

GETTYS, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. GRIFFIN, and Mr. CHAPPELL):

H.R. 17302. A bill to increase the availability of mortgage credit for the financing of urgently needed housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 17303. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELL of California:

H.R. 17304. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to establish educational programs to encourage understanding of policies and support of activities designed to enhance environmental quality and maintain ecological balance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.R. 17305. A bill to prohibit the movement in commerce of certain crocodilian hides, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 17306. A bill to provide equitable access to the U.S. market for imported textiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COWGER:

H.R. 17307. A bill to exempt from certain deep-draft safety statutes passenger vessels operating solely on the inland rivers and waterways; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 17308. A bill to amend the Wagner-O'Day Act to extend the provisions thereof to severely handicapped individuals who are not blind, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 17309. A bill to provide for annual adjustments in monthly monetary benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration, according to changes in the Consumer Price Index; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 17310. A bill to establish a national cemetery in New England; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself and Mr. COLMER):

H.R. 17311. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 17312. A bill to provide for a coordinated national boating safety program; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 17313. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to further the reduction of draft calls in the Armed Forces of the United States by increasing the pay rates of certain enlisted members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 17314. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 17315. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to elementary and secondary schools and other educational institutions for the conduct of special educational programs and activities concerning environmental protection and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ST. ONGE (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BURTON of California, and Mrs. GREEN of Oregon):

H.R. 17316. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. ESCH, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. McCLORY, Mr.

MOSHER, Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. SCHWENGER, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, and Mr. WHEALEN):

H.J. Res. 1194. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the period beginning September 20, 1970, and ending September 26, 1970, as "National Machine Tool Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.J. Res. 1195. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for representation in the Congress for the District constituting the seat of Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROE:

H.J. Res. 1196. Joint resolution establishing the Commission on U.S. Participation in the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H. Res. 955. A resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation of certain activities of William Orville Douglas, Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, to determine whether impeachment proceedings are warranted; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. ADDABBO (by request) introduced a bill (H.R. 17317), for the relief of Cynthia Irene Popham, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

464. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, York, Pa., relative to establishing a Subcommittee on the Credit of the United States within the Committee on Ways and Means, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE CASE AGAINST JUSTICE DOUGLAS

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, another facet in the case against Justice Douglas unfolded earlier this week, the chief initiator was none other than the Justice himself.

Without explanation Justice Douglas took himself out of a Supreme Court decision to permit the filing of briefs by outside parties in cases involving the lewd film, "I Am Curious Yellow." Despite the Justice's silence on the matter, I think the conclusion to be drawn is rather obvious. In my opinion, he excused himself because he has a conflict of interest in the case. The film "I Am Curious Yellow" is distributed in the United States by Grove Press, Inc., whose president also published the Evergreen Review, the magazine that printed excerpts from Douglas' new book next to pictures of nude couples engaged in highly sug-

gestive activity. While this candor on the part of the Justice is certainly refreshing, I think the question can be fairly asked in light of his past activities: Why is he so tardy a convert to the cause of impartial justice? He obviously did not feel quite so imbued with the spirit of judicial impartiality when he took part in the libel case concerning publisher Ralph Ginsburg and Senator BARRY GOLDWATER. Douglas was not then bothered by the fact that while the Ginsburg-Goldwater suit was headed for the High Court, he had written an article for profit, for one of Ginsburg's magazines. On the contrary, he joined in a particularly strong dissent against the majority of the Supreme Court Justices in regard to the Court's ruling against Ginsburg.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the conflict of interest which caused Douglas to excuse himself in the obscenity case presently before the Court, equally applied in the Ginsburg case. Moreover, this is a matter which should be examined most closely by the House Judiciary Subcommittee which has met today to begin a 60-day investigation of the misconduct charge against Justice Douglas.

Until the Judiciary Committee instituted action, there had been some question as to which committee should conduct the investigation, the Judiciary Committee or the Rules Committee. Since the former has asserted its primary jurisdiction in this matter, it is my hope that the investigators will discharge their responsibilities in a truly objective and nonpartisan matter. For, if Justice Douglas has been guilty of such misconduct as would warrant impeachment under the terms of the Constitution, the subcommittee members have the solemn duty to fully report their findings. By the same token, if the results of the investigation warrant it, the House must not hesitate one minute in instituting full impeachment proceedings. To adopt any other course of action would be to make a mockery of our principles of justice and our judicial institutions.

As a personal matter, I have grave reservations about the judicial and extrajudicial activities of Justice Douglas. In my view, however, justice and fairness dictates I withhold my personal expressions until after all the evidence is in. I plan on taking a dispassionate view of

the charges made against Justice Douglas and whatever evidence is unearthed by the subcommittee's investigation. I do this contrary to the examples set by those who prejudged Judges Clement Haynesworth and Harrold Carswell on the basis of half-truths, innuendos, and outright misrepresentations made by certain enemies of constitutional government.

It is in this fashion that I hope to contribute to an atmosphere that will insure that the needs of justice and the needs of society will be fully accorded in the case against Justice Douglas.

GUARANTEED CHARITY—THE LATEST MERRY-GO-ROUND

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 27, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the "sell" job on the recently passed guaranteed annual income legislation—affectionately called "family assistance" by its manipulators, seems to have been highly effective. As yet, no one reminds the people at home where the money will come from. Santa Claus will write the checks.

Here in the District of Columbia, testimony is given of working people who are quitting employment because they can do better on welfare. Others already are asking that the \$1,600 qualification level be increased so they can continue jobs at \$6,000 to \$7,000 per year and still get some of the easy money.

Already, from my constituents, I am receiving inquiries "to get all the facts" so they can figure on how to come out best—by continuing to work in order to try to make ends meet or to quit and go on the "charity subsidy."

I am not speaking lightly—the opinion moulders have done a terrific job as salesmanship and these inquiring people are in earnest. The land is flowing with milk and honey. Utopia is here at last. Charity is no longer an act of love—it has nothing to do with one's neighbor, the church, fraternal order or God. One has only to look east to Washington, D.C.

Those who will continue to work, despite higher deductions from their paychecks to offset the subsidized inflation, will need to increase their earnings by the amount paid those as a reward for not working. We can expect all prices and costs to correspondingly increase, and by every economic theory, we will all just start over—except that those who enter higher pay brackets will also find themselves in higher tax brackets. But, the tax-free foundations will continue to flourish.

The Washington merry-go-round continues to turn. If such a bonanza had been the program of a Democrat, it would have immediately been denounced as Communist. Since it is the requested program of a Republican, it is politely called Socialistic. Do not the Bolsheviks in Russia call themselves Socialists?

In 1969, a thought-provoking paper

entitled "Legal Plunder" was distributed by the Economic Council Letter. I think it is more timely today than in 1969.

If charity is to the Christian an act of love, can we by force of law, steal from the worker to give to the nonworker and still retain love? If so, we may still return to a Christian nation—one by compulsory love by an act of Congress.

I insert the council letter, a pertinent news clipping, and a copy of my remarks of February 6, 1969, as follows:

[From the Economic Council Letter, May 1, 1969]

LEGAL PLUNDER—WORK WITHOUT PAY VS. PAY WITHOUT WORK

According to official figures, about 75 million people are gainfully employed in the United States. What official figures don't show, however, is that more and more have been working without pay in recent years without realizing it. They work for the government increasingly, without pay, because of the steady rise in the tax take. The effect steadily tends toward forced labor. Despite the great ingenuity of the average American, none seems yet to have figured out the trick of how to work for government and get paid for it without becoming a part of it.

What we are considering here is a proposal to extend legal plunder still further. Whether it is called assured annual income, a guaranteed annual wage, or income without work, makes no difference. It is just a scheme for another form of legal plunder. This is because the proposal goes beyond mere support of the government for itself. It is to compel the producers, who must carry the whole population of 200 million people on their backs, to pay an extra exaction through government to perhaps 30 million people or family units, for not working at all.

Thus we would have three major categories on nonproducers to be carried by the producers. Roughly, it would mean that the 75 million producers must first carry the 14 million nonproducers called government officials and employees. Then they would have to carry an additional 30 million indigent nonproducers who would be paid for not working at all. And this would be in addition to carry indirectly, as they now do, most of the 81 million others that we call dependents.

THE ORIGIN OF PROPERTY

A man can live and satisfy his wants only by ceaseless labor; by the ceaseless application of his faculties to natural resources. According to the French philosopher Frederic Bastiat, in "The Law," this process is the origin of property.

But it is also true that a man may live and satisfy his wants by seizing and consuming the products of the labor of others. This process is the origin of plunder.

Now, since man is naturally inclined to avoid pain—and since labor is pain in itself—it follows that men will resort to plunder whenever plunder is easier than work. When, then, does plunder stop? It stops when it becomes more painful and more dangerous than labor.

The proper purpose of law is to use the power of its collective force to stop this fatal tendency to plunder instead of to work. All the measures of the law should protect property and punish plunder. But generally the law is made by one man or one class of men. And since law cannot operate without the sanction and support of a dominating force, this force must be entrusted to those who make the law.

Thus it is easy to understand the perversion of law, how instead of checking injustice, it becomes the invincible weapon of injustice.

SOCIALISM IS LEGAL PLUNDER

Those who would fight Socialism as legal plunder, in many cases delude themselves with the statement: "The war that we must fight against Socialism must be in harmony with law, honor, and justice."

Such a statement upon examination turns out to be a non sequitur. It means that one who makes it has enmeshed himself in a vicious circle. He would use the law to oppose Socialism? But it is upon the "law" that Socialism itself relies. Socialists desire to practice legal plunder, not illegal plunder. Socialists, like all other minority monopolists, desire to make the law their own weapon. And when once the law is on the side of Socialism, how can it be used against Socialism? For when plunder is abetted by the law, it does not fear courts, troops, or prisons; rather, it may call upon them for help.

There are only three things which can happen under legal plunder:

1. The few plunder the many.
2. Everybody plunders everybody.
3. Nobody plunders anybody.

The choice must be made among limited plunder, universal plunder, and no plunder. The law can follow only one of the three.

THE SEDUCTIVE LURE OF SOCIALISM

One of the most popular fallacies of our times proceeds from the notion that it is not sufficient that the law should be just; it must be philanthropic. Nor is it sufficient that the law should guarantee to every citizen the free and inoffensive use of his faculties for physical or intellectual and moral self-improvement. Instead, it is demanded that the law should directly extend welfare, education, and morality throughout the nation.

This is the seductive lure of Socialism. But it must be emphasized that these two uses of the law are in direct contradiction to each other. We must choose between them. A citizen cannot at the same time be free and not free.

CHIMERAS

Periodically during the past 250 years, a glittering chimera has captured the mass mind. The effect usually has been to undermine and upset the social and economic stability of one or several nations for some time. Chimeras are the stock in trade of Socialism.

The dictionary calls a chimera an absurd creation of the imagination; a foolish or horrible fancy; an incongruous medley; a hybrid of mixed characteristics produced by grafting.

Among the more conspicuous mass madness engendered by one chimera or another during recent centuries have been the Mississippi Bubble in France, the South Sea Bubble in Great Britain, the Tulip Bubble in Holland, and the Welfare Bubble in the United States. Each grew out of chimeras of similar nature, such as those which are implicit in the mass madness of the United States during the past 35 years. Among these chimeras are the following:

- The more abundant life.
- Get rich quick.
- Something for nothing.
- Government can do anything.
- There is all the money one needs.
- We owe it to ourselves.
- I am my brother's keeper.
- Poverty can be abolished.
- Social Security.
- Pay without work.

PAY WITHOUT WORK

The proposal of an assured annual income, or pay without work, is just another chimera. Life is competitive, and competition sets the minimum level of individual human effort which nature will tolerate in return for the right to live.

There is no right to income without work for anybody at any time or in any place.

either in theory nor in practice, in religion or the Bible, in politics or economics, in the Constitution or jurisprudence, or even in majority insanity is there or can there be any such right.

Work is a means to life. To remove the necessity for exercise (mental or physical) or to weaken its importance, atrophies life processes and invokes death processes.

Individuation is a cardinal feature of the pursuit of happiness and the flowering of personality. For life and growth it requires the stimulus, guidance, and control of the mental and physical capacities of the individual, activated by the catalyst of work.

Enterprise is the basis of all well-being. It represents work applied to the purposes of leadership. Enterprise is the cornerstone of a going-concern economy. Its objective is the exercise of leadership to make it possible for many to work together in production, distribution, and service in the hope of profit.

Work is the cornerstone of civilization. Without work, there can be no earnings or income. Without earnings, there can be no savings. Without savings, there can be no capital. Without capital, there can be no science or technology.

There is no power in government or law to change such fundamentals. There can be no "absolute constitutional right to an income."

WHERE WOULD THE MONEY COME FROM?

Guaranteed-income advocates insist that the government make its relief payments in cash. They base this fantastic nonsense on a spurious argument. They say that the only trouble with the poor is lack of money. We should, therefore, give them the money and not attempt to dictate how and on what they should spend it. There must be no relief in kind, because we should not interfere with their liberty to spend their government cash, but "let them make their own mistakes."

Such a preposterous proposal ignores the simple fact that one reason they are poor is their incompetence. Most cannot manage the cash they have. Incompetence to earn and incompetence to spend: just look at the daily papers for examples. Cash is the very last and worst thing to be given to a compulsive gambler, a drunkard, or a drug addict. As soon as one has gambled the money away or spent it on whiskey or heroin, is government to telegraph him more? And if it doesn't, how is it to see that he and his family get proper nourishment, or that he has enough left over for the rent, or that his family are decently dressed, or that his children are properly educated?

If, as some think, there might be 30 million units (half the national total of 60 million) thus to be financed with cash, and if at the start each of these units is to be given \$3,500 a year, it would mean a total of \$105 billion to be added to the nonproductive overhead expense of the economy (now over \$300 billion) and subtracted from the income of the producers. Thus, in order to start such fantastic nonsense, there would have to be a tax increase of more than 25 percent. The money would have to come from the producers. There could be no other source.

However, the point of diminishing returns in taxation already has been passed, so that there is no reason to assume that it might be possible to move from the prevailing 60 percent of nonproductive overhead expense to 75 or 80 percent.

In other words, the money could not come from anywhere for long. In fact, such profligacy would be so extreme that the present declining incentive to producers would accelerate, and before long the question to be faced would be: Who will do the work? Just look at the effect of the Social Security chimera in but 30 years. Look at the effect, also, of the compulsory retirement chimera. And look at the effect of the welfare chimera in the field of relief in just a decade.

THE ABILITY OF GOVERNMENT

The proposal of an assured annual income, to be guaranteed by government, pursuant to law, means management by government and politics.

You can look upon the past 35 years in the United States as a laboratory experiment in management by government and politics. It provides more evidence on the subject than you can use.

The record clearly shows that in addition to the unsound moral, economic, and philosophic basis of what has been taking place, there is a record which shrieks eloquently that government really can't manage anything. It just doesn't have the capacity.

The minds which have shaped and controlled government in the United States during the past generation could hardly be classified as on a level above the adolescent stage. Probably the most profound shortcoming of those who have been running things has been their complete unwillingness to consider or use elementary means of measurement. They do not respect or capitalize upon the structural elements which are indispensable for a complete anatomy. They are intolerant of balance, proportion, and equilibrium. Their half-baked position is like that of one who insists on eating his cake and having it, too. They want the benefits of science and technology, but they absolutely refuse to respect the essential principles of science and technology as means to ends to achieve and retain such benefits. Therefore, without knowing it, they have given us an economy in liquidation. And, what is worse, they don't even know the meaning of a going-concern economy.

Therefore, we have a steady degeneration which spreads while you sleep throughout all of life. You now live in a quicksand economy. The prevailing economic illiteracy is an all-pervading force among politicians and political lawyers and represents a form of economic illiteracy. The result is that their thinking is half-baked, and their practices are half-baked. We have a half system of government.

Another light on the ability of government is provided by pointing out the infantile attitude those in control take with respect to the tax base. There is no indication that they are even aware of the fact that the tax base is of equal importance to the tax rate. Thus, their approach to taxation also is half-baked. Moreover, they are not aware of the fundamental importance of the rate of change in a tax. The rate of change in a tax usually is a more serious matter than the amount of change.

One of the most outstanding manifestations of political insanity in recent history is so-called Social Security. It represents one of the most gigantic frauds ever erected. Not only is it a fraud from the standpoint of both producers and beneficiaries, but it is also a progressively degenerative force in its effect upon the entire national economy. Yet, the superman of politics, education, and government do nothing about it.

In Summary—

This additional scheme for legal plunder on a scale without precedent in all history is proposed to wipe out poverty in one fell swoop because a group of social reformers are impatient with the present "rag bag" of measures to combat poverty.

Such a preposterous sophistry can get attention only because of the complete failure of education to prepare the individual for life. Upon this failure is superimposed the driving power of the Communists and Communist sympathizers. If taken seriously, the idea of pay without work certainly would implement the Communist objective of making Capitalism pay for its own funeral.

The idea of pay without work would mean the crudest kind of misrepresentation by those spearheading it—propagation of the

belief that such a thing might be possible. In other words, encouraging millions to expect the impossible and to think they might have a right to anything of the kind.

In figures, it appears that from \$105 billion to \$150 billion a year would be taken from the 75 million producers of the country in addition to the \$300 billion they are now coughing up for government. This would be paid in cash to 30 million nonproducers for not working, and it would be done as a matter of right.

But experience shows that this would be merely the beginning. Look at the precipitate rise in government expenditures. Look at Social Security. Look at welfare. The record shows no case in all history where once the politicians got control of the currency, they failed to debauch it. Lenin and Stalin knew this, too.

The management of this colossal delusion of pay for not working would be committed to government, in total disregard of the overall record of history, showing the incompetence of government management in large-scale economic and fiscal affairs. Also, it would be in disregard of the record of the past 35 years which clearly indicates the incompetence of government management. In other words, government cannot be capable, honest, or constitutional in the hands of those now running the country.

Then there would have to be disregard of the fact that the financial position of government today has been so undermined as to suggest quicksand and near total loss of credit. One measure of this is the destruction of three-fourths of the purchasing power of the dollar in 35 years, since 1933. The dollar is now worth less than 25 percent of its value at that time. Where would the money come from?

Disregard would be necessary, also, of the effect of reducing further the incentive to producers to work. Who would do the work?

However, if all these factors were to be ignored—and we don't think they will be—there is very little prospect that such a totally crazy idea will receive serious consideration, because the Welfare Bubble will burst long before that point is reached. Our ridiculous monetary situation has absorbed so many crazy ideas that it is fast approaching the point of a super nuclear detonation in the area of economics and mathematics.

The politicians in France followed a course similar to what we have been following since 1933. In 44 years, from 1914, they wiped out 99.6 percent of the value of the franc. In other words, when the insanity finally stopped, the franc was worth only four tenths of one percent of its value in 1914.

Finally, and in view of what we have said, we think you won't have to worry much about this scheme of legal plunder in false whiskers if you expose it for what it is.

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 24, 1970]

QUANDARY FOR MOTHERS—PAY INCREASE HURTS

(By Betty James and Jack Kneece)

A growing number of District mothers whose children have been in day-care programs are leaving good jobs and reapplying for welfare because of an out-of-date salary formula in the District's working mothers program. A Senate panel has been warned.

After hearing this yesterday, Sen. William Proxmire, D-Wis., called for liberalizing the law governing day-care grants for working mothers.

Witnesses said many mothers receiving a small subsidy that allows them to place their children in day-care centers often resign their jobs and reapply for welfare when they receive a small raise making them ineligible for day-care benefits.

Mrs. Charles Runyon, chairman of the District's Public Welfare Advisory Committee, cited several examples she said are typical of mothers being forced to drop out of the day-

care program, becoming candidates for welfare roles again.

"These people are not on public assistance and they don't want to be," said Mrs. Runyon.

"Almost half of all the children now in welfare's day-care program," she told the District Appropriations subcommittee, headed by Proxmire, "have mothers or fathers who are working.

"They are single persons, heads of households earning less than \$6,000 annually. The department shares in their day-care costs according to a fixed schedule.

"A parent may have to pay anywhere from 50 cents per week to \$2.50 per week per child," she said, according to a formula.

She said the cost of living has increased 14.3 percent since the formula for the day-care subsidy was devised.

The formula is in such serious disproportion to the cost of living, said Mrs. Runyon, that an average of 30 mothers per month are leaving the day-care program.

Among the several examples cited by Mrs. Runyon was the case of the working mother who paid \$8.50 per week for her three children, then \$18.50 after one raise and finally she was forced to pay \$30 weekly when another raise priced her out of eligibility, negating the effect of her raise.

Mrs. Runyon's 26-member group is seeking \$291,000 to allow an increase in the cutoff level from \$6,000 to \$7,000 annually, among other changes.

She said there now are 1,225 children in the District whose mothers work while they are in day-care centers or licensed private homes in the day-care program. About half the mothers work and the other half receive funds under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). Those who aren't working are training in the District's Work Incentive Program, known as WIN.

She said more than 400 mothers are expected to complete WIN training by Jan. 1, and thus be dropped from welfare rolls.

In addition to changing the cutoff point, Mrs. Runyon's committee, which is composed of representatives from each District social service agency, recommended that Proxmire's subcommittee:

- Allow the department to pay a higher share of the day-care costs.
- Provide for a differential to nonwelfare families as a built-in work incentive.
- Raise rates paid to day-care "mothers" who now receive \$15 per week per child in their care.

"This is so logical and sensible," said Proxmire. "I hope we will be able to find out how we can . . . get more action promptly."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 6, 1969]

SALARY RAISES—A VICTORY FOR WHOM?

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, now that the Rules Committee has tabled any possibility of bringing the Federal salary increase to the floor for approval or disapproval by the full membership, we hear the rumor—"This is a victory." Apparently the pay raise is now automatic on February 14, 1969, and there can be no vote—no chance to show our constituents opposition to this increase of 41 percent on our own salary.

"A victory for whom?" may haunt us. For we, the recipients of a salary increase, were not even permitted an opportunity to express by record vote the wishes of our people.

A strange victory when we consider that the action of a few must have assumed the attitude that the full membership could not be entrusted with our own decision as to whether or not we approve of this increase. The inference is that gag action was necessary to keep the bill from the membership

because—had the pay bill been discharged the Members would have voted to kill it.

Will we benefit by a pay raise, when we can anticipate the increase will be immediately offset by additional inflationary increases in other areas of the economy. Can we not expect that the private and public sector will immediately follow suit—and justify their increases on our leadership?

Labor will demand appropriate increases, the farmers will feel justified in seeking higher prices or larger supports—business executives will feel free to upgrade their salaries to induce capable men into the ranks of free enterprise. Caution against inflation has been scattered to the winds. In short, the entire producing economy of our country will overnight be dissatisfied. We have but opened a Pandora's box to a renewal of revolutionary inflation.

Many among the citizenry already feel themselves aggrieved—our retired citizens, pensioners, salaried people, and welfare recipients can be expected to see in our indiscretion the need for reaction so they, too, can offset the spiraling losses in the purchasing price of our dollar.

And what of our young men in the military forces? In Vietnam under combat conditions a private receives \$186.40 per month, a captain receives \$621.80 per month. These are men who face death at any moment. Can we refuse to grant them a 41-percent military pay raise?

Salaries and costs have already all but priced us out of competition on the world market. Where will there be victory on the world exchange from such action?

Consider also the precedent now established—that is, that a committee can circumvent the wishes of the full membership of the House. Can we distinguish such action from taxation without representation?

Can we allay, as unfounded, the growing uneasiness of our people that a committee may be established to raise taxes without any vote or the opportunity of the constituents to express disapproval. Government which denies its people a voice is not representative government. Rather, it is called government by committees—soviets.

The pay raise may be considered a victory by some, but I fear it will be a short-lived victory which can only usher in further chaos and disorder among our concerned people.

WE MUST SUSTAIN THEM

HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many of us can completely visualize the living conditions in a North Vietnamese prisoner-of-war camp—the solitary confinement, the mental anguish, lack of medical attention, inadequate diet, the public spectacle and humiliation as American prisoners of war are paraded through North Vietnamese villages.

I wonder how many of us would find it possible to maintain our sense of reason. I wonder how many of us would feel like giving up, after 5 years under conditions that are virtually indescribable.

More than 1,450 soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen are either prisoners of Hanoi or are missing in action. At least 430 are known to be prisoners. More than 2,600 next of kin in all 50 States are enduring a tragic state of anxiety for their loved ones.

All of us received in our offices last year a picture of a handsome little boy, 2½ years old. He has never seen his daddy, who was shot down over North Vietnam. He does not know if his daddy is a prisoner of war or if he was killed in action. His mother does not know. His grandparents do not know.

The picture of this little boy touched my heart as I realized that we Members of Congress had had an opportunity to see something this little boy's daddy had never seen—the face of his son.

I am sure all of us have received anguished letters from parents and loved ones pleading with us, as Members of Congress, to do something—anything. I felt helpless as I wrote them telling them the House and Senate had passed resolutions calling upon North Vietnam to comply with the Geneva Convention which provides for the humane treatment of prisoners of war. I felt helpless as I did this, because Hanoi, one of the 123 signatory nations, has repeatedly refused to comply with the humanitarian objectives of the Geneva Convention.

Mr. Speaker, when this body passed the above resolution, and the Senate passed an identical resolution, while it did not move Hanoi from its apparently inflexible position, it emphasized again, for all the world to see, that it is not the United States but the Government of North Vietnam which has been inhuman.

We must find a way to convince Hanoi that the United States of America will not stand by any longer and tolerate this inhumane treatment. The incredible torture being perpetrated on American servicemen should be enough to bring the wrath of the entire civilized world down on Hanoi.

Words alone avail nothing. We must act. Hanoi has capitalized on the division of American public opinion on this war, stalling and delaying peace talks in the hope of winning at the peace table what she has failed to take by military action. It is clearly manifest that Hanoi is responsive to public opinion. Let us take advantage—let us take the initiative—and embark upon a massive letter-writing campaign to the Hanoi delegation in Paris, expressing our dissatisfaction and urgent concern in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation of ours is more than 200 million strong. We must let the North Vietnamese know—and the entire world—that we are as one voice demanding humane treatment of our American servicemen captured in battle.

I sincerely hope that my colleagues will find it possible to pay tribute to these brave Americans on May 1, "An Appeal for International Justice Day," at Constitution Hall. I hope Constitution Hall will be filled and overflowing with Americans from all walks of life—Americans concerned about other Americans who have made a greater sacrifice than any of us can imagine.

We summoned these fine young men to battle, they responded willingly and marched bravely to the conflict prepared to lay down their lives for this Nation—for you and me. If a merciful God has spared them, we must sustain them. We can do no other.

UTAH RETAIL GROCERS ASSOCIATION FLAG PROJECT

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, if there is a frontline American it is the retail grocer, particularly the independent retail grocer who daily communicates personally with a large cross section of America. I had the honor of representing the retail grocers of Utah during a large part of my life and know of their dedication to American ideals of work, thrift, obedience to God and country. A former President once stated:

Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country.

I know of no business or profession whose members more appropriately fulfill that injunction than America's retail grocers.

The Utah Retail Grocers Association, representing free-thinking businessmen in every city and town and at virtually every commercial crossroads of our State is now engaged in an activity to offer 25,000 American flags to Utah's citizens. Virtually all citizens go regularly to their food markets and grocery stores. These frontline Americans of my State have adopted this project because they love and respect their citizenship and because they are in a strategic position for performing this public patriotic service. Officers of the association include Harold H. Smith, Heber City; President J. W. Williams, of Morgan; Ralph Miller, Jr., of Moab; Waldo L. Macey, of Salt Lake; H. Dee Hutzley, Ogden; and H. Vern Brazell, executive director, Salt Lake City. A report of their activity is contained in the following news release:

UTAH FOOD STORES OFFER FLAG OPPORTUNITY

Ten thousand American flags, the first part of a 25,000 shipment, arrived in Salt Lake City this week aboard a special IML Flag Express from Valley Forge, Pa., to support the Utah Retail Grocers Association Flag Waving Program.

The flags will be distributed to food stores in the state, according to Harold H. Smith, Heber City, president of the association. They will go on sale May 13. He said, "Our goal is to make American flags available at the neighborhood level. Many people who would like to have a flag and would display the flag to not have one because they find they have to write away or make a special trip someplace to get one. By having them available in the grocery stores flags can be taken home with the groceries. We want to put a flag in every Utah home that wants to have one, wants to give the respect it deserves and wants to display it."

The flags are five by three feet, stitched, color fast cotton and come in a kit complete with pole, rope, mounting bracket, and display instructions. Kits are expected to sell for \$3.49. Individual grocers will give special discounts to scout groups, cub packs, explorer posts and other civic or religious organizations that wish to sell flags. Those organizations will sell the flags at \$3.49 and keep the discount from the grocer, says Mr. Smith.

In addition to selling flags, the Utah Retail Grocers Association will run an educational campaign about flags, the history of our flag and the proper use of it. Every grocery store is being urged to fly a flag on the front of the building as part of the Flag Waving Campaign.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LOYALTY DAY TO HONOR POW'S AND MIA'S

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States, by proclamation, has called upon the people of the United States, and upon all patriotic civic and educational organizations to observe Friday, May 1, 1970, as Loyalty Day, with appropriate ceremonies in which all of us may join in a reaffirmation of our loyalty to the United States of America.

The full meaning of ordinary words is often discovered only when we know their origin. The President's proclamation points out that the word "loyal" has its origins in the Latin word for "legal." Ultimately, to be loyal means not only to be faithful to a person or a cause or a nation, but to be lawful as well.

It is particularly fitting, therefore, that Loyalty Day on May 1 will be the day that a special tribute will be paid to Americans who are missing in action or prisoners of war in Southeast Asia. This will be a resounding demonstration of support for these brave Americans and our support of the ideals of justice under law between nations.

As one of six Representatives and six Senators assisting Senator BOB DOLE of Kansas in this special tribute at Constitution Hall this Friday, I urge the participation of all Americans regardless of how they may feel about the conduct of the Vietnam war. By this action we will declare our support for these missing Americans and prisoners of war within the context of Loyalty Day to emphasize our belief in the rule of law which is embodied in the 1949 Geneva Convention on prisoners of war, and which both North Vietnam and the NLF have continued to violate. We hope to turn world attention to the continued violations of the North Vietnamese and the NLF in refusing to provide proper nourishment and humane treatment for all American prisoners of war, their refusal to identify all prisoners, their denial to American prisoners the right to communicate regularly by mail with their families, and their continued detention of the seriously ill and wounded.

Mr. Speaker, the total number of American military men who are classified as prisoners or missing in action is today reported at 1,472. Of these, 1,008 have been prisoners or missing more than 2 years; 493 have been missing more than 3 years; and 171 more than 4 years. Twenty-two have been missing more than 5 years. One prisoner of the Vietcong, an Army sergeant recently observed his 6th year in captivity.

In his report to the Nation on Southeast Asia last week, President Nixon again stated the deep concern of all Americans concerning the American prisoners of war held so cruelly and treated so badly by the North Vietnamese and Vietcong.

This week in Washington, D.C., concerned Americans will have an opportunity to show their concern and to pay tribute to American prisoners of war and

April 28, 1970

those missing in action. I look forward to a very large and meaningful participation in that meeting in the interests of human decency and international justice.

POSTAL REFORM BILL H.R. 17070

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have today received a memorandum from Reed Larson, executive vice president of the National Right to Work Committee which is addressed to all members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee regarding the postal reform bill, H.R. 17070.

In order that the entire membership will be aware of the position of the National Right to Work Committee on this legislation, I am inserting the memorandum and proposed testimony in the Record in its entirety:

NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C., April 27, 1970.

MEMORANDUM TO: ALL MEMBERS, HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

Attached is a copy of our statement on H.R. 17070, hearings on which were summarily concluded after only three days of testimony.

We are sending this to your office for consideration because we were given no opportunity to present it to your Committee. We asked Chairman Dulski on April 16, the day this bill was introduced, for an opportunity to testify. That letter, and a subsequent wire, have not even been acknowledged.

Since the testimony of those critical of this complex and radical 156-page bill was limited to one day, we must assume that it is the intention of the promoters of the "postal reform" deal to muzzle critical comment.

H.R. 17070 is the fourth Administration-sponsored version of "postal reform." Significantly, each of the three earlier bills (H.R. 15430, H.R. 11750, and H.R. 4, as amended) was presented in a way which avoided any Committee hearings whatsoever—and this time the critics of the bill get one day!

We respectfully request your careful consideration of the enclosed statement.

REED LARSON.

STATEMENT DELIVERED INDIVIDUALLY TO MEMBERS, HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE, BY REED LARSON, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK COMMITTEE, APRIL 27, 1970

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee: My name is Reed Larson. I am the Executive Vice President of the National Right to Work Committee, a single-purpose citizens' organization dedicated to the concept that union membership should be voluntary, not compulsory. We represent a cross-section of workers from all walks of life, including many members of unions both in the private sector and in public employment.

We regret very much the crisis atmosphere under which this very complex legislation is being pressed upon the Congress and the American people. The impression has been widely circulated that, unless Congress quickly rubberstamps this package, precisely as presented by the AFL-CIO and the White House, the Nation will be faced with another illegal postal strike.

It seems clear to us the primary reason for the attempt to railroad this measure through the Congress is that some of its provisions

will not stand up under the glare of public inspection. This is unquestionably the case with the provision authorizing compulsory unionism—and it may likewise be true of other Sections of this complicated 156-page proposal.

The *Washington Daily News* summarized this issue cogently when it said editorially on April 17: "Mr. Blount says that this agreement if it goes through Congress would permit unions to negotiate for union shops. Union shops require all employees to join the union, whether they want to or not. This is common in private industry, but is it good public policy? In principle, no. The question for Congress is whether this is too stiff a price to pay for reform of the postal system, desperate as that need is. If the union shop possibility isn't in the package, the whole deal could be defeated by the union lobbies, even though an eight per cent pay raise is at stake. This is a sharp turn-around in public policy, which Congress should examine with extreme care; and on which outpouring of opinion from the public at large would be decidedly in order."

Without question the American people, in overwhelming numbers, oppose this radical turn-around in public policy. But they are about to get it rammed down their throats.

The hasty consideration being pressed by the White House is apparently designed to foreclose any careful examination of the measure, or public awareness of the magnitude of the sell-out of the public employee's freedom which is involved.

Section 222 of this proposal would subject postal employees to coverage of Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act. Section 7 is the provision which has led to the wide-spread practice of compulsory unionism in private industry. It purports, on the one hand, to guarantee the rights and privileges of employees, while cynically destroying those rights on the other. Section 7 specifies that employees shall have the right to form, join or assist unions and the right to refrain from such activities, but shall be deprived of these rights "to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment."

It is important to recognize, furthermore, the distinction between compulsory unionism in private industry and compulsory unionism in government. Bad as the practice is in private industry, it is abhorrent in government employment. No official in the federal government other than Postmaster General Blount has ever tried to defend it. The right of federal employees to refrain from union activity was reaffirmed by President Kennedy, and strongly defended by his Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg, who told a union convention: "I know you will agree with me that the union shop and the closed shop are inappropriate to the federal government. And because of this there is a larger responsibility for enlightenment on the part of a government union. In your own organization you have to win acceptance by your own conduct, your own action, your own wisdom, your own responsibility and your own achievements."

Protection of this right was pledged by the 1968 G.O.P. platform. It was reaffirmed last year by President Nixon, and supported by Secretary of Labor George Shultz. Secretary Shultz as recently as last November said that "a person should not have to be a member of any organization to be able to work for the government."

One of the factors which makes compulsory unionism in government particularly offensive to those who genuinely believe in the civil rights of government employees is the fact that union resources, directly and indirectly, are used in substantial amounts for political purposes. The imposition of compulsory unionism on government employees means that an individual, in order to work

for his own government, can be compelled to pay money to a private organization which uses his money for political purposes with which he may disagree.

This legislation amounts to a renewal of the old Spoils System in its most ugly aspects. Political activity on the part of government employee unions, even when membership is voluntary has been severely criticized, but to add the injustice of compulsory union membership makes it an outrage which this Congress will surely reject—if given an opportunity to consider the issue. In this connection, the *New York Times* commented editorially last November, under the heading, "Backing The Boss In Politics": "It is true that postal unions and other federal employee organizations have found many ways to circumvent the rules that are supposed to keep them out of direct support for favored candidates. But none of this makes less improper the situation in New York in which unions embracing a third of a million municipal employees provide major financial help to elect or defeat the man who has a decisive voice in determining how much money they will receive from the public purse in higher wages, larger pensions and the other benefits they regularly seek. Whether or not the law condones it, here is a real conflict of interest."

On this point, Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black wrote a few years ago, "There can be no doubt that the federally-sanctioned union shop contract here, as it actually works, takes a part of the earnings of some men and turns it over to others, who spend a substantial part of the funds so received in efforts to thwart the political, economic and ideological hopes of those whose money has been forced from them under authority of law."

Mr. Kurt Hanslowe, former assistant general counsel of the United Auto Workers, now a professor at Cornell University, put it this way: "The union shop in public employment has the potential of becoming a neat mutual back-scratching mechanism, whereby public employee representatives and politicians each reinforce the other's interest and domain, with the individual employee and the individual citizen left to look on, while his employment conditions and his tax rate and public policies are generally decided by entrenched and mutually-supportive government officials and collective bargaining representatives over whom the public has diminishing control."

Published figures indicate that about 200,000 of the 750,000 postal employees have chosen not to join any union. The freedom of these employees to work for the government without being compelled to join or pay dues to any private organization is, in itself, an issue of major national significance. In addition, those who have chosen to join a union deserve the protection of their right to quit paying dues to any union which they feel is not serving their interests or the interests of the country.

But even more significant is the precedent which will be set by passage of this legislation. As George Meany told this Committee on April 23, "We think this bill is only the beginning. . . . We in the AFL-CIO hope to be back before this Committee in the very near future, urging adoption of a measure that will insure genuine collective bargaining for all aspects of employment for all civilian workers of the federal government." The official publication of Mr. Meany's organization acknowledged the far-reaching consequences which could be expected from Congressional endorsement of an authorization for compulsory unionism. Said the AFL-CIO News: "What's good enough for Uncle Sam ought to be good enough for every state, county, and city."

The Postmaster General, and some of his defenders have tried to portray this bill, negotiated at AFL-CIO headquarters as a compromise. They contend that because some

employees in the present 19 Right to Work states may not lose their Rights to Work protection through this bill, it is a case of meeting union officials half-way. Like other information circulated by the Postmaster General about the compulsory union shop authorization, this is inaccurate and deceptive. The fact is that 750,000 postal workers now enjoy protection from compulsory unionism. Even if the Postmaster General's assertion that state Right to Work laws would apply to postal workers is correct—and it is not—this means that some 550,000 postal workers would lose their Right to Work protection. Even for those who are willing to use an employee's freedom of choice as something to be placed on the auction block in political horse-trading, this is, indeed, a shabby compromise.

We believe that this entire package is a sell-out, not only of the postal workers, but of all public employees. It provides what George Meany and other union officials want most—compulsory unionism—in exchange for their support of a so-called postal reform bill. Mr. Meany made it clear when he appeared before this Committee last Thursday that, if he doesn't get his compulsory union shop authorization, he won't support the bill. I don't know how the subject could be put any more clearly.

The entire issue has been summarized succinctly in a letter we received from a long-time postal employee in New York City. His name is Joseph Romeo, Jr. On March 30 he wrote us as follows: "I am personally interested in forced unionization of postal employees because I am a postal employee and I stayed on the job during the recent strike. I was a member of a postal union for eleven years until I quit my membership last year because the union began to favor striking against the government. Sometime ago I wrote my Senators and Representative expressing my opposition to forced unionization of postal employees."

