancement and general welfare of the Hopi Indian Tribe of the State of Arizona;

H.R. 10106. An act to revise the definition of a "child" for purposes of veterans' benefits provided by title 38, United States Code, to recognize an adopted child as a dependent from the date of issuance of an interlocutory decree; and

H. Con. Res. 582. Concurrent resolution to designate May 1, 1970, as a day for an appeal for international justice for all American prisoners of war and servicemen missing in action in Southeast Asia.