Should Joseph Romeo be fired for refusing to pay dues to a union which promoted an illegal strike? President John F. Kennedy said no! The 1968 GOP Party platform said no! And present Federal policy (Executive Order 11491) says no—it protects the freedom of all postal workers to work whether or not they pay money to a union—but H.R. 17070 proposed by the Administration would change all that. It would strip postal employees of their Right to Work protection.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, I cannot believe you agree that people like Joseph Romeo should be fired for refusing to pay dues to a union which advocates illegal strikes against the government or any other policy which offends the conscience of the individual employee. That is exactly what will happen if this bill is adopted as written—and neither of the architects of this bill, Postmaster General Blount, or AFL-CIO president George Meany can deny it.

We are greatly heartened that several distinguished members of this Committee have voiced their concern about this provision. We are also heartened by the fact that no member of this Committee has ever indicated that he believes postal workers should be deprived of their right not to join a union. At least two members of the Committee, one Democrat and one Republican, have publicly announced their intention to submit an amendment which will retain for postal workers the freedom of choice which they presently enjoy under federal policy. Congressman Henderson released a statement on April 22 announcing the language of the amendment which he will offer. We strongly endorse that proposal. We also endorse a similar proposal which Congressman William Scott of Virginia has indicated that he will offer.

Gentlemen of the Committee, we would like to close with a final plea that each of you take your stand with the individual

postal worker, defending his interests rather than the special interests of Mr. Meany and other union officials who wish to compel membership in a union as a condition of employment.

Unless it is amended to preserve the freedom of choice which postal employees presently enjoy, we urge that H.R. 17070 be rejected by this Committee.

COLLEGE FACULTIES FED UP WITH CAMPUS MILITANTS

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appeared in the April 26 issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer to which I can only add my "Amen." It discusses a recently released survey conducted by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education which, contrary to popular belief, indicates that the overwhelming majority of college faculty members are fed up with campus militants and favor effective measures to maintain order.

I urge your attention to the message contained in the editorial, the full text of which follows:

DISENCHANTED PROFESSORS

With the belated arrival of spring weather, when college students traditionally take to the out-of-doors with a mixture of exuberance and mischievousness, a number of campuses around the country have been hit by outbreaks of violence.

There is especially timely interest, therefore, in the results of a survey just released by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education—presenting the views of more than 60,000 college and university faculty members on campus disorder and related subjects.

It will be recalled that, when campus violence erupted on a large scale several years ago, faculty members frequently gave the disorderly students vocal and even active support.

The faculty members in this category may always have been only a small minority of the total but their militancy gave many people the impression, rightly or wrongly, that professors and instructors were predominantly sympathetic to student uprisings.

Whatever may have been the case at one time, the Carnegie survey indicates that the overwhelming majority of college faculty members are fed up with campus militants and favor effective measures to maintain order.

The survey, taken during the 1968-69 academic year, reveals that more than 80 percent of the faculty members responding to the question believe that "campus demonstrations by militant students are a threat to academic freedom."

More than 76 percent feel, "either strongly or with reservations," that "students who disrupt the functioning of a college should be expelled or suspended."

A majority of the faculty members expressed opposition to lowering admission standards for students from minority groups and to abolishing grades and making all courses elective.

None of this is to be construed as a lack of awareness on the part of college faculty members relative to the need for change. Most of them went on record in favor of improvements in curricula and were critical of policies that "reward conformity and crush student creativity."

It well may be concluded from the survey results that large numbers of college professors have grown a bit weary of smashed windows, occupied buildings, marching mobs throwing rocks, shouting obscenities, and the various other unpleasanties to which they have been subjected.

"IF I WERE 21 TODAY" IS SUBJECT OF KEELER ADDRESS

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most respected and thoughtful business and civic leaders of the Nation is the distinguished principal chief of the Cherokee Tribe in Oklahoma, W. W. Keeler of Bartlesville, who is better known in the business community as the chairman and chief executive officer of the Phillips Petroleum Co. and chairman of the National Association of Manufacturers.

On April 20, in Detroit, Mich., Mr. Keeler spoke before the Economic Club of Detroit on the intriguing subject "If I Were 21 Today."

The speech was not only an eloquent affirmation of faith in the 21-year-old of today, but a commanding challenge to the business community of the Nation.

I believe it is one of the finest speeches I have read in a long time, and I offer it for the RECORD in the hope that many Members of the House will share my view regarding it.

The text of the speech follows:

IF I WERE 21 TODAY

(Address by W. W. Keeler)

It was just 207 years ago today that an Indian last made a speech in Detroit—or so I've been told. His name was Pontiac. What he said that day brought on a five-month siege of your city and a frontier war which lasted for two and a half years. I am pleased that the people of Detroit have finally agreed to let bygones be bygones. While I intend to address myself today to the concerns of young people, let me assure you that it isn't with the intent of putting them on the war-path. My purpose today is simply to discuss what I would do if I were 21 today.

Recently a Michigan educator put this provocative thought before members of his graduating class: "Half of everything I have taught you for the last four years is wrong. The problem is that I don't know which half is which." We all have this problem of sifting out the facts and trying to make valid judgments based on what we think is right.

Surely, in today's complex world the 21-year-old faces a staggering task in sorting out truth from fancy as he begins to focus on possible lifetime pursuits. Yet it is terribly important that the 21-year-old masters this task. The young men and women now in their early twenties will someday hold the future of this land; they are to be the inheritors of our system. So we need to consider our complex world from their point of view. To the degree we can understand these young people, we may be able to leave them something of value on which to build the better world.

You and I see today's young people as the most singularly blessed of all generations; the best informed and educated, the most affluent, the healthiest, the most dedicated. We must also see them as so many of them see

themselves—as the most challenged group of young people in history. Our older generation should try to help these gifted younger men and women meet these challenges by encouraging and somehow guiding their enthusiasm and abilities.

We need to help them see that our world is not only one beset with problems, but also a world bursting with opportunities. Opportunities, both to solve these problems and to adventure boldly into the future. We can help them, because any of us who try to imagine ourselves as 21 year-olds, do so from a perspective of experience and observation not possible to today's generation.

If I were 21 today, my greatest concern would be over what is broadly labeled "the quality of life." This covers everything from the air we breathe to the nature of the people who breathe it. It embraces the crisis in our cities; the growth of dissent among people of all ages, but particularly among the younger generation; the issue of war and peace; hunger in the world; and the lack of trust between individuals, groups and nations.

If I were 21, I suspect I would be impatient with The System for being so tardy in supplying solutions to these critical concerns. I think, too, I would be resentful of the amount of attention my elders are paying to the comparatively few young people who have "copped-out" on the world and are substituting withdrawal, rhetoric, rebellion and drugs for creative problem-solving and hard-won achievement.

Given an overriding concern with the quality of life and a strong commitment to change it for the better, where would a 21-year-old find his best chance for translating his concern and commitment into achievement? Obviously there are many callings and each young person must find the one best suited to his talents, education, and goals. I think Bill Keeler, if he were 21 again, and wanted to bring about constructive changes, would consider possibilities in four vocational areas—government, social service, education, and business.

Let's look at the possibilities in government. As a 21-year-old, I would have been amply exposed to the philosophy that government, with its political power, can "do it all" in changing, re-shaping and bettering the lot of mankind. But I would wonder just what major problems government has solved in the past, and which problems it seems likely to conquer in the future. I might see government, and those who serve in it, as catalysts of change; shapers of priorities; but not really as problem-solvers. And if I were 21 today, I would want to be where the action is—where the answers can be found to problems that are developing.

As for social service, certainly the young man or woman who has the desire, talent and training for working with people faced with the difficult conditions created by many of the problems of our society, will find a rewarding career in this profession. But, as significant as his role is, the social service worker seldom gets the opportunity to grapple with the causes of despair, only with the consequences. The man who gets at the causes is the one who solves the problems. And, if I were 21 today, I would want to be a problem-solver.

How about the possibilities in education? If I were 21, and were inclined by interest and ability to shaping men's minds, I am sure I would want to teach. There can be no denying the importance of educating others for the quality of our life may very well hinge on how well those who teach our children do their job. But, if I were 21 today, I am sure I would be happiest and most productive as a shaper of action rather than minds—again, a problem-solver. And so, in my search to find where the action is I would finally ask myself: "What about business?"

I would learn that only a small percentage of my classmates are headed for careers

in business. But I would also discover that a large percentage of those in the leadership, problem-solving roles in our society have a business background. I would learn that industry stands accused as the Great Polluter of our world, but I would hope that men like you would refute this accusation and demonstrate to me that only the genius of private industry can solve the problem. I would learn that many of today's consumers are disenchanted with some of the products and services of American industry, but I would hope that men like you would tell me that the products of industry are making man's life longer, happier, and more useful. I would learn that industry has been charged with exploiting the working man, but I would hope that men like you would document for me industry's long and successful efforts to bring the host of benefits of our system to all working people.

And so, if I were 21 again and had this knowledge to face the future with hope instead of frustration; if I were really serious about coming to grips with today's great problems, even at the risk of creating some new ones, I would cast my lot with American business and industry. This is the force in our society which has proved its creativity in solving problems. I would choose business now, as I did 40 years ago, because I am certain I would find in it the very best opportunities to deal effectively with the issues affecting the quality of life.

War and peace would be an issue deeply troubling me as a 21-year-old intensely concerned about the quality of life. I hope I would encounter business leaders who are encouraging people to work together regardless of national boundaries, and who are working themselves to ease international tensions especially through their contacts with people in other lands as a by-product of trade transactions.

The idea that economic power, used constructively, can be a deterrent to the use of raw military power would have a deep appeal and I hope you would be demonstrating this to me. I am sure I would find it significant that American business influence is on the rise around the world at a time when American political and military impact appear on the wane. I, and many other 21-year-olds, would want to participate in the transfusion of American technology, American resources, and business know-how into other lands—an important step in insuring world peace by increasing the standard of living of people around the globe.

World hunger would be another aspect to the quality of life that would particularly trouble me as a 21-year-old. I would know that my country possesses the technology and experience to help solve this problem. I would want to hear more from business leaders about exciting new solutions, such as the establishment of a worldwide extension service. Modeled along the lines of our Farm Bureaus, this service would carry improved methods to the farmers of the world, particularly those in emerging nations in language they could understand. Concerned 21-year-old youths could put their hearts and energies into an effort such as this.

Environment would be an aspect of the quality of life of immediate concern to me as a 21-year-old. I would no doubt be taking part in this week's environmental teachings being held at campuses across the country. I would be angered that environmental pollution and related problems have been permitted to reach such magnitude. I would be frustrated at the apparent lack of action to correct them. I would find it significant that recent public opinion studies reveal that Americans believe that pollution is one of the most crucial—if not the most crucial—problems facing the nation.

I would look to business to challenge me in the search for creative ways to solve pollution problems. I think I would be intrigued,

if I were an engineer for instance, at the prospect of joining one of Detroit's great automobile companies in the development of new engines and new devices to solve the problem of pollution from exhaust discharges; I might be challenged by the efforts of one of the great energy companies to develop fuels to power the pollution-free engines of the future.

I would be excited by the regional approach to the problem of water resources, such as the Ohio River Valley project. For more than 22 years, this project has been quietly benefiting eleven and a half million persons in the Ohio River Valley. I would be impressed by the fact that the Authority which operates this system was created and is funded largely through business leadership.

I would also be impressed at the good-citizen role being played by a New Jersey chemical company, which makes its water treatment facilities available to the surrounding community. I would be intrigued by a container manufacturer's experiments with roadways paved with ground waste-glass as a means of utilizing solid wastes.

Deterioration of our urban centers would also distress me as a 21-year-old. I would be cynical because politicians seem able to offer only modifications of discredited programs, thus producing only further frustration among the people. On the other hand, I would be encouraged by companies that have assumed leadership roles in solving urban problems. For example, Detroit Edison is drawing upon the imaginative contributions of great urban planners such as Constantinos Doxiadis. Pioneering accomplishments are being achieved in low-cost housing by such business leaders as Eli Goldston in Boston and John Humphrey in Cincinnati.

If I were 21 today, I believe I would join forces with forward-looking business leaders who are determined to restore our great cities. Whether I were an engineer, architect, city planner, sociologist, training specialist or banker, I would be eager to help business solve such knotty problems as urban renewal, traffic control, mass transit and providing risk capital for new businesses.

The plight of our minorities would concern me if I were 21. I would be troubled that they have been neglected for so long. Being part of a long neglected minority group myself, I would have a special understanding of the resentment against a society which for too long has said to its minorities: "You aren't a part of us." But I would realize that business and industry can be the most effective force in bringing a segmented society together.

Nowhere would I see this leadership being more effectively exercised than here in Detroit where men like Henry Ford, Jim Roche, Lynn Townsend, and NAM's former chairman, Guy Peppiatt, have sparked a drive to provide training and jobs for what used to be called the "hard-core" unemployed. It is significant that two of the three men to head the National Alliance of Businessmen have come from your city. Any 21-year-old should have confidence that the automobile industry, which has done so much to help minority groups through employment, will continue this important task. The dignity of work is priceless, to a man, and business may be justly proud of the role it has played in recent years in providing this dignity to so many of our nearly forgotten citizens.

Of course, there are other problems related to the quality of life which business may play a dynamic role in helping solve in the years ahead. But just the few I have discussed illustrate the opportunities business offers to young people who care seriously about the quality of life and want a really active role in improving it.

But despite opportunities for action, if I were 21 today I would be helpless in one regard. I would have little or no immediate influence on the key factors which determine

the success or failure of our business system. Only you have that power. Therefore, if I were 21, I would leave you responsible leaders with one earnest admonition. And that is, "Don't blow it, Dad." Don't blow our free enterprise system before I get a chance to participate in it.

As a 21-year-old, I would realize that despite my eagerness and self-confidence, the world of business won't be turned over to me today. And so, as I begin to climb the ladder of achieving a better quality of life for people in our land, I need the assurance that the steps won't be pulled out from under me.

So if I were 21, I would urge you gentlemen to keep our system sturdy and sound. To do this requires first maintaining a stable national economy. Business cannot survive long in a climate of runaway inflation—nor can it remain healthy in a climate of "no-growth." The balance is delicate and the decisions businessmen sometimes have to make regarding wages, prices, investments and other such factors may not always win public plaudits. But these hard decisions must be made—and wisely—if the generation of 21-year-olds is to inherit a viable system.

I would urge you also to continue the "good works" which embrace all the aspects of what is termed the "social responsibility of business." It's this responsibility that attracts dedicated youth to the business world. Nothing turns them off faster than your turning away from living up to this responsibility. I suspect we are moving into an age in which the willingness to live up to our social responsibility may become a part of the public franchise to do business. This may be voluntary—in which case our system of free enterprise survives; or by edict—in which case the system fails. If you are going to win and hold today's 21-year-old, and also keep our system free, then the choice for you is clear.

If I were 21 I would urge you to meet the demands of the marketplace head on. You are part of a system in which the competitive market ultimately judges the worth of your efforts. This competitive market is the very sinew of our national economy. Today, that market is demanding better and safer products, finer service, and more reliable warranties. You should be running hard in the competitive race to best meet these demands. And you must meet these demands on your own before government forces you to do so. Your customer will be far better served by the constructive results of your own initiative, than by the restrictive results of Federal regulation. History shows that such regulation may lead to complete state control. If I were 21, I would hold that the worst legacy that could be left me would be a state-controlled economy—a legacy left by an industrial management that failed to provide the leadership and the foresight to come to grips with change.

Furthermore, if I were 21 and wanting to inherit a viable business system, I would also urge you to maintain stable, effective labor-management relationships. I would think it important to retain the workability of the collective bargaining process if I am to be an effective achiever through business. Turning unresolved disputes over to third parties for arbitrary settlement will, in the long run benefit neither you nor your employees. Worse yet, it will relinquish my birthright—and your obligation—to the management of corporate affairs.

Finally, if I were 21 I would urge you to make room for me and my generation in the exciting and challenging world of business. When young people come to work for you, give them something to do which is meaningful. Let the 21-year-old have his fair crack at applying his ambition and dedication to building a better world. If you don't give him this chance, you will most

surely lose him to some competitor, or another segment of society which does offer him the kind of action that will fulfill his ambition.

If I were 21, I would have faith that you would not let me down. That is why, if I were 21 again, I would cast my lot with you. And in doing so, I would face the future with optimism. An optimism built on faith in a system which has met and solved every problem which it has confronted. I would be eager to tackle my opportunities as a problem solver in this system.

There are no such problems, and thus no such opportunities, on the moon. Neither does any life exist there.

SUPPORT OUR SPACE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 25, Red China placed its first satellite in orbit about the earth. The announced weight of the satellite—380 pounds—is clearly compatible with a launch vehicle that could also serve as the booster for an intercontinental ballistic missile.

On the same day, Soviet Russia made a new stride forward in space capability by launching eight satellites with one rocket vehicle. Meanwhile, the Soviets are continuing their work toward a manned space station, as indicated by their current series of Soyuz flights.

These events illustrate once more that the international competition is keen for the technological leadership signified by space achievement. While we steadily reduce our investment in science and technology, others continue to move forward.

All Americans were proud last summer when our astronauts achieved man's first landing on another celestial body, the moon, and returned safely to earth. We were proud again this month when the Apollo 13 crew—with outstanding support from the worldwide ground support team—returned safely after encountering an emergency that had crippled their spacecraft as they neared the moon.

But so far as investment in future progress is concerned, we may be acting like the fabled hare who took a nap and let the tortoise win the race. The space budget in fiscal year 1971 will decline for the fifth straight year, even if the other body should agree to the modest authorization approved by the House on April 23. And there were those in this House who would have eliminated the entire future from the space program.

If we do not support the future, we invite a repetition of the challenge of the late 1950s and early 1960s, when the Soviet Sputniks and cosmonauts alarmed the world and threatened the success of our efforts to achieve peace. If we fall behind once more we may have to exert extraordinary efforts and excessive funds to catch up.

Would it not be wiser to provide steady support for our space science and technology, and avoid another Sputnik crisis?

PETER WESTOVER'S HOPES FOR AMERICA'S FUTURE

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, in these days, when young men seem more interested in criticizing our Nation rather than praising it, more interested in discarding our fine traditions rather than honoring and maintaining them, it is particularly encouraging to me to know there are still young people who do believe in patriotism and in upholding their country's traditions.

It is an honor to announce that one such a young man, a Vietnam-based soldier and a constituent of mine, Sp4c. Peter Westover II, of Relay, Md., has won the highest award in the 1969 Freedom Foundation Letter Awards program.

Specialist Westover, a 101st Airborne Division soldier, received the first prize Defender of Freedom Award in ceremonies at the Freedom Foundation headquarters at Valley Forge, Pa., in February. The award consists of an encased George Washington Honor Medal and \$1,000 cash.

The full text of Mr. Westover's letter follows:

MY HOPES FOR AMERICA'S FUTURE

(By Sp4c. Peter Westover II, U.S. Army)

Sirs: Let's be honest: the greatest hope for any citizen army is peace; we want to go home.

But since it seems unlikely we shall have any reasonable peace without victory, then peace can wait and we can wait. Because when we go home, we're going home with our peace; a real peace, to go home to. Citizen soldiers we might be. But Americans and soldiers, by God we are.

A great deal more than that there is not. One tends to think there is so much to hope for until one stops to think about it and realizes how much we have to be thankful for and how little we've got to hope to change.

Peace, yes. But perhaps the greatest hope should be this: that we have the good sense to maintain our traditions:

Patriotism: that we have the love of our country to put its good before all things.

Unselfishness: that we have the love of our fellow Americans to put their good on par with our own.

Judgment: that we judge our fellow Americans fairly and do not forget to weigh our own value; that we judge by intent as well as ability, by effort but not necessarily result.

Honesty: that we are fair with our country and fair with our fellow Americans.

Courage: that we have the courage to speak out and the greater courage to act at whatever personal cost when something is wrong; that we also have the courage to accept what is right for our country even when we do not personally like it.

Common Sense: that we continue to govern ourselves, to improve, to progress, in the manner of the Constitution. It has served us some two centuries now, without failure. And if history never teaches us anything else, it should teach us to stick to that path.

Plainness: that we speak openly and plainly in all our dealings and act upon them in the same manner.

Steadfastness: that when right, we never retreat, however hard the course; conversely, that when wrong, we act as strongly to correct ourselves.

God-fearing: that we do our best by country and fellowman and in so doing, our best by the God that made us.

These are great traditions. They have been with us since even before Lexington and Concord. They have made America all it is. And, maintained, they will maintain her.

Peace, yes. And that one hope: that we have the good sense to maintain our traditions. With them, fortunes may rise and fall, dissent and disorder come and go, but our country will stay the greatest nation on earth . . . and the greatest home.

Yes, we have some changes to make. Not just America. But us. And, yes, it can be a better America. But without our traditions intact and adhered to, there is no "can be" about it. It's a "will be."

RESOLUTION SUPPORTS BYELO- RUSSIAN FREEDOM

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in New York recently a group of devoted men and women met to once again publicly denounce the Soviet occupation of their homeland, Byelorussia. In these particularly troubled times we sometimes overlook the struggle of those people who were among the first victims of Soviet aggression. Theirs has been a long fight, almost five decades, yet it is one from which these people, who are dedicated to once again seeing their country free, have never wavered. They deserve our encouragement, praise, and prayers.

Mr. Speaker, at the New York meeting in the Biltmore Hotel a resolution was unanimously adopted by the delegates marking the commemoration of the 52d anniversary of the Declaration of Byelorussian Independence. Under the permission heretofore unanimously granted me I include it at this point:

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE RALLY COMMEMORATING THE 52ND ANNIVERSARY OF THE PROCLAMATION OF BYEORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE HELD AT THE BILTMORE HOTEL IN NEW YORK CITY ON MARCH 22, 1970

Byelorussians living in the United States and Americans of Byelorussian descent fully realize the important role and immense responsibility which they share in the struggle for promoting and maintaining the human, the social, and the national rights of the Byelorussian nation. While enjoying the civil rights guaranteed all citizens of the U.S.A., Byelorussian-Americans have made use of underlying American democratic principles to direct the attention of American society and the Government to the facts concerning the economic exploitation of Byelorussia by the central Soviet authorities as well as the systematic attempts to stifle Byelorussian national culture.

The Byelorussian people, cut off from the outside world by the barbed wires of the Soviet-Russian empire and the Communist propaganda curtain, are today deprived of their rights to be masters of their own land and lives. The key positions in Byelorussia are occupied by Moscow's stooges, party bureaucrats whose main objectives are to siphon from Byelorussia her economic wealth and by means of Russification to thwart the development of Byelorussian national cul-

ture. Imperialistic Moscow, in order to better camouflage her policy of exploitation, keeps secret from the Byelorussian people and the outside world the main indicators that reflect the real nature of Soviet Byelorussia's statehood, economy, and culture. An array of unanswered questions constantly persists.

What percentage, for example, of administrative and party positions in the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (BSSR) are occupied by Russians? Will the Soviet 1970 census indicate an answer to such a question? Probably not!

What is the balance of industrial and agricultural export versus import in the Byelorussian Republic? Have the Muscovite colonizers ever answered this question? Never!

How many books and periodicals are currently being disseminated in the BSSR in Byelorussian versus Russian? Has anyone ever received an answer to this question? No one, not ever!

How many schools in the BSSR are teaching in the Byelorussian language and how many in the Russian language? Why has the Education Ministry of the Republic shamefacedly kept mute on this score?

In spite, however, of intensive Soviet propaganda by which the Soviet Communist Party attempts to cover the gloomy reality that exists today in captive Byelorussia, the effects on Byelorussia of the economic and cultural oppression of her people are widely known to the outside world. And national resistance in Byelorussia is on the rise: there have been requests from Miensk (Minsk) for greater rights for the Republic's administration; requests for an increased usage of the Byelorussian language in official life of the BSSR; drives for an increased number of national theaters, museums, books and periodicals; repeated attempts by Byelorussian intellectuals to wrest from party falsifiers the treasures of their national past. That all this has been known in Western countries, is the result of the unrelenting efforts of the Byelorussian political emigres.

To paralyze these efforts toward exposure of the Soviet regime in Byelorussia, the Government of the BSSR has been conducting among Byelorussian emigres subversive activities channeling them both through the newspaper *Voice of the Homeland* and through broadcasts of the short-wave radio station *Soviet Byelorussia*.

In order to render harmless the influence upon the Byelorussian people of news on the political activities of Byelorussian emigration, the State Security Committee of the BSSR, moreover, has increased its public attacks on Byelorussian national organizations abroad. Perhaps, the most recent proof of this are the publications of a book, *In the Light of Undeniable Facts*, by Academician Lauren Abetsedarski and a so-called "novel-lampoon" of Illa Hurski, "Foreign Bread" published in the literary magazine *Polymia*. Yet, neither the falsifier of history, Abetsedarski, nor the graphomaniac Hurski have been able to divert the attention of the Byelorussian people from the plight of their economic and cultural deprivations. Such evil is readily understood and that is why at a recent conference in Miensk in January 1970 Pilatovich, the Secretary for Ideological Matters of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Byelorussia, warned his watchdogs that currently "one of the most common dangers lies in revival of nationalism."

We convene today as participants of the 52nd Anniversary of the proclamation of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic and solemnly decide and support the following declaration:

Byelorussians everywhere—whether living in Byelorussia, or dispersed across the expanses of the Russian empire, or settled in

the countries of the Free World—have never in the past nor will ever in the future become reconciled with the oppressive Communist-Russian regime in Byelorussia. With all our might and all our means we shall continue the struggle against the enslavement of the Byelorussian nation. We shall forever strive for the restoration of genuine national sovereignty and integrity as well as for the realization of freedoms set forth by the historic Charters of the Council (Rada) of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic and by the Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations.

Long live the Byelorussian Democratic Republic!

Long live a fighting Byelorussia!

A RESOLUTION URGING HUMANE TREATMENT FOR ALL FELLOW PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. CHARLES W. SANDMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 23, I had the honor of attending the 25th annual reunion along with fellow prisoners of war interned in Stalag Luft Three in Germany during World War II. Representative BURT L. TALCOTT, of California, also a prisoner at the camp, and I, introduced a resolution in support and urging humane treatment of our prisoners of war in Vietnam. The resolution was adopted unanimously by the 430 former prisoners of war attending the reunion. I would like to have this resolution placed in the RECORD today because I think it has a special significance coming from the hearts of men who have been prisoners of war themselves and who also know better than anyone else the ordeals suffered by parents and loved ones at home during the uncertain periods of incarceration.

The resolution adopted by those attending the reunion follows:

RESOLUTION URGING HUMANE TREATMENT FOR ALL FELLOW PRISONERS OF WAR

We, as former Prisoners of War: *Knowing first-hand the agonies of prisoners of war and their loved ones;*

Realizing that individual servicemen have no authority in determining the military or diplomatic decisions of their national governments;

Believing that humane treatment should be accorded every individual regardless of his race, nationality, station in life, or charge against him;

Shocked by the knowledge that the government of North Viet Nam refuses to disclose to our government or to the next of kin information concerning the capture, condition or location of prisoners;

Appreciate the anxiety and loneliness of wives, parents and children who are not informed concerning the locations and conditions of their missing servicemen; and

Having uncontroverted evidence that prisoners now in the custody of the North Vietnamese Government, Viet Cong and Pathet Laos are being mistreated and their families subjected to unimagnable torment in clear contradiction of the Geneva Convention and the fundamental rights of men;

Now, therefore, in the interests of basic humanity and universal comradeship,

We:

Urgently urge that all civilized persons of all nations insist on the elemental judicial privilege of habeas corpus—which accords any next-of-kin to have the person of a prisoner identified or produced or his place of burial known—for themselves and for all others;

Strongly advocate that all nations and governments comply fully with the Geneva Convention pertaining to prisoners of war; and

Earnestly implore every human being in every land to make their feelings known directly to the authorities of North Viet Nam by writing to:

Office of the President
Democratic Republic of Viet Nam
Hanoi, North Viet Nam

Executed in open convention during the 25th National Reunion of the Amerikanish Kriegsgefangenen (former American prisoners of war) at Cincinnati, Ohio, U.S.A., April 25, 1970.

IT'S YOUR MONEY

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the *Caroline Progress*, a weekly newspaper in my congressional district, had an editorial in its April 22 issue commenting on the amount of the public debt and what could be done with the annual interest approximating \$18 billion per year if we did not have to pay it and the Nation had not been guilty of deficit financing over the years.

Of course, we cannot turn back time but this thoughtful editorial may be persuasive in determining the future course of congressional action.

The editorial is set forth in full at this point:

IT'S YOUR MONEY

If you would like to have something really big to stew over, why not consider the federal debt, which now stands at \$277 billion. If that is too overpowering, take the annual interest on the debt alone—approximately \$18 billion dollars.

Suppose that we had no national debt, and that the huge sum we pay in annual interest could be put to a really constructive use.

For example, President Nixon has proposed that an additional \$10 billion be spent for municipal waste treatment plants, over the next five years. If the \$18 billion now going to interest were available, the entire project could be under way this year!

Stewart Udall recently said that it would take about \$100 billion until the end of the century to restore the water, land and air to its natural quality. Again, if that \$18 billion didn't have to go for debt charges, pollution might be controlled in a half-dozen years instead of thirty.

Well, you may say, all this is useless speculation because the debt is there—all \$277 billion of it—and we have to pay the interest each year. True enough, but just stewing about the problem should show the folly of ever again having an unbalanced federal budget except in a national emergency. During the past five years alone interest costs increased by some 70 per cent. Isn't it about time for all of us to do more worrying and begin to apply the brakes on government spending?

REFLECTIONS ON EARTH WEEK

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star of April 27, 1970, in an editorial emphasized that we are all passengers on the spaceship earth together and that we must all work together to preserve our environment and to find the answers to other national problems.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this important subject, I place the editorial in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

REFLECTIONS ON EARTH WEEK

The first great environmental teach-in is now history. On balance, the country probably is the better for it—somewhat more aware of the pollution problem and of the depth of public concern, and more informed about the sacrifices that will be demanded if the environment is to be saved.

But Earth Week cannot be recorded as a complete success. It produced its share of serious disappointments. It is regrettable that a fair number of the Daughters of the American Revolution saw the flap over ecology as a subversive plot. It is unfortunate that some black activists considered it a honky diversionary tactic. President Nixon, who has tabbed the environment as the number one national priority, might have unleashed a bit more enthusiasm for the event. And some of the Earth Week leaders should have curbed their instinctive enthusiasm for the jugular attack on the administration, the system and the establishment.

A degree of suspicion and indifference is inevitable and excusable. But the fiery rhetoric of some of the Earth Week oratory is not.

The purpose of the week-long event was, presumably, to educate, to interest and to involve the total community in the process of reversing the poisoning of the planet. The purpose was not—or should not have been—to mount a blatantly partisan attack on the Nixon administration. The President may be open to criticism for moving too slowly and cautiously in pressing for implementation of his own environmental program. He should, however, be encouraged to do more and to move faster—not vilified for what he has done.

Industry is another logical target of the militant ecologists. But the logic of applying pressure to the main polluters was, in a dismaying number of instances, counterbalanced by supreme logic. Offers from industry to discuss the problem and to search for solutions were disdainfully dismissed. Offers of financial support from industry were, in some cases, refused as tainted money. The issue, in short, became more important than the solution.

These self-proclaimed teachers have one important lesson to learn. The environment is no one's sacred preserve. There will be no solution unless the administration in power and the industrial leadership join in the search for it. All of us—the DAR, the Black Panthers, the SDS and General Motors—are in this together and have exactly the same stake in the outcome. No offer of help or show of interest, whatever the source, can be refused. For—assuming that the prophets of ecological doom are right—we all work together, or we all go separately.

ELIMINATE POVERTY IN THE MILITARY

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, it is a national scandal that members of our country's armed forces are required to live below the poverty level. On Monday, April 27, 1970, I introduced legislation, H.R. 17261, to eliminate, from poverty, all members of the military and their dependents.

The situation with regard to poverty in the military is much greater than many would believe. For instance, a report issued by the Department of Defense in January of this year indicates that at least 12,589 military families are actually receiving welfare. The breakdown by States is as follows:

Summary of military families by State who are receiving public assistance

(*Indicates that the State declined to participate in survey)

State:	No. of Families
Alabama	88
Alaska	10
Arizona	130
Arkansas	0
California	7,500
Colorado	91
Connecticut	*
Delaware	36
District of Columbia	6
Florida	111
Georgia	1,118
Hawaii	75
Idaho	58
Illinois	211
Indiana	133
Iowa	*
Kansas	142
Kentucky	207
Louisiana	*
Maine	*
Maryland	0
Massachusetts	200
Michigan	122
Minnesota	*
Mississippi	21
Missouri	*
Montana	19
Nebraska	66
Nevada	0
New Hampshire	1
New Jersey	130
New Mexico	*
New York	1,653
North Carolina	54
North Dakota	25
Ohio	*
Oklahoma	184
Oregon	*
Pennsylvania	*
Rhode Island	*
South Carolina	0
South Dakota	23
Tennessee	*
Texas	43
Utah	*
Vermont	*
Virginia	63
Washington	*
West Virginia	*
Wisconsin	34
Wyoming	25

* Does not include Cumberland, Monmouth, and Passaic counties.

During debate on the welfare bill, it was estimated that almost 150,000 servicemen and their families live at below poverty level.

It seems inconceivable to me that we can have serious hope for an all volunteer military service when pay conditions require men to be compensated below the poverty level exist.

What man would volunteer for poverty?

Local governments are currently having a very difficult time filling available policemen and firemen positions with \$6,000–\$9,000 beginning salaries. There is no comparison between this and the military enlisted man in the pay grade E-1 who receives \$1,598.40 basic pay per year.

My bill also raises compensation for those in the pay grade E-1—recruit through E-7 in the first 2 years of service by 25 percent. The bill allows the servicemen to receive this or the poverty level provision whichever is greater.

As an example of poverty in the military, I cite the case of a serviceman in the pay grade E-1 with three dependents. This serviceman, with the new pay raise, receives total pay and allowances of \$285.38 per month. The current poverty level for this size family is \$310 per month, according to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. By virtue of serving in the military this man is compensated at well under the current poverty level. Many servicemen do receive allowances for housing and food; but, as in the example cited, even with these allowances many servicemen are forced to live below poverty level.

No one should be drafted into the military service and then be forced to live on resources below poverty. My bill would eliminate this now and in the future.

SURREATTSVILLE HIGH SCHOOL PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE AWARD

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent Public Service Award given Surrattsville High School in Prince Georges County, Md.

In this time of keen awareness of man's effect on his environment, none of us can afford to turn from any measure of responsibility.

Last month about 100 students from Surrattsville High School organized a campaign in which they spent several days clearing roadways and vacant lots. The campaign, in conjunction with the Prince Georges Department of Public Works, was deemed a success, so much so that the students have been asked to present their program to other student governments in the county.

In commenting on their award, I add my congratulations and personal commendation for a project well conceived and well done.

OBITUARY FOR THE CALIFORNIA ZEPHYR

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly disappointed with the decision by the Interstate Commerce Commission to permit the death of our Nation's best known passenger train service, the California Zephyr.

I was saddened with that action because I do believe the traveling public must be served, and there are many who do want to take the train as was demonstrated so well by the Zephyr which operated with a high percentage of its capacity filled. For this reason, I also strongly support positive action by the Congress.

My position has been clear over the years as a strong supporter of the continuation of rail passenger service. We must continue our fight to secure adequate legislation to keep the passenger trains running, because if we do not accomplish this goal in the immediate future, we will not have any passenger trains left to save.

Because there were so many of us who fought for the continuation of the California Zephyr, I want to share with my colleagues a recent article appearing in the San Francisco Chronicle, which I insert at this point in the RECORD:

LAST MAGICAL TRIP OF THE ZEPHYR

The California Zephyr died yesterday—and some of America died with her.

Hundreds lined the Western Pacific tracks in Northern California to snap pictures and wave good-bye to the loveliest and most loved train in all the country.

And when she rolled into Oakland's Third and Washington streets station for the final time last night, and when her groaning engine sounded a haunting farewell whistle blast, there weren't many dry eyes among the 350 passengers.

"What a tragedy that the Government didn't step in—we're losing a natural resource," observed a balding, cigar-chomping gentleman who was among the huge crowd to greet the streamliner at the depot.

What sort of magic did this silver train weave upon those who rode her?

It might have been the spectacular scenery she passed through, much of it timed for daylight viewing on the leisurely 2½-day run between Chicago and Oakland.

There was something irresistible about a train that each day for 21 years meandered through the Feather river canyon, snaked her way across the Colorado Rockies, and then continued her serpentine course over the Mississippi River into the heartland of America. And back.

To many, the Zephyr was unquestionably a time machine that carried them off to an earlier era—when the living was supposed to be easy, or at least looked that way from the observation club car.

The Zephyr was one of the few good trains, and probably the only great one, still around in 1970.

The carnations on the dining car tables weren't plastic. The silverware, the crystal and the linen tablecloths and sheets were real. The stewards and conductors exuded politeness.

But perhaps it was more basic than that, tapping something more fundamental to the human psyche than nostalgia.

"I don't care if it costs a billion dollars to run this—it would still be worth it," said Amy Robertson, 9, of Arlington, Va. She was on the last run, and it was her first railroad trip.

"The neatest thing I've ever done," exclaimed her companion, Tom Schneider, 9, of Kankakee, Ill. He was staring out a vista dome as the Zephyr wound its way across the Utah desert under a full moon.

INHERITANCE

Millions of other youngsters, of course, will never ride a train. Whether they like it or not, they have inherited a frenetic new age that emphasizes speed and the future over being and nowness.

Their pabulum has been the freeways, the jets, the instant electronic communications—and instant pabulum.

It's not that they wouldn't appreciate, if ever they were given the chance, standing on open vestibules like yesterday's Zephyr passengers, breathing fresh air, staring wonderously at the mighty pine and spruce trees along the Feather river, feeling the wind ripple across their faces, hearing the clackety-clack of wheels upon rails, and existing for that particular moment—suspended in time, and somehow impervious to time's tyrannys.

LOSSES

"We lost \$2.5 million this last year because there weren't enough passengers," a Western Pacific official said while carving some ham at breakfast in the dining car.

"The money is in freight," he added, as the Zephyr eased past some clear blue pools of quiet water high up in the Sierra.

His company, which operated the Zephyr in fine style from Salt Lake City west, spent four years pleading with the Interstate Commerce Commission for permission to discontinue its end of the service.

Justifiably upset over the losses, the executives and the accountants triumphed, of course, over the crew members, romanticists and fellow-travelers who rallied to the Zephyr's cause.

And last month the ICC consented to the train's demise.

STEWARDS

"Where do I go from here?" asked steward Robert DuBoce, as he polished glasses behind his bar in the rear lounge car.

Although most of the 235 Western Pacific crew members on the six Zephyr trains will be shuffled into freight jobs, nearly 90 sleeping and dining car stewards will be without any work.

The severance pay isn't enough to sneeze at," glumly observed DuBoce, who is 59 and has spent all of his life on the rails.

His dank mood fell in sharp contrast to the bright rays of sun streaking through his car's vista dome.

The Zephyr was coming home now, high-balling through the gentle rolling hills of the Sacramento Valley.

STOP ARMED ATTACKS ON AIRCRAFT

HON. LEONARD FARBSTAIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, 1970, faculty members of the Columbia University School of Public Health and Administrative Medicine sent the following letter to President Nixon:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are professional colleagues of Professor E. R. Weierman, Professor of Public Health, Medical Care and Medicine at Yale University, who together

with his wife, died in the recent Swiss air crash. Professor Weierman has made distinguished contributions to the study and development of health services in this country, and his loss can be ill-afforded. The act which destroyed Professor Weierman and his fellow-passengers is deplored by all civilized people, wherever their political and national sympathies may lie. We are moved by compassion to urge you to initiate and to support whatever measures may prevent terrorism in the air. We are moved by larger dangers, which Professor Weierman's death has brought home to us, to urge you to seek every possible means to bring the warring parties in the Middle East to negotiate peace.

Respectfully yours,

The recent terrorist attacks on planes, culminating in the tragic loss of 47 lives in the crash of a Swiss air jet over Zurich, has brought strong worldwide reaction and calls to stop this premeditated horror. There have been a number of suggestions with regard to bringing an end to these terrorist acts, including my own resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 533—urging the President to determine and undertake appropriate actions with respect to stopping armed attacks on aircraft and passengers engaged in international travel. I urge our Government to pursue every possible avenue toward a solution. Let it be hoped that through a concerted and international effort, this needless loss of life can be stemmed and freedom of travel without fear can be reestablished.

THE GREEK COLONELS AND THEIR PENTAGON PALS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Pentagon's support of the Greek military junta should be of concern to us all. The following editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle states the grounds for public dismay over the Pentagon's flagrant disregard for the will of Congress:

It is reported that the Defense Department has been flouting national policy and overriding congressional authorization by secretly shipping millions of dollars worth of military equipment to the military junta that has usurped the government of Greece.

The reports have understandably outraged members of a Congress that has imposed strict limitations on such shipments and is told that the restrictions are flagrantly disregarded, through the expedient of supplementing authorized military aid with so-called "surplus stocks."

A sharp cutback in the quantity of such aid was imposed in 1967 after the Greek colonels ousted the constitutional government and imposed a military dictatorship that jailed hundreds of Greek citizens and instituted highly repressive measures on the pretext that the country was in danger of a Communist takeover.

No such danger existed, the Council of Europe has now declared in a 40,000-word report that accuses the junta of inflicting torture and other ill treatment upon its numerous political prisoners as a matter of common "administrative practice."

A victim of those practices, the Greek composer Mikis Theodorakis, has asserted

upon his recent release from detention that the junta's system of prisons and concentration camps is "inadmissible" in any European country and for "every man who is civilized and free."

The council report, approved by 15 European nations, calls upon the military government to abolish torture, to release its political prisoners, and to restore without delay the human rights and fundamental freedoms it has denied to Greeks. Until it does so, any approval of its methods such as is implied by lavish shipments of arms, is certain to arouse hostility and resentment not only here at home, but also abroad.

POSTMASTERS VISITED
WASHINGTON

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, it was my very pleasant experience last Wednesday to receive a delegation of postmasters from my congressional district. The postmasters are members of the Westmoreland County Chapter of the National Association of Postmasters, and the delegation also included guests from Fayette and Armstrong Counties. Stanley Mokowski, from my hometown of Jeannette, is chapter president. Arrangements for the trip to Washington were under the direction of George Yedlicka from Rilliton and Ruby Briner from Acme. The county representative on the State committee for arrangements was Bob DeLotto from New Kensington.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the postmasters enjoyed their visit to Washington and I hope it was a fruitful visit for them. I know it was both enjoyable and fruitful from my standpoint. We had an opportunity to discuss many matters; problems and concerns that they had as well as issues that affect our communities. We also had an opportunity to just socialize, and that allowed me to renew so many long and cherished friendships.

Sometimes we have a tendency to take things for granted. The operation of our post offices is an example. We get out mail and answer it. We send and receive important and valuable documents and parcels. In all of these instances and more, we assume efficiency and reliability and honesty and we get it. But we should pause occasionally to express our appreciation to the selfless men and women who administer our post offices and the dedicated employees who work under their direction. Over the years, they have proven to be more than good public servants. They are often found in positions of civic leadership and their role in our communities are invaluable. We are truly fortunate to have people of this caliber administering one of our Government's earliest and most vital functions and I am especially fortunate to have the outstanding type of postmaster we in Westmoreland County do have.

I WOULD RATHER WORK

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, in this day when there is fear that so many people are turning to welfare as a way of life, it is indeed encouraging to find an example of a person who is determined to go it alone.

Such a person is Mrs. Joan Gorder of St. Paul, who as a member of a rare breed, has a story worth telling. Could it be that we are missing something?

The article follows:

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press, Apr. 26, 1970]

MOTHER OF FOUR CHOOSES TO WORK INSTEAD
OF RECEIVING AFDC FUNDS

(By Eleanor Ostman)

"I'm not only on a treadmill; I feel like I'm in quicksand," says a St. Paul mother of four who has chosen to support her family by her own labors rather than go on welfare.

She tells her children, "You have a right to only that which you earn," and she has adhered to that philosophy herself for the last seven years although she is becoming ever more disillusioned "as the fine line" between the financial benefits of earning a living and going the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) route "gets thinner and thinner."

Mr. Joan G. Gorder, 1818 Dayton Ave., spoke of the frustrations she and others who choose to work feel when she wrote a letter to the Pioneer Press Mallbag recently.

Basing her letter on the fact that during a recent month, Minnesota had the highest AFDC payments of any state in the nation and that Ramsey County pays more than neighboring Hennepin County, she wrote, "Have you been paying attention? Are you aware . . . that we here in Ramsey County pay the highest amount to our welfare and AFDC recipients of anyone else in the country? Yet the WRO (Welfare Rights Organization) women are . . . wailing for more money for furniture and clothing. What's going on? We have neither the highest cost of living nor the highest wage scale. But we sure do have the biggest give-away program in the nation. What a demoralizing honor for the taxpayers."

During an interview, Mrs. Gorder expanded upon the points in her letter and the frustrations of taking what she had always, until recently, felt the honorable path. She calls herself "a staunch conservative" and that led to her decision, made seven years ago when her youngest child required surgery and she found herself in dire financial straits.

In process of divorce, she turned to public assistance, asking them to pay a mounting light bill "so at least we would have the lights on while we tried to see our way out of the mess," she says. "I didn't want permanent help." At the time, although nearly penniless, she didn't qualify for help so she vowed "never to take a cent from any welfare agency."

"Somehow we kept the lights on. I took in sewing and was licensed by the state to do babysitting in my home. Somehow we kept body and soul together and by staying home, I saved money. There were no work clothes to buy, I could cook from scratch, bake bread and sew all the children's clothes." Her children are now 16, 13, 12 and 7.

She "wasn't about to take something for nothing," but looking back and foreseeing the future, the advantages of AFDC for a person in her situation keeps increasing. She's had some college and if, as an AFDC mother several years ago, she'd taken advantage of the education opportunities, she could have had the time to earn a master's degree by now and already would have been working at a substantial salary.

Instead, she went to work at the Main Post Office. By working a less desirable shift and by studying to become a mail sorting machine operator, she earns two extra pay premiums. Before the postal workers strike, her take-home pay was \$68 a month more than that of an AFDC mother. Even the six per cent raise recently won by the strike will not compensate for cost of living increases. She cited her co-workers who do not earn the extra pay premiums and may earn less than public aid payments.

She just took her children to a dentist—paid for out of her own funds. So are medical bills, but AFDC recipients get all medical and dental payments in addition to their allotments. She does not get food stamps. "I've had my stove for seven years and it was old when I got it; I paid \$40 for it. My refrigerator was used when I bought it; so were the washer and dryer."

Gesturing to her surroundings in the modest duplex where she and the children live she said, "You can see we don't live in the lap of luxury." Her refrigerator's freezer conked out months ago and a good deal of food was lost. "If I were on AFDC, I'd call the Welfare Department and they'd fix or replace it."

"If I buy it and pay for it, then I take care of it because I know how much it cost," she says. She tells her children the same thing. "If you get something new and you wreck it, you haven't earned the right to have it replaced."

Mrs. Gorder longs to have a home of her own but she can't afford the substantial down payment. But she reads of programs to buy homes for people on welfare. With her tax money.

"There are others like me in the same boat. We wonder who's crazy? Why are we beating our heads on the wall?" she muses.

"Some people have no other route than to go, but on the welfare rolls." She cited a woman she knows with a ninth grade education and five children.

"I've always been a blooming optimist but now I wonder where we've gone. Most of the people I know are unhappy—they're fed up to the teeth. This give away permissiveness has got to stop. I wish taxpayers could revolt and we probably would if we didn't live under a take-your-money-before-you-see-it situation."

Her "blooming optimism" is fading because she feels American society is disintegrating.

"'Help yourself' doesn't mean anything anymore—it's just words; 'Respect' is ancient history—it should be marked 'archaic' in the dictionary; 'Responsibility' is semi-archaic and 'Morals' are a thing of the past," she mourns.

One of her main concerns is the divorce system of this nation, and that the availability of welfare funds "is a government program aiding and abetting the downfall of the American family."

Despite her status as a divorced woman, she's worked long and hard to give men equal rights in the divorce courts. When she and her husband separated, they agreed that they were mutually responsible for their children; that although he does contribute some funds to their support that she would work, too. They concur that it is important that children of a divorce know both par-

ents and do not become pawns in the parents' disagreements.

"The AFDC caseload would be reduced by half if divorce laws were more stringent," she commented. "The mother automatically gets the kids; the father automatically pays. If he does not pay under such unequal terms, then the wife and children turn to AFDC. Men who might by some fluke keep the children don't get welfare payments, however. If a woman knew that when she went to a lawyer to start divorce proceedings, she stood an equal chance of losing the children and having to pay support to her husband, she might think twice."

Mrs. Gorder is interested in a program underway in Minneapolis and now making a foothold in St. Paul. It's called WORKfare and one of its major aims is to sit in at divorce proceedings to see if a fair decision is made, if the better parent gets custody of the children, and if when the mother gets the family, how many go directly to AFDC for help. "This group is getting at the root of the problem," she believes.

"The looseness of the whole situation reflects on the children. When partners don't have responsibility toward marriage, when they value freedom more than their family, we will see the destruction of the American family," she believes. "And what's this really doing to the children?"

Mrs. Gorder is an articulate woman who reads voraciously, researches her topics and would like to have the time to write about her beliefs. She believes that many women now on AFDC could work if they could alternate babysitting chores with another mother working an alternate shift. "Another woman and I did that. We saved babysitter money we might otherwise have paid. What's a few more kids around the house when you have your own anyway?" she says.

She'd like segments of society to get away from thinking they have unearned rights. She'd like to see the belt tightened; to get respect, responsibility and morals back into the fiber of national life. What can we do?

"We can put every ounce of pressure possible on our elected officials," she urges.

But there's always that fine line growing thinner and thinner. If the time should ever come that she herself must go on welfare, she says, "I would take advantage of every educational program available to equip myself for a better life. I couldn't live with myself if I just sat back and enjoyed the free ride." And if her name was ever on the AFDC rolls, she would tell everyone who would listen how much it was costing the taxpayers to support her and her family.

The plight of people in postal service was emphasized during the recent strike with some strikers earning less than they would get on public assistance. "We went on strike on the 20th of March. Welfare checks weren't to be mailed until the 31st, and yet the minute the strike was declared, we heard stories of welfare and AFDC people who were already starting to wonder if they would get their checks on time."

If the strike had continued through the 31st, Mrs. Gorder vowed to her fellow picket carriers that she would take her picket up to 476 St. Peter (site of the City and County Welfare offices) and march back and forth of their door.

For people in her situation at basically low-paying jobs, she says the challenge is gone when compared to public assistance. "It used to be that you earned money to get ahead, but when some people get as much for doing nothing, we start to wonder. When people feel that they're going to live off the fat of the land, the situation will never change."

Speaking as a taxpayer, Mrs. Gorder said, "I have sympathy for the guy who's paying. The noose gets tighter and tighter."

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recommend two important pieces of veterans' legislation to this body which I am introducing today. The first bill proposes the establishment of a national cemetery in New England. It authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Army to acquire land not exceeding 500 acres in New Hampshire, Vermont, Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, or Connecticut for this purpose.

For years now, Mr. Speaker, there has been an urgent need for a national cemetery in New England. The need has not diminished.

There are 98 national cemeteries in this country, but there is no national cemetery in the New England area. This region is being discriminated against.

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of urgent concern since it is the right of every veteran to be accorded the honor of a burial in a national place of honor. The saturation point of our national cemeteries in other areas of the country is rapidly being reached. This places an additional burden on the families of our veterans who wished to have their loved ones buried in one of this Nation's national cemeteries.

Moreover, the need for the acquisition of new land is pressing. Land is becoming more and more scarce and land costs are soaring. If we continue to wait to acquire land for a national cemetery in New England, the cost will become prohibitive and New England will find itself permanently without burial facilities for its honored and patriotic veterans.

Our veterans have been willing to make the greatest sacrifice any man can make. They have offered their country their lives in an effort to keep America free. Is it too much to ask, Mr. Speaker, that these loyal Americans be afforded the honor of burial in a national cemetery? I think not. Therefore, I urge that this body take immediate action on this legislation directing the Secretary of the Army to acquire land in New England to be used as a national cemetery.

Mr. Speaker, the second piece of legislation that I am introducing today would provide for annual adjustments in the monthly benefits received by our veterans. This legislation is essential.

Inflation has hit hardest those of our citizens who are dependent upon pensions for their economic support. The cruelty of inflation is that it hurts the very most those who can least afford it—those who are forced to live on fixed incomes.

This situation is unfair. Our veterans have given unselfishly of themselves. They are not the draft card burners or the protestors. They are not Americans bent on revolution or the destruction of our society. These are the patriotic Americans who form the backbone of our Nation.

Many of these veterans depend almost entirely upon their monthly veterans' benefits for their support. But during a period of inflation, such as we are enduring at the present, their benefits pay for less and less. Prices are rising while monthly benefit checks remain the same. In effect, the dollars they receive are shrinking in pay power. This is a serious problem, and one that must be corrected without delay.

The legislation that I am proposing today would end this inequity. It would provide that annual adjustments be made in the monthly monetary benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration based on the changes in the Consumer Price Index.

This is good legislation. It is needed legislation. It is time we stopped bending over backwards to make excuses for the hippies and yuppies and draft-card burners who care more for their own skins than for the security of America. It is time that we did something to help this country's defenders—her veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this legislation to my colleagues in the hope that they will see fit to take prompt action on this matter of great importance.

PILOT FATED TO DIE WRITES WHY HE GAVE SERVICE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in the heat of dissension, we lose sight of the basis of our commitment in Vietnam. The night before he was tragically killed in a plane crash, Air Force Lt. John Banks III very movingly outlined his reasons for being in Vietnam and his dedication to serve his country. I know all my House colleagues will find his comments very poignant and I am honored to share the attached article from Stars and Stripes:

PILOT FATED TO DIE WRITES WHY HE GAVE SERVICE

Lieutenant John Banks, III, of the Air Force was killed in the crash of a transport plane he was co-piloting in Viet Nam. The day before he was killed, he completed an essay which he planned to enter in a contest. A companion forwarded it to his father who lives in Superior, Wis.

Dorothy Brussard, AMVET's Auxiliary publicity official, forwarded a copy of it. It was titled, "For Those Who Wonder Why." Here-with the Stars and Stripes prints the document.

"I am an American—a defender of freedom and guardian of the Nation. The service I render to my country is not only duty, but an honor and a privilege—duty, as a citizen whose life holds responsibility for country in high regard. Honor, as an individual before God with respect for the ideals that make these United States a democracy. Privilege, for the ability to give, and fortunate enough to have been born in a land where my life, mind and ideals are my own.

"To serve our country as a fighting man is a trust bestowed on me by the people. It is my hope for millions outside our borders

who suffer under the rampage of tyranny, the absence of justice and freedom.

"As an American fighting man, I find faith in my God and courage from those who have gone before me. My reason for service is a symbol for all men to see that the sacrifices of my fellow Americans was not in vain. I make no claim to another's land or government but stand ready at the borders of freedom, not as an aggressor, but as a defender; and the nations of the world will know that 'the pursuit of happiness' is more than spoken words, but a way of life.

"The orders I receive are derived from the people and I am responsible to them."

I AM A REACTIONARY

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, we live in an age when fundamental human values are often mocked and derided; when manifestations of love of the flag and America are frequently scorned.

Many tend to associate the rantings and ravings and violent rebellion of a few young people with all of America's youth. I reject this assumption because I feel that most young people are orderly, stable, and hold basic tenets of belief in decency in society.

It is deplorable that the disorderly youth get more television exposure than the orderly. Discord and dissention make the front page. Good behavior is not news and never reported.

Are young Americans radicals or reactionaries? I think most are reactionaries in the context of the following article written by a teenager and reprinted in the April 9, issue of the Mississippi Baptist Record. I commend it to my colleagues:

I AM A REACTIONARY

In the church bulletin of the First Baptist Church of Wichita Falls, Texas, where Dr. Landrum P. Leavell is pastor, we found an article of such interest and so potent that we pass it on to our readers.

"Just for the record—and with out apology—I AM A REACTIONARY! I react to sin and sadism, riots and revolution, gutlessness and Godlessness! I re-act to Hedonism and humanism; to philosophies and sophistries which seek to destroy those values which made this country great; which fashioned the fabric of civilized mankind. I re-act to dancing the permissive polka with those who'd whirl me all the way to Hell while whispering that God is dead and the Devil is a myth; to those ministers who'd convert my house of worship into a hootenanny hall or political forum.

"I re-act to the emasculation of my Faith in the name of humanistic togetherness; to my love for the Holy Bible, my loyalty to the flag and my esteem for the police. I re-act to being scourged with the lash of collective guilt—as if I personally poured liquor down the alcoholic's throat, peddled the heroin, mugged the little old lady, created the slum and invented The Bomb!

"I re-act to the glorification of welfarism over work; Pot over pink lemonade; the Pill over purity; demonstration over dedication; desire over discipline, nihilism over nobility; selfishness over sacrifice, hauteur over humility, 'rights' over right.

"I re-act to the portrayal of my American friends as 'Fascist beasts' and Ho Chi Minh as Santa Claus; to those who consider love

as nothing more than sex act; who preach 'peace' to promote surrender. I re-act to student radicals who are so enamored of their own worth that they must destroy all other worths—who are FOR nothing except their 'right' to be against everything!

"I re-act to the stupefying sentimentality of amateur do-gooders who, like carved wooden monkeys, see no evil, speak no evil and hear no evil—even when it runs riot with a shotgun, molotov cocktail or plastic bomb; who would re-write Little Red Riding Hood to have her 'rehabilitate' the wolf while screaming 'hate-monger' at the rescuing woodsman!

"You'd better believe I'm a reactionary. In my book, it's time all responsible adults began reacting instead of suffering the insults, inconveniences and intimidations of a noisy minority who would sacrifice their own freedom and ours on the altar of atheistic materialism: If we did, the kooks and creeps would soon crawl back under their rocks and this tired old world would have time to bind its wounds and regain its sense of humor."

This sounds like it might have been written by an over 30, moss-backed conservative member of the "establishment," but it was written by a teenager to the editor of the Nashville Banner. May God give us more such teen-agers.—Bulletin, FEC, Clinton.

ABUSE OF OUR FLAG

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the inner anguish concerned Americans feel as some young Americans despoil the flag of our country is graphically and poignantly expressed in a letter to the editor of today's Washington Star by John Delizza. This is particularly tormenting for former American servicemen who have fought, often been wounded, and seen their buddies die—all to preserve, protect, and maintain freedom and liberty in the United States of America and a reasonable facsimile thereof in other countries of the world.

It is both devastating and tragic that some young people could have become so misguided, so valueless, so deliberately unpatriotic and disrespectful of abiding faith, as to do these things. Again one asks, who is responsible? How did they get that way? It cannot all be dope, or disenchantment with Vietnam, or the perennial "revolt of modern youth."

Let us hope and pray that in most cases they will find themselves and become useful citizens. If irremediable in individual cases, then perhaps Mr. Delizza's "one-way ticket" is the best response.

The article follows:

"I WAS SHAMED"

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

Sir: Twenty six years ago I was in a small town outside Salerno, Italy. It was around the end of World War II. The town had been completely destroyed, deserted by all the inhabitants—smoke, ruins, flame and destruction were all around us.

I was a young boy then. My friends and I were looking around for food; we were starving and scared. The Germans were all around us. All of a sudden we heard the terrible noise of machines—tanks were coming our way. We were scared; we embraced each other from fear. Who was the enemy? Were they

Germans? If they were, they would certainly kill us.

Suddenly, in all these clouds of smoke we saw a flag; we saw a flag standing up straight, full of pride and honor. You should have been there; it was the most beautiful sight any man could have wished for. The tanks were getting closer; we didn't know what to do. We kept looking at that flag, looking, looking; and all of a sudden a smile was coming back to our face, first slowly and then bigger, bigger and deeper. It was the American flag, the American flag; and we cried and screamed with joy in our heart. The fear was gone, there were no more soldiers to kill us.

"It's the American flag; the Americans, the Americans are here," we cried. "We are free; freedom is here at last." And we ran down the hills, we ran to our mothers hiding in the hills, in caves, even in wells. We ran with the scene of that beautiful flag we had just seen in these clouds in our eyes. . . . The Americans, the Americans are here. Boy! What a joy it was; what a sight to remember.

We cried; we cried in our mothers' arms with joy; and I remember saying to my mother: "We are not going to be killed any more, mother, the Americans are here."

How I have learned to love that flag ever since. How beautiful it was to see the sight of those American soldiers coming to our town to bring us justice, liberty, peace. How we learned to love those soldiers standing there outside of their tanks, beside the American flag. What men they were; what heroes.

Now, after twenty six years, I am living in America. I have lived here for 24 years and have been a citizen for 20 years. I have learned to love and respect that flag more and more; and, today, I feel just as strong about it as when I first saw that flag on the hills of Salerno. But the other day, when I saw on television, in the Capital of this great nation, a young American burning the American flag in the middle of Dupont Circle and waving the Communist flag straight up in the air, I could not feel anything but horror. I was shamed, broken-hearted. Then tears came down to my face. "Man," I said, "you are not an American. Your father could not be the same soldier that gave me life, freedom and justice on these far hills of Salerno. You are not an American. You don't really know what freedom means. If you believe so deeply that your country is wrong and the enemy is right, then go there. Go to China, to Russia, wherever you think that you want to be. I will pay your one-way ticket."

"I am sure that down deep there are many Americans that would be more than willing to help you and other people like you with a one way ticket out of this country; but don't come running back home to us because you didn't find running water."

To burn the American flag is treason. Ignoring the act is worse.

JOHN A. DELIZZA.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 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?

THE STUDENT IN THE UNIVERSITY AND SOCIETY OF TODAY, NO. 8

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. McCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, last week some students from the University of Illinois were in Washington to visit with Members of Congress about the financial plight of many college enrollees from lower income families.

I was particularly impressed by the initiative taken by University of Illinois students in voting to assess themselves a nominal fee each semester to be used as a fund to assist those among their colleagues facing financial difficulties in the achievement of their educational goals.

With the hope that this extraordinary initiative will be of interest to lawmakers, college officials, and citizens concerned about problems of higher education in other States as well as Illinois, I include as part of my remarks today additional information on the University of Illinois initiative to help needy students.

I call attention to a most interesting discussion of the various forms of public aid to higher education by Frank W. Lowe, a doctoral student in economics at the University of Maryland. Mr. Lowe's paper, "Public Financing of Higher Education: The Implications of Various Forms of Public Aid in Terms of Efficiency, Income, Distribution, Etc.," was prepared for an economics seminar last semester. I include the paper in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks:

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT ASSOCIATION,
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS,
Urbana, Ill., April 13, 1970.

HON. ROBERT McCLORY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McCCLORY: This letter is being sent to Illinois Congressmen with whom we are seeking appointments during our visit to Washington this week. (We apologize for Xeroxing; but we know you would rather have us in class than typing!) We are coming to discuss present and proposed federal student aid programs and the plight, at present, of students from low-income families. Our purpose here is to introduce ourselves and to state our objectives in making this trip to see you.

We are not coming to Washington with panaceas. We believe you know the importance of attaining what President Nixon termed, in his message on higher education three weeks ago, "a great American goal:" that "No qualified student who wants to go to college should be barred by lack of money." We are certain that you share our concern that federal programs to this end should be both effective and fair.

Therefore our first objective is to make ourselves available to you for your questions. We are familiar with many of the problems of the needy students on our campus. We have noted the effects of state, federal, and private aid programs and where their greatest lapses seem to have been. We invite you to use our visit as an opportunity to ask students whatever questions would help you reach or review your positions both on this year's Office of Education funding for student aid, and on new programs presently being proposed by the President and others.

Second, we hope to learn a great deal our-

selves, from you and from each other. We will share experiences with the other students from other states and types of institution who will also be in Washington next week for this purpose. For example, many of them have expressed interest in the new student fee which we (Students for Equal Access to Learning) proposed and which was approved, 3 to 1, by our student body this February.

This student-initiated project will raise from Urbana students up to \$100,000 next year to help our neediest classmates—those most threatened with being unable to enter or continue. The crisis on our campus, as on most, is due to shrinking student aids and sharply rising enrollment and costs (just last week our tuition was raised 70%).

To stimulate greater attention to this situation and generate new resources for our neediest classmates, we challenged the state government of Illinois to match what we raised. We will also soon issue a challenge to our alumni to join us. We enclose information about this self-assessment and a copy of our letter to the executive director of the State Board of Higher Education. In it we describe the present dismal situation and ask the state to begin doing as much for the very needy as it has, through the generous and welcome Illinois State Scholarship Commission, for middle-income college applicants.

Students at other schools have voted similar assessments upon themselves; we know of such actions at Eastern Illinois University, the University of Colorado, and, if it passes in a referendum being held now, at the University of Southern California. We find that groups of students on campuses all over the nation are discovering that an important battle in the war on poverty is being fought and lost right on our campuses. Each year rising costs and rising numbers of students overwhelm the limited available aid funds, making the chances of the poor to participate in higher education slimmer and slimmer.

As you can see, many of us across the nation are trying to do our part in reversing this trend. Naturally we are keenly interested in state and federal programs which would help achieve the same purpose. So we hope to learn more about the President's fiscal year 1971 education budget requests and about the various new items of student aid legislation being proposed and considered.

Our third and final major objective this week is to initiate a coordinated, continuing national student effort to bring attention and resources—private, state, and federal—to the great need for new grant and loan funds. At present, thousands of potential college students cannot build viable programs of self-help to put themselves through college because they are unable to find necessary supplements to their own resources.

We agree with Mr. Nixon that it makes excellent social and economic sense to allow each American to develop fully his talents, through education for which he is able and in which he is interested. We think the country needs every man it can get in these difficult times. We want to do all we can to increase this critically important, high-yield investment in people.

We would greatly appreciate time with you and hope you can fit us into your schedule.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES HARMS,
Chairman, Undergraduate Student Association.

BILL PEARSON,
Steering Committee, SEAL.

STATEMENT BY STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN, APRIL 13, 1970

For the second year in a row our concern over shortages of student aid funds affecting over 100,000 American college students brings us on an urgent trip to Washington.

President Nixon said in his message to Congress this March: "Something is basically unequal about opportunity for higher education when a young person whose family earns more than \$15,000 a year is nine times more likely to attend college than a young person whose family earns less than \$3,000."

At the University of Illinois there are four times as many freshmen this year from the upper income half of the state as from the lower. This represents no improvement, and possibly a deterioration from the situation which first concerned us and brought us here last year.

President Nixon, March 19, 1970: "No qualified student who wants to go to college should be barred by lack of money."

The President called this "a great American goal." We agree. In the meantime the actual level of funds available to meet this goal is decreasing relative to the need.

Restricted access of the poor to higher education is highly costly to the excluded individuals. This is justification enough for renewed action to reduce these economic barriers. However, it should not be forgotten that there are considerable short- and long-run costs to society which come from our failures to invest in the development of human resources.

We students at the University of Illinois acted on our concern over this situation when, in February, we overwhelmingly approved an extraordinary new fee through which we will contribute up to \$100,000 a year in additional aid for our neediest classmates.

At that time we emphasized that we have neither the responsibility nor the resources to solve the problem of unequal access to our university. We called on the State of Illinois to match our contribution by an equal amount of new, targeted, aid for these students. We shall also ask our alumni to join us.

We are here this week to thank Congress for its continued firm support for the principle of equal opportunity in higher education and to ask that federal programs to help accomplish it be funded this year at levels commensurate with the need. In recent years our colleges have encouraged application from the needy who, though academically able, might not have had hopes of meeting the sky-rocketing costs of higher education. They must not now be told that those funds are, indeed, unavailable.

We will present to our Congressmen details of how present funding levels are crippling needy students already at our campuses and will bar others from coming at all. We are being joined by other students from across the nation, a number of them from schools whose students have recently approved special self-assessments, like ours, to help their needy classmates.

JAMES HARMS,
Chairman, Undergraduate Student Association.

ROSE MIRANDA,
PORFIRIO ROSALES,
Students, Special Educational Opportunities Program.

KEITH PATTEN,
BILL PEARSON,
Steering Committee Members, Students for Equal Access to Learning.

[From the University of Illinois Mothers Association Illi Notes, April 1970]

STUDENTS CHALLENGE THE STATE TO JOIN THEM IN RAISING \$1 MILLION FOR THEIR NEEDY CLASSMATES

Last spring a group of University faculty pledged 1 percent of their annual salaries to help students from needy families whose continuance or initial attendance at the University was threatened by curtailed federal student aid programs. In doing so they founded the Human Resources Investment

Fund in the University of Illinois Foundation, to which they and their colleagues have contributed almost \$28,000 since last April.

Almost as soon as this faculty generosity became known on campus, a group of students in the University Y.M.C.A. decided to join in the effort. They formed Students for Equal Access to Learning (SEAL) and circulated a plan among campus organizations which called for a program of voluntary student giving to help meet the present aids crisis.

SEAL's first activity was to gain University approval for a special contribution card at registration in September, 1969. As a result, over \$6,000 was collected from students for the Human Resources Investment Fund. More than 250 needy students have received grants from HRIF or from its Martin Luther King Fund division as a result of the generosity of these faculty and students.

Despite these efforts, the University remains seriously short of student aid funds. Last year a needy student whose circumstances changed during the year was able to receive an adjustment in his federal Educational Opportunity Grant as late as May. Adequate funds were available for all students eligible to receive them. But this year, all EOG funds were committed before school even started. And loan funds were so scarce that many students received only 80 percent of the amount for which they were eligible. Rising college costs and failure of aid programs to grow were the major reasons for the worsening situation, which affects hundreds of students at Urbana.

A measure of the magnitude of the aids shortage is the fact that the University's Special Education Opportunities Program, which expected to enroll 400 new students, was cut back to only 275 beginning students. Comparable cuts in the number of non-SEOP students from equally needy backgrounds were experienced at Urbana.

As the fall progressed, SEAL members Ed Leuchs, sophomore in planning from New Jersey, Keith Patten, sophomore in general studies from Elmwood Park, and Bill Pearson, junior in chemistry from Springfield, continued to study the national problem of restricted access of the needy to higher education. Together with SEAL adviser David Eisenman, an assistant dean of student personnel, they began to develop the plan which was passed in a special referendum at registration in February.

The new fund-raising effort could produce as much as \$1 million over the next four years. It has been hailed across the state in editorials—one in the *Springfield Illinois State Journal* and over radio station WBBM in Chicago, among others—as an excellent example of constructive student action.

In the February referendum students voted 14,879 to 5,025 to authorize the University to collect \$2.00 from them at registration each semester for up to four years. Any student not wishing to participate can obtain a refund several weeks after registration. All proceeds will be used for grants to needy students, administered by the University's Student Financial Aids Office.

But the most interesting feature of all is that the plan will be in operation for only one year unless the state of Illinois agrees to match the students by giving an equal amount in new money to help students caught in the aids shortage.

The Board of Trustees has approved the new assessment and will appeal to the State to match what the students raise next year and in the three following years. After four years the students hope the aid crisis will have passed. It has not, a new vote of the student body will be necessary if the assessment procedure is to continue.

The decision to challenge the State to match student contributions was reached

after SEAL's study of the problem. Jim Harms, chairman of the Undergraduate Student Association, became involved in SEAL in December. "We do not pretend that students either should or can meet the problem of economic barriers to higher education," Harms says. "Our objective is to attract greater public attention and public funds to investments in human resources. That is why we are requiring the state to match our commitment."

SEAL advertising prior to the referendum in February emphasized that grants to needy students not only benefit the student, but also lead to social dividends which fully repay society for its investment. For example, GI's educated under the GI Bills have paid back more than the entire cost of these programs in increased federal income taxes alone—taxes on the added earnings which can be attributed to their continued education. And their higher earnings continue to produce about \$1 billion each year in taxes.

Ed Leuchs thinks it is important that people understand how profitable for everyone our investments in education for the needy can be. "We could go down to Springfield and present studies showing how it pays, in dollars and cents, to educate everybody who has the ability and the desire," he says. "Then we could turn it around and show how much it costs the taxpayers if they fail to enlarge access to higher education, by pointing out such things as welfare costs, limited productivity, lost tax revenues, and the other consequences of failure to develop fully each man's potential."

Leuchs and the other members of SEAL became convinced that their message would be more likely to get through if, as Leuchs says, we students put our money where our mouths are." Hence, the decision to ask the students to commit themselves to an ambitious new contribution program if the state would match them.

SEAL's plan, and the Illinois referendum, are not the first actions of this sort in the nation. But the requirement that the state match the proceeds, and the arrangement for refunds to any students who do not wish to participate, are unique. Last spring students at the University of Colorado voted to assess themselves a mandatory \$5.00 per semester for the next ten years to help their needy classmates. This fall students at Eastern Illinois University narrowly defeated a referendum to give \$2.00 per semester, but the fee was approved by the administration and Board anyway, when Eastern's President explained that there was more student support for the plan than the vote indicated.

Bill Pearson explains why SEAL decided to include the refund procedure: "Taxes, as opposed to voluntary contributions, ought to be borne by the entire group which benefits from the programs they support. Our whole society—not just us—benefits from the increased productivity, self-reliance, taxes, and civic participation which college education typically makes possible. It is inappropriate to tax students to pay an uneven share of the costs," he says.

What are SEAL's members doing now that the referendum has passed and the challenge to the state is being handled by University administrators? Keith Patton explains that SEAL is working on a national effort to bring to Congress reports of the need for increased student aid. Delegations from universities all over the country may go to Washington this spring to bring reports of what program cuts have done to needy students on their campuses.

And SEAL may ask alumni to match them if the aid deficit turns out to be bigger than they and the state can handle.

In any event, it will be a busy spring for some young men and women concerned about their classmates, about equality of access to higher education, and about their society and its priorities.

FROM OFFICE OF PUBLIC INFORMATION; UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

URBANA, ILL.—Student leaders at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign urged the Illinois Board of Higher Education today to reconsider its rejection of a unique offer by students to pay half of a student aid proposal themselves.

The proposition, designed to help low-income students, hinged on a legislative appropriation of matching funds.

Federal funds for student aid were cut sharply this school year.

A group of students organized as Students For Equal Access to Learning had won overwhelming approval for the plan among fellow students on the Urbana-Champaign campus, and secured the backing of the university administration and the U. of I. Board of Trustees.

But the plan foundered Tuesday when the Board of Higher Education refused to forward it to the legislature.

Students for Equal Access to Learning and the Undergraduate Student Association at the U. of I. at Urbana-Champaign said the board's staff missed the point when it suggested the matching funds might come from the university budget.

"It is SEAL's intention by its assessment plan to induce the state government of Illinois to make an absolute increase in expenditures on education," the two student organizations said in a statement. "It was not and is not SEAL's intention to establish new priorities within the education budget of the state, however important it may be to do that."

Under the proposal, students would tax themselves \$2 apiece each semester for four years, providing the legislature would match their contributions on a dollar for dollar basis.

Student approval of the plan was by nearly a three to one margin. The vote, during registration in February, was 14,879 to 5,025. The total vote of 19,904 out of 30,167 students registering was the largest in any student referendum in U. of I. history.

The U. of I. Board of Trustees promptly approved the plan at its February meeting, just nine days after the votes were counted.

The SEAL and UGSA statement noted that their request amounted to an additional sum of only three-tenths of 1 per cent of the Illinois State Scholarship Commission budget.

"In 1968-69, fully 83 per cent of Illinois State Scholarship Commission money went to students at private Illinois colleges, two-thirds of whom were from the upper income half of Illinois," the statement said. "Surely it makes sense to spend very modest additional sums to insure that the able sons and daughters of lower income families will have a chance at least to attend the relatively less expensive state institutions.

"The action by the Board of Higher Education ignores entirely the real issues which led to our unprecedented self-assessment," the students said.

STUDENTS FOR EQUAL ACCESS
TO LEARNING,
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS,
Urbana, Ill., April 3, 1970.

Dr. JAMES HOLDERMAN,
Illinois State Board of Higher Education.

DEAR DR. HOLDERMAN: As you know, in February we students at the University of Illinois, Urbana campus, approved a new semesterly student assessment; its proceeds will be used for grants to our classmates whose need remains unmet after existing state, federal, and private aid funds are exhausted. Next year we expect this program to raise as much as \$100,000 to meet the severe shortage of student aid which we expect at Urbana.

It is our understanding that the Board of Higher Education has approved this extraordinary student-initiated assessment. We

also understand that you have deferred action on our request that what we raise from ourselves be matched by equal sums of new state grant funds, *over and above* the U of I and ISSC budgets presently under consideration.* These new funds we are requesting would be administered by the Student Financial Aid office at Urbana (as our contributions will be) for those among us whose unmet need—after considerable self-help, reasonable debt, and whatever existing aid funds are available—most threatens their enrollment or continuation here.

This letter is intended to explain our request further. We trust that this will be useful to you in your deliberations.

For reasons which were stated eloquently by President Nixon in his special message to Congress on higher education two weeks ago, we believe that insuring students of equal ability an equal chance to develop that ability through higher education is nothing more than sound—and essential—economic and social policy. However it is an inescapable fact that the proportion of Illinois college students from families with incomes in the lower half of the state's distribution continues to be dishearteningly low. This year our freshmen were *four times* more frequently from families in the top half of the state's income structure than from the lower half. At private institutions the imbalance is even greater. Much of it can be traced to purely economic barriers which are keeping talented sons and daughters of low-income families from developing fully their talents.

As the enclosed figures indicate, there has been no improvement in the past few years—and may even have been deterioration—in this statistic for our campus, even though in these same years funding of Illinois State Scholarship Commission programs has approximately *doubled*. One reason why these substantial (and commendable) state expenditures have not had much effect in improving the posture of the needy in their access to campuses such as ours may be the restriction of ISSC awards to sums not exceeding tuition and fees:

A middle-income student wishing to attend a private Illinois institution may have a net need (after his parents' standard contribution, his summer and term-time earnings, and a reasonable amount of borrowing) of \$1,000. Since this will generally be less than the private college's tuition and fees, he can be given an ISSC grant for this entire sum. Another student, from a family of considerably more modest means, may find that he is \$1,000 short of meeting the *lower* costs of a publicly supported institution. But since that institution's tuition and fees are considerably less than \$1,000 his *identical* net need *cannot* be fully met by an ISSC!

Federal programs, and even private endowments, are equally prone to guidelines which have the effect of denying adequate aid to clearly needy students while granting equally large or larger awards to equally- or less-needy classmates. Financial aids officers see such cases daily.

Thus, even if federal, state, and private programs were sufficiently funded that every student who *qualified* for aid actually *received* that aid (and, as you know, this is far from the case at present), there would be a need for discretionary funds to be administered by the universities for the appreciable number of students whose unmet need—after considerable self-help, including indebted-

*In our discussions with the University administration we emphasized that in making this request it is *not* our intention to put an additional claim on the University's already-tight budget. We are asking the *state of Illinois* for a very modest, special-purpose *absolute increase* (of about three-tenths of one percent of the ISSC budget) in state expenditures on student aid.

ness—would *not* be covered by these programs under their existing guidelines.

We are not criticizing the ISSC. There can be no doubt that its programs have been enormously successful in what we take to be their primary objective: keeping *private* Illinois colleges accessible to *middle- and upper-middle-income* Illinois youth. (In 1968-69, 83% of ISSC funds went to students at private institutions. And only a third of these grants went to students from the lower income half of Illinois.) We are arguing that if this goal has been worth these sums (\$26 million this year) to the people of Illinois—and we think it has been—then surely it makes sense to spend very modest additional sums to insure that the able sons and daughters of *lower-income* families will have a chance to attend at least the relatively less expensive *state* institutions.

Our action in assessing ourselves to provide new funds for these lower income students affirms our belief in the social and economic importance of what President Nixon has termed (in his March 19 Congressional message) "a great American goal." We agree with the President that "No qualified student who wants to go to college should be barred by lack of money."

We greatly appreciate and applaud the President's pledge of substantial new federal resources toward the achievement of this critical national goal. And we do not feel that it detracts from this welcome new federal initiative that he called upon state and private agencies to increase *their* investments in these human resources. We had already taken what we think is a modest but significant step in this direction. Soon we will be asking the alumni of our institution to join us in this effort.

We hope that the Board of Higher Education will forward our request for matching funds to the Governor as soon as possible. We trust that with the President's voice added to our own, the state government of Illinois will respond, taking the lead in a renewed national effort to achieve equality of access to higher education and fuller utilization of the talents of *all* Americans.

Even if we had not taken our initiative; even if the President had not chosen this time to make a renewed federal commitment; beyond these acts there remains the basic situation we have sketched in this letter. These facts, themselves, justify additional state expenditures for aid to the needier Illinois students and potential students. These expenditures will pay back enormous social and economic dividends.

We urge the state of Illinois to accept our challenge, and make its matching money a first step toward a new effort to equalize access to higher education for Illinois youth.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES HARMS,
Chairman, Undergraduate Student Association, University of Illinois, Urbana.

WILLIAM PEARSON,
Steering Committee Member, Students for Equal Access to Learning.

PUBLIC FINANCING OF HIGHER EDUCATION:
THE IMPLICATIONS OF VARIOUS FORMS OF PUBLIC AID IN TERMS OF EFFICIENCY, INCOME DISTRIBUTION, ET CETERA

(By Frank W. Lowe)

BACKGROUND

Public support of higher education in the United States dates back to almost as early as the Declaration of Independence. In fact, the first state-supported institution, the University of the State of New York, was established in 1784. By 1853, there was a total of 17 state-supported universities.

The first substantial Federal support of higher education was the Morrill (or Land Grant) Act of 1862. This act authorized

30,000 acres of land for each Representative or Senator in the State for agricultural and mechanical arts colleges. The Nelson Act of 1907 provided substantial increases in Federal aid. Even more significant, however, was the later "G.I. Bill" of 1944 which provided tuition and subsistence payments to several million veterans of World War II. Many of these benefits were to be later extended to Korean and Viet Nam veterans.

Both Federal and State and local government aid to higher education have grown rapidly in the last few decades. Federal expenditures for higher education increased from about \$159 million in 1945 to some \$4.7 billion in 1969. Likewise, State and local government expenditures rose from about \$800 million in 1950 to about \$6½ billion in 1969.

Public support of higher education has been to a great extent defended on the basis that it was desirable to the effective functioning of a democratic society; further, that all competent individuals who sought a higher education should have the opportunity to do so. Likewise it is argued that higher education results in significant external economies (social benefits) to the community as a whole in other respects; namely: (1) greater earnings resulting in additional tax revenues; (2) better citizens who are less likely to commit crimes; (3) greater mobility to meet the needs of the labor market; and (4) a pool of talent that contributes to the health, welfare and security of the nation.

On the other hand there are many who maintain that higher education results in largely private benefits; that, the individual is rewarded by receiving a higher return for his services than he could otherwise command. In fact, Milton Friedman attributes none of the neighborhood effects to vocational and professional schooling that are associated with a general education. He would treat as similar the investment in higher education (human) or non-human capital, and maintains that, except for market imperfections, capital would be as readily available for investment in human beings as for physical assets and the rate of return would be roughly equal between the two.¹ However, the wide support for public aid to higher education is reflected in the ever-increasing Federal and State and local expenditures in this area.

Types of assistance to students and institutions

Public support of higher education is normally classified as either direct student aid or institutional aid. In the case of direct student aid, assistance is given directly to the student in the form of loans, scholarships or other subsidies. Normally, the student may select the institution that he wishes to attend. In the case of institutional aid, funds are made available directly to the university or college, primarily in the form of research or education grants.

Of the total Federal outlay of approximately \$4.7 billion in fiscal year 1969 for higher education, about \$1.1 billion represented direct student aid. The remainder, some \$3.6 billion, represented institutional aid. State and local government aid is almost wholly in the form of institutional aid.

The following are the major Federal programs for student aid:

1. "G.I. Bill". Some \$466 million was paid to Korean and Viet Nam veterans in fiscal year 1969. A total of some 400,000 veterans were enrolled in vocational or professional schools. Under this program, students are paid \$110-\$160 monthly, out of which tuition and other expenses must be paid.

2. Loans. Assistance in the forms of loans is made available under the National De-

Footnotes at end of speech.

fense Education Act of 1958 and the Higher Education Act of 1965. Under the former, needy students are given an opportunity to borrow at an interest rate of 3% with the Federal government furnishing 90% and the institution 10% of the loan funds. Under the latter program, the student can obtain loan from private banks, savings and loan associations, credit unions or the institution itself. The government pays a maximum of 6% interest while the borrower is in school and 3% on unpaid balances afterwards. It is anticipated that some 398,000 loans under the National Defense program and some 924,000 loans under the guaranteed loan program will be awarded in fiscal year 1970.

3. *Grants.* The three major grant programs are:

(a) Work-Study under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964;

(b) Educational Opportunity Grants under the Higher Education Act of 1965;

(c) Upward Bound under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The Work-Study program pays a part of the student's expense by providing part-time jobs. The other programs provide funds to those with exceptional financial need, with the Upward Bound program directed to assisting young people from low-income families to stay in high school and continue on to college.

4. *Scholarships.* The National Defense Education Act of 1958 established 23,000 scholarships annually for four years. The primary purpose of the program was to provide graduate fellowships in the sciences, mathematics and languages to enable the U.S. to "catch up" with Russia.

Some 7,500 scholarships are presently awarded under this Act. Additional scholarships are also made available by other Federal agencies, some of which are: The National Institute of Health, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Science Foundation. These, like the National Defense scholarships, are principally directed towards the physical sciences.

Federal support in the form of institutional aid is provided in two major areas: (1) loan funds for the construction of college dormitories, classrooms, libraries and other facilities; and (2) research and education grants.

In fiscal year 1969, Federal funds totaling some \$700 million were made available for construction of higher education facilities. At the same time, nearly \$3 billion was provided for academic research and development.

Since student fees provide only about 50% of the total costs, State and local funds largely make up the deficit in the operation of public universities and colleges.

Efficiency and income distribution aspects of public aid

Perhaps the two primary criticisms relative to the efficiency and income distribution aspects of public aid to higher education are that: (1) the process is wasteful in that it encourages many less-talented individuals to enter college rather than go into the labor force; and (2) the assistance goes primarily to the children of middle and high-income families while the children of poor families are unable to attend college.

As Theodore W. Schultz has pointed out, the present financing of higher education is in general quite regressive. It adds to the value of the human capital of those who attend college relative to those who do not go to college because it increases the lifetime earnings of college graduates in part at the expense of others; also, because higher education provides educational services predominantly for students of middle and upper income families and a part of the cost of these educational services is paid for by taxes on poor families. Schultz maintains that the present public financing results in substan-

tial amounts of valuable assets being transferred by society to a particularly intellectually elite set of individuals.²

In a similar vein, Burton A. Weisbrod recently testified that State-supported institutions of higher education by charging the same tuition rate to all regardless of the ability to pay have given large subsidies to the more affluent. His study of public higher education in California revealed that the affluent benefited disproportionately from the public subsidies because they are more likely to attend a public college, more likely to attend a high-subsidy school, and more likely to remain until graduation. The following estimated distribution of subsidies by level of family income were indicated by Weisbrod's study:

	Families without children in public higher education	Families with children in public higher education—children in—		University of California
		Junior college	State college	
Average income.....	\$7,900	\$8,800	\$10,000	\$12,000
Average subsidy.....	0	\$1,050	\$3,810	\$4,870
Subsidy as percent of income.....	0	12	31	41

As Weisbrod points out, rather than charge differential rates according to the ability-to-pay, public supported institutions have preferred to keep tuition rates as low as possible to all students. The difference between the above and the pattern that would exist if vertical efficiency were being maximized—all subsidies going to the poor—is obviously great.³

Seymour Harris has likewise pointed out that state tax systems which provide a substantial amount of support to public higher education are hardly progressive. State and local income taxes tend to be heavier on the low-income than on the high-income groups. In 1954, for example, the average rate for incomes up to \$2,000 was 9.8% as against 7.4% for those incomes over \$10,000. Of course, a burden of 10% imposed on low incomes is much greater in welfare terms than 10% levied on an income above \$10,000. Yet instead of State and local tax rates rising with rising incomes, they fall. Thus, it is the low-income family that bears a heavier burden of State and local income taxes which form a significant source for support of public higher education, and at the same time it is these families whose children are less likely to attend public colleges. Thus, the poor lose some or all of the public subsidy.⁴

In the case of the Federal college housing loan program, it is likewise apparent that a substantial subsidy is provided to middle and upper-income families. This program provides long-term Federal loans at 3% to public and private educational institutions for the construction of housing facilities. Charles L. Schultze estimates that the lower interest rate made available by the Federal government reduces room rent by \$6 to \$7 per month for students at publicly-supported institutions of higher education. Since approximately 45% come from families with incomes above \$10,000 per year (also for students who board away from home, the proportion is probably even higher), the subsidy involved in the college housing program substitutes for funds that these families, who are not in the lower income group, would have spent.⁵

Since 1965, the Federal government has assisted in the construction of more than \$9 billion in academic and housing facilities. Approximately \$3.6 billion of this total has been used for construction of dormitories and

housing facilities. It is estimated that living quarters have been provided for some 600,000 students. This would provide an annual housing subsidy of some \$36 million, with about 50% of the subsidy going to students of middle and upper-income families. As pointed out by Schultze, the expenditure of these funds may be desirable, but to the extent that the objective is to increase the flow of funds into higher education, and not merely to subsidize college housing for the sons and daughters of middle- and upper-income groups, this use of Federal program funds is debatable.

As previously noted, the largest item in the form of direct Federal aid to institutions of higher education is that of academic research and development grants. This assistance totals some \$3 billion annually (or about 60% of the Federal outlay) and supports about two-thirds of all research and development at universities. Some 30,000 research assistants are employed in these programs.

There has been much debate on the effects on higher education of these Federal grants. It has been argued that such grants cause the universities to suffer financially in that the Federal government does not pay the full overhead and indirect costs attributable to these programs; also, that the Federal grants divert teaching personnel into specialized grant programs thus adversely affecting the overall educational program; that they aid physical sciences at the expense of the social sciences and humanities; that they deprive the smaller colleges of talented personnel who go to the larger, favored institutions, and that they further aggravate the inflationary problem in universities and colleges.⁶

There is no doubt that Federal grants are increasingly being used to bid salaries and allowances up and bid teaching assignments down. Teaching talent is being siphoned away from the classroom into highly specialized grant programs. Likewise, since few Federal fellowships are offered in the social sciences and humanities, many of the more talented students are drawn into the physical sciences and engineering. Further, to the extent that Federal funds create added inflationary stimulus and increase tuitions and other costs, additional barriers are placed on the opportunities for sons and daughters from low-income families to attend universities and colleges.

Among other criticisms of institutional aid is that it is wasteful and inefficient since it keeps tuitions low and tends to attract students of lesser talent who would not have otherwise gone to college. Thus, some 50% of entering students fail to complete college. Also, the low tuition helps all students equally including those who could afford to pay higher tuition. By raising tuitions according to the ability-to-pay, brighter children from poorer families could better afford to go to college.

Some economists argue that direct student aid in the form of loans, scholarships and other subsidies is much more effective than institutional aid. It is maintained that such aid tends to separate the serious from the casual student, that it better aids the sons and daughters of low-income families, and that since higher education primarily rewards the recipient in the way of increased future income, it rightfully places the repayment burden on the borrower.

Of course, many studies relating income to education confirm that higher education generally results in higher future earnings. Data cited by Edward E. Denison show that median income for college graduates in 1958 tended to be about 47% higher than for high-school graduates and about 72% higher for individuals with an eighth-grade education. Similarly, in 1961, the differential was 45% and 68% with regard to high-school and eighth-grade levels, respectively.⁷

Footnotes at end of speech.

Recent studies by James Morgan and Is-mail Sirageldin indicate that the type or "quality" of the college degree has an important bearing on income expectations. The following are annual earnings for family heads in 1964 according to the quality of college:

Types of degree:	Average Annual Earnings
Most selective (medicine, law, etc.)	\$15,200
Selective (engineering, accounting, etc.)	9,450
Nonselective (general, arts, education, etc.)	8,400
No degree	5,500

Since it appears that professional schooling results in higher earnings, it has been suggested by Morgan and Sirageldin (among others) that these individuals should bear heavier educational costs than the less selective degree earners.⁸

One of the major criticisms of the loan program is that it diverts many students from the ranks of education, social service, civil service and education to the more liberally rewarding sciences and professions. It is pointed out that it is much more difficult to take a "flier" into the lower-paying services when one is carrying a \$10,000 indebtedness on one's back. One proposal frequently advanced is that the amount that individuals pay back should be governed by their earnings. Thus, individuals who entered into low-paying but socially-beneficial occupations such as teaching, writing, preaching, and social services would not be penalized or disadvantaged.

Theodore Shultz in supporting public investment in higher education has estimated the private rates of returns to those of corporate firms and the private domestic economy.⁹ During the period 1958-1961, Shultz estimated that a college education yielded a return of nearly 15%. On the other hand, the return to corporate manufacturing firms and the private domestic sector averaged about 7% and 11%, respectively, during this period.

Other economists tend to disagree with Schultz's findings. Gary S. Becker, for example, in his study found that the rate of return on college education was comparable to the rate earned on investment in tangible capital. Becker indicates that by making adjustments for ability and other factors the average return to all college graduates would be somewhat less than 9%. At the same time, Becker estimates the average return on all business capital to be about 8%—not very far apart from the return for college education.¹⁰

While Schultz neglects to adjust his figures for opportunity costs, he has pointed out that such costs are far from negligible. He has estimated that in 1956 the total outlay on formal education in the United States was \$28.7 billion, of which \$12.4 billion was income foregone. Other economists who question that there is an underinvestment in higher education likewise maintain that the inclusion of these costs would substantially reduce the estimated return on education.

Milton Friedman maintains that if capital were as readily available for investment in human beings as for investment in physical assets, the rate of return would be roughly equal between the two. However, he feels that there is sufficient evidence that the rate of return on investment in professional schooling is very much higher than the rate of return on investment in physical capital. This difference, he suggests, arises from the existence of underinvestment in human capital. He believes that this underinvestment reflects an imperfection in the capital market. This imperfection arises to a great extent from the risk involved in the investment in human capital. If a sufficient in-

terest rate to cover the risk were charged, Friedman believes that the rate would probably conflict with usury laws and make the loans unattractive to borrowers.

Friedman would justify government intervention on the grounds that this "technical monopoly" causes underinvestment in educational; also, that these imperfections tend to restrict the more expensive vocational and professional training to individuals whose parents can finance the training required. Such individuals are thus made a "non-competing" group sheltered from competition by the unavailability of the necessary capital to many able but poorer individuals. Government intervention would then make capital more widely available and would thereby do much more to make equality of opportunity a reality, to diminish inequalities of income and wealth, and to promote the full use of our human resources.¹¹

Friedman would accomplish the above by making funds available to individuals who would in turn agree to pay to the government in future years a specified percentage of their earnings in excess of a specified sum for each \$1,000 that they received from the government.

Under Friedman's proposal, the individual (or his parents, etc.) would generally bear all the extra costs of higher education and in turn receive all the extra returns. This he would support on the basis that there are little if any social benefits derived from professional or vocational training.

Various plans have been suggested for educational tax relief. Critics of these plans generally argue that such plans would provide relatively greater benefits to families in higher income brackets. This would not be wholly true of some plans such as the flat percentage tax credit plan and the 100% credit plan with dollar ceiling and the sliding scale credits which are graduated so as to favor students in low-tuition institutions.

Under the Ribicoff Amendment (introduced in 1964), upper middle-income families who have children in high-tuition institutions would get relatively small credits and wealthy families would get none. Under the plan, a family with an income under \$25,000 with a student in a university or college with tuition between \$1,000 and \$1,500 would get a credit which equaled between 21% and 27% of outlay. The credit would be reduced by 1% of the amount by which income exceeded \$25,000 and would reach zero at an income level of \$57,000. In contrast, a student at a low-tuition college with \$200 expenses would get a credit of \$150 or 75% of his outlay so that his cost would be reduced from \$200 to \$50.

Under the Ribicoff Amendment, tax credits would be distributed as follows:

Adjusted gross income class	Amount	Percent of tax savings
Up to \$3,000	\$10.0	1.0
\$3,000 to \$5,000	85.0	11.0
\$5,000 to \$10,000	375.0	51.0
\$10,000 to \$20,000	205.0	28.0
\$20,000 to \$50,000	65.0	9.0
\$50,000 and over	2.5	0.5
Total	740.0	100.0

The above plan would result in about 91% of the tax savings going to families with an income under \$20,000. Families in the \$20,000 to \$50,000 bracket would get 9% of the total and those above \$50,000 would get about 1/2 of 1%.

Proponents of the Ribicoff plan point out that the oft-repeated claim that much of the educational tax credits would help those who need it least is a myth. Under this plan, most of the savings would go to middle-income and lower-middle-income groups. The rich would get none.¹²

It has also been suggested that repayments under loan programs should be made deductible from income for tax purposes. At present, it is anomalous that such repayments are not deductible, while contributions made in recompense for scholarship aid, for which the obligation is moral rather than merely legal, are.

Summary and critique

In general, it is apparent that the present pattern of public support to higher education is economically inefficient and results in adding to the future income stream sons and daughters of middle and high-income families in part at the expense of those who cannot afford a college education.

Low tuitions result in large subsidies to the more affluent. Likewise, housing subsidies from the Federal college construction program which amount to over \$300 million annually substitutes for funds that families in the middle and upper-income levels would have otherwise spent. Also, colleges admit at least two freshman for every one who will survive to graduate. If these colleges charged full costs, many who lacked capabilities might be motivated not to enter college or to drop out sooner and enter the labor market. Some may argue, however, that this extra cost is necessary in the "discovery" process, and that it might be worthwhile since some talented students would not be "discovered" if they were required to pay the full costs of education.

It is clear that Federal fellowships and scholarships provide substantial aid to the physical sciences, mathematics, and engineering, but little to the arts and humanities. Likewise, the National Defense Student Loan program provides greater resources to the student in the professional schools. Graduate and professional students may borrow up to a maximum of \$10,000. On the other hand, a student who may be interested in teaching or the ministry or other fields that yield less income but much greater social benefits is limited to a maximum loan of \$5,000. Thus the opportunity to put the weight of the Federal loan assistance to the neglected social sciences and humanities is lost. Likewise, research and other Federal aid to students is concentrated in the physical and life sciences and engineering. Virtually no student aid is granted in the social sciences and humanities.

Undoubtedly, the most serious defect in the present pattern of public support of higher education is that little opportunity is given to competent but poor students to either enter college or remain once they are enrolled. It is estimated that there are some 600,000 low-income students who have college potential. Of these, there are some 100,000 of outstanding ability each year who fail to continue their education because they cannot hurdle the economic barrier. This group of superior students constitutes an untapped reservoir of potential leadership.

Despite a false but widespread impression to the contrary, the Government is making virtually no effort to conserve and develop this talent. Even where low-income students are able to enter college, little is done to avert dropouts among talented students for economic reasons. Many financial-aid officers, even where loan funds are available, are reluctant to authorize loans as large as low-income youngsters require since if they rely on loans alone it is felt that they are assuming an undue burden of debt. There are no general Federal scholarships at any level except for a few restricted programs. Fellowships are concentrated in the graduate studies.¹³

In addition to low-income backgrounds, many talented youngsters have had inadequate secondary school preparation, have come from culturally disadvantaged environment, have had little or no motivation, and have lacked adequate health services.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Until 1965, there were no Federal programs designed to generate skills and motivation necessary for success in education beyond high school among young people from low-income backgrounds and inadequate secondary school preparation.

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 authorized the Upward Bound program to remedy poor academic preparation and motivation in secondary school and thus increase a youngster's promise for acceptance and success in a college environment. During the program years ending in 1966, 1967, 1968, and 1969, the program has provided some 70,000 disadvantaged student participants with opportunities which they would not have otherwise received to overcome handicaps in academic achievement and in motivation to complete high school, and to enter college. Studies of program results have shown that Upward Bound participants have a substantially lower high school dropout rate than is considered normal for the low-income population. Participants have also had a considerably higher admission rate to colleges—approximately 79% of Upward Bound students enrolled in colleges as compared with an average of 20% for older brothers and sisters and 40% for the national student population.

In addition to changing college admission patterns among low-income students, the Upward Bound program has achieved retention rates of about 80%, which is higher than those of the national student population. The graduation rate is as yet unknown, but the experience to date indicates that it will compare favorably with the national average of about 50% of entering freshman.¹⁴

It is apparent that the Upward Bound program has been successful in enabling a student who may be apathetic or even hostile because he comes from a disadvantaged environment or has shunned meaningful educational pursuits because of inadequate school experiences to release his real talent. Quite often the potential that such a student possesses may not be shown in traditional measurements such as test scores or grades.

Because of woefully inadequate Federal financing, this program has only been able to serve approximately 4% of the 600,000 low-income students who have college potential. Most of these talented youngsters could not have surmounted the economic hurdle or the barriers of a disadvantaged background had they been limited to help from traditional programs. Given 10% of the total public outlay for higher education, it is likely that this type of program might enable most or all of the 600,000 students from low-income families with college potential to go to universities and colleges.

It is apparent that a program such as Upward Bound in which the subsidy goes to the low-income family in its entirety is much preferable to the pattern of public support to institutions of higher education in which the affluent benefit disproportionately from the public subsidies.

Two new programs have recently been initiated by the Office of Education which seek to encourage disadvantaged students to enter and remain in institutions of higher education. One, "Talent Search", attempts to alert students of high intellectual ability to the advantages of a college education and how it might be financed. The second, "Special Services", provides tutorial and remedial aid to students already enrolled in college in an effort to ease their adjustment to a new intellectual and cultural environment.

The modest resources available to these programs, however, provides little encouragement to those who would hope for a significant improvement in public policy. Furthermore, it is rather tragic that some \$30 billion is expended annually for higher education, yet there is little provided for research on those factors related to social and fiscal policies in this area, and only limited attention

is available from the best minds to guide the American people in the important choices that they must make. Little research has been sponsored by the Federal Government, by state governments and by university research centers relative to: What are public practices, policies and plans in the definition of who should go to college? in the distribution of the cost burden? in assuring quality of educational opportunity adapted to the needs of modern life? in the study of cost-quality relationship? in achieving economy and good fiscal practices? in determining just how much should in the aggregate be spent on higher education? and in the coordination of objectives, functions, and activities?

PUBLIC FINANCING OF HIGHER EDUCATION:
BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Becker, Gary S. "Underinvestment in Education", *American Economic Review*, Vol. L (May 1960), pp. 346-354.
2. Becker, Gary S. and Chiswick, Barry R. "Education and the Distribution of Income", *American Economic Review*, Vol. LVI (May 1966), pp. 358-369.
3. Benson, Charles S. *The Economics of Public Education*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961.
4. Benson, Charles S. *Perspectives on the Economics of Education*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1963.
5. Campbell, Angus and Eckerman, William C. *Public Concepts of the Costs and Utilities of Higher Education*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1964.
6. Denison, Edward E. "Measuring the Contribution of Education to Economic Growth", *The Residual Factor and Economic Growth*. OECD Study Group in Economics of Education, The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris, 1964, pp. 13-55.
7. Federal Aids for College Students. Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1967.
8. Freeman, Roger A. *Crisis in College Finance*. Institute for Social Science Research, Washington D.C., 1965.
9. Friedman, Milton. *Capitalism and Freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.
10. Guidelines. Upward Bound 1969-1970. Office of Economic Opportunity. Washington D.C., 1968.
11. Harris, Seymour. *Higher Education Resources and Finance*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
12. Harris, Seymour and Others. *Education and Public Policy*. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1965.
13. Hungate, Thad L. *A New Basis of Support for Higher Education*. Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1957.
14. Kuznets, Simon. *Modern Economic Growth*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1966.
15. Morgan, James and Sirageldin, Ismail. "A Note on the Quality Dimension in Education", *Journal of Political Economy*, September-October 1968, pp. 1069-1077.
16. Schultz, Theodore. *Economic Value of Education*. Columbia University Press, 1963.
17. Schultz, Theodore. "The Rate of Return in Allocating Investment Resources to Education", *Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. II (Summer, 1967), pp. 293-309.
18. Schultz, Theodore. "Resources for Higher Education: An Economist's View", *Journal of Political Economy*, May-June 1968, pp. 327-347.
19. Schultze, Charles L. *The Politics and Economics of Public Spending*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute, 1968.
20. Seligman, Ben B. *Permanent Poverty, an American Syndrome*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1968.
21. Sexton, Patricia C. *Readings in the School of Society*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1967.
22. Smolensky, Eugene. "Investment in the

Education of the Poor: A Pessimistic Report," *American Economic Review*, Vol. LVI (May 1966), pp. 370-378.

23. Vaizey, John. *The Economics of Education*. New York, N.Y.: Free Press, 1962.

24. Weisbrod, Burton A. *Spillover of Public Education Costs and Benefits*. Cooperative Research Project No. 1045, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Washington University, Missouri, August 1963.

25. Weisbrod, Burton A. "Collective Action and the Distribution of Income: A Conceptual Approach," *The Analysis and Evaluation of Public Expenditures: The PPB System*. A Compendium of Papers Submitted to the Joint Economic Committee, Vol. I, pp. 177-197, 91st Congress, 1st Session, 1969.

26. Review of Economic Opportunity Programs, By the Comptroller-General of the United States Made Pursuant to Title II of 1967 Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Report to the Congress of the United States, 91st Congress, 1st Session, March 1969.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Friedman, Milton. *Capitalism and Freedom*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1962, pp. 100-107.

² Schultz, Theodore W. "Resources for Higher Education: An Economist's View", *Journal of Political Economy*, May-June 1968, pp. 327-347.

³ Weisbrod, Burton A. "Collective Action and the Distribution of Income: A Conceptual Approach." *The Analysis and Evaluation of Public Expenditures: The PPB System*, A Compendium of Papers Submitted to the Joint Economic Committee, Vol. I, p. 195; 91st Congress, 1st Session, 1969.

⁴ Harris, Seymour. *Higher Education Resources and Finance*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962, pp. 328-329.

⁵ Schultze, Charles L. *The Politics and Economics of Public Spending*. Washington, D.C.; Brookings Institute, 1968, pp. 120-122.

⁶ Freeman, Roger A. *Crisis in College Finance*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Social Science Research, 1965, pp. 144-148.

⁷ Denison, Edward E. "Measuring the Contribution of Education to Economic Growth", *The Residual Factor and Economics*, OECD Study Group in Economics and Education, Paris, 1964, p. 30.

⁸ Morgan, James and Sirageldin. "A Note on the Quality Dimension in Education", *Journal of Political Economy*, Sept.-Oct. 1968, pp. 1069-1077.

⁹ Schultz, Theodore, op. cit.

¹⁰ Becker, Gary S. "Underinvestment in Education", *American Economic Review*, Vol. L (May 1969), pp. 346-354.

¹¹ Friedman, Milton, op. cit.

¹² Freeman, Roger A., op. cit., pp. 208-236.

¹³ Harris, Seymour and Others. *Education and Public Policy*. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1965, pp. 86-93.

¹⁴ Review of Economic Opportunity Programs. By the Comptroller-General of the U.S. Made Pursuant to Title II of 1967 Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Report to the Congress of the United States, 91st Congress, 1st Session, March 1969, pp. 99-103.

THE FLATBUSH BOYS' CLUB
HONORS DR. CHARLES W. MUELLER

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, on April 23 the Flatbush Boys' Club honored one of Brooklyn's most distinguished citizens. Dr. Charles W. Mueller, a prominent

Brooklyn obstetrician and gynecologist, was guest of honor at the 66th Annual Dinner of the Flatbush Boys' Club. It was an honor well deserved.

Today, there are more than 600 boys' clubs affiliated with the national organization in the United States. Because of the work of such concerned people as Dr. Mueller, the club has remained relevant to the needs of young men. I am proud to say that the Flatbush Boys' Club is one of the finest clubs in the Nation. The club has continued to work to develop the interests and the talents of boys in the community—boys who have gone on to make important contributions to their country and their community.

As we all know, the incidence of drug abuse in this Nation has increased to the extent that it has become the most

serious problem confronting our youth. The Flatbush Boys' Club has been a leader in the fight against such abuse because it is fortunate to have a program entitled "Preventive Drug Addiction" for the youth of the community.

The program was the inspiration of Dr. Charles Mueller. It includes the distribution of information to members of the community to aid in the detection of addicts. It allows such drug centers as Odyssey House to use the center's facilities at designated times. In addition, the activities at the center give young men in the community the opportunity to engage in meaningful activity. Indeed, if there were more such clubs and programs, we might well witness a sharp decrease in the incidence of addiction among our youth.

It is with pride that I add my name

to the long list of people honoring Dr. Charles W. Mueller for his work for the Flatbush Boys' Club.

THE DRAFT BEFORE, NOW AND IN THE FUTURE

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of April 24, 1970, carried an article on the draft before, now, and under proposals for the future, which I believe should be of interest.

The article follows:

THE DRAFT BEFORE, NOW AND IN FUTURE

WASHINGTON, April 23.—Following is the STATUS YESTERDAY

White House analysis of "The Impact of Draft Reform on Individual Registrants": STATUS TODAY

If yesterday, a registrant was:

Today, the registrant is:

1. Attending college as a student for baccalaureate degree.
2. Planning to enroll in college.
3. Attending junior or community college or approved technical school (but not studying for baccalaureate degree), or participating in approved apprentice program.
4. Attending junior college or community college in a program leading to baccalaureate degree from a four-year college.
5. Planning to enroll in a junior college, community college, or approved technical school or apprentice program.
6. Holding a deferment granted because of employment (including agricultural).
7. Not holding an employment deferment.*
8. Holding a paternity deferment.
9. Not holding a paternity deferment.*

- Eligible for student deferment as before.
- Eligible for student deferment after he enters college until the Congress passes proposed legislation and the President issues a second executive order.
- Eligible for student deferment as before.
- Eligible for student deferment as before. Deferment will be continued upon transfer to a four-year institution.
- Eligible for student deferment after entry until the Congress passes proposed legislation and the President issues a second executive order.
- Eligible for employment deferment as before.
- Not eligible for employment deferment.
- Eligible for paternity deferment as before.
- Not eligible for paternity deferment. May be eligible for hardship deferment.

STATUS IN FUTURE UNDER THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS

After the second executive order to be issued if the Congress passes proposed legislation, a registrant's status would be as follows: Same as today.

Ineligible for student deferment. If called for service after he enters college, a student would be granted postponement of induction until end of semester or term. College men enrolled in R.O.T.C. or other military programs could postpone active duty until completion of their study programs.

Same as today.

Same as today.

Ineligible for student deferment. If called for service after beginning a program, a registrant would be granted postponement of induction until appropriate breaking point in program.

Same as today.

Same as today.

Same as today.

Same as today.

*Registrants with applications for employment or paternity deferments pending before today will be eligible for such deferments so long as qualified under regulations in force yesterday.

DEDICATION OF GEORGIA REHABILITATION CENTER

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, the State of Georgia has reason to be very proud of its accomplishments in the field of vocational rehabilitation. Recently, another milestone was reached in Georgia's program to assist the disabled in returning to productive roles in society. On March 1, 1970, Dr. Edward Newman, Commissioner of the Rehabilitation Services Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, gave the principal address at the dedication of a \$1 million addition to the

Georgia Rehabilitation Center at Warm Springs, Ga. Mr. Jack P. Nix, Georgia superintendent of schools was kind enough to send me a copy. The Georgia Rehabilitation Center is now a \$3,500,000 complex which renders treatment to the seriously disabled. I believe that Commissioner Newman's remarks on the program being carried out at Warm Springs deserves full consideration and widespread distribution. Therefore, I have asked that Commissioner Newman's remarks be inserted in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY COMMISSIONER EDWARD NEWMAN

When I say that I am particularly honored and gratified to be here with you today, I hope you will believe that it is not just the ceremonial oratory to be expected from a Federal official on such an occasion as this.

Long before I became Commissioner of the Rehabilitation Services Administration—indeed, long before such a possibility ever

entered my mind—I had resolved to visit, if the opportunity ever arose, the State whose vocational rehabilitation program is often cited as the model of excellence.

As director of the Massachusetts Vocational Rehabilitation Statewide Planning Project, I had heard many good things about the Georgia program.

You have every reason to be proud of the outstanding accomplishments of your State program. You have been a consistent leader in State rankings each year—both in numbers of rehabilitants and per capita rate of rehabilitation. Your vocational rehabilitation program is truly an ornament to the reputation of your great State of Georgia.

I do not think it accidental that we find in the South some of the most vigorous and dynamic programs of vocational rehabilitation. There is a spirit here of willingness to help one's neighbor to help himself, as well as pride in self-reliance and personal dignity. Both of these characteristics I admire and respect, and find them much in common with our New England outlook.

One of the most rewarding aspects of this work is the opportunity to meet people who are courageous beyond the customary demands of that trait. I am not among those who subscribe to the belief that dependent people are anxious to remain so—whether we speak of those casualties of our society or economy who, for one reason or another, are obliged to depend on welfare, or of our nation's disabled citizens handicapped by birth defect, accident or disease, who are anxious to return to as normal a life as they can, and to resume a productive role in society. The very best in the American character, from which the vocational rehabilitation movement springs, is illustrated by the Georgia Rehabilitation Center, and this new addition which we dedicate today.

With this \$1,000,000 addition, the Georgia Rehabilitation Center will double its bed capacity from 125 to 250, and a medical clinic and auditorium have been added along with additional space for program services. The Center's limited bed space has resulted in long waiting lists of clients who are in need of evaluation and vocational training, but with this new addition we hope that waiting time will be substantially reduced.

There are other reasons why the Georgia Rehabilitation Center is of particular interest to me, as a Commissioner of vocational rehabilitation relatively new in office—and as one who had his basic training at the State level in the administrative, fiscal, technical and planning problems of the program.

I came to this post with some ideas of my own that I hoped to be able to put into practice on a national scale, ideas which I find, happily, are being implemented right here in Warm Springs.

For example, it is no secret among rehabilitation people that our program has sometimes been accused of playing a "numbers game" or meeting some kind of "production quotas" each year. Our critics say we do that by singling out for services a good number of people with minor impairments which may lend themselves to a higher likelihood of success. But here in Georgia you are meeting the challenge of the hardcore, seriously disabled, whose cases are costly, time-consuming, and which stretch your professional abilities to their limits.

The Georgia Rehabilitation Center is designed to serve these seriously disabled people. 30% of the patients here are in wheelchairs, for example.

As Commissioner of the Rehabilitation Services Administration, I believe that our program should move toward widening its responsibility to more severely disabled people. I am intensely interested in the development of a delivery system of rehabilitation services which will make our State-Federal program truly a community program. I welcome the disappearance of red tape and long waiting periods. I would like to see a network of available, accessible, and responsive community rehabilitation programs.

We know that any assault on the multiple problems of the disabled will also be an assault on the problems of poverty and welfare dependency. Not only do disabled people often become poor, but poor people become disabled with a statistical frequency which is more than a mere coincidence. Without question in my mind, poverty breeds illness, mental retardation, disability, and a dependency cycle which feeds upon itself.

While I have a vision of community rehabilitation programs for the large majority of disabled people for whom even routine services will make a tremendous difference in their lives, the seriously disabled must have a resource such as this to turn to: a regional or State-wide rehabilitation facility like this Center, bringing together a wide range of competent people in their respective professional specialties, where those who require intensive services may live on the premises while being served.

Another aspect of this outstanding facility which is especially gratifying to me is the genuine working partnership which exists between the voluntary agency and the federal and State programs. This partnership pays more than mere lip service to the concept of voluntarism. It is a partnership in which the whole is more than the sum of its parts.

Without the unselfish and wholehearted cooperation of the Warm Springs Foundation, the new Center and the addition which we dedicate today would not have been possible. The land on which this Center was built, as you know, was donated by the Warm Springs Foundation. The walkway which connects these two facilities—one owned and operated by the Foundation, the other by the Georgia Office of Rehabilitation Services—is a physical symbol of the working partnership here in Warm Springs. This is a model of the voluntary agency working with the State agency, which encourages and stabilizes the voluntary services.

Georgia is one of those States which have led the way in developing a plan to promote the orderly growth and development of voluntary agencies serving the disabled. An annual agreement for purchase of services permits voluntary agencies to plan for the year ahead, and offers them a measure of fiscal stability.

Today, in view of this handsome complex of buildings valued at more than \$3,500,000 let us not lose sight of another aspect of the Georgia Rehabilitation Center which reflects the basic philosophy of our movement. You treat people here, not cases or file numbers. The genius of the vocational rehabilitation program since its founding 50 years ago has been its ability to keep the individuality of each disabled person paramount. Rehabilitation is unique among public social programs, in that it keeps foremost the goal of gainful occupation for each handicapped client. It develops an individualized plan for each client, and maintains flexibility in the provision of client services, with the freedom to create for the individual client a "mix" of services purchased from a variety of public and private resources. The boundaries between various jurisdictions (Federal, State and local—) have often proven to be insurmountable barriers to other human service programs, but vocational rehabilitation learned to cross them.

Finding the money to encourage development of other facilities around the nation, like this one at Warm Springs, will be difficult at present. Money for construction, as well as for many other urgent needs in human service programs, is tight. But I plan to be around awhile—and you do, too—so that I feel free to look ahead at a vision of what the future might hold.

This June, the State-Federal vocational rehabilitation program will mark its 50th anniversary. In the decade ahead, I believe the rehabilitation movement will emerge as a major contributor in the fight against disability, poverty, and dependency. Our success will depend upon the working partnership between public resources and private initiative. The Georgia Rehabilitation Center is an example of this kind of partnership.

I hope to learn a great deal on my visit to Warm Springs, both from my opportunity to walk through the Center and meet its staff and patients—and from my tour of other State agency programs in the area. Georgia has a great deal to show the rest of the States about the administration of a model program.

In the decade which lies ahead, I hope to see a door opened to the disabled in every community—a door, such as the one on this very building, leading to a planned program of comprehensive services for the disabled. I see the involvement of the rehabilitation agency, even if needed services range beyond the traditional limits of vocational re-

habilitation, and extend into such areas as transportation and housing for the disabled, for example.

I would like to see the rehabilitation agency in each community to be that Open Door to a new life for America's disabled citizens.

Here in Warm Springs, at the Georgia Rehabilitation Center, you are doing much to help make that vision a reality. I commend you for your compassion, for caring, and for helping disabled people to use their courage and determination to lead productive, dignified lives.

THE CATHOLIC URBAN SCHOOL: THE PATTERNS OF SURVIVAL

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, recently Dr. Francesco Cordasco, professor of education at Montclair College in Montclair, N.J., provided me with a copy of an address he delivered before the 67th annual National Catholic Education Association Convention in Atlantic City.

Dr. Cordasco's address defines the problems facing Catholic urban schools and suggests a program for their survival, including:

Continuing attention by Catholic schoolmen to the urban poor;

A new awakening of community support for Catholic urban schools;

The involvement of all Catholic institutions in the educational service to assure needs for the child and his family;

A recognition that the decline in religious vocations must be reversed;

A new liaison between suburban and urban Catholic schools; and

A continuous involvement in educational experimentation by Catholic colleges.

The problem of Catholic education is a vital part of the entire context of urban education. I commend this address to the attention of my colleagues. The address follows:

THE CATHOLIC URBAN SCHOOL: THE PATTERNS OF SURVIVAL

If there is agreement on anything in American Catholic education, it is in the grim statistical data which delineate a symptomatology of decline in enrollments and the closing of schools. Catholic school enrollment has dropped 500,000 in two years; in June 1969, some 301 Catholic elementary and secondary schools closed throughout the nation, and some 111 more began phasing out grades and consolidating classes. In 1968, school closings numbered 445 with the heaviest attrition in the elementary sector; the school mortality pattern in American Catholic education was inexorably progressive: in 1966-67, 50 elementary schools closed; in 1967-68, 152; and in 1968-69, 225. The National Catholic Education Association has predicted that some 200 schools will close in 1969-70. According to Msgr. James C. Donohue, director, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Catholic Conference, "Enrollment in Catholic elementary and secondary schools has dropped from 5.6 million in the 1964-65 school year to an estimated 4.86 million in the current school year (1969-70)—a decline of three quarters

of a million students in only five years." And Msgr. Donohue couples with his notice of the declination of enrollments the severe financial straits in which Catholic schools currently find themselves, and the adverse fiscal burdens which the loss of children from the Catholic schools impose on the public schools:

The reason is obvious. When children leave a Catholic school which has closed or been forced to cut back its operations for financial reasons, they do not vanish. They go to school somewhere, and "Somewhere else" means the local public school.

The dollars and cents implication for public schools are clear. The more former students of Catholic schools enroll in public schools, the more public schools will be obliged to provide additional teachers, classrooms, equipment, and materials—and this is at precisely the time when they are increasingly hard pressed for funds. Indeed, the conclusion seems inescapable that the worse by the financial crisis in non-public education.

The available figures demonstrate that this is no fantasy. For instance, it is estimated that taxpayers in the Detroit area have paid some \$90 million over the past four years to accommodate in public schools some 50,000 former Catholic school students who have been forced out of Catholic schools which have closed, consolidated, or curtailed classes. This is, furthermore, a continuing expense, since these students will continue to be a drain on the taxpayers' pocketbook for as long as they remain in public schools.

There can be no retreat before the appalling attrition in Catholic school enrollments; and there can be no denial of the fiscal burdens which have rendered, in a period of inflationary havoc, Catholic schools no less immune to the rigid and iron laws of economics. But Catholic leadership has failed to examine the total context out of which the declining enrollments have emerged. For the most part, Catholic educators have attributed the closing of their schools simply to severe financial strain, an equation which has assumed the force of a *post hoc, ergo propter hoc* demonstration in logic; and if they have not sought a causal connection between declining enrollments and the phenomenon of fiscal crisis, they have squandered an immeasurable prodigality in pleading the righteousness of their quest for public funds. But like Odysseus, the Catholic educator has not yet made his way home: for if he has encountered and vanquished federal interdiction (Polyphemus), he has been lost to the ideologies of extravagant praise for Catholic schools in America's search for a true pluralism, or to grim warnings (such as those expressed by Msgr. Donohue) to the public sector as to the grave financial consequences that must follow the closing of Catholic schools.

In my judgment, Catholic educators, in their emphasis on the search for financial support, have made a twofold tragic error. First, they have attributed to the need for money, the grave and imperiled condition of Catholic schools; and second, they have failed to discern that the struggle for public support for Catholic schools can no longer be argued in the rhetoric and language which characterized the 1950's and early 1960's. And this is not to minimize the struggle of those earlier years, or to suggest that the history of public support for private schools in America has been fully written. It is as yet an unfolding story, but the enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965, with its provisions for Federal support to private schools, has unequivocally established the principle of support.

A survey conducted by the American Jewish Congress showed that bills to provide direct state aid to parochial and other private schools were considered by 20 state legislatures in 1969, with passage achieved in

three of the legislatures, but with "a continuing effort by religious groups to win public funds for parochial schools." Whatever form public support of private schools assumes, it is, in my judgment, inevitable; and the intricacies of the pattern it assumes will be formulated within the ensuing few years. The questions which should concern Catholic educators are those which ask: What is the quality of our schools? Whom are we (and whom should we be) educating? What are our responsibilities to the new poor in the cities in which our schools have been traditionally located? Have we a philosophic commitment and a set of clearly defined objectives which justify Catholic schools? What is to be done about the declination in religious vocations and the staffing of parish schools?

As always, history can be used as an instructive force in confronting current problems. The history of Catholic education in America has been written more as church history than as social process and as a consequence many of the dynamics which underlie the origins of a parochial school system have been adumbrated under the religious rubrics of the third Plenary Council of Baltimore (1884), religious protocol, and clerical and episcopal intransigence faced with the reputedly irreligious public school. What (in our judgment) has been paid little attention to is the struggle and social adaptation of an Irish peasant immigrant urban subcommunity out of which the parish school (fashioned in the mandates of the Third Plenary Council) emerged. It is my view that the impoverished urban Irish community created a community school system to serve its children and that its motivation was political and social; only incidentally were the strategies of a church-school system evolved, in a measure dictated, in order that the Irish community school be given cohesiveness, a *Gemeinschaft* strength, and an inviolable religious ideology. And this is not intended to demean the religious motivation: it is rather to note that an impoverished and deprived ("disadvantaged," if one prefers the current euphemism) urban community used both ethnicity and religion as the basic weapons against an oppressive establishment. Seen in this perspective, the Catholic parish schools are an historical analogue which should help explain the efforts of the contemporary urban poor (predominantly Black, Puerto Rican, and Mexican-American) to create community school systems which reflect their *ethos* and assure their cultural survival; and out of a multitudinous experience, Irish Catholic schoolmen should be, not only the best informed educators on urban education and the aspirations of ethnic enclaves, but should be (as they have not been) the most stalwart defenders of urban educational decentralization and of community control of schools. The two basic ingredients which irretrievably relate Catholic schools to the contemporary urban context are poverty and ethnicity; and the contemporary setting is an urban America in which the parish school originated and in which it has traditionally prevailed.

The contemporary urban educational scene is one of confusion, bitterness, a worsening reality which persists despite massive federal aid and a plethora of ambitiously experimental constructs: the answers to a multitude of problems are not easy, but as Daniel P. Moynihan (who is an exemplar both of ethnicity and social class) sardonically observes, it may be that the problems have not been correctly defined:

As the decade closed the New York City Master Plan was to declare: "The plain fact is that no one yet knows how to make a ghetto school work."

This statement in itself is a considerable advance, even though the problem is still poorly stated by describing the slum school as a "ghetto" school.

(The plain fact is that nobody knows how to make a real ghetto school—that is, one made up of European Jewish students—not work. The ghetto schools of Europe were where Nobel physicists first learned calculus. One of the most profound misstatements of the situation of the black in urban America—or, for that matter, that of the Irish, Italian and other agricultural immigrants who arrived in the cities in circumstances comparable to those of the blacks—has been to state it in terms of the Jewish experience.)

Nonetheless, the illusion of knowledge faded with the New York City Master Plan, and this at least is the beginning of problem solving.

Characteristically, Moynihan will have infuriated some people, but with typical perspicacity, he has cut down to the root of the matter. If education is to be effective (Moynihan is saying) in urban schools (which have traditionally been the schools of the minority poor), then it must reflect the lifestyles, the mores, and the needs of its constituency: in sum, it must be both of and by the community. The public schoolmen have not yet comprehended this elemental dynamic: the complexity of the struggle for the control of public schools cannot be understood unless one sees the struggle in ethnic and community terms with all of the intricacies of a socio-economic tableau in which new destinies and power are being forged.

But the Catholic schools do understand the dynamic; both their genesis and experience confirm the fact. For the Catholic urban schools, the problem has a different dimension. As community schools, the problems of community relevancy and participation would (in my view) be quickly resolved for urban Catholic schools. An Irish, Italian, or Polish Catholic slum school which has kept intact its ethnic wellsprings and community anchorages can be equally as well a Black or hispanic Catholic slum school with the strength which ethnicity and community afford. For Catholic schoolmen, the problem quite simply is: "Will we undertake to educate the Black and hispanic poor who are the new constituencies of our urban parishes?" And the answer to this question must be forthright and honest; on it hinges the survival of the urban Catholic school.

It is not an easy question. And it cannot be dismissed by noting that the Black urban poor are, in the main, non-Catholic: for, if this imposes the need to define Catholic endeavour in apostolic terms, it cannot obscure the relatively modest efforts of American Catholicism in behalf of Black Americans. But what of the hispanic poor, traditionally Catholic, and the mission of the Catholic urban school? How are we to explain our essentially unsubstantial efforts in their behalf? Has the urban parish school retreated so far from its twin dynamics of ethnicity and community that the hispanic poor are invisible in its midst?

It is the urban *demos* which Catholic schoolmen must redefine once again. With this done, other problems will be easily resolved. If we keep in mind that it is to the urban citadels of the poor that Father McCuskey is referring in his apostrophe to the Catholic school, his words have a poignant eloquence:

"Have the Catholic schools in America been a failure or a success? The first answer is a retort: Has any human institution been an unqualified failure or success? One could as easily ask: Is any marriage an unqualified failure or success? Perhaps in all fairness, we should let each generation return its own answer. In general, however, it can be readily said that in many important ways, as shall be seen, the Catholic school has been and is an outstanding success. Frankly, where it may have fallen short of its demanding ideal, a portion of the blame can be laid at the door of government whose

policies on support have made the burden of financing the Catholic school such a heavy one. In any event, the Catholic school has tried to keep troth with the transcendent character of its Master's mission."

I have prepared a seven-point check list of recommendations for Catholic schools, and they are skeletally appended; in my text I have intruded on most of them, and they might be considered an inventory for survival. No one of them is listed without a full awareness of the difficulties imposed and the uncertainties to be encountered. Yet, in my considered judgment, they point the way to a renaissance of Christian effort in behalf of children: For Catholic schools there can be no retreat from the urban centers and the contexts of socio-economic deprivation; Catholic schoolmen must define as their major constituency the urban poor; ethnicity and community must provide the animus which gives meaning and dimension to educational programs, governance, and participation; Catholic schools must draw support from all Catholic institutions (health services, etc.) to assure all needed service for the child and his family; the declination in religious vocations must be reversed, and the dominant administrative and teaching cadres of Catholic schools must be the religious; liaison between suburban and urban Catholic schools must be established with a major assumption of fiscal support borne by affluent suburban parishes, with a continuing exchange of staff, students, and an eclectic sharing of facilities; Catholic colleges and universities must be continuously involved in educational experimentation within Catholic schools and must become the major resource for innovation and advisement.

My recommendations are neither naive nor quixotic. If money is a necessary ingredient, it is not the major element which prognosticates success or failure. The major ingredient must be a commitment to the ideals of Christian education, and the tenets of an Judaic-Christian ethic. All else is, at best, relative. Catholic schoolmen in today's troubled times, should find encouragement in the words of St. Jean Baptiste de La Salle, an earlier Catholic educator of modest talents, who faced the staggering problems of his devout commitment with these words: "As our office offends the schoolmasters, we have in everyone of them a declared and inveterate enemy, and all in a body they have often armed the powers of the world to destroy us. Yet, notwithstanding all, the edifice is standing, although it was so often trembling on the brink of ruin. This is what leads me to hope that it will endure, and render to the Church the services she has a right to expect from it."

MANDATORY RETIREMENT AT 100

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from one of my Congressmanless Washington, D.C., constituents. I thought I should share his comments with all the Members of this eminent body.

I do not necessarily share my correspondent's views on the need for a mandatory retirement age. Age is not an infallible indication of either ability or incompetence. But barring other reforms of the seniority system, this may be an alternative:

I am sure the Democratic Study Group has given much thought to means of getting younger, more capable men in positions of authority. It's clear that most men will not relinquish power voluntarily and therefore it is necessary, or at least desirable, to come up with a proposal which would permit as little rational opposition as possible.

Few men who are 70 will vote to have an age restriction of 70 or even 75 imposed on committee chairmen. Even men of 75 or so would see themselves threatened if a limitation of 80 were to be imposed. But what about this: who, with a straight face, could seriously insist that a man of 100 years be given a committee chairmanship? A bill to prohibit centenarians from being committee chairmen should be relatively easy to get through the House. Clearly, no one is affected. The same is true for 95 and even 90.

My suggestion would be that a bill be introduced to limit the age of committee chairman to 100 as of 1970; to 95 as of 1971; to 90 as of 1972; etc. Thus, in seven years, we would have a livable maximum age of 65.

This de-escalation is too rapid, of course, and compromises would have to be worked out.

In compromising, a maximum age of 70 might be agreed on and perhaps the seven years could be extended to ten or twelve. But, the dam would be broken.

UNITED STATES SHOULD SEEK U.N. CONSIDERATION OF THE CAMBODIAN CRISIS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we are being told that Cambodia is being invaded. The Nixon administration says it is giving consideration to Cambodia's request for massive military assistance. We do not have any assurance that such assistance, if rendered, would not include American advisers or even troops. This is clearly a case for consideration by the United Nations, not a case for unilateral intervention.

I have sent the following telegram to the Secretary of State. It is my fervent hope that by taking this case to the United Nations, we can avoid the quagmire of another Vietnam.

The telegram follows:

It is imperative that the Cambodian crisis be submitted to the United Nations Security Council at once. If the Security Council can come to no agreement on the matter, then the issue should be referred to the General Assembly, at a Special Session to be called for the purpose, under the "Uniting for Peace Resolution."

If an invasion of Cambodia by North Vietnam is in progress, as you have suggested, then this is clearly a case of aggression and should be handled in accordance with the provisions of the Charter. I cannot understand why this has not been the Administration's position from the beginning.

If an appropriate body of the U.N. finds that aggression is being committed and that collective action should be taken under U.N. auspices, then the United States should fully support that action. If, on the other hand, there is no such finding by a U.N. body, then the United States should not attempt once again to play policeman on its own or with

a handful of allies. The American people want no more Vietnams.

I understand that a new Cambodian Ambassador has just arrived in New York, and I hope Cambodia will take its case to the Security Council. But if Cambodia does not do so promptly, the United States should.

PHILADELPHIA CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE TO HELP ESTABLISH A CENTRALIZED FACILITY WITHIN PHILADELPHIA FOR THE DIAGNOSIS AND REFERRAL OF DRUG ADDICTS AND FOR COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAMS OF DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Paul D'Ortona, president of the City Council of Philadelphia, has brought to my attention Resolution 248, which was adopted unanimously by the council on April 16. This matter is of vital importance to the city of Philadelphia, and I call this resolution to the attention of my colleagues:

RESOLUTION No. 248

Memorializing the U.S. Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to help establish a centralized facility within Philadelphia for the diagnosis and referral of drug addicts and for comprehensive programs of drug abuse education.

Whereas, Recent investigation has confirmed that the extent of drug addiction in Philadelphia has reached alarming proportions; and

Whereas, Drug addiction is a disease that results in debilitating effects on the individual and his social environment; and

Whereas, Addicts often are forced to resort to supporting their habit by crimes against property and persons; and

Whereas, Drug-related thefts are estimated to involve millions of dollars of property each year in this city; and

Whereas, Existing treatment settings in the Greater Philadelphia area do not have adequate facilities to treat the great number of addicts needing rehabilitation; and

Whereas, There is a demonstrated need in the City of Philadelphia for a centralized diagnostic, referral and educational facility; and

Whereas, President Nixon has recognized the need for expending more federal funds for strengthened enforcement, more research, and improved rehabilitation; therefore

Resolved, By the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby memorialize the Honorable Robert Finch, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, to help establish, through the National Institute of Mental Health and other appropriate agencies, a centralized facility within the City of Philadelphia for the diagnosis and referral of drug addicts and for comprehensive programs of drug abuse education.

Resolved, That certified copies of this Resolution be sent to the President of the United States, Vice-President, Speaker of the House, President Pro Tempore of the Senate, United States Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Congressional representatives from Philadelphia and United States Senators from Pennsylvania, as evidence of the sincere sentiments of this legislative body.

Certification: This is a true and correct copy of the original Resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Philadelphia on the sixteenth day of April, 1970.

PAUL D'ORTONA,
President of City Council.

Attest:

CHARLES H. SAWYER, Jr.,
Chief Clerk of the Council.

ERNEST CUNEO WRITES ABOUT
VIETNAM

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, a former colleague, Morgan M. Moulder of Camdenton, Mo., has brought to my attention an article from the St. Louis Globe Democrat by Ernest Cuneo concerning our policy in Vietnam. At Mr. Moulder's suggestion, I bring it to the attention of the Members of the House. The article follows:

"BACK TO AMERICA" OR "ON TO HANOI"?
(By Ernest Cuneo)

WASHINGTON.—We are not listening to a great debate on American foreign policy for the simple bad reason that full consideration of available courses are not being considered.

The Senate is determined that we vacate Vietnam immediately. The President is in accord with the objective of Vietnam withdrawal, but asks for time.

No one pretends that this is anything but an American defeat, and the world so regards it.

Reasonable senators very reasonably declare the United States should never have entered Vietnam in the first place. This may be true, but these same reasonable senators ought to consider what other reasonable men believe we should have done when we got there. Unfortunately, this is not being mentioned, much less debated.

But there is authority, from Shakespeare to Von Clausewitz, that what we did after we landed in Vietnam has a great deal more to do with the present deplorable state of our affairs than the intervention itself. Declared Shakespeare's Polonius, "beware of entrance to a quarrel; but being in, bear't that the opposed may beware of thee."

This, of course, is exactly what the United States has not done in Vietnam. On the contrary, we have repeatedly assured the enemy that we fight a limited war for limited objectives.

We have not only limited our weapons, but we have informed the enemy of vast areas in his own country where even these would not be used.

We have assured the enemy and the world that we will permit strikes at us from sanctuary border states.

We have accepted his denials that he has an army in Laos, even when that army attacks in vast force.

We have withdrawn troops, thus exposing those remaining.

The vital military element of surprise, we have abandoned. Our military are regularly hauled before Congress to reveal publicly their tactics and strategy.

In an effort to bring about negotiation, we have deprived our own troops of air protection. The American casualties since negotiations started are appalling. Yet the only thing decided is the shape of the table. Nothing else has been offered by the enemy.

From this, it is at least an arguable inference that defeatism and palliation of the enemy may be the very cause of our misfortunes.

Worldwide pressure has mounted, not eased, since American policy wavered. The Middle East has been raised to the point of explosion. Small powers order us out, our allies leave us. In other quarters of the globe, large American properties are seized; our embassy compounds are assailed by rioters.

Withal, we have the greatest military force in world's history. Its effectiveness is magnificent, its morale high. Indeed, from the standpoint of Von Clausewitz, the performance of our armed forces is miraculous.

Incredibly, our armed forces have not even been allowed a military objective. The final military objective is to break the will of the enemy's army to fight. In order to break the will of an army, it must be defeated in battle. In order to defeat it in battle, it must be cut off from its base or its base destroyed.

But the United States armed forces have not been permitted by Washington to invade North Vietnam, in general, nor to assail the enemy's main bases, Hanoi and the port of Haiphong, in particular.

"WELFARE CADILLAC": THE SONG
THE PRESIDENT DIDN'T HEAR

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the song "Welfare Cadillac" initially requested by President Nixon for a Johnny Cash performance at the White House created such a controversy that the song was omitted from the program.

Without commenting on the merit of the song, I thought it would be of interest to make the words available through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a matter of information.

The words of the song, as published in Human Events, follows:

THE WELFARE CADILLAC

Well I never worked much
In fact, I've been poor all my life. I guess all I really own is 10 kids and a wife
This house that I live in is mine
But it's really a shack
Yet I always manage somehow to drive me a brand-new Cadillac.

The back door steps they done fell on down
The front screen door is off and layin' somewhere out there on the ground
The wind just now whipped another piece of that old tar roofin' off the back
Sure hope it don't skin up that new Cadillac.

The front porch posts they're loose at the bottom

In winter time we sometimes have some snow blow through the cracks
It isn't too bad, we just pile up and sleep back under that new Cadillac.

I know the place ain't much
But I sure don't pay the rent
I get a check the first of every month from this here federal gov'tment
Every Wednesday I get commodities
Sometimes four or five sacks
Pick 'em up down at the Welfare office drivin' that new Cadillac.

Some folks say I'm crazy and I've even been called a fool
But my kids get free books and free lunches at school

We get peanut butter and cheese, and man they give us flour by the sack
Of course them welfare checks they make the payments on this new Cadillac.

Now that I see it these other folks are fools
They're work'n and payin' taxes just to send my young'uns to school
The Salvation Army cuts their hair and gives the clothes we wear on the back
So we can dress up and ride around and show off 'his new Cadillac.

But things still are goin' to get better yet or at least that's what I understand
They tell me this new President put in a whole new poverty plan.

He's goin' to send us poor folks money
They say we're goin' to live down here in style

In fact, my wife's already shoppin' around for her new Cadillac.

HE GAVE LIFE TO THE LAW

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, just recently, one of the most respected and distinguished legal scholars in this Nation, Charles B. Elliott, passed away in Columbia, S.C.

"Mr. Charlie," as he was affectionately called by thousands of aspiring young attorneys, including myself, dedicated his entire career to the law and preparing others for a legal career. He revered the law, and he inspired in his students a healthy respect for those legal principles upon which our great democracy was founded.

I have never seen his equal in the field of constitutional law. I have often said that if the Warren Court had taken Mr. Charlie's "con law" course, quite possibly, our Constitution would not have been so manhandled by the Court in the past 15 years. Like our distinguished colleague in the other body, the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. ERVIN, Professor Elliott could quote verbatim from the major cases which have been decided by the High Court in its history.

Mr. Charlie is survived by his dear wife, Mrs. Irene Elliott. Like her late husband, Mrs. Elliott has devoted an outstanding and unselfish career to the education of our youth. Among the many English courses she taught at the University of South Carolina before a well-deserved retirement were the legendary Great Books and Epic Poetry. My profound expression of sympathy goes to Mrs. Elliott upon her great loss.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the State newspaper is a tribute to Mr. Charlie. It says far better than I how deeply we shall miss this remarkable and gifted man, and I commend it to my colleagues and the Nation as follows:

HE GAVE LIFE TO THE LAW

The world has too few people like Charles Bell Elliott; now it has one less.

When he died Sunday at 84, "Mr. Charlie" had been out of the mainstream of South Carolina affairs for some years. Yet few men were remembered with greater fondness and

respect than this man who left such a strong imprint on the law of the state and upon the hearts of those who knew him.

His great, domed head was a veritable law library, but his specialties were property and constitutional law. He practiced and taught law with zest and rare skill. His scholarship, particularly in the area of property law, contributed greatly to its development.

A great human and a great humorist, "Mr. Charlie," for 25 years a teacher at the University of South Carolina Law School, had a rare ability to make such dry and obtuse subjects of Future Interests (Property 4) interesting and understandable. He regaled his students with anecdotes from his long career as a lawyer, even injecting a large dash of wit, and the law became alive.

On May 31, 1967, many of those former students gathered to pay homage to this great lawyer, great teacher and old friend. The group included the state's most prominent leaders of the bar and of politics. Governor McNair, former Governor Russell were among those making testimonial remarks, and the Charles B. Elliott Fund was established at the University. The prevailing sentiment was affectionate appreciation.

Those who missed "Mr. Charlie" along the way missed an experience and a treat.

COMMENDATION OF COMMISSIONER DONALD JACKSON AND HIS ICC STAFF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the most frequently heard and often believed complaints today is that the Federal bureaucracy is so weighted down by its own bulk that it is incapable of responding to the citizenry it is supposed to serve. We know, from our own volume of individual casework, that while there is sometimes merit to this allegation, for the most part our Government employees perform their jobs with distinction. It is especially pleasant, therefore, to bring to the attention of my colleagues just one example—representative of countless thousands—of the kind of outstanding service that the agencies of our Government do perform, every day, for the citizens of our Nation. This particular case is explained in the following letter of appreciation to Commissioner Donald L. Jackson and his staff at the Interstate Commerce Commission for their expeditious solution to the kind of frustrating problem with which we are all familiar. I would like to add my own commendation for the fine work of the ICC.

The letter follows:

MUNICIPAL COURT LOS ANGELES

JUDICIAL DISTRICT,

Los Angeles, Calif., April 17, 1970.

Commissioner DONALD L. JACKSON,
Interstate Commerce Commission,
Legislative Office, Washington, D.C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER: We wish to thank you and your staff for your assistance in locating and expediting delivery of our special trust refund check forms shipped from Chicago and unobtainable due to the recent wildcat strikes in the trucking industry.

The shipment had been delayed for more

than a week. Our attempts to locate it were fruitless. We had called, the bank had called and the printer had called. The only answer we received was that the shipment could be anywhere between Chicago and Los Angeles.

Your office was contacted at noon on April 6 and at 4:00 p.m. that same day we were notified that the shipment was in Los Angeles and could be picked up immediately.

Your efforts prevented any delay in our continuous mailing of approximately 300 bail refund checks per day to many recipients badly in need of the money.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE J. BARBOUR, Clerk.

SGT. GARY SCHOBORG

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 21, Sgt. Gary Schoborg, 20, died in a hospital in Da Nang of wounds suffered in a battle on April 13.

I never met Gary Schoborg, but I feel as if I knew him very well. When I heard the news, there was little I could do. His parents had written me about Gary before. I sent them a message of regret and then I sat down and looked over the letters I had received from Gary over the past year.

I first heard from him on May 12, 1969. He had been in the Army for less than a year. He was at Fort Riley at the time and he described it as "an all right place but I do not feel that I am doing my duty here." He continued: So I have volunteered to go to Vietnam."

Gary ended this first letter this way:

I know what I want. I thought about it for a long time and I'm ready to go. I know there is a chance I might not come back but that is up to God—and I have faith in Him.

By the time Gary received my reply, his orders had come through and he was to go to Vietnam in August. He wrote me again in July 1969, thanking me for helping him with his orders. His only request was that I write his family. He thought that it might make them feel better about his assignment. So I wrote Mr. and Mrs. Schoborg that same day.

On April 21, 1970, I heard the news.

There is very little a man can say to a family which has given its son in war. I rise here today to pay tribute to Gary Schoborg. I rise on behalf of the American people for whom Gary paid the highest sacrifice.

Gary was not content to let others do the fighting. He wanted to do it himself—and he did.

At a time when the loyalty of American youth is often brought into question, Gary Schoborg stands as a man who gave unselfishly of himself for his country. Though words of praise and gratitude can never fill the void in the Schoborg family, it humbles those of us whom Gary died protecting, to know the kind of man, the kind of true hero he was. Those of us whom he left in this world honor the memory of Gary Schoborg. I

wish I could have met him—but I am proud to have known him.

The article by Howard Raver reporting Gary's sacrifice, from the Kentucky Post of April 24, follows:

"A FEW DAYS AND I'LL BE HOME"—THEN DEATH IN VIET (By Howard Raver)

Gary Allen Schoborg was a boy who, when he knew he had to do something, wanted to get it done.

That's how it was when he went into the Army. He felt strongly about the war in Vietnam, was anxious to get it over with.

So Gary wrote his congressman, Gene Snyder, and asked that he be sent to Vietnam.

And Gary is northern Kentucky's latest battle casualty. He died Tuesday in a hospital at Da Nang from head wounds he suffered April 13.

Sgt. Gary Schoborg, 20, was the son of Mr. and Mrs. William H. Schoborg of 2745 Dakota avenue, Covington.

An artilleryman he had been stationed at Fire Base Nancy, 13 miles from the Demilitarized Zone in Vietnam, with a battery of the 1st Battalion, 39th Artillery.

His family learned by telegram that Gary had been wounded by shrapnel when the base was attacked by hostile forces.

Wednesday an Army officer came to the Schoborg home with the sad news that Gary had died. He never regained consciousness, his parents were told.

Gary had just graduated from Holy Cross High School in June 1968, when he enlisted in the Army. He went into service shortly thereafter, on July 3.

He took his basic at Ft. Benning, Ga., then trained as a gunner at Ft. Sill, Okla. From there he went to Ft. Riley, Kan., then took survival training—by his own request—at Ft. Polk, La.

Early in 1969, during the Russian-Czechoslovakian trouble, Gary was sent to Germany to take part in war games along the Czech border. He was there three months.

"He felt he should be in Vietnam, so he wrote Mr. Snyder," Mrs. Schoborg said.

"Gary came home on leave, and when he got back to Kansas he had a letter from Mr. Snyder saying he could go to Vietnam," she said.

Gary left for Vietnam last September.

He kept his family informed by letter—at least three or four a week—of his experiences in Vietnam.

In his last letter, Gary wrote that he was due home June 1, when he would be out of the Army, too.

He had an R&E (rehabilitation and recreation) leave coming up May 16 to 22—"and when I get back I'll have only a few days to serve and I'll be home," he wrote.

On April 6, Gary was assigned to Fire Base Nancy. "I don't like it," he confided in his letters. "We're getting hit too often. Nobody seems to be out to win."

On the heels of word of Gary's death came a telegram to the Schoborg family from Rep. Snyder, who had been keeping in close touch with his case.

"Gary gave his life for his country without question," Snyder said. "He exemplified the highest ideals of duty, honor and country."

Gary is the area's 108th serviceman to give his life in Vietnam, and Kenton County's 43rd casualty. His is the first area death since mid-January.

Besides his parents, Gary is survived by three sisters, Mary Ellen, Roselyn and Kathi Schoborg, all at home, and two brothers, Randy, at home, and Dennis Schoborg, Covington.

Mr. Schoborg is an assistant supervisor at the Southwestern Publishing Co., Cincinnati. Swindler Funeral Home, Latonia, is in charge of arrangements.

COMMUNIST INFLUENCE NOW RECOGNIZED IN BOMBING OF PUBLIC, PRIVATE BUILDINGS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we all deplore and condemn the bombing and burning of public and private buildings, purportedly as a form of protest.

Dean Clarence E. Manion in Manion Forum points out in a recent issue that both liberals and conservatives are now recognizing the Communist influence in this brutal campaign of anarchy and destruction.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this vital and important matter, I insert this recent issue of Manion Forum in the RECORD:

EVEN LIBERALS NOW RECOGNIZED RED PLOT: PRESIDENT SHOULD ADMIT THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF WORLDWIDE COMMUNIST CONQUEST

(By Dean Clarence E. Manion)

Encouraged by President Nixon, our Congressmen are pushing passage of legislation to end the terrifying bomb blasts that have been rocking various parts of our country. Security officials agree that the New York and Maryland explosions are merely the beginning of a new wave of such attacks.

What is the motivation for this destruction? At whom and at what should these new antibomb laws be aimed?

Any of your lingering doubts about the firm Communist connections of this revolutionary guerrilla movement that has been exploding in and throughout the United States in recent years may now be dismissed forthwith. Arch-Liberal Max Lerner of the *New York Post* has definitely conceded the point. He even gives us the technical specifications.

Writes Lerner: "Ever since the SDS turned into a Communist outfit two broad approaches to strategy have been in contest. The strategy of the SDS Maoists (Mao disciples) is that of classical Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries . . . (i.e.) to treat the black worker as part of the working class and to ally students with the proletariat.

"The strategy of the SDS Weatherman (faction) and its various splinter groups on the other hand has been to abandon class or race, to focus on the blacks as the only immediate revolutionary force in America and to use campus disruption and finally the terrorism of the urban guerrilla movement to break up the fabric of the American life system." (Chicago Sun-Times, March 17)

The remarkable thing about the Max Lerner diagnosis is that while it was being printed Conservative Senator James Eastland of Mississippi was telling the U.S. Senate substantially the same thing. Whatever Senator Eastland and Max Lerner agreed upon is, ipso facto, news, and when their agreement has to do with the activity of the Communist conspiracy in this country, you may be sure that the terms of the accord are immediately removed far beyond the possibility of serious dispute.

Senator Eastland's specifications dealt directly with Castro's responsibility for the growing "chaos, anarchy and terror" in the United States today. His speech focused upon Castro's "venceremos brigade" of American

sugar cane cutters who recently went to Cuba, ostensibly to help with the Red sugar harvest.

The Senator insisted that the 1,002 American youths who went to Cuba on this junket were trained there to attack and destroy America. He declared that the purpose of the project was not to cut sugar cane but to hack away at the foundations of the United States. The Senator announced that his Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security will soon conduct hearings on the Communist cane-cutting venture.

The purpose of the hearing, he said, will be to "direct attention to some of these visitors to Castro's domain and to their violent, destructive and revolutionary actions in this country . . . Jerry Rubin, Dave Dellinger and Tom Hayden are veterans of Cuba and veterans of an attempt to disrupt a national convention and to destroy our judicial system . . . Mark Rudd made his journey to Havana and returned to lead riots which almost wrecked Columbia University. Rudd moved on to the leadership of the dangerous Weatherman faction of the SDS."

Other visitors to Cuba, said Eastland, include "Yvonne Bond, a Berkeley riot leader" and "Robert Collier, mastermind of a plot to blow up the Statue of Liberty . . . Ralph Featherstone, who was recently killed in a bomb explosion in Maryland, attended a conference in Havana in 1968 along with Tom Hayden and Dellinger, the prime organizer of this traveling circus."

So now, at long last, it has become apparent to both Liberals and Conservatives that the "liberating" Communist outlaws are inside this country in force, following the same bombing, burning and killing routine that their Red counterparts are employing in Viet Nam, Laos, Cambodia, Calcutta, Guatemala and the Philippines.

President Nixon is reported to be working hard on a timetable for the complete removal of American troops from Viet Nam, but there is still no evidence of a complementary administrative effort to get Communist troops out of this country and/or to formulate an American foreign policy that is realistically attuned to the state of war that the Communists are conducting against us here and all over the world.

The time has come for our President and the great patriotic silent majority of the American people—Liberals and Conservatives—to recognize, however, reluctantly, the obvious fact that the U.S. is now besieged from within and without by a carefully coordinated conglomeration of forces fanatically dedicated to the complete destruction of our established institutions of freedom and the subjection of the American people to the horror of an alien, ruthless and completely materialistic tyranny.

This is the hard but inescapable truth that the President of the United States must find the courage to tell the American people, and to tell them now!

NIXON MUST AVOID JOHNSON ERROR

Over this microphone two weeks ago, Arthur Motley, the distinguished publisher of Parade Magazine, explained the final, and now self-acknowledged collapse of President Johnson's plans for his own re-election in 1968. According to Motley, the collapse resulted from the President's deliberate failure promptly and regularly to tell the American people the whole unpleasant truth about our military involvement in Viet Nam. Publisher Motley maintained that this unfortunate, politically motivated mismanagement of the Viet Nam war news finally backfired on President Johnson and ultimately forced his dramatic, humiliating retirement from public life.

President Nixon must now profit from this bitter experience of his immediate predeces-

sor. In the interest of his own political future and in the vital interest of his county's survival, our President must now candidly and fully disclose the nature and ramified extent of the Communist conquest of this country.

For even to the casual observer of current developments in Laos and Cambodia, it is becoming ever more obvious now that our Communist enemies have no intention of permitting us to "cut and run" out of Southeast Asia. Our tragic "no-win war" in South Viet Nam has paid too many rich dividends to the worldwide Communist conquest for the Red directorate to permit us to escape merely at the price of our presently accumulated losses in men, money and international prestige.

For instance, what would the SDS and its sundry affiliates do for a recruiting battle cry in this country if we should suddenly and miraculously disengage and remove our military presence from Asia? What would they do with the big supply of Viet Cong victory flags that are now immediately available for all of their American demonstrations of destruction on our campuses and in the streets of our cities?

Any American who is naive enough to believe that our complete withdrawal from Viet Nam would immediately pacify our marching mobs and restore sweet peace to our universities had better play back my quote from Max Lerner.

The President has been informed that large Soviet-built helicopters, piloted by Russian fliers, are now being used by North Viet Nam to ferry troops and supplies to Laos in preparation for a new Communist military offensive against that country. The immediate Communist objective in Laos is to force the installation of a new pro-Communist coalition government upon that country, which will then prevent the continuation of our bombing of the Laotian Ho Chi Minh trail into South Viet Nam. When the bombing ends, the Communist troops in Laos will have a safe sanctuary in which to prepare for their climactic assault upon Saigon.

President Nixon knows now that Thailand is preparing militarily to come to the aid of the Laotian government's desperate defense against the invasion and occupation of Laos by 65,000 North Vietnamese troops. But the President does not yet know how much and what kind of American military assistance Thailand will expect us to supply to support its effort to help the Laotian forces.

However, both President Nixon and the Thai government know that if the North Vietnamese take over Laos, then President Nixon's prospective Vietnamized defenses of South Viet Nam, shorn of American military assistance, will promptly collapse. When that happens the successful Communist conquest of Thailand will follow immediately. The big Red pointer will then swing toward Taiwan, Indonesia and the Philippines.

The basic continuing misrepresentation of the "Viet Nam War" has been just that, namely, that it was and is a war for Viet Nam. The bitter truth, untold by President Johnson, was and is that Viet Nam is merely one segment of the Communist war for the world. Rusk, Rostow and McNamara knew that, of course, but they lacked either the will or the wish to contest the big war with the Communists on the critical ideological level, the only plateau where the war could have and still can be won.

So President Johnson was led to believe that the Viet Nam engagement could be plausibly presented as a "holding action," pending the accommodation of the American popular mind to some sort of a semi-civilized compromise with a Communist world, a compromise that would keep us all alive—at least for the time being.

NIXON KNOWS RED TECHNIQUE

From his critical, firsthand experiences with Alger Hiss and Whittaker Chambers, President Nixon knows that while the Communist war is total and completely ruthless, its primary weapons are aimed, in this order, at the sophistication, subversion and, ultimately, at the wholesale demoralization of its enemies. Theoretically, Communist military troops are to be used as police forces to hold and control populations previously conquered by these Communist processes of creeping mentalism.

When the intellectual leadership of a Communist target country has been misled into the delusion that the Communist idea is sound and that its ultimate acceptance in one form or another is inevitable, the effective military defenses and defenders of that country will first be enervated, then discredited, and in time will come to be despised.

When you observe these ideas blossoming in the universities, in the communications media and finally in the pulpits, you may rest assured that the hot Communist Summer is nigh. Unlike Hitler's Nazi, the Communist totalitarian is not confined in the narrow conception of a master race—he is driven ruthlessly through all boundaries, races, colors and creeds by the force of a master idea.

Out of the depth of his own bitter experiences, Whittaker Chambers comes up with its best expression. He says, "The tie that binds Communists across the frontiers of nations, across the barriers of language . . . in defiance of religion, morality, truth, law, honor, even unto death is a simple conviction, (namely) *it is necessary to change the world* . . . It is man's second oldest faith. Its promise was whispered in the first days of creation under the tree of the knowledge of good and evil: Ye shall be as Gods. The Communist has chosen," says Chambers, between "irreconcilable opposites." He has chosen man instead of God; mind instead of soul; Communism instead of freedom.

"Communism is what happens" he continues, "when, in the name of mind, men free themselves from God." The Communist ignores the historical fact that "there has never been a society or a nation without God (while) history is cluttered with the wreckage of nations that became indifferent to God—and died." (Whittaker Chambers, "The Witness," Random House, pp. 16 and 17)

President Nixon spent two years studying the Hiss-Chambers case as a Member of the House of Representatives Committee on Un-American Activities which confronted and exposed Hiss and Chambers in 1948. I am therefore sure that he is thoroughly familiar with the remarkable book of Chambers' confessions from which I have just quoted. This is why it is difficult for so many of Mr. Nixon's friends to understand why, as President of the United States, he now attempts to build bridges of trade and aid over the "gulf of ideology" that separates us from Communist regimes that rest upon the corpses of their own murdered people.

These same friends fail to understand why the President has forbidden Americans to travel to or trade with friendly anti-Communist Rhodesia while he encourages more Americans to travel to and trade with Red China, which is a main military support of our Communist enemy in North Viet Nam.

To what purpose is President Nixon attempting to appease our Communist enemies in their diplomatic chancelleries while we fight with them in our streets and bury the American boys whom they have killed on the battlefield?

The President must know something good about these Communists that we do not

know. Why don't we all ask him to come back on the air and tell us what it is?

CONSPIRACY AT ISLA VISTA

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the first cries during the recent violence at Santa Barbara was the charge of police brutality, issued appropriately within easy reach of the news media. Such tactics are part of the common stock of techniques used by the organized radicals who plague many of our campuses. Robert Betts explores a number of these tactics in the second of a series of articles from the San Diego Union and I know my House colleagues will discover his findings of particular interest.

The article follows:

[From the San Diego Union, Mar. 30, 1970]
CONSPIRACY AT ISLA VISTA—DEVICES USED BY
RED-FRONT GROUPS SWAYED REBELLION ON
CAMPUS

(By Robert Betts)

(Second of four articles)

The residents of Isla Vista, a few miles up the coast from Santa Barbara, Calif., were the latest to feel alarm at the fury of what is commonly called "student protest."

Police grappled during the rioting with a tall, scruffy-looking youth and brought him, struggling and stumbling, to a patrol car to be handcuffed, searched and bundled inside.

"Oh, please don't hurt me, don't hurt me!" he cried. "I've done nothing. I'm innocent. Oh, you're strangling me!"

It was a pathetic wail and it was heard by newsmen standing nearby with their cameras, microphones and tape recorders. The youth had seen them. Perhaps they would duly take note of one more incident of "police brutality."

NOT IMPRESSED

Those who had covered similar events in other places, and who were becoming familiar with the strategy and ploys of the militants, were not impressed.

Only the representatives of the radical propaganda press, busily flashing their pictures, were ready with gory tales of "pigs" beating up students.

"For years it has been a Communist policy to charge 'police brutality' in a calculated campaign to discredit law enforcement," said J. Edgar Hoover, director of the FBI. "The riots and disorders of the last three years clearly highlight the success of this smear campaign . . . to the point where it has been accepted by many individuals having no affiliation with or sympathy for the Communist movement."

The revolutionaries make no secret of their aim to destroy the police forces. Members of the Students for a Democratic Society attending Communist "New School" lectures in New York have been told: "The plan is to force the police to shoot at unarmed students and thus discredit themselves with the petit-bourgeoisie and bring them into rapport with the revolution."

An FBI agent on the scene during most of the Isla Vista rioting, during which 125 arrests were made, said, "We've recognized several familiar faces—agitators from Berkeley, San Diego and other places in California as well as some from out of state.

"It's the same old pattern. They use some local issue, real or phoned up, and gain student support. A lot of students do have grievances. They're unhappy with the way things are—in society and in their education, and they're impatient for changes. The agitators—hard-core militants—however, are not interested in the welfare of students. They're out to break the educational system. They use student grievances to arouse youthful passion and rebelliousness to a point where it only needs some little incident like an arrest or police questioning over some misdemeanor to spark off violent insurrection.

"Sometimes, when they think the time is ripe, the agitators will create an incident in the hope of forcing an arrest.

"Most of the disorders that have occurred in the last six years were sparked by a single incident, generally following an arrest for some minor breaking of the law. The strategy is so unvarying, it's a wonder Americans aren't wise to it by now."

The method of working up student protest and fueling it so that it flares into violence has been set out in directives issued by the SDS and other leftist organizations which in turn draw inspiration, counsel and sometimes their orders from the organization most experienced in subversion—the Communist party.

The first move is to set up a "free speech" stand on campus, invite opposing as well as primed speakers, petition, hold rallies, get people involved in debate and organized for political action.

Once students have been manipulated into confronting the authorities over some issue, the object is to maintain their support as demands are stepped up until they become "non-negotiable."

If the authorities yield on one demand, the radicals move on to another issue, dramatizing it with demonstrations, organizing strikes, sit-ins or other acts of civil disobedience that will challenge the authorities to take disciplinary action.

"ALWAYS PUSHING"

"We use the technique of demands, always pushing and pushing on through demands, to an end where they have to give in or fight against the revolution," admitted Dave Gilbert, an SDS organizer.

"The role of organizer is crucial," says chief SDS theoretician Carl Davidson. "He or she should neither passively go along with the students government 'reformer' types nor stand apart from the action denouncing it as a 'sellout.' Rather, his task is that of constant criticism from within the action. When the reformers fail, become bogged down, or are banging their heads against a wall, the organizer should be there as one who has been with them throughout their struggle to offer the relevant analysis of why their approach has failed and to indicate future strategies and tactics."

Davidson points out: "We should be well aware of the fact that the kind of power and changes we would like to have and achieve are not going to be given us gracefully. Ultimately, we have access to only one source of power within the knowledge factory.

"And that power lies in our potential ability to stop the university from functioning."

The extremists have emphasized that they want to use the university as a launching base for revolution, that they are interested in student "reforms" only so far as they win young recruits for the wider assault on authority at large.

The ranks of the malcontents are swelling and each demonstration becomes potentially more dangerous.

"We are going to be on the streets in every part of the country from now on," declared

Bernadine Dohrn, self-styled "revolutionary Communist" and an SDS organizer.

Isla Vista residents who thought the violence there was a spontaneous outburst on the part of angry UCSB students changed their minds when they learned that handbills from a Los Angeles group calling itself "The Conspiracy" had been distributed the day before, directing students to a park near the local Bank of America building—the one which later was burned to the ground.

Open use of the title "conspiracy"—adopted from the Chicago "conspiracy" trial—is a semantic trick intended to bring ridicule on the "Red-hunters," while providing a convenient cover term for all those interested in fighting "fascist repression," as well as those engaged in subversive activities.

The SDS has called on students to "join the Conspiracy"—to "organize conspiracy rallies locally."

The Los Angeles "Conspiracy" was identified as sponsor of a rally at UCLA campus a few days before the Isla Vista rampage. The UCLA group, shouting "Right On!" (the current revolutionary slogan), marched to nearby Westwood Village and broke windows in the Bank of America branch there, as well as in several other business offices, before police broke up the demonstration.

A few days later, while police and the National Guard were restoring order in Isla Vista, a fire bomb was hurled through the window of another Bank of America branch in San Clemente, Calif.

"We are focusing on those financial centers in our community which profit from war and exploitation," the Conspiracy announced, charging that the Bank of America was one of the institutions responsible for "draining the economic resources of this and other countries."

THE REVEREND JOSEPH L. PERRY, JR.

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that my distinguished colleagues in this body were as inspired as I by the eloquent and beautiful prayer of Reverend Perry.

Mr. Speaker, it is both a privilege and a personal pleasure for me to welcome the Reverend Joseph L. Perry, Jr., to our Nation's Capitol.

Reverend Perry is the minister of the Reformed Church of Linden, N.J.; he has served the people of Linden in that capacity for more than 14 years.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, the Linden Reformed Church is preparing to celebrate its 100th birthday. While this makes the Reformed Church the oldest place of worship in Linden, it does not detract from the youthful spirit and vigor of the congregation and its minister.

The members of the Reformed Church exemplify the highest traditions of service to faith, to the community, and to the country. In Reverend Perry, the Linden Reformed Church has found a pastor whose own life is a reflection of this service, and whose good works are a source of comfort and meaning to all who have had the pleasure to know him.

I am honored to represent the congregants of the Linden Reformed Church in the Congress, and prouder still to publicly acknowledge their many contribu-

tions to our State of New Jersey and to our Nation.

The history of the city of Linden and the Linden Reformed Church are closely interwoven in a pattern of progress and success. Today, we wish the Reformed Church a very happy birthday as it enters its second century.

MRS. EDITH ROBIS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, recently in McKeesport, Pa., in my 20th Congressional District, some of the most prominent figures in public life joined with the hometown people to pay tribute to an individual who gave more than 30 years of dedicated service to others with little personal recognition.

The individual was a generous, warm-hearted woman, Mrs. Edith Robis, retiring as supervisor of the city's recreation board after 36 years. Her title was a formal one. She was better known, and will continue to be so, as "The First Lady of Recreation" or "Mrs. Recreation" by all who worked with her over the span of three decades.

Mrs. Robis began her career in recreation work by helping organize activities for children at various churches and schools in the city. She joined the city's recreation staff in 1933 and organized basketball leagues throughout the town. Under her leadership, she watched the program grow to a point where more than 500 youngsters were playing in approximately 50 leagues for various age groups. Some of her "teams" have won trophies in competition; some of the youths, whose talents she first developed, have gone on to achieve prominence in higher levels of athletics.

It is impossible to know just how many lives were touched by this woman. Her interest and love of children went far beyond regulated games and activities. Her organized programs included field trips, boat outings, dances, and other programs. She sewed uniforms for youngsters marching in downtown parades and recently formed a fife and drum corps, demonstrating her and the city's feeling of patriotism.

It is not surprising then to understand why accolades were showered upon her on retirement by local, county, and State governmental leaders, civic and educational figures and clergymen. The list of speakers included the Honorable John G. Brosky, president judge of the family division of common pleas court; Leonard C. Staisey, chairman of the Allegheny County Board of Commissioners; State Representative John T. Walsh; McKeesport Mayor Zoran Popovich, and two former mayors, Charles A. Kinkaid and Albert Elko; City Councilman Julius T. Lenhart; and school directors William Bechtol and William Lickert.

There were others, just as sincere, who spoke in voicing their love and respect for Mrs. Robis. These included William

Matta, commander of the Catholic War Veterans post; Dr. Leonard Winograd, rabbi of Temple B'Nai Israel; the Reverend Father Stanley Idzik of St. Mary's Polish Church; the Reverend Father Eric past director of Auberle Memorial Boys Town; Samuel LaRosa, director of McKeesport Boys Club; the Reverend Father Method Royko, pastor of St. Nicholas Greek Catholic Church; the Reverend James Cherry, of Bethlehem Baptist Church; and Mrs. June Markosky and Joseph C. Puskacic, who organized the testimonial dinner.

President Nixon also joined in eulogizing Mrs. Robis. In a personal letter to her, presented by Joseph Zajicek, administrative assistant at my Pittsburgh office, the President wrote:

I know your work has meant a great deal to the people of your community and that many of the projects you initiated will continue to serve McKeesport for decades to come . . . It is a great pleasure for me to commend you for your exceptional work and to wish you many years of health and happiness . . .

Mr. Speaker, the President joined more than 30,000 residents of McKeesport in voicing that same wish.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S ANTIHEROIN ACTION PROGRAM

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues so well know, the drug problem in the United States has reached alarming proportions. I am pleased, however, that President Nixon is committed to attacking this problem in every way possible.

The President's antiheroin program is a case in point. It is a major part of the administration's program against drug abuse. The full extent of this program was recently set forth in great detail and with great accuracy by the very able Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Enforcement and Operations, Eugene T. Rossides.

In remarks delivered before the Bronx Board of Trade and Chamber of Commerce, New York, on April 16, 1970, Mr. Rossides gives a good picture of the varied aspects of the antiheroin program. It includes not only enforcement, but also education, research, foreign policy, and cooperation with States and the private sector.

I would also call to the attention of my colleagues the very distinguished and effective role being played by the Bureau of Customs in the drug program. When this body debated the Treasury-Post Office appropriations bill, H.R. 16900, on April 13, I spoke at length about the importance of this old-line agency at page 11282 of the RECORD. Mr. Rossides' remarks give a good idea of the work that Customs is doing right now.

I would like to include the speech by Assistant Secretary Rossides at this point in the RECORD:

PRESIDENT NIXON'S ANTI-HEROIN
ACTION PROGRAM

I would like to discuss with you tonight President Nixon's action program to curtail the flow of heroin into the United States, to curtail its use in the United States, and Treasury's role in this program.

The anti-heroin program is a major part of the overall anti-drug abuse program of this Administration. The problem of drug abuse and particularly heroin abuse was not created overnight, and it will not be cured overnight. The drug problem of the 1950's became the drug crisis of the 1960's. It will take hard work and cooperative effort in the 1970's by many groups on the Federal, State, and local levels to win this battle. I bring you a message of hope tonight but also a message of hard work ahead for all of us.

President Nixon recognized the problem during his campaign for the Presidency in a statement that he made at Anaheim, California, on September 16, 1968. In that statement, the President said:

"Four weeks ago, after the convention at Miami Beach, I came out to Mission Bay to rest and to work. When I was there, a letter was delivered to me from a 19-year-old girl. She described to me her involvement with narcotics from the time she was sixteen years old; she told me how many of her teenage friends had also become hooked on drugs; she gave the details of the horrible life they led, and the gruesome things they did to support their habit. She asked me what I could do to help her generation, and because she was still on drugs she never signed her name.

"This was not some statistic that sent me this letter. It was a human being, someone's daughter—and in a letter like this the evil of narcotics comes through a good deal clearer than it does from reading statistics or a local newspaper.

"I don't have to tell you this story, many of you are aware of the wholesale destruction of lives within your own area."

"Let us begin to face facts—and to act upon that knowledge. Narcotics are the modern curse of American youth. Just like the plagues and epidemics of former years, these drugs are decimating a generation of Americans."

How many of you know people in your neighborhoods, perhaps on your street or perhaps in your family, who have become victims of drugs?

That young girl asked what the President could do to help her generation.

The President has acted on several fronts: First, he has elevated the drug problem to the foreign policy level and, indeed, to the level of personal Presidential initiatives in foreign policy.

Second, he has stressed the role of education, research and rehabilitation and provided for increased funds and emphasis in these essential areas.

Third, he has recommended differentiation in the criminal penalty structure between heroin and marijuana.

Fourth, he has provided a substantial increase in budgetary support for law enforcement in this area.

Fifth, he has stressed the need for cooperation with the States and the involvement of the private sector.

In short, the President has highlighted the multi-dimensional aspects of the problem and has moved on many fronts, both governmental and non-governmental, to meet a problem of crisis dimensions.

For the first time in history, we see not only the total involvement of the institution of the Presidency in the battle against drug abuse, but also the personal involvement of the President himself.

FOREIGN POLICY

President Nixon has made the drug problem a foreign policy issue and has taken per-

sonal initiatives in eliciting the cooperation of the governments of Turkey, Mexico, and France.

Once President Nixon has raised drug abuse to the foreign policy level, the Department of State, as the primary representative for communicating to foreign governments the vital interests of the United States, became responsible for doing everything necessary to advance our drug abuse policy through diplomacy.

Secretary of State William P. Rogers has given high priority and personal leadership to the State Department's efforts in this area. Last year, he appointed a senior Foreign Service Officer as his Special Assistant for Narcotic Matters in order to better coordinate and push forward the various elements of the campaign against narcotics which have foreign relations implications.

This new role of the State Department in the Administration's war on narcotics has had a unique and immediate impact. In the past, the primary contact with foreign governments in this area had been almost exclusively limited to the enforcement level. Through the use of diplomacy, however, we have, in my judgment, achieved a substantial advance in our objectives. As Under Secretary of State Elliot Richardson observed recently:

"We have made processing and producing nations aware of the terror drugs have brought to our society. We have stressed that what has happened here can happen to them.

"Diplomacy is . . . a means of achieving national objectives. In the case of narcotics I believe we have successfully employed it to transmit our sense of urgency to . . . [Turkey, Mexico, and France] so that, even though their own immediate interest in tighter measures of control is a good deal less acute than our own, they are moving ahead with encouraging speed."

Our first, and to date most fruitful diplomatic advance, was made with the Government of Mexico. It is estimated that 15 percent of the heroin and 85 percent of the high-potency marijuana consumed in the United States is illegally grown and refined in Mexico and smuggled into the United States.

Operation Cooperation, the successor to Operation Intercept, has led to a meaningful working relationship between the two governments in the area of opium poppy and marijuana eradication and smuggling suppression. Our very able Ambassador to Mexico, Robert McBride, has the drug problem on the top of his priority list. I predict that the two governments will be working together in ever-increasing harmony and effectiveness.

It is estimated that 80 percent of the heroin entering the United States annually originates in Turkey. That is why, as Mr. Richardson said, "Turkey has figured so prominently in our diplomatic activities on narcotics." Our efforts have been aimed at helping the Government of Turkey bring the illicit opium traffic completely under control. We are in the advanced stages of negotiations with the appropriate levels of the Turkish Government. Our Ambassador to Turkey, William Handley, also has the heroin problem at the top of his priority list.

Our diplomatic efforts with the Government of France have also been helpful. France has become concerned with its own increasingly serious heroin problem and has launched a major drive against the operators of clandestine heroin production laboratories operated on her soil, often by foreign traffickers.

RESEARCH

The national dialogue on drug abuse has demonstrated that our knowledge of many of the most abused drugs is far from ade-

quate. Little is known, for example, of the long-range effects of the continued use of marijuana and the vastly more powerful LSD. We do know that there are no known beneficial effects, and that both can induce psychological dependency and loss of goal orientation. Far more must be known, however, about LSD and marijuana if we are to prevent their use through persuasion.

In this connection, the outstanding contribution of Dr. Stanley Yolles, Director of the National Institute of Mental Health of HEW, to the Administration's program, should be noted. It is under Dr. Yolles' auspices that the bulk of the research sought by the President will be accomplished.

DIFFERENTIATION IN PENALTY STRUCTURE
BETWEEN HEROIN AND MARIJUANA

But Dr. Yolles has already made his mark. It was his cogent and articulate testimony which laid the groundwork for the Administration's decision to reverse the traditional approach to marijuana by differentiating in the penalty structure between heroin, a true narcotic, and marijuana, an hallucinogen. Both are treated the same under present Federal law. The President's decision to seek revised penalties for marijuana violations has gone far toward achieving another Administration goal: credibility with the young.

EDUCATION

The drug abuse problem is one of both supply and demand, and President Nixon's response has been guided accordingly. While we are battling to eliminate the supply at the source and to stop the smuggling of illicit drugs into the United States, the goal of eliminating the demand for drugs among our young is, in my judgment, also central to success.

The key to eliminating the demand for drugs lies in education. President Nixon is convinced that much of our problem is attributable to the mass of information and street corner mythology which has filled the vacuum left by our failure in the past to deal with the young on a mature, reasoned and factual basis. In the past, government took the easy but ineffective route of "do as I say because I say so" rather than the more difficult route of clearly presenting the facts necessary for informed decision.

Again stressing the theme of prevention through persuasion on March 11 President Nixon released a million dollars to the National Institute of Mental Health for marijuana research, and another million dollars to NIMH for an expanded program of public education and information on drug abuse, including creation of a national clearing house for drug abuse information.

INCREASED ENFORCEMENT BUDGETS

Drug law enforcement is a difficult and dangerous business. It demands the highest standards of professional competence of enforcement agents. President Nixon has increased substantially the budgets of the two Federal agencies primarily concerned with drug law enforcement—the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs and the Bureau of Customs.

The burdens carried by these agencies are illustrated by the record of the Treasury Agents of the Customs Service, who in 1969 worked over 111,000 hours on their own time without pay to meet the challenge of drug abuse.

In enforcing the law, only half the job is done when the suspected violator is arrested. Society is not protected until a jury is persuaded of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. Skillful prosecution is necessary.

The Department of Justice is meeting this challenge with a new aggressiveness inspired by this Administration, backed up by substantial funding for the narcotics prosecution section of the Department.

COOPERATION WITH THE STATES AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR

No one is more aware than President Nixon of the vital and necessary role of the States in the battle against drug abuse. In December, the President was host to the State Governors at a White House conference designed to produce the closest cooperation between the Federal and State Governments.

The State of New York, of course, under Governor Rockefeller, has led the way for all the States in combatting drug abuse.

It was under Governor Rockefeller's leadership and at his personal initiative that New York's pioneering mandatory treatment program for addicts was born. For the first time, as the Governor said, we have a "program for getting addicts off the street where they endanger others and under confinement and treatment where they can help themselves."

In January, Governor Rockefeller again broke new ground when he proposed the Nation's first State methadone maintenance program which it is hoped will in time return up to 80 percent of the hard-core heroin addicts to an orderly and productive life.

If the State of New York provides the finest example of State participation in the anti-drug campaign, the Advertising Council shows the way for the private sector.

In a campaign under the auspices of the National Institute of Mental Health, the Advertising Council is using youth-oriented media to educate rather than to frighten. The Council reports "fantastic interest" in the program, directed at the intellect rather than the emotions. It is a perfect example of President Nixon's theme of prevention through persuasion.

TREASURY'S ROLE IN THE PRESIDENT'S ANTI-HEROIN ACTION PROGRAM

Treasury is playing a major role, primarily through its Bureau of Customs, in the enforcement phase of the President's antiheroin action program.

In his September 16, 1968, Anaheim, California, speech, the President stated:

"Let us recognize that the frontiers of the United States are the primary responsibility of the United States Bureau of Customs. I recommend that we triple the number of customs agents in this country from 331 to 1000."

The President has followed through on that pledge. In his July 14, 1969, Message to the Congress on the Control of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, he stated:

"The Department of the Treasury, through the Bureau of Customs, is charged with enforcing the nation's smuggling laws. I have directed the Secretary of the Treasury to initiate a major new effort to guard the nation's borders and ports against the growing volume of narcotics from abroad. There is a recognized need for more men and facilities in the Bureau of Customs to carry out this directive."

This directive was backed up with a substantial antinarcotic supplemental budget request. The Congress responded magnificently and passed in late December of 1969 an appropriation for 8.75 million dollars for 915 additional men and for equipment.

The leadership role of Congressman Tom Steed of Oklahoma, Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee which handled the President's request, and the then ranking minority member, Congressman Silvio Conte of Massachusetts, in support of the supplemental appropriation request, is an outstanding example of bipartisan action in our Nation's war against drug abuse.

The House Appropriations Committee Report, in relevant part, stated:

"The Department testified that every available index indicates that problems associated with the use of marijuana and narcotics in the United States have reached major proportions. Drug usage is now widespread both geographically and among strata of society in which previously such usage was

rare. Usage among college and even high school students is reported as commonplace.

"In order to deal with this problem, the Department proposes to substantially increase the law enforcement effort against smuggling. The whole problem is put into sharp focus by the following testimony from the Treasury Department:

"Almost all of the marijuana, all of the hashish, all of the cocaine, and all of the smoking opium used in the United States is smuggled into this country."

"Operation Intercept," a recent blitz law enforcement effort along the Mexican border, demonstrated rather conclusively that smuggling activities can be substantially reduced by increased enforcement efforts. "The Committee strongly supports the Department's objective of reducing to a minimum the smuggling of this contraband into the United States. The Committee specifically allows the 915 additional positions requested and urges the Department to move ahead on this project as rapidly as practicable."

Customs has moved expeditiously to implement the supplemental appropriation, and I am pleased to report that the Commissioner of Customs, Myles J. Ambrose, has informed me that commitments have been made for the entire number of 915 additional personnel authorized by the supplemental appropriations and they will all be on board by June 30, 1970. A substantial amount of this new manpower will be assigned to the New York metropolitan area, as well as to the Mexican and Canadian borders and other trouble spots, to interdict the flow into the United States of narcotics, marijuana, and dangerous drugs.

NARCOTICS INTELLIGENCE GROUPS

Customs has established international narcotics intelligence groups with offices in New York, Houston, and Los Angeles. Additional intelligence offices will be opened in Miami and Chicago in the near future. These groups will provide better evaluation of the information relating to smuggling into the United States. They will permit more extensive dissemination of intelligence throughout the national and international enforcement community.

AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING

In support of the intensified enforcement effort, the Bureau of Customs is currently installing a central ADP intelligence network which will provide a comprehensive bank of suspect information on a twenty-four hour a day basis, to agents and inspectors. On April 1, 1970, Customs established a computer center to process enforcement intelligence information, and a trained operation and programming staff is supporting the data processing center located in San Diego, California. Expansion of the system to cover all inspection stations along the Mexican border will be completed by November, 1970.

The initial data base has been compiled from existing suspect records. With the coordinated efforts of the various Customs offices, rapid growth of the data base is expected. Data concerning suspect aircraft and vessels are being added to the system. A task force has begun to define nationwide law enforcement intelligence needs of the Bureau of Customs. This study will be completed by November, 1970.

FACILITIES

New Customs facilities along the Mexican-United States border are being acquired and present facilities are being enlarged to accommodate the additional Customs enforcement personnel. At some ports, these improvements involve creation of additional vehicle and pedestrian lanes and rearranging traffic patterns to provide more expeditious handling of vehicles and persons crossing the border. At others, trailers and prefabricated equipment are being acquired for use until such time as permanent facilities can be installed.

LABORATORIES

New laboratories have been established in San Antonio, Texas, and San Diego, California, with the analysis of narcotics as their primary purpose. These laboratories will provide more rapid identification of narcotics and dangerous substances and thus accelerate the judicial processing of violators.

TRAINING

Customs has embarked on a major training program stressing anti-narcotics smuggling. This training has been particularly important for inspectors and commodity specialists. Training will continue to be a major activity as we process the 915 new employees authorized by the supplemental appropriation.

ADDITIONAL EQUIPMENT

The supplemental appropriation provides for five additional aircraft, four additional boats, and 148 additional interceptor-type automobiles.

RADIO COMMUNICATIONS

The Bureau of Customs is modernizing and supplementing present radio communications in order to obtain complete coverage along the Mexican border. This improved communications system will contribute greatly to the effectiveness of both United States and Mexican officials in Operation Cooperation.

INTENSIFIED INSPECTION PROGRAM

A program of intensified examination of passengers and their baggage arriving at all major airports, and of foreign mail parcels and commercial cargo has been instituted.

Customs' Office of Operations has created a new Enforcement Inspection Section which will be responsible for developing plans and procedures for carrying out the enforcement responsibilities of the augmented inspection force.

A team concept was initially tested in Philadelphia and Buffalo for agents, inspectors, and commodity specialists jointly to select and examine commercial cargo shipments for both contraband and revenue purposes. Based on their activity and success, guidelines have been established. This team concept will be in operation throughout the United States by the end of May, 1970. New agents entering on duty throughout 1970-71 will permit increased coverage and blitz operations at airports of entry.

It should be noted that the vast percentage of Customs seizures are made by the inspectors without advance information, and that Customs seizes more drugs than all other Federal agencies put together.

Customs is presently reviewing all its procedures and methods with a view to increasing its enforcement effectiveness, particularly in procedures called preclearance and the Accelerated Inspection System. Treasury and Customs will be consulting with industry and government representatives to review each preclearance operation to determine if enforcement can be raised to a satisfactory level.

The Accelerated Inspection System, which has proved so successful in facilitating the flow of passengers, has been under evaluation for its effectiveness in suppressing smuggling. Preliminary study indicates that enforcement must be improved while still preserving the benefits of facilitation.

CARGO THEFT STUDY

Treasury has now under serious consideration by a special task force proposed administrative actions and legislative proposals to prevent theft of international cargo at all ports of entry—airports and seaports—throughout the nation. This includes, of course, New York's Kennedy International Airport.

Because of the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Customs over theft from Customs' custody and because of its existing presence and responsibilities at all ports of entry, Customs is uniquely qualified to take the lead in solving this problem.

A by-product of this effort will be increased risks for the drug smuggler.

PUBLIC SUPPORT AND COOPERATION

In this situation we cannot hope to do business as usual. Our current anti-smuggling enforcement drive will mean that more travelers are going to be inspected more closely, more baggage examined and new inspectional techniques employed for detecting criminal smugglers. It will mean some additional inconveniences for the international traveler. It may require a few more minutes for customs clearance. We suggest that this is a small price to pay to help keep drugs out of the hands of your children, my children, and the boy or girl next door.

I am convinced that the American public fully supports this program. Enforcement officials cannot do the job alone. We need the cooperation of the public on many fronts. Regarding inconveniences, we need the public's understanding, patience, and cooperation.

Government cannot do the job alone. We need the support of the private sector for maximum effectiveness. We have spoken with a number of representatives from industry and labor and will be talking to many more. Treasury is most pleased that all the groups we have met with have volunteered to cooperate in the drive to suppress drug smuggling.

To sum up, President Nixon has highlighted the multi-dimensional aspects of the drug abuse crisis and has taken several major initiatives:

First: He has elevated the drug problem to the foreign policy level and made it a matter of personal Presidential concern.

Second: He has stressed the role of education, research and rehabilitation, and provided increased funds in these essential areas.

Third: He has recommended differentiation in the criminal penalty structure between heroin and marijuana.

Fourth: He has provided a substantial increase in budgetary support for law enforcement in this area.

Fifth: He has stressed the need for cooperation with the States and the involvement of the private sector.

Let there be no false optimism. The road ahead is long and hard—and requires the active participation of all of us.

CONGRESSMAN BOB ECKHARDT DESCRIBES CONSUMER CLASS ACTION BILL

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, "consumerism" is a movement which is very much in vogue these days. No legislative measure I know can contribute more to that movement than the consumer class action, and no man deserves more credit for the pioneering legal work done on the consumer class action concept than the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Congressman BOB ECKHARDT.

While many lawyers and consumer advocates were still talking about what a great idea a consumer class action would be, BOB ECKHARDT was doing the kind of hard legal research and disciplined thinking about the subject which is an essential foundation for a sound legislative proposal. Thus, when our colleague from Texas speaks about consumer class

actions, he speaks not only with his usual keen insight, but also with the authority of experience.

When BOB ECKHARDT talks about consumer class actions, we all should listen. I am happy, therefore, to be able to include in the RECORD at this point a recent talk by our colleague from Texas delivered before the Business Executives Seminar at the Brookings Institution:

STATEMENT ON THE CONSUMER CLASS ACTION BILL BY HONORABLE BOB ECKHARDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, BEFORE THE SEMINAR FOR BUSINESS EXECUTIVES, THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 15, 1970

"Quality of the environment," "consumerism"—these are the slogans of the day. Everyone is for them. The problem is: how to put together good, sound legislative machinery to accomplish an objective which is generally conceded to be desirable. First, I should like to lay out the problem of protection of consumer rights, giving some idea of its magnitude. Then, I should like to state in rather specific terms an approach to its solution.

MAGNITUDE OF DECEIT AND OVERREACHING AGAINST CONSUMER

Recent statistics on the amount of fraud and deception in the marketplace indicated that as much as \$30 to \$40 out of every hundred dollars that the consumer spent is wasted or lost forever because of fraud and inefficiency and greed. The total amount that Senator Philip Hart has estimated that is spent for goods and services of no value, comes to \$174 to \$231 billion each year. His Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation calculated the following amounts wasted by consumers each year:

1. Monopolistic pricing above competitive levels, \$45 billion.
2. Food prices based on a study showing that deceptive packaging forces consumers to pay 11% more than necessary, \$14 billion.
3. Automobile repairs for work done improperly or unneeded or not done at all, \$10 billion.
4. Oil quotas adding this amount to prices that would otherwise be paid based on free market prices outside the U.S., \$8 billion.
5. Auto insurance based on subcommittee figure showing what could be saved, \$3 billion.
6. Life insurance based on records outside the subcommittee showing total death benefits and company expenses totaling only 30% of premiums paid by policyholders, \$14 billion.

These six items alone account for \$94 billion and they do not include the huge amounts of waste and cost of medical care, housing, credit, frauds, defective products, and worthless drugs.

What is Congress doing about it? The Task Force on Consumer Affairs of the Democratic Study Group recently presented a consumer message to Congress.

A PROGRAM ON CONSUMER MATTERS

The report of the Democratic Study Group Task Force on Consumer Affairs is an encouraging innovation in Congressional process. During his term in office President Johnson delivered many messages to the Congress setting out in some detail the framework of various public programs dealing with consumers, poverty, crime control, housing, and the like. President Nixon has not at this late date in the session spelled out a national program.

Some of us in Congress are attempting to fill the need for direction and purpose thus left unfilled, at least in the field of consumer affairs. I am one of 17 members who have prepared a message to Congress on this

matter. It sets out many important areas for consumer legislation.

First, the Task Force endorses the establishment of a separate federal agency devoted exclusively to the consumer. This agency would represent the consumer viewpoint before Federal regulatory agencies, courts, and the like. It would receive complaints and serve as a voice for the consumer.

Second, the Task Force endorses legislation in the fields of product safety, food safety, and medical safety. It also seeks legislation requiring that information important to consumers be readily available, such as disclosing nutritional value, and the like.

The Task Force also recommends processes for protection against deception and fraud. These would include authority for the Federal Trade Commission to seek temporary injunctions and restraining orders to stop deception in the marketplace, and provision for class actions based on violations of State or Federal consumer protection laws. Under the legislative proposals, retail outlets that deal in trading stamps would be required to offer honest cash redemption, and manufacturers would have to warrant that they would repair or replace faulty merchandise.

The message also deals with protection of consumers against defamation by credit agencies, and it calls for a Federal Consumer Credit Code to deal, generally, with the problems of consumer credit.

THE POSSUM GUARDING THE CHICKEN COOP

Many proposals in Congress deal with improvements in the Federal Trade Commission or other federal agencies. But I have little faith that the FTC will ever be effective to fully protect the consumer.

As is all too well known by those dealing with them, government agencies are not always energetic and prompt. Relief is often inadequate. Take, for instance, the Federal Trade Commission. It was created as an administrative agency to protect the consumer against unfair and deceptive trade practices. The Holland Furnace Company case illustrates the inadequacy of this protection.

In December 1936, the company agreed to a Federal Trade Commission consent order against certain misleading advertising claims and the proceedings dragged out through 1954. Not until 1958 was a cease and desist order issued. This prohibited Holland "from engaging in a sales scheme whereby its salesmen gained access to homes by misrepresenting themselves as official inspectors and heating engineers. Having gained entry they then dismantled furnaces on the pretext that such was necessary to determine the extent of necessary repairs." Holland Furnace Company ignored the court decree enforcing the case and desist order and was heavily fined for contempt of court in 1965.

If it thus takes 29 years for the consumer to get relief, I have come to have serious misgivings about the ordinary policing agencies' ability to protect the people. Administrative budgets and personnel are limited, and the agency stumbles over its own processes. Hurdles and barriers are written into agency laws by lobbyists for the industries controlled, and the possum is set to guard the chicken coop.

In trying to devise legislation that will work in the consumer field, I have kept these points in mind: Good legislation must envisage the existence of competing interests or of forces which are otherwise self motivated. And it must supply machinery, readily at hand, to accomplish the public purpose.

The public purpose may be the sharing of increased productivity and the furtherance of industrial justice—as in the Labor Act—or it may be the extension of the availability of electric power—as in the TVA and REA programs. Here it is the protection of consumers in the marketplace—the protection of one who deals occasionally with another

who makes it a business to engage in that particular selling activity.

The diffuse interest of the purchaser engaging occasionally in the particular type of transaction does not measure up to the intense interest of the seller in making that transaction highly profitable when repeated thousands of times. The techniques used may include conditions or provisions that are illegal or unenforceable, but it is simply not practicable for the single purchaser to contest them.

For instance, a lodging place alters its room rate, in breach of the desk clerk's stated agreement with the lodger, by placing in effect some special rate for the Sugar Bowl season in New Orleans. The lodger must pay the rate or suffer the inconvenience of having to try to extricate his luggage by judicial process. The practice is one which can be perfected by the landlord over many Sugar Bowl seasons, but the customer confronts the problem perhaps once in a life time.

THEORY UNDERLYING H.R. 14585 AND NEED FOR IT

It is, in my opinion, not practical to try to delineate all the types of practices perpetrated against consumers which entail fraud, deception, overreaching, and vending such shoddy merchandise as to breach an implied warranty that the merchandise is suitable for its apparent use. Neither is it practical to establish at a federal level an entire new substantive law of deceit. And, as we have seen, dependency on governmental nursemaid is likely to result in disillusionment.

I think it is better to rely on existing statutory and common law, and developing concepts of the duty of the seller to deal fairly in the marketplace—concepts which are developing in the courts in civil cases and in the Federal Trade Commission in proceedings there. Such development should be encouraged by federal procedural law like that contained in H.R. 14585.

Existing substantive law is, or is becoming, adequate to protect the consumer's interest in the marketplace. But the machinery of protection is not adequate. State procedural law is in most instances clumsy and antiquated.

As we have already intimated, the main reason why consumers cannot be properly protected under existing process is that their individual claims are too small and they cannot be aggregated in class actions in most instances and in most jurisdictions.

Deceptive advertising, usurious interest rates, overpriced drugs and food, and adulterated meat are all wrongs involving small amounts of money, many under \$200. Very few would be large enough so that a wronged consumer could effectively secure his rights through the law. The duped consumer is apt to have precious little money to support a test case to establish the rights of the many. The amount he may recover is not likely to pay the court deposit, let alone the lawyer's fee.

Few lawyers, other than the very young and very idealistic, are to be found who are anxious to endure time-consuming litigation for a \$50 fee. A \$200 judgment is not likely to be a powerful deterrent to the wrongdoer. The usury laws prove this. In a study conducted under the auspices of the University of Pennsylvania, it was concluded that "(t)he number of consumers having no redress because the amount lost is not commensurate with the attorney's fee constitute the vast majority." Small claims generally do not warrant individual litigation and the misbehaving corporations that bilk the consumer know it. "In many instances, fraudulent operations carefully avoid cheating individuals out of large sums of money because they realize that no one bilked out of fifty dollars is going to pay a lawyer to get his money back."

In testimony before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Phil Schrag, a lawyer with the NAACP legal defense fund, described a food freezer swindle in which people were promised a freezer along with the normal amount of food it would take to feed a family each week. Because Mr. Schrag had his salary paid by the defense fund he could take the case. He calculated the amount of time it would have taken had a private attorney been engaged in the litigation. He eventually recovered \$700 which was the amount that this particular family had been swindled out of and for that \$700 he spent 119½ hours of his time. If he had been a private attorney charging a fee for urban practice of say \$40 an hour, his time on the case would have cost \$5,136 to recover \$700.

THE CONSUMER CLASS ACTION ACT

As we have indicated, state laws have gone a fair way to devise substantive provisions for consumer protection. And the State courts have hewed out, by common law process and statutory interpretation, a considerable body of consumer law. But the processes of the State courts do not afford effective means of permitting many persons who have bought from different agents of a given defendant, or from the same agent in different transactions, an opportunity to lump their claims together so as to have a large enough damage claim to finance the suit; the court costs involved, the lawyers' fees, and such notices as must be printed. Therefore, the Consumer Class Action Act, H.R. 14585, establishes Federal policy that this machinery shall be available through use of the Federal courts and their liberal procedure for joining many persons in class actions.

Section 4 contains the gravamen of the bill. It makes an "act in fraud of consumers which affects commerce" an unlawful act which will give rise to a civil action triable in the district courts of the United States. Such suits may be tried without regard to the amount in controversy. An "act in fraud of consumers" is defined as including two distinct things: An unfair or deceptive act or practice as the Federal Trade Commission Act condemns in Section 5(a) (1); and an act which gives rise to a civil action by a consumer or consumers under State statutory or decisional law for the benefit of consumers.

Such a suit in Federal court would apply the law of the States in exactly the same manner that the Federal courts apply such law in a diversity of citizenship cases. Thus, the court in any suit is dealing with a definite body of law in a manner in which it is accustomed to deal with such law. There is nothing unfamiliar in the act which would make it difficult for the court to proceed according to customary practices. For instance, the conflict-of-law law which ordinarily applies in diversity cases would establish the law applicable to any body of facts before the court.

SHORTCOMINGS OF DIVERSITY JURISDICTION

It is very important, however, that these substantive offenses, initially spelled out in State law, be considered as Federal offenses triable in a Federal court and that the basis for jurisdiction be without respect to amount in controversy.

Of course, suits in Federal court on diversity of citizenship can presently be tried on the basis of State substantive law, just as suits under this act would be tried—with one exception: There is no requisite of jurisdiction based on jurisdictional amount in this act. This is important because in *Snyder v. Harris*, 89 S. Ct. 1053 (1969), it was held that claims of the individuals in the class action cannot be aggregated toward the \$10,000 minimum.

As is well known, cases come into the Federal court through two doors: First, diversity of citizenship with a \$10,000 jurisdictional

amount; and second, Federal question jurisdiction.

In the latter type of case the jurisdictional requisite may apply but the statute involved itself may waive it. That is what is done here.

The Class Action Bill will allow consumers to achieve justice in federal court if state class action statutes are inadequate and too rigid to protect legal rights. Perhaps the most notable failure is in New York where the recent case of *Hall v. Coburn* has been litigated.

This case involved a consumer class action against a finance company which had allegedly violated the New York Retail Installment Sales Act by using contracts printed in less than 8-point type. The NAACP legal defense fund sought refund of the service charge, a statutory penalty, on behalf of all consumers who had signed small-type contracts prepared and repurchased by Coburn Corporation within the period of the statute of limitations. However, the action was dismissed on two grounds; first, aside from the request for identical damages caused by identical conduct, the class was not united in interest; and second, maintenance of the class action would deprive members of the class of other remedies which they might prefer to pursue against the defendant or against the merchants with whom they had dealt.

Neither of these grounds is compelling. The fact that identical damages are sought for identical conduct makes a case more suitable than unsuitable for class action treatment. Furthermore, class members' interest in pursuing other remedies can be preserved by limiting the scope of the judgment in a class action to the remedies that are actually sought. *Hall v. Coburn* Corporation is typical of state class action law. Similar unnecessarily restrictive state decisions can be found in such states as Mississippi, Massachusetts, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, and Washington. Other states, like North Carolina and West Virginia, have too few reported cases to predict the viability of a consumer class action. In these jurisdictions the status of consumer class actions is, at best, uncertain.

In some states, the class action procedure is wholly adequate. I have, therefore, included a provision in my bill to prevent removal from the state court to the federal court by the defendant where the state forum has been chosen. It provides:

"This section shall not be deemed to prohibit a plaintiff from choosing a State forum without the case being subject to removal on grounds of federal question jurisdiction under Title 28, Section 1441, United States Code."

The election given to the plaintiff to proceed in either the state or federal court is just what is done with respect to *in personam* maritime claims in the "savings clause" of 28 U.S.C. Section 1333. Removal under Section 1441 is not a constitutionally compelled but a prudential disposition, subject to whatever qualification Congress may dictate.

This bill provides that injured consumers may bring class actions in the district courts of the United States under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, including Federal Rule 23, the most modern class action procedure in the United States. These class actions would be available in transactions affecting interstate commerce where violations of state or federal consumer protection law have occurred.

The proposed law dispenses with jurisdiction amount and diversity of citizenship for purposes of class actions.

PRESIDENT'S CONSUMER BILL IS ILL-CONCEIVED

Several months after my bill was introduced, the President endorsed generally the concept of class actions and subsequently had his own legislation introduced, H.R. 14931 and S. 3201. I submit, the Nixon bill

is itself unfair and deceptive to the public. In theory it purports to establish a buyer's bill of rights. In fact, it attempts to sell to the buyer a bill of goods. It lulls the public into thinking they will be protected. Let us examine what is, in fact, done:

Under the Nixon approach, no action may be brought by an individual or a class until the government has successfully terminated its own lawsuit. There is no precedent in the annals of Federal legislation for this. The Government would decide which private rights are to be enforced. The Attorney General and FTC stand, as it were, like a traffic policeman, giving the green signal to one group of would-be litigants and the red signal to others.

There is, it seems to me, a serious constitutional question here involving procedural due process. Can Government establish that certain acts are prohibited and that their commission may result in civil liability but then afford a remedy only to those injured by that wrongful act which the Government chooses to single out?

It would seem that all consumers affected by the prescribed activity of fraud, deceit or overreaching would constitute a class or persons whose rights under the law have been invaded. But the violation of the right of any one of them gives rise to a remedy subject to the discretionary action of the Department of Justice in bringing a governmental action against the offender.

For instance, suppose Montgomery Ward and Sears Roebuck both manufacture chain saws whose lubrication systems are so defective that the links wear out and the chains fall apart at a time far short of the warranty. By selling the saws under such warranties, exactly the same breach of duty has been committed against the purchasers of both companies. But the Attorney General chooses to sue only Sears Roebuck. The Attorney General, under the Act, can thus choose which potential civil litigants, whose rights have been invaded, shall have a remedy.

If this is not actually unconstitutional, it is a policy which is most reprehensible, one which is conducive to official corruption.

The hypothesis assumes a defective lubrication system and a violation of law. But in any actual case this question cannot be determined until after trial. Suppose the allegations upon which a case must rest cannot be sustained in either the case of Montgomery Ward or Sears Roebuck. The bringing up of the case against Sears Roebuck opens up a flood of expensive private, civil litigation against that firm, with attendant bad publicity, but insulates Montgomery Ward. Such a provision of law would invite politics and graft in the governmental process.

The same situation does not exist in the case of the antitrust laws. There a federal civil antitrust action does not have to await a criminal action.

The process provided under the Nixon approach is further defective in that inherent in it are the same defects that presently exist in dependence upon the FTC as the consumer's watchdog. It merely utilized the Justice Department in the same general way that present law utilizes the Trade Commission. Of the two the Commission is better staffed and better versed in the subject matter than the Department.

FTC CANNOT FEASIBLY CARRY THE WHOLE LOAD

The Federal Trade Commission receives 9,000 complaints a year. They are able to investigate only one out of eight or nine of those complaints. Of the 10% or so that are investigated, not even one in ten results in a cease and desist order. To make that kind of record, the FTC has 1,300 people, including 500 lawyers and a \$14 million budget.

The Administration proposes to allow the Justice Department to receive complaints, in-

vestigate each one of them, and then decide whether to bring suit.

To do the job that the understaffed FTC has been trying to do, Justice proposes to establish a department of 30 people for the first year at a cost of \$1.3 million. The second year, 60 people are envisioned.

One witness testifying on behalf of consumer class actions estimated that in order for a federal agency to handle adequately the justifiable consumer complaints susceptible to class action treatment, it would take a budget of \$35 billion a year. This same \$35 billion effect, and more, could be achieved under my bill at no cost to the taxpayer except for whatever small additional administrative cost, if any, incurred by the federal court system.

It may be argued that the existing attorneys can do the job of investigating and bringing suit. Yet one need only examine the record from the Hearings before the Committee on Appropriations for the Justice Department to see how the Department of Justice is already overburdened.

As John Mitchell has himself said "... We are convinced, however, that a substantial increase in manpower is absolutely necessary to deal with the magnitude of the problem and that additional manpower can be effectively deployed along the lines indicated." The Solicitor General, Erwin Griswold, said, "A year ago I was overwhelmed with work; yes, I still am." His department is typical yet the Administration proposes additional workloads on an already understaffed department. The consumer will pay the price.

The Justice Department, if we are to be realistic, will have to establish priorities. They will have to decide what they consider important or unimportant. The priorities of the Justice Department may not always coincide with those of the victimized consumer.

The small consumers stand to benefit least from this provision. Poor, uneducated, and somewhat skeptical of the Government to begin with, he probably will have little success in convincing an agent of the Federal Government by letter or in person that he has a valid case. If the small consumer cannot get the Department of Justice to seek relief for him, he is left with very little means of help under the Nixon approach.

The only way that some may get action may be to hire a lawyer to represent them before the Department of Justice. Thus, a consumer may, in effect, have to press his case twice: once before the Justice Department or the FTC and then again, if he is lucky, before the court.

But who is most likely to be able to hire a lawyer to press his case with the Justice Department? These are:

- (1) A competing seller who would like to open the gate to civil litigation against his competitor, or
- (2) Any seller who would like to keep the gate closed to litigation against him.

The consumer himself is the last person likely to be represented by counsel before the Department of Justice—and the consumer is the last person likely to get justice. This proposition is not altogether unprecedented.

The people best able to protect the rights of the consumer are the consumers themselves. The Government can help but it should not be able to prohibit. That is why our bill allows class actions directly without Government interference.

POTENTIAL OF DELAY GREATEST DRAWBACK

The potential of delay, though, remains the greatest drawback in the Administration approach. The complaint must come in, be considered, investigated, sent up for further action, and then prosecution may result, just as in the case of the FTC. All of this takes time. In a case before the FTC involving the Crawford Corporation and interlocking directorates in the prefabricated housing in-

dustry, the case was dropped on April 4, 1969, when it was discovered that the Defendant had withdrawn from the prefabricated housing business in the early months of 1964, five years earlier.

On April 4, 1962, the FTC field office in Chicago began to investigate the Vollrath Company of Sheboygan, Wisconsin for "making false savings claims and misrepresentations about the construction, efficacy, and other features of stainless steel cookware. Four years later, the case was given to the Bureau of Deceptive Practices for prosecution. Another year passed before a hearing examiner made the initial decision in the case and still another year before the Commission made its final decision. The time lapse from investigation to decision was six years.

In the Federal Trade Commission the average time lapse is four years with two years of investigation and two years of prosecution in the central office. Until the end of that period, there is no halt upon the activities of the company. The Justice Department, with far less resources than the FTC devoted to consumer affairs, cannot hope to even achieve that degree of promptness.

The ABA Consumer Committee and Its Recommendations

The American Bar Association has set up within its Section of Antitrust Law a special Committee on Consumer Legislation. A third of this committee is composed of members of Washington law firms with a strong interest in administrative agencies and the methods of influencing them. Another third is composed of lawyers from New York firms, all primarily corporation defense oriented and at least one with present interests in the defense side of antitrust class actions. The remaining third is composed of lawyers from very large firms in Chicago, Los Angeles, and Cleveland representing such clients as U.S. Steel, major book publishers, General Motors, Chrysler, Firestone, Timken Roller Bearing, Westinghouse, and others.

This committee of nine has come out against consumer class actions as a means of revitalizing American law for the protection of the consumer and in favor of relegating this important subject matter to the old, tired processes of the Federal Trade Commission. All the consumer bills dealing with this subject—my bill in the House, Senator Tydings' bill in the Senate, and the Administration's proposals—call for consumer class actions, yet this small defense lawyer-oriented splinter of the whole body of the bar proposes altogether bureaucratic processes for protecting consumers.

"PLEASE THROW US IN THE BRIAR PATCH"

They are saying, "Please throw us in the briar patch," the briar patch of the Federal Trade Commission. Indeed, this is exactly where they want to be thrown.

As Ralph Nader has pointed out, administrative agencies have fallen down in their duty to protect the public interest. They have become the hospitable briar patch into which malefactors against consumers wish to be thrown, and the lawyers for these interests do not even have the subtlety of Brer Rabbit but plead directly their preference for the briar patch of the Federal Trade Commission. What a comfortable and sound hedge against effective action this has become! It is a familiar ground of the Washington lawyer who can speak directly to the commissioners and other administrative personnel of the agencies. He cannot speak directly to the judge who is trying the case in which he is involved about the merits of that case. He has come to be more comfortable with those before whom he may plead over lunch than before those he must address at the bar.

Naturally the typical defendant lawyer who wants to isolate his client from the risk of a large and successful class action does

not want to put this effective instrument in the hands of the consumer.

The consumer class action is good enough for big plaintiffs who own stock in corporations whose directors have allegedly cheated them. Why is it not good enough for little people who have been massively bilked for defectively manufactured products? Why, merely because the amount in controversy is something less than \$10,000 should consumers go without an effective remedy?

*Who Shall Determine Private Rights:
Courts or Bureaucrats?*

Some of the Committee's objections to court relief are most puzzling unless considered in light of the interest of Washington lawyers in controlling the process. For instance, on page 30 of the report the Committee shows a preference for the use of the Federal Trade Commission hearing examiner over the use of what the Committee calls "an often distant Federal Court." It is true, of course, that a "hearing examiner" can ride circuit for the distant commission. But for myself I would rather entrust my rights to courts and juries located in my State, usually my town, than to the tender mercies of the FTC in Washington, D.C., particularly when members of this Committee of the Bar are in Washington with much closer access to them than I am.

With all its shortcomings our system of using judges and juries to determine private rights is far better, far less corruptible than any other system of determining private rights and remedies. I submit that it is better than the so-called "prompt and uncomplicated" procedure for "recovery of actual damages by consumers" proposed by the Committee. Listen to this uncomplicated and prompt procedure:

"As soon as final determination of liability in a proceeding commenced by the Justice Department or the FTC either through a final court judgment or a final Commission order, the Commission will designate a hearing examiner to see that injured consumers are accorded relief. The hearing examiner will immediately enact a process by which consumers who have suffered from the practice will be made aware that they can obtain monetary recovery and any other appropriate relief."

The report, in outlining its proposed process, requires that the consumer await the go-ahead sign from the Commission. It says on page 31:

The Commission will then ask the consumer to complete a form setting forth the basis of his claim.

Now, what does this mean? It means that if Betsy Smith has bought a deceptively advertised and faulty dishwasher, she first hires a Washington law firm to lobby with the FTC or the Justice Department to bring a general action against the Dixie Belle Washing Machine Company. After the case has wended its way through the FTC and the Justice Department processes, an order will be issued. Of course, she has no way of influencing the nature of that order, though her rights may depend on its terms. She then must present her case before the hearing examiner.

Peculiarly, the Bar Committee suggests that she may not need a lawyer in this process. Presumably the Dixie Belle Washing Machine Company will be represented by counsel. (In passing, I must say that I am always suspicious of those who advise me that the proceeding I am engaged in is "so uncomplicated that no lawyer may be required.") Her case is not decided by a jury of persons living in her community but by a hearing examiner sent down from Washington.

If Betsy Smith gets a favorable determination from the hearing examiner, the Dixie

Belle Washing Machine Company will probably want to appeal the case and the "simple and prompt proceeding" may lose such character as it wends its way through the federal court system.

REFORM OF FTC DESIRABLE BUT SHOULD BE COMPLEMENTARY TO CLASS ACTION RELIEF

It should be understood here that I am not arguing against reform of the FTC processes, but I reiterate what I said to the Committee upon the opening of the hearing:

Congress has the means of making [a vehicle for justice for consumers] one that is self-induced and self-propelling, not one that depends for its impetus upon the good motivations and energetic administration of a commission. Commissions are not always well motivated. Many exemplify the principle of the possum guarding the chicken coop.

The Commission processes are necessary for the protection of many very small consumers. Many reprehensible practices should be curbed by cease and desist orders as they are now. It may be desirable to provide a system of fines and of some degree of restitution in a proper case.

But I still insist that the following principles of law and justice are paramount:

Just as the fear of criminal prosecution goes a long way toward making men honest, the threat of an effective civil suit goes a long way toward making them scrupulous. Though lawsuits are sometimes complicated and protracted, the fact that they are available induces people dealing with each other to deal fairly. Unless there is an effective process for individuals, acting either alone or in concert, to obtain redress, without the prior intervention of a governmental agency, honesty and fair dealing rest solely upon the consciences of the dealers and the bureaucrats, and the sensitivity of these consciences I am not willing to trust.

CONCLUSION

The Consumer Class Action Act would allow a group or class of consumers to sue the defendant directly. This approach needs no government subsidies to pay for it. It needs no department to administer it. In contrast, the Administration bill not only will require lawyers, investigators, and economists all paid for by the Government, but it will require two lawsuits where one is sufficient. The federal courts are already overburdened and it makes little sense to have the Government institute one lawsuit and then the individual litigate the same matter in a different suit later.

H.R. 14585 affords an extremely practical and effective way of establishing a strong body of consumer law. It acts pragmatically under existing law, permitting a common law approach for remedying and curbing overreaching in the marketplace. It does not attempt to anticipate in exquisite detail every fraud or act of overreaching which might give rise to a consumer class action. But since it adopts State law as Federal law, it gains all of the specificity of existing statutory and common law applicable to the facts: The businessman has notice of what activities are to be considered illegal in exactly the same manner that he has such notice in a case which is in Federal court on the basis of diversity of citizenship.

It is the sponsors' hope that this bill will afford an opportunity, on a nonpartisan basis, for Congress to give the consumer what he has long needed—a fair break in his day-to-day dealings in the marketplace. It is not only the consumer that needs the assurance of the fairness of the marketplace but also the vast majority of merchants who do deal fairly. The good reputation of the marketplace is essential to a healthy free competitive economy.

ANGOLA AND GULF OIL

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the colonial control of Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea by Portugal has been one of economic exploitation, forced labor, and the denial of fundamental human liberties. While other European nations have recognized the rights of nations to self-government, Portugal stands alone in trying to stifle popular movements now fighting for independence.

The United States preaches self-determination around the world, yet its actions in this situation affirmatively encourage the opposite situation. Our Government supplies Portugal with funds, knowledge, and materials. And Portugal's illegal use of American military equipment in Africa elicits no outcry, let alone embargo, from Washington.

Furthermore, the activities of the American-owned Gulf Oil Corp. in Cabinda, Angola, serve to further solidify Portugal's colonial interests. Portugal's 1969 profit of \$20 million on the Gulf operations paid for half of the Angolan military budget. And, while the European power consumed 78,000 barrels of this oil herself last year, she exported another 72,000 barrels during that same period, thus helping to stabilize her weak economy and enabling her to sustain a long-term military commitment against the Angolan insurgents.

The American Committee on Africa is today presenting a statement at Gulf's annual shareholders meeting. By this action, it is attempting to draw public attention to the active cooperation of the American Government and Gulf in Portuguese colonialism. As a member of the Subcommittee on Africa of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I am deeply concerned with this situation. Accordingly, I am placing the committee's statement in the RECORD. The statement follows:

AN OPEN STATEMENT TO THE ANNUAL MEETING OF GULF CO., 1970

We, concerned citizens and representatives of organizations, address this statement and appeal to the Gulf Oil Company on the occasion of the annual stockholders' meeting on April 28, 1970. We call upon the Gulf Oil Company to withdraw immediately from its operation in the Portuguese-ruled enclave of Cabinda, a part of the West African colony of Angola. Our reason for this is that Gulf is giving substantial support to Portugal in her war against the African people of Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea (Bissau) to keep them indefinitely in colonial status. Gulf supports Portugal's refusal to recognize the right of the people in the Portuguese colonial areas of Africa to self-determination and independence. Too small and poor a country to control a rebellious empire without help, Portugal depends on outside assistance such as the support received from U.S. corporations like Gulf.

Portuguese domination of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) has been characterized by economic exploitation of the country and its people; the practice of a forced labor system; the denial of political expression to almost all the people; and the

perpetuation of educational practices which have resulted in an illiteracy rate of more than 90%.

We believe the people in the Portuguese colonies (which Portugal calls "overseas provinces") have the right to freedom and independence. Popular movements in all the Portuguese colonial areas are now fighting for this freedom. The aid which Gulf gives to Portugal in defiance of United Nations resolutions, the Organization of African Unity and the just aspirations of the people of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) must end. * * * Independence in Asia and Africa after World War II, Portugal merely changed the technical names of her colonies to "overseas provinces" and called them an integral part of Portugal. She claimed a "civilizing mission" and acknowledged as "civilized" only those who were "assimilado," that is, educated in the Portuguese language, culture, and religion. By 1960, Portuguese figures indicated that only 15 per cent of the population of Mozambique could read and write at all, and many had become literate while working in the gold mine of South Africa. In Angola they could claim literacy no higher than 10 per cent. In Guinea, with the population of a million, only 11 Africans had obtained a university education.

A *Police State*. Portugal itself is a police state, and the colonies are run with even less democracy and greater brutality. The "overseas provinces" are ruled from Lisbon through the Overseas Ministry. All officials are appointed, and top officials are chosen in Lisbon. Censorship, prohibition of trade unions, the single-party system, and the extraordinary powers of the secret police mean that no effective expression of opinion by the people is possible. A passbook containing tax and labor record must be shown on demand (with the penalty "correctional labor") or stamped to permit travel; this is an efficient control of movement and labor supply.

Nearly all (90 per cent) of the African people still live and work on the land. Portugal actively promotes European settlement through land grants and other concessions, most successfully in Angola. The average land acreage occupied by Europeans is 60 times that of Africans. Seventy-five percent of Angolan coffee (the chief export, and the chief U.S. import) is produced on 550 European plantations. In the agricultural settlements in Mozambique, the European farmer is granted 125 acres of land while the African farmer is given 25.

Revolt. All through the 1950's while other colonies were moving towards independence, the growing peaceful protests of the peoples of Angola, Guinea, and Mozambique were met by intransigence and increasing violence. Each country experienced a police massacre which solidified opposition to Portuguese rule. In Guinea, in 1959, 50 striking dockworkers were killed. In Angola, in a protest march in 1960 following the arrest of many political dissidents, 30 were killed and 200 wounded, and two villages destroyed. In Mozambique, in a dock strike in 1956, 49 were killed and in 1960, at Mueda, 500 unarmed people were shot down as they demonstrated. Popular rebellion broke out in 1961 in Angola, in 1963 in Guinea-Bissau, and in 1964 in Mozambique. The African nationalist armies in each of the three territories now control large areas in which they have introduced their own schools, clinics, markets, local governments, and other social institutions. They have pinned down an estimated 150,000 Portuguese troops and forced Portugal to spend half of her national budget for military purposes with consequent rising dissatisfaction and draft resistance at home.

GULF AND THE WAR IN ANGOLA

Cabinda. Gulf is now prospecting for oil in Mozambique, but its major operation is in Angola. Gulf started looking for Angola oil in 1954 and made its first strike in Cabinda

in 1966. It is the sole concessionaire in Cabinda, a small enclave between the two Congos north of Angola but ruled by Lisbon as part of that colony. It is the most profitable oil area in Portuguese Africa and will probably rank among the first six oil producers in Africa; until the Cabinda strike, Portugal had to import oil from the Middle East.

The *Wall Street Journal* has estimated Gulf's expenditure on exploration and development at \$130 million by 1969; World Petroleum 1969 reported expansion plans at a probable cost of \$76 million which would bring production up to 150,000 barrels a day by the end of 1970.

Financing the War. Portugal's profit on the Gulf operation, in addition to the availability of the oil, is considerable. Under a 1968 agreement between Portugal and Gulf, Gulf made advance payments when Portugal was hard pressed financially by escalation of the three wars. Payments include surface rents, bonuses, income tax equivalent to 50 per cent of profits, a 10-cent royalty payment on each barrel of oil, and certain concession payments. Total payments in 1969 were approximately \$20 million, about half the Angolan budget allocation for military purposes. In the contract Portugal retains the right to take all the crude oil produced, or its equivalent in refined products, should her military or political needs dictate it. In 1969 Portugal consumed 78,000 barrels, so that the anticipated output of 150,000 barrels should leave a considerable amount for export. (With the increased production profits to Portugal will also increase.) This strengthens Portugal again by strengthening her neighbor and supporter South Africa, who lacks only oil for sufficiency against possible world sanctions.

War in Cabinda. The close relationship between Gulf and war operations in the Cabinda area is revealed in a book, *The Terror Fighters*, by a South African journalist, A. J. Venter, wholly sympathetic to Portugal. He writes of Cabinda:

"After the initial onslaught which followed close on the heels of the March 1961 attacks in Northern Angola, the insurgents were successful in occupying more than 90 per cent of the enclave. . . . They were successful in routing the ill prepared Portuguese militia and police and stopped just short of the capital, Cabinda."

He describes the crucial importance of air support (he saw U.S. built planes) to Portugal's long struggle to re-establish control. Of Gulf itself, he says,

"Although they were obliged to suspend operations during the worst of the terrorist raids in 1961, machine gun muzzles were barely cold before they moved in again."

Eight years later "it is still necessary to travel in the interior with some means of protection." (From Venter's comments it is clear that guerrilla activities continue in Cabinda.)

Portugal Defends Gulf. When Gulf struck oil in 1966, Portugal moved additional troops into the area and intensified its "resettlement" program which involved building new villages (strategic hamlets) with unusual amenities such as schools and water supplies, and moving the African population into them; in 1967 Cabinda received the largest allocation for rural re-grouping projects.

The Gulf contract with Portugal itself stipulates that the government "agrees to undertake such measures as may be necessary to ensure that the Company may carry out its operations freely and efficiently, including measures to permit the company the use of and free access to public land and such measures as may be necessary to prevent third parties from interfering with the company's free exercise of its contractual rights."

Further, the authorities agree "to provide military guards to protect the oil fields if

special security measures prove necessary." Venter describes oil camps "surrounded by 8-foot barbed wire and spotlights" in fortified isolation from the community. All this "defense" is, of course, directed against the African majority which, in turn, naturally views Gulf as part of the Portuguese enemy.

PORTUGAL AND U.S. SUPPORT

Gulf is not the only visible sign of the U.S. alignment with Portugal in her African wars, and the Gulf operation seems to the African people quite consistent with what else they know of the United States. Its actions speak louder than its voice which officially condemns colonialism and supports the right of people everywhere to freedom and independence.

Military Aid. The United States has a direct military alliance with Portugal and supplies Portugal with funds, knowledge and material. And although it stipulates that U.S. military equipment is not for use outside the NATO area (i.e. in Africa), repeated proof of its use in the colonial wars has brought no embargo from Washington. The U.S. maintains a permanent Military Assistance Advisory Group in Portugal (some of whom visit Africa) and operates a large base in the Portuguese Azores. Further, the U.S. proposed and ensured Portugal's membership in NATO, and other NATO members, particularly West Germany, now aid the Portuguese military effort more directly than does the United States.

Economic Interest. Although the military need for the Azores base and the Portuguese alliance is challenged on technical, nonpolitical grounds by some current analysts of the military establishment, the growing economic involvement of giant corporations like Gulf in the Portuguese colonial economy is forging new and stronger links between the United States and Portugal. And this is being done at the expense of incurring hostility of the people of the colonies, and in Portugal as well.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. If the Gulf Oil Company didn't have the Cabinda oil concession, wouldn't some other company from some other country?

Perhaps so, and we oppose any exploitation of the natural resources of a country for the benefit of others, and any force that aids colonialism. But Gulf is a U.S. company and we therefore have a particular responsibility to try to change a policy which we believe to be wrong politically, economically, and morally.

2. Isn't the Gulf Oil Company helping the people of Angola economically through its operation?

It is helping the government a great deal but that isn't the same thing. Little trickles through to the people in the form of social services or local improvements, or directly as wages. Cabinda is a "boom town" development, with the inflated costs, and scarcity of housing and other essential commodities, that connotes. This hurts the people, for only skilled technicians get "boom" salaries to match costs. Gulf is reported to have employed about 2,000 people; of these about 500 are from the United States and another 1,000 from abroad, leaving only 500 possible positions for "Portuguese" Angolans. With full operations, total employment has decreased.

3. An individual company can't set foreign policy; shouldn't the U.S. government speak and the company follow its lead?

We believe that the U.S. government should support United Nations policy by ending both military and economic involvement in the Portuguese colonies. The government's failure to do so does not absolve Gulf of responsibility for its actions. Gulf may have decided to invest in Angola purely as a money-making proposition, but it is not "neutral" or able to refrain from participating in internal politics. Gulf is strongly sup-

porting Portugal, a colonial power, in a war against "rebellious" subjects, and (aside from the war) in maintaining control of country without even consulting the inhabitants. It should get out, and its stockholders who do not wish to defend the Portuguese empire should insist that it do so.

4. Doesn't Gulf serve a useful function in training Angolans for modern life and industry?

Very few Africans are employed in the Gulf operation, though an additional number are employed by various other U.S. companies. But even if many were employed with adequate salaries and on-the-job training and upgrading, this would not compensate for the aid Gulf gives to the people's primary oppressor—Portugal. Every question must be viewed in the light of the bitter eight-year struggle for independence. Angolans are waging despite the enormous handicap of an underdeveloped people challenging a nation with modern arms and industry supported by the NATO countries. To offer training to a handful of people in the face of this struggle is not even a bribe, but only an insult.

5. Doesn't the involvement of modern Western corporations in a colonial economy exert a moderating influence on the government?

The slight change in Portuguese policy came when it first let the outside investors in, changed the name of colonies to provinces, and moderated some features of dictatorship. It did this when it entered the United Nations in an effort to forestall reporting on the colonies and finally surrendering them, and the change was a response to strong anticolonial pressure, not to friendly support and financing. The incredible violence—including massacres—with which Portugal met the outbreak of nationalist resistance, without any suggestion that negotiation or compromise was possible, indicates her inflexibility. The Western corporations, especially Gulf, are helping Portugal continue a war which she would have had to abandon if dependent on her own resources. Far from a moderating influence, they are her lifeline.

6. Do you really expect Gulf Oil to abandon its profitable Cabinda operation?

Probably not, while profits continue high, and the United States continues to ignore United Nations resolutions, and Portugal, which needs Gulf, maintains control. But that does not mean that we have no responsibility to do what we can to change the situation, or to expose the role of Gulf.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

Find out now how you can work with the campaign against Gulf Oil, and with other activities to break the United States-Portugal alliance. The American Committee on Africa has background information on Gulf and other U.S. corporations functioning in the Portuguese areas, the U.S.-NATO-Portugal alliance, and the African liberation movements. Write to ACOA for more information.

American Committee on Africa, 164 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10016.

WHY WE PROTEST GULF OIL COMPANY'S OPERATION IN PORTUGUESE AFRICA

As you know, oil and its derivatives are strategic materials indispensable to the development of any territory; they are the nerve-centre of progress, and to possess them on an industrial scale is to ensure essential supplies and to dispose of an important source of foreign exchange.

Apart from this, in the mechanised wars of our times, its principal derivative—petrol—plays such a preponderant part that without reserves of this fuel it is not possible to give the Army sufficient means and elasticity of movement. The machine is the infrastructure of modern war, and machines

cannot move without fuel. Hence the valuable support of Angolan oils for our armed forces.

REBOCHO VAZ,
Governor-General of Angola.

(NOTE.—African World Annual 1967-68, p. 29.)

THE U.S. AND PORTUGAL

A growing number of individuals and organizations in the United States are protesting the "indispensable support" through oil production which the Gulf Oil Company is giving to Portugal in three desperate wars to maintain colonial rule in Angola, Guinea, and Mozambique. Portugal is too poor a country, and too small, to keep her empire without help. This help comes from her NATO allies, from her military alliance with the United States, and from giant corporations like Gulf who help her to exploit the African people and rob them of their natural resources. In protesting the operation of Gulf Oil Company in Portuguese Africa, we protest U.S. complicity in colonialism and military repression.

THE LAST EMPIRE

The Portuguese have been in Africa for 500 years, though their full control is less than a century old and resistance never completely ended. * * *

We make these charges in demanding that Gulf Oil disengage from the Cabinda oil operation:

1. *The Gulf Oil operation, by giving financial support to Portugal, subsidizes Portugal's war against the African people.* It is estimated that this year, the Cabinda oil operation will produce 150,000 barrels per day which will provide Portugal with royalty payments of \$15,000 a day. The expected proceeds to the Portuguese government, when one adds in not only royalties but also income tax, mining development fund and other proceeds, amounted to almost 20 million dollars in 1969 according to a United Nations working paper. This was almost half of Angola's total military budget in 1969.

2. *The Cabinda oil operation, while helping the Portuguese government, does not enhance the economic well being of the African people.* Out of hundreds of staff positions, most jobs have been reserved for Portuguese citizens and for technical and engineering personnel recruited from Gulf subsidiaries in the rest of the world, eliminating Africans almost completely. The revenue is shared between Gulf and the Portuguese colonial government, and little trickles through to the people in social services or local improvements. This is the nature of colonialism.

3. *The Cabinda operation further strengthens Portugal's ability to wage its war by providing a strategic product.* Cabinda is expected to become the sixth largest oil producer in Africa, and can provide all of the oil needed by Portugal. In 1969, Portugal imported approximately 75,000 barrels per day. By the end of 1970 Cabinda production alone should be twice that amount. Furthermore, under the agreement with Cabinda Gulf, the Portuguese government has retained the right to take all crude oil that is produced or the equivalent in refined products should her military or political needs dictate it. Angola's Governor General recently observed, "The machine is the infrastructure of modern war and machines cannot move without fuel. Hence the valuable support of Angolan oils for our armed forces."

In addition, the Cabinda strike will ultimately be able to provide oil for South Africa, the one necessary commodity not yet discovered by the apartheid regime.

4. *The operation of Gulf Oil in Cabinda, where the struggle for liberation predates the oil strike, is dependent for its security upon the military power of the Portuguese government.* The arrangement made with

Portugal in 1966 and in 1968 stipulates that the Portuguese government "agrees to undertake such measures as may be necessary to ensure the company may carry out its operations freely and efficiently . . . to prevent third parties from interfering with the company's free exercise of its contractual rights." This means that a major American corporation relies on the colonialist Portuguese government to protect it from the very people who should be served by the natural resources of their own country.

The Gulf Oil operation in Cabinda represents the U.S. and its people in the eyes of Angolans, American resources and prestige are therefore on the side of the exploiter. Therefore, we, as concerned citizens and representatives of organizations, demand that the Gulf Oil Company divest itself of its involvement in the Cabinda oil operation and in other Portuguese colonies; discontinue its support for the Portuguese economic and military effort to perpetuate colonialism, and use its profits already made in this operation to support the people who are fighting to bring freedom and independence to their country.

PORTUGAL IN AFRICA

The Portuguese presence in Africa today is still characterized by ignorance, repression and a careless exploitation of the African people and in purely human terms the lessons of the past offer little hope for the future. (James Duffy, *Portuguese Africa*, 1959.)

PORTUGAL IN AFRICA

Portugal is the last old-style colonial power in the world. With a population of about nine million in a 35,000-square mile corner of Europe, she still attempts to rule 14 million people occupying nearly 800,000 square miles in Africa (and outposts in Asia as well). Since 1961, nationalist African forces have been challenging the Portuguese occupation by armed rebellion.

PORTUGAL'S AFRICAN TERRITORIES

Portugal's colonies in Africa include Angola, Mozambique, Guinea, the Cape Verde Islands off the coast of Mauritania-Senegal, and Sao Tome and Principe, islands in the Gulf of Guinea. Guinea (Bissau) is a small enclave between Guinea (Conakry) and Senegal in West Africa, with a population just over half a million, and a subsistence agricultural economy. Angola on the Atlantic and Mozambique on the Indian Ocean are the northern outposts of suppressed southern Africa, vast territories with rich agricultural lands, untapped mineral wealth including oil, and enormous economic potential.

Despite the subsidized efforts of Portugal to encourage European emigration to the colonies, and the migration of hundreds of thousands of refugees fleeing the war zones, Africans outnumber Europeans in the colonial areas of ratios of 15 to 1 and up. The population breakdown in 1960-62 was:

	Total	White	African	Melito (racially mixed)
Angola.....	4,957,500	1,300,000	4,604,000	53,500
Mozambique...	6,581,465	150,000	6,400,000	31,465
Guinea.....	534,568	3,000	527,000	4,568

¹Since this period the white settlers in Angola have increased substantially with an estimated white population of 420,000.

BACKGROUND

The Portuguese first made contact with the African peoples and states in her present territories in the fifteenth century, but did not control them administratively until after World War I. The 500 years of Portuguese rule is a carefully fostered myth. On both coasts Portugal found complex and flourishing civilizations and her control was limited to coastal forts to protect trade and alliances with local chiefs and princes. The subse-

quent introduction of the slave trade in Angola led to war, depopulation, and chaos in the interior. For two centuries Africa, for Portugal, was primarily an outpost on the way to India. Only when the eastern empire met reverses was serious consideration given to the African interior, and a search for gold and silver undertaken. African uprisings were frequent on both coasts well into the twentieth century, and control was not established by Portugal until after other European powers had set the pattern with greater colonial strength and stability.

Throughout the whole period, Portugal proclaimed a civilizing and Christian mission in Africa. But it was not until 1951 that she claimed the colonies as provinces of Portugal. Then they were reclassified in preparation for Portugal's entrance into the United Nations, to forestall possible international concern about non-self-governing territories.

Portugal's colonies differ from South Africa in the absence of apartheid, and the color line is not sharply drawn. Until the sixties, when the independence of most of Africa created new pressures, the colonial populations were divided into Europeans; *assimilados*, Africans or meticos officially equal to the Europeans; and *indigenas*, the native population. After the theoretical 500 years of civilizing rule, only 1 per cent of the African population had reached *assimilado* status. The structure and theory of Portuguese colonial power are economic, social and political, not specifically racist, but the effect is the same.

The most that can be said on behalf of equality and multiracialism in the Portuguese colonies is that the people of Portugal, like the people of the colonies, suffer under a militarized dictatorship and economic oligarchy; their poverty is crushing, their literacy low, their civil liberties in abeyance.

Public opinion about Portugal's colonial progress was jolted by the 1961 revolt in Angola, and today the colonialists face major wars of liberation in all three territories of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea. The Lisbon Government has been forced therefore to remodel her myths by passing reforms for the provinces, by accelerating economic and educational development, and by trying to modernize the colonial structures. But any political opposition, particularly the African nationalist movements, is branded and propagandized as being Communist-inspired. Thus behind the facade of Portuguese flexibility is the continued brutal repression of popular elements and the denial of self-determination.

THE POLICE STATE APPARATUS

The police state in the colonies is an extension of the police state in Portugal itself and the recent change in rulers did not alter the structure. For three decades, Premier Antonio de Oliveira Salazar built up a firm control of Portugal and its empire through an elitist coalition of business, military, and church powers. At home, opposition is silenced by imprisonment or exile; in the colonies by imprisonment or execution.

The most feared arm of the government in the suppression of dissent is the Gestapo-like PIDE, the International Police for the Defense of the State. But the government structure and its supporting legal system are themselves totalitarian. Government censorship, the prohibition of trade unions, and a single-party political system aid in close control of the populace. Enfringements on possible rights of the accused include a six months' renewable detention without arraignment, legal charges, or right to counsel; the constant "unavailability" of legal counsel; the use of torture to extract confessions with no check on interrogation procedures; and the interference of the PIDE in legal affairs. Prisoners are threatened with "fixed

residence" in concentration camps and state "security" measures are used to prolong sentences.

The colonial situation aggravates these injustices. The people overseas are more defenseless (more than 90 percent do not even understand the language of their rulers), the police more ruthless, and the state personified in any Portuguese citizen, particularly an employer. Missionary accounts detail the brutality with which the African majority is controlled.

The *indigenas*, even without the name, are subject to a passbook system not unlike that of South Africa. The *caderneta* (passbook) contains the tax and labor record of the bearer, and names of members of the family with photographs and fingerprints. It must be shown on demand, and stamped before the bearer can travel. If papers are lost or not in order, the bearer may be sentenced to correctional labor (a possibility that furnishes a convenient labor-supply control). Intellectuals, or *assimilados*, are subject to different harassment. For example, the PIDE arrested a group of Mozambicans including authors, journalists, an artist, a student, and a medical assistant in December, 1964. They were accused of contact with subversive nationalist organizations. They were detained until February, 1965, and not placed on trial until the next year, when Lisbon annulled the trial because of unsubstantial evidence. Yet after this, in April, 1967, the men were brought to trial again, and they are in prison today.

COLONIAL ADMINISTRATION

Although they were declared integral provinces of Portugal by the 1951 Overseas Reform Act, the colonies are still administered through the Overseas Ministry as colonies. Central policy decisions are made by the autonomous Council of Ministers, with the Premier presiding, in consultation with the Overseas Council and other bodies. Since 1964, the "provinces" have been represented on the Overseas Council by two members and an alternate elected by each provincial Legislative Council. The Legislative Councils are not representative and their functions are only consultative. Their elected members (15 out of 36 in Angola and 3 of 29 in Mozambique) are chosen by a narrow electoral roll which virtually excludes Africans in Angola, and by chiefs in the land reserves in Mozambique. Top officials such as the Governor General are chosen in Lisbon, and all officials are appointive. A three-layer bureaucracy controls the people: civil, military and PIDE.

THE ECONOMY

The potentially rich colonies of Angola and Mozambique serve the traditional colonial function of providing the mother country with raw materials, external markets, and, because of their wealth, foreign exchange. Major export earnings come from primary agricultural products that are mostly in the hands of Europeans: in Angola, coffee, sisal, maize, cotton, and sugar; in Mozambique, cotton, cashews, sugar, copra, sisal, and tea. In Angola, secondary earnings come from mining; in Mozambique, from transportation (port and rail). Angola has oil, diamonds, and iron ore resources for significant economic development.

Thus far, industrialization has been minimal in both territories, confined to some processing of primary products and light manufacturing for local consumption. However, something of an economic boom has started—in Angola as the result of exploitation of oil by U.S. companies and in Mozambique as the result of heavy South African investment, exemplified by the new hydro-electric complex, the Cabora Bassa.

Among the recent changes made by Portugal in reaction to world opinion was to open the territories to foreign investment. Portugal's own resources do not permit full exploitation of the natural wealth of the col-

onies or diversification of their economies, but it was not until 1965 that foreign investment was encouraged (when war expenditures were draining Portugal's resources while the wars called attention to the backwardness of the colonial economies). Such investment currently is being concentrated in mining, including oil; processing of agricultural and fishery products; and land (plantation) ownership. Both Angola and Mozambique have increased their share of the world export market and are benefiting from an expanded infra-structure, including hydroelectric and irrigation projects. Reforms in trade relationships between Portugal and the expanding colonies are too recent for analysis, but there is conflict over the lack of free convertibility in currencies and also budgetary deficit problems.

LAND POLICY AND USE

Some 90 per cent of the Angolan and Mozambican people still live on the land and try to make their living from it. Thus land policy is closer to the life and livelihood of the people than any other.

Portuguese land policy is one of actively promoting European settlement in the colonies through land concessions and settlement schemes. This is part of a plan for better utilization of land by the total population, but, even more important, for the strengthening of European control. Approximately 12,000 settlers enter Angola annually, and a lesser number Mozambique, but European colonization is growing in both countries. Poverty in Portugal is a strong inducement.

Land policy favors the settler to the extent that in Angola average land acreage occupied by Europeans is 60 times that by Africans; 550 European plantations produce 75 percent of Angolan coffee, the major export crop.

Africans have no representation on the plenary councils of the provincial settlement boards which advise on matters of land settlement and rural reorganization. The latest administrative moves include expensive settlement projects for Portuguese peasants (i.e. in the Mozambique Limpopo Valley) and inducements for Portuguese soldiers to settle in the colonies for economic and defense purposes. South African farmers, too, are settling in Mozambique.

The administration is also forcibly relocating the people in *regedorias*, African land reserves. Ostensibly, the resettlement provides opportunity for medical, educational, and technical assistance to Africans. But the relocations, often regimented, barrack-like villages, also make possible easier administrative and military control of the people. Although in some cases Africans if registered under Portuguese civil law may own land, the *regedorias* are communal areas; Africans who live outside of them are subject to removal from their land if it is not cultivated for two years.

The difference between European and African agricultural settlements is deeply discriminatory, at least in Mozambique. A *Colono* is considered a European-type of settlement and the farmer is granted 125 acres of land together with technical and financial aid, in the *ordenamento*, the African-type settlement, the farmer is allotted 25 acres. Gross annual returns on these projects average \$16,200 per settler family in the *Colono*; \$600—one thirtieth as much—in the *ordenamento*. Theoretically, an *ordenamento* farmer who proves his skills may join a *colono*, but his starting handicap is enormous.

LABOR

Recent reforms have modified the traditional system of forced labor in the colonies that differed little from slavery. But administrative control and coercion still force African men to provide labor for colonialists' agricultural, mining, and public works schemes without any say in what their wages

and working conditions will be. In 1958, Marvin Harris wrote in reference to Mozambique:

"All that is necessary for (this) system to function is for the administrator to have the power to indict the Africans as malingerers without having to prove it in a court of law. Under existing laws, natives so accused are faced with the alternative of being conscripted for public works or of "voluntarily" signing a contract with private employers. These laws indirectly equip the administrator with almost complete discretionary power over the Africans' mode of employment."

The extent of pressure exerted is revealed indirectly by statistics showing that less than 10 per cent of the male population live and remain at home throughout the year. This, in turn, has potential for the loss of unworked land, discussed above.

Wages. The absence of trade unionism or even minimal civil liberties means that African workers have no protection from coercion and wages are abnormally low. Only random figures are available: the average unskilled migrant worker in Angola earns \$22.70 per month, \$10 of which is given to him "in kind;" while non-migrant unskilled workers receive \$23.00 per month. A skilled worker may earn up to \$116 a month, although the minimum subsistence income needs for a family of five in a city such as Luanda are more than \$200 per month. The average daily wage of agricultural workers in Mozambique is 18 cents a day, and estimated earnings of Mozambican cotton workers are less than \$30 per year.

The low wages of Africans depress the per capita annual income to an estimated \$97 to \$143. On the other hand, improvement in wage scales (at least compared to Portuguese home wages) is one of the attractions used to spur European migration. Although racial breakdowns in the wage schedules are not published, it is clear that in general European workers receive up to three times the wages of Africans.

The European profit from low African incomes can be seen also in price differentials. Annual per capita income for independent coffee farmers in Angola is \$42 and their coffee sells in rural markets at \$175 a ton. The export price paid to the European exporter is \$630 a ton.

Migrant Labor. The exploitation of Mozambique labor at home has made Mozambican workers a good recruitment source for the mining industry in South Africa, where one third of the total work force is now Mozambican. The workers are recruited by labor associations representing South African mines. In southern Mozambique, the primary recruiter is the Witwatersrand Native Labor Association (on whose Board sits the American financier, Charles W. Engelhard).

As an average, 100,000 Mozambicans are recruited annually for a maximum 18-month period, and the contract seems rather to be with the Portuguese government than with the men themselves. The Portuguese collect a service charge of approximately \$5.25 per laborer, and Portugal is allowed to maintain taxation collection posts in South Africa. Half of the workers' wages are returned by the employers to Mozambique to be paid only when the recruits return home. As part of the current contract, South Africa agreed to use the Mozambican port of Lorenzo Marques as the import facility for half of the goods coming into the Transvaal region of South Africa.

Workers from Mozambique also enter South Africa for other work, sometimes illegally, and additional workers go to adjacent countries. An estimated 300,000 leave the country annually as migrant workers.

Social Services. Very little is recorded on the general social services (health, pensions, insurance) provided to Africans, but in the most developed territory of Angola life expectancy is only 28 to 35 years, while one out of every three children dies at birth.

EDUCATION

The Portuguese maintain that there is no racial discrimination in education, and no racial breakdown on student population is available. It would, however, be fair to say that rural schools are almost completely African while urban schools vary from African through integrated to wholly white. At the more advanced levels of secondary schools, there are progressively fewer Africans. The 1965 statistics given below refer to school population, the number in schools, and not to the full population of school age.

	Angola	Mozambique	Guinea (1964)
Rural primary (1st 3 years).....	118,372	373,912	1,376
Percent of total school enrollment.....	45	75	-----
Full primary (1st 5 years).....	106,773	68,153	11,684
Percent of total school enrollment.....	43	20	-----
Secondary (academic, technical).....	27,797	24,887	787
Percent of total school enrollment.....	10.6	4.4	-----

Present emphasis is on technical education and the growth of rural primary schools. This may mean that more children will have three years' elementary schooling; but adults with five years of schooling and less are usually classified as functional illiterates. At present it is estimated that more than 90 per cent of the people are illiterate; these figures indicate that the illiteracy rate will not drop below 90 per cent.

THE WARS OF LIBERATION

Open fighting between Portuguese troops and African nationalist forces has been continuous in Angola since 1961. Three major nationalist political groups are involved: the Revolutionary Government of Angola in Exile-National Front for the Liberation of Angola (GRAE-FNLA), with headquarters in Kinshasa, Congo; the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) with headquarters in Brazzaville, Congo; and the National Union for Total Independence of Angola (UNITA). In Mozambique, two major parties exist, the Mozambique Liberation Front (FRELIMO) and the Mozambique Revolutionary Committee (COREMO). Fighting by Frelimo began in northern Mozambique in September, 1964; three provinces are now under siege. In Guinea, half of the country is controlled by the forces of the African Party for the Independence of Guinea and the Cape Verde Islands (PAIGC).

In all three countries, as nationalist organization and military effectiveness have increased, economic, social, and political institutions are being established by the populations living in areas no longer under Portuguese domination.

The Portuguese Response. The costly struggle on widely scattered fronts is a severe strain which Portugal could not bear without help from other nations. In 1967, military expenditures accounted for 45 per cent of her national budget. Troops in the African territories are estimated at between 130 and 150,000 and to maintain them a new military service law in 1967 expanded both eligibility criteria and length of service.

The presence of South African troops has already been reported in Mozambique, and South African equipment in Angola. It is obvious from the South African press that South Africa considers defense of white minority rule throughout southern Africa (including Rhodesia as well as the Portuguese colonies) as an integral part of her own self defense.

NATO. However, throughout the years, the bulk of the support for Portugal has come from her allies in NATO, and partic-

ularly from France and West Germany. Portugal was invited to join NATO in 1949 by the United States, despite NATO's founding "on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law."

The present Commander of Allied Forces in Europe, Lyman Lemnitzer, defended the alliance on May 8, 1963: "Portuguese soldiers, while fighting for the defense of principles, are defending land, raw materials, and bases, which are indispensable not only for the defense of Europe but for the whole Western world." Recently Portuguese officials have pressed NATO to extend its official sphere to include the southern Atlantic and Indian Ocean areas. African nationalists who are engaged in a difficult struggle against the Portuguese quite naturally identify NATO with the Portuguese enemy.

Portugal's direct gains from NATO membership, other than ideological support, are: an annual military review which makes recommendations for the improvement of military forces; information from planning committees in the fields of petroleum, coal and steel, and agricultural and industrial materials; and officer training at the NATO Defense College.

The United States. In addition to undetermined amounts and kinds of NATO contribution to Portugal's defense, military relations are conducted on a bilateral level. For the United States the use of the Portuguese Azores as a military base is deemed the most significant security interest. This agreement, after the termination of the contract in 1962, is based on ad hoc Portuguese consent. The U.S. also maintains a permanent military mission in Portugal and military and naval officials have been cited as accompanying Portuguese officials on tours of the African territories. Under the U.S. Military Assistance Program, Portugal received before 1960 \$300 million worth of military equipment, although after 1961 this amount has been substantially reduced to less than \$5 million per year. The U.S. has also lent \$15 million for the building of three naval escort destroyers, and in 1967 renewed the loan of two such ships to Portugal with the stipulation that they not be used south of the Tropic of Cancer.

But ambiguity still surrounds the extent of American military aid. In 1965 a group of international arms salesmen and pilots were indicted in the U.S. for exporting, without a license, seven Douglas B-26 Invader Bombers to Portugal. The aircraft, part of a total Portuguese order of 20, were flown from the U.S. through Canada to Portugal. The defendants in the case claimed to be working under the protection of the Central Intelligence Agency, and although the C.I.A. denied involvement, the men were never convicted. Other more indirect sales of American armaments occur through sub-contracting by American aircraft corporations, with the ultimate sale of American equipment to Portugal.

The United States insists that all such military aid which is officially directed to Portugal is used only to bolster mutual security interests in the Atlantic, while material cannot be used for Portugal's African wars and control is maintained over certain types of private sales as well. Although Portugal is openly receiving more naval and aircraft from European allies, it is undeniably that any military aid to the Portuguese regime or to its NATO partners supports the overall strengthening of the military and thus the reallocation of resources to the major African battlefield.

UNITED NATIONS ACTION

In 1960, the General Assembly declared that Portugal's colonies were under the jurisdiction of the U.N. Charter, and requested that Portugal report to the Secretary General about her non-self-governing territories.

Portugal refused, stating that the territories were a domestic concern. In 1961, the General Assembly established a sub-committee to examine conditions in Angola after the war began there. Following a year-long study, it called upon Portugal to cease its war of repression and to transfer power to the Angolan people.

In 1963 and 1965, the Security Council, recognizing the right of the territories to independence, called on all nations to refrain from offering any assistance, including arms supplies, which would enable Portugal to continue suppressing the people of the territories. The General Assembly, in 1965, asked all nations to break off trade and diplomatic relations with Portugal. On all of these resolutions, the United States abstained.

In 1966, the U.N. Special Committee of 24 on Decolonization called for the sanctions of the 1965 resolution to be made obligatory for all member states. Due in part to United States opposition, the General Assembly did not take that action. The Assembly has continued to call for an end to military, financial and other aid to Portugal, and has recently added a call for moral and material assistance to the African people. Representatives of the Republic of the Congo, Senegal, Zambia, Tanzania, and Guinea have submitted complaints to the U.N. about Portuguese military actions taken against their countries. In addition agencies of the United Nations are involved in the care of hundreds of thousands of African refugees from the territories.

U.S. INVOLVEMENT

The United States' primary concern in relations with Portugal has been for the strategic value of the Azores base and the Portuguese role in European defense. But there are growing economic reasons for U.S. interest in a stable Portugal and continued Portuguese control over African territories.

Trade. The United States is Portugal's third largest trading partner, taking 9-10 per cent of Portuguese exports worth \$68 million, and providing a comparable amount of her imports. The U.S. is also Portugal's third largest source of income-producing tourism. The U.S. takes 26 per cent of Angola's exports, valued at \$57 million (1965-66), and provides 9 per cent of her imports, including wheat, automobile parts, machinery, worth \$21 million. One-half to two-thirds of Angola's coffee and more than half her fishmeal go to the United States. In 1965, exports from Mozambique, mainly tea and cashews, to the U.S. were worth \$7.5 million, and imports, \$9 million.

Loans. The Interamerican Capital Corporation of New York has made large loans to Angola and Mozambique for the construction of a textile factory, paper mill, hydroelectric installations, roads, and airports. The Export-Import Bank loaned \$2.5 million, guaranteed by the Portuguese Government, to the Companhia Mineira de Lobito e Sociedade Mineira do Lombigo to purchase 30 American-made diesel locomotives for the transport of Angolan iron ore; and more than \$5.5 million has been loaned to the Portuguese Government since 1961. The Bank of America is involved in the financing of the large hydroelectric dam project, the Cabora Bassa, in northwest Mozambique, and brokers Dillon Read and Company have arranged a number of American-backed loans to Portugal.

Investment. Since Portugal relaxed foreign investment regulations in 1965, major U.S. companies have invested in the African territories. Allis Chalmers has nine branches in Angola and has contracted for the processing of iron concentrates. Firestone plans to invest \$5 million in a Mozambique factory. General Tire and Rubber Company holds stock in an Angolan manufacturing firm. Standard Electric of Portugal, a U.S. subsidiary, will manufacture telecommunications electrical parts in Luanda, Angola. Pfizer

Laboratories and Singer Sewing Machines have branches in the territories, and Anglo-American Corporation, through its South African company with American capital, holds growing interests in Angolan fisheries, a cashew business in Mozambique, and mineral prospecting in Angola (copper) and Mozambique (iron). An American businessman sits on the Board of Directors of the Angola Diamond Company (DIAMANG) the largest employer in Angola. This Board receives net profits four times the amount of the official wages paid in cash to the more than 25,000 workers.

Oil Companies. More important than these for both financial and strategic reasons is the involvement of American oil corporations. The major company is the Gulf subsidiary, Cabinda Gulf Oil Company, which has had an exclusive concession from the Portuguese Government for exploration off the Cabinda enclave since 1957. At a cost of \$125 million, a rich strike was finally made in 1966. Angola will receive 50 per cent of the profits, providing Portugal with much needed revenue of \$10 to \$20 million a year. By 1970 Portugal will be self-sufficient in oil and, in fact, an exporter. If production aims are met, Angola will be the fourth largest oil producer in the world, and of strategic importance to the entire economic system of southern Africa, especially industrialized South Africa which is still exploring for oil off her own coast. The oil discovery has spurred government rural reorganization of Africans in Cabinda and strengthened defense arrangements to prevent attacks against the oil installations. Recently Diversa of Dallas received a 20 thousand square mile diamond and oil concession in Angola. Mobil Oil and Texaco companies act as distributors of fuels and lubricants in Angola.

In Mozambique, the Mozambique Gulf Oil Company, a subsidiary of Gulf Oil and Pan American International Oil Company, discovered butane gas deposits off the coast, and a gas line is being built to supply the Transvaal area of South Africa. Other U.S. firms with oil exploration concessions include Hunt International Petroleum Company, Sunray Mozambique Oil Company, Clark Mozambique Oil Company, Skelley Mozambique Oil Company, and in northern Mozambique, Texaco. Caltex and Mobil distribute oil products in Mozambique.

In Guinea, Standard Oil of New Jersey, through Esso Exploration, Inc., has a sixty-year petroleum concession and has thus far invested more than \$8 million.

These corporations not only provide Portugal with tax returns but also contribute to a special tax established in 1965 for corporations whose annual profits reach \$16,000 or more. Other corporations have made contributions to Volunteer Corps in Angola.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

In effect, the United States is at present supporting Portugal in its attempt to maintain an African empire despite the rebellion of its subjects in every area and the opposition of most of the world. The U.S. is allied militarily with Portugal; its economic interests in the African territories are growing; and its influence has already prevented meaningful United Nations action to aid the nationalist struggles for freedom.

We urge the reversal of this policy:

1. The strategic necessity of the Azores base is doubtful, in view of long range aircraft and missile development. Nor is it certain that Portugal would insist on U.S. evacuation of the base in reprisal for anti-colonial actions by the U.S. In any case, the U.S. loses more than it gains from the base and the military alliance if the price is alignment with colonialism in Africa, for colonialism is doomed.

The alliance with Portugal should be ended and the Azores base relinquished.

2. United States trade, loans, and invest-

ment in the Portuguese African territories should be discouraged before the stake of U.S. business grows larger. It might be pointed out as a matter of self-interest that, aside from the moral question of support for colonialism and the danger of wars spreading, these businesses are involving themselves in a losing cause.

3. Without military and economic pressures to aid Portugal, it should be easier for the United States to support the recommendations of the U.N. Decolonization Committee for sanctions against Portugal and aid to the freedom movements, and the U.S. should do so.

4. Private as well as government action is needed. Investors should make certain that their own funds are not used by banks and companies that do business in the Portuguese territories. Private and public influence should be brought to bear on such institutions to disengage.

A variety of ways are open for direct support to the nationalist movements that are struggling for freedom. They need funds for schools, medical clinics, their organizational apparatus and their armed forces. One way to reach them is through the Defense and Aid Fund of the American Committee on Africa, which can also supply further information, if desired.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Area Handbook for Angola, U.S. Government Printing Office (Washington, 1967).

Chilcote, Ronald H., Portuguese Africa, Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Duffy, James, Portugal in Africa, Penguin African Library, 1963.

Harris, Marvin, Portugal's African "Wards", American Committee on Africa, 1958.

Portuguese and Colonial Bulletin, London, Vols. 7 and 8, 1967, 1968.

"Three Revolutions: Angola, Mozambique, Portuguese Guinea," Africa Report (November, 1967).

United Nations, General Assembly, "Territories under Portuguese Administration" A/7200/Add 3, 17 October, 1968.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION EXPLOITS ITS TRUST

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, April 20—page 12531—I called to the attention of this body the highly controversial activities of the American Council on Education, in exploiting its academic confidences.

At that time I related that the answers to the college entrance questionnaires, completed by most of our students seeking college admission were "safeguarded" by storage in an undisclosed foreign country. The identity of this Nation, which the American Council on Education feels more trustworthy than the United States, leaves much to conjecture as well as objective. Could it be Britain, Yugoslavia, Sweden, or Russia? Nobody knows but ACE.

Now the ACE experts have further diverted their attention from curriculum and educational endeavors. Their research chief, Alexander W. Astin, utilizes the power of suggestion to enhance more violence on college campuses while its special committee on campus tensions, headed by Sol M. Linowitz, blames Vice

President AGNEW and Governor Reagan for campus unrest and tension, if not violence.

Who is going to tell the American people what Nation's intelligence banks "safeguard" the confidential key, compiled by ACE, and who on our campuses are sympathetic with violence?

I insert several news clippings, as follow:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 12, 1970]

CAMPUS PROTESTS SHOW NO SIGN OF DECLINING

(By Eric Wentworth)

Contrary to official expectations, there have been at least as many campus protests this year as last.

Uprohavs struck campuses from Quinnipiac College in Connecticut to the University of Arizona.

The first weeks of spring have brought a seasonal upsurge in rallies, demands and vandalism. Some of last year's prime battlegrounds are already back in the news: Cornell, Harvard and Columbia, for example.

But tallies by two research teams show the volume of protest actions was surprisingly heavy even before the current post-vacation outbreaks.

Alexander W. Astin, research chief for the American Council on Education, reports one or more incidents at 155 of 195 campuses that his team surveyed from last September through February.

Astin's figures include 175 protests against the college or university itself on 84 of these campuses, plus 260 protests involving the Vietnam Moratorium, antipollution, the "Chicago Seven" trial or other off campus issues on a total of 141.

The Chicago-based Urban Research Corp. reports its latest boxscore shows at least one protest on more than 90 campuses from Jan. 15 to April 1, or just as many as during the same period last year.

Neither group has kept tabs on the suspicious fires in ROTC offices and other campus vandalism that could not be linked directly to student demonstrations. But Astin reports that his September-February survey shows demonstrations leading to property damage in 14 cases, physical violence in 18 and one or more arrests in 24.

These figures together give the lie to the cautious optimism for a quiet year voiced by certain Nixon administration officials before classes began last fall. They also belie the assumption that campuses by and large have been relatively calm so far this year.

One reason for this assumption may be a tendency among newspapers, magazines and broadcasters to give campus protests less exposure, especially with high school uprisings vying for the limelight.

A well-placed source confides that some of the same university administrators who last year complained that press and television were giving campus protests too much attention now mutter about "suppression" of such news.

From the academic authorities' standpoint, one benefit of less public attention has been the virtual silencing of last year's congressional outcry for antiprotest laws.

But Rep. (Blank) warns that campus unrest is "a dormant issue, not a dead issue" on Capitol Hill. "The issue will come back sure as shooting," he adds, if a new wave of demonstrations this spring stirs public opinion just as Congress is at work on a major new higher-education bill.

Astin and Urban Research's president John Naisbitt, among others, fear just such a wave is on its way. "I think everything points to that," Naisbitt says.

A new round of anti-war protests this coming week could offer the occasion for major demonstrations on or near some campuses.

The Boston area may be one trouble spot.

Harvard radicals harassed a committee of prominent visitors at that university's Center for International Affairs this past Thursday, and have talked of a building occupation this spring.

At Massachusetts Institute of Technology, which saw repeated demonstrations earlier this academic year, one highly placed source familiar with student moods reports "a calm that is even more worrisome." It reflects, he explains, a deep sense of frustration.

Many causes that student protestors have been espousing have a familiar ring.

Of the 175 anti-institution protests Astin reports from September through February, 62 were "war-related" against such targets as ROTC, research for the Pentagon, and recruiting by the military services for defense contractors such as General Electric Co. (A GE official reports company recruiters this year visited 400 campuses, and encountered protests on about 30—most of them orderly.)

Another 42 incidents, according to Astin's survey, involved black students' demands for black studies programs, more black faculty members, admission of more black students, and the like. At Yale, blacks blocked a showing of "Tarzan the Ape Man" in March, calling the film "racist."

In the West, athletic ties with Brigham Young University touched off protests at several major universities, including Arizona, New Mexico, Washington and Wyoming because of the Mormon Church's ban on admitting blacks to priesthood.

The Mormon university responded in late March with full-page newspaper ads asserting the belief that "all men are brothers" and suggesting "the time will come" when blacks can become priests.

The other 71 anti-institution protests in Astin's tally mostly involved familiar issues of university governance (a greater student voice in policy-making), campus social rules, course requirements, tuition increases and the hiring or firing of professors.

Locally, 87 were arrested at the University of Maryland last month after a building occupation to protest the philosophy department's denial of tenure to two assistant professors.

This past week, 181 students at predominantly-black Maryland State College on the Eastern Shore were arrested after demonstrations demanding an audience with President John Williams to discuss grievances.

Preserving the environment has become a lively issue among thousands of college students as well as adults, with a wide array of demonstrations planned for "Earth Day" on April 22. By and large, however, blacks and white radicals have tended to steer clear of this movement or try to divert it to their own concerns.

"Most of the blacks and chicanos see it as a cop-out," Naisbitt observes. He refers to an incident at San Jose State College in California, where students gained nationwide attention in February by burying a new automobile to protest smog. Less noticed was a counter-protest by 75 blacks and chicanos, who according to Urban Research carried signs reading "Don't Bury the Car" and "Ecology Is Not the Issue."

Many of the protests so far this year have come on campuses already battlescarred from previous confrontations from the mammoth Universities of Michigan and Wisconsin to tiny Voorhees College in Denmark, S.C.

But Urban Research, in a closer look at protests on 65 campuses from mid-January through early March, found roughly half occurred at previously tranquil institutions.

Like the urban riots that spread from Los Angeles, Newark and Detroit to smaller cities, campus protests have been cropping up at obscure private colleges, two-year community colleges and even seminaries. (Fifty-two students at St. Thomas the Apostle Major Seminary in the state of Washington, according

to Urban Research, called for a boycott to protest suspension of one student because of "scandalous" publicity when he visited a tavern to recruit entertainers for a rock show at the state reformatory.)

Quinnipiac College in Connecticut, an independent school with roughly 2,000 students near New Haven, is another example of this trend.

At previously quiet Quinnipiac, a college spokesman related, students staged a one-day, round-the-clock sit-in in the campus library last month while leaders negotiated a list of 16 demands with college trustees and administrators. As many as 267 slept in the library during the non-disruptive demonstration.

The students left voluntarily after resolving a number of issues, which generally concerned such matters as voting seats on the board of trustees, curriculum reform, and tuition rates.

Meanwhile, the National Student Association has been extending legal advice to restless students on such diverse campuses as Emmanuel College in Boston, Augustana College in Rock Island, Ill., Calvin College in Grand Rapids, Mich., and Fisk University in Nashville, Tenn.

One prominent educator, a veteran of campus uprisings, believes protests will be a fact of life in American higher education for many years to come. He compares it to the labor movement: People warned of a revolution at first, but have learned to live with recurring strikes.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 26, 1970]

AGNEW HELD FANNING UNREST—CAMPUS REPORT ALSO HITS LEGISLATIVE ACTION

(By Eric Wentworth)

A committee studying campus unrest warns that "political exploitation of campus problems by some public figures" has become one of the factors dividing academic communities.

Sol M. Linowitz, chairman of the American Council on Education's Special Committee on Campus Tensions, told questioning reporters at a briefing that these public figures include Vice President Spiro T. Agnew and California Gov. Ronald Reagan.

"The Vice President's remarks have not been helpful," said Linowitz, who was President Johnson's envoy to the Organization of American States. He said students repeatedly mentioned Agnew's suggestion . . . that all student protesters can be tarred with the same brush—an evident reference to the Vice President's "impudent snobs" speech last October.

"Public officials and others having the public's attention," the special panel said in its report released today, "should gauge their responses 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."

This was but one of scores of findings and recommendations by the 18-member committee, which also included university presidents and professors, student leaders, a trustee, publisher Bill D. Moyers of Newsday (a former press secretary to President Johnson) and executive director Whitney Young of the National Urban League.

The ACE announced plans to set up the committee last June to show, among other things, that the academic establishment could cope with campus problems itself without needing anti-unrest measures pending in Congress and state legislatures.

"Efforts to politicize colleges and universities risk public reprisals, with consequent restrictions on free inquiry," the panel said in today's report. "Legislative moves in this direction, at both state and federal levels, are already deeply disturbing."

The 79-page report represents the most comprehensive effort to date to catalogue the causes and symptoms of campus tensions and suggest possible remedies. All members gave the report their "general support"—a fact that helps explain the broad-brush nature of its recommendations.

It coincides with a growing round of campus protests, peaceful and in some cases violent, around the country. "The arrival of spring," the committee noted, "signalled disruption that may, in total, surpass that of the record year, 1968-69."

The problem in America, the panel said, is "far less severe" than in some countries. But behind the data on demonstrations the group found a "deeper crisis: confusion and uncertainty about the proper direction of change in higher education."

In listing the main sources of student unrest, the committee covered largely familiar ground. Complaints ranged from institutional indifference to institutional racism.

"The war in Vietnam and the draft system, in concert," the committee said, "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."

At another point, it observed, "avoidance of the military draft all too often is a factor in a student's decision to attend or to remain in college."

The report found campus tensions in almost every cranny of the academic community, but said these are "not necessarily harmful . . . it is the responses to tension that lead to constructive or destructive outcomes."

At the Friday briefing, Linowitz agreed that the panel's recommendations tended to be general and often obvious. They ranged from giving students a voice in policy-making and rewarding professors who teach well, to broader representation on trustee boards and in improving campus communications channels. They stressed the need for fairness, due process and mutual respect.

The committee chairman said, however, that these self-evident truths are being neglected or misunderstood on many campuses today.

The committee appeared at odds with Vice President Agnew in recommending "novel admission practices" at some institutions. Agnew has criticized quotas and open admissions policies, which Linowitz said this recommendation would include.

One of the report's more controversial recommendations called for a review of policies on faculty tenure—the job security a person enjoys once he has proved his competence. The basic defense for tenure is that it protects a professor's "academic freedom" to espouse unpopular views.

The committee said, however, that tenure has come to provide job security in the trade union sense as well, and "sometimes has been a shield for indifference and neglect of scholarly duties."

POSTAL REFORM

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service began executive sessions this morning on the new postal reform bill submitted to Congress by the administration.

Our committee has been working actively on postal reform for more than a year. Indeed, it was a year ago last Wednesday—April 22, 1969—that we be-

gan open hearings on postal reform legislation. I had introduced comprehensive postal reform legislation—H.R. 4—more than 3 months earlier on the opening day of the 91st Congress.

On the day that the administration sent the President's message and its new reform bill to Congress—April 16—I introduced the bill in the House and announced that public hearings would begin the following Wednesday, April 22.

We had held 35 days of public hearings last spring and summer on this subject and the 3 additional days of hearings completed yesterday were restricted to the new factors in the reform issue as a result of the negotiations downtown.

Those hearings ran until after 6 p.m. last evening in order to give the parties full opportunity to express their views.

COMMITTEE GOOD FAITH CLEAR

The good faith of our committee is clear. We have moved once again in a very prompt manner to deal with the very controversial issue of postal reform which now has been linked, unfortunately, with immediate employee benefits. These immediate employee matters probably should be handled separately.

I want to take exception to the untimely remarks yesterday of the Postmaster General—as reported in the press—on the matter of postal reform in an appearance at the National Press Club.

The General has been a vigorous and adamant advocate of his views on postal reform. I cannot quarrel with his basic desires. But I do raise question about the propriety of some of his remarks.

All of us in this House are well aware of the crisis that developed in the Post Office Department last month with the shutdown of operations in several areas. The bill we now have before us results from the unique downtown negotiations which were initiated after the mail stoppage.

THE GENERAL'S WARNING

Now, the General is warning of a new stoppage unless we in Congress act in haste on postal reform. His desire for action is understandable, but his threat is no asset.

My position on the need and desire for postal reform is clear. So, I believe, is the sincere concern of our committee.

The administration blamed last month's mail crisis on the failure of Congress to act earlier on postal reform. Now, the Postmaster General is raising the prospect that we face another crisis unless we railroad his postal reform bill unchanged through the Congress in the next few days.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Postmaster General is overzealous in his postal reform efforts.

It is a matter of fundamental fact that even if postal reform legislation had been passed into law last year—when I was trying very hard to hammer out a bill—it still would not have prevented last month's crisis.

HASTY ACTION NO SOLUTION

Nor would hasty action on postal reform itself by Congress at this time make any immediate changes in the situation.

What the General is referring to, of

course, is his mandated proviso in his so-called package that an additional pay raise and other employee benefits are contingent upon approval of the administration's version of postal reform.

I recognize the needs of the postal employees and I have right along. Our committee and the House recognized this need last October with the passage of H.R. 13000, which the President threatened to veto.

The crux of the employee problem is separate from the overall matter of postal reform. To combine them in one package and put a gun at the head of Congress to act is hardly the sensible and responsible way to accomplish meaningful reform.

COMMITTEE PROCEEDS IN ORDER

For the administration to persist in putting a gun at the head of Congress and promoting crisis talk is irresponsibility of the first order.

Our committee is proceeding in an expeditious, but orderly, fashion. We could not defend before the American people any different approach.

There are honest differences of views and these must be given reasonable consideration. I hope and expect our committee to act promptly—but responsibly.

We can use some similar support from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

EXPULSION FOR CAUSE—A NEEDED UNIVERSITY POLICY

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the disgusting performance by some students at Harvard University on April 15, 1970, is dismayingly reported by another Harvard student in William Buckley's column in the Washington Star of April 27. To gain perspective of what is involved in terms of long-range planning this report should be read with care.

Students who deliberately break college regulations—students who deliberately destroy property or assault police or assist others in doing so—should be expelled forthwith. It should be made clear to them as they enroll that this will be done without exception by college administrators.

Why this has not been the policy, at other than a few institutions, is hard to understand.

The article follows:

RIOTS WILT THE CHILDREN'S FLOWERS

(By William F. Buckley Jr.)

I turn this column over to a sophomore at Harvard, Mr. Laurence T. May, who writes about the events in Cambridge on April 15. . . .

Dear Mr. Buckley: You probably read the piece in the New York Times concerning the riot in Harvard Square last Wednesday. The article was a bit brief for an event described by the commissioner of public safety as "the worst civil disturbance in the history of the state." I was there for a lot of the action and will agree with the statement.

The mob was the most ugly I have ever seen. The ferocity, the determination, the hatred they felt for the police was frightening. People who think that these kids are only frustrated youths, upset about the war or whatever, have no conception of what they are really dealing with in situations like this riot.

I don't think I'm at all astray if I say that what I witnessed was nothing more than the collective expression of the criminal mind.

These kids were, a lot of them anyway, on drugs. I have never seen groups of "kids" quite as literally mad as I saw Wednesday. They were shrieking, chanting, yelling; the ones with painted faces added to the barbaric imitations.

The defiance was unmatched; even in prison where you would expect a hell of a lot more frustration than what is caused by a war 5,000 miles away, the inmates would not repeatedly return, repeatedly club cops, repeatedly throw wine bottles or whatever. Convicts at least exhibit some cunning in riots; the Harvard riots had none of that, unless you count the attempts by professionals to firebomb buildings. Imagine if you can, kids so passionate as to run through clouds of tear gas to hurl cobblestones at retreating police.

The mob arrived in Harvard Square at 7 p.m., there being four officers on duty there. One officer tried to "reason" with the group near him and they simply laughed in his face shouting "pig" and obscenities.

By 7:30 Cambridge police were lined up behind the "MBTA" Kiosk. Above them, on the wall surrounding Harvard Yard, ten feet off the ground, were at least 150 "street-people." The rioters threw rocks, bottles, boards, bricks . . . you name it . . . down onto the police who simply stood in rank. Down went one cop, hit by a brick, down went another. Still they didn't move from ranks.

Behind the wall, Harvard University police moved to clear the kids off. Incredibly, a senior tutor and an assistant Dean of the College told the university police to leave the kids alone: "We don't want any trouble. Don't start a riot." This while a full riot was in progress.

The incident has caused understandable friction between university and city police. A university cop told me last night that he is afraid that if they need assistance from Cambridge police some day, it will not be given quickly.

Harvard students generally abstained from actual rioting, though there were a number of identified exceptions. Mostly, they were just stupid: Stupid not to stay off the streets, so they got clubbed or gassed or obstructed police.

The rioters were mostly those the press rather charitably called "hippies"—the drop-outs, the long-haired welfare recipients, the panhandlers, the druggies, and the ubiquitous professionals.

George Wald, Harvard's Nobel-winning flower child, was of course in the middle of things. He actually went up to policemen in the streets, demanded that they stop, demanded that they "use reason" with the kids. While he was so engaged, a kid hit a cop with a baseball bat painted black (doesn't show up at night, nor in news photos usually). Wald, by the way, says he fears "lower-class Catholics becoming outraged." Imagine if I told him I feared middle-class Jews rioting in the streets!

The next target is New Haven on May 1st. Unless the Panthers are freed and \$10,000,000 indemnity paid to their party, the "political dissenters" say they'll destroy the city.

Do you think there are Communists involved? My fellow students don't, even when the Communists say they're Communists! You see, the riot was caused by the frustrations of the kids in the Harvard ghetto.

Perhaps we'll have a federally sponsored

summer program soon, or a swimming pool in Harvard Yard.

Better, a Head Start course for Harvard students.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, more than 25,000 residents of the 18th Congressional District of Michigan have replied to my 1970 questionnaire on important national issues. It was one of the most enthusiastic responses ever to this annual program. Their views on Vietnam, welfare, 18-year-old voting, drugs, and Government spending offer an interesting look at the directions in which some Americans would like to see our country move. May I call the attention of my colleagues to the following tabulation of questionnaire replies and summary letter which was sent to President Nixon:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to inform you of the results of my 1970 Congressional Questionnaire program. More than 25,000 residents of the 18th Congressional District in Oakland County, Michigan, took the time and trouble to respond—one of the most enthusiastic returns ever to this annual program.

In addition, Mr. President, high school seniors throughout my District were invited to participate. I thought it would provide a method for them to make their views known at a time when so many young people urgently need a sense of participation. Nearly 3,400 seniors replied. Their opinions are also summarized in the enclosed tabulation and provide an interesting comparison with the replies of adults.

A majority of both adults and teenagers agreed in their support for gradual withdrawal of troops from Vietnam and Vietnamization of the war. But one-quarter of those who replied called for immediate and complete U.S. withdrawal, many of them underscoring their concern in personal letters. Nearly 20 percent said they favored increased military action in an effort to end the war.

Similarly, both groups urged that less tax dollars be spent on foreign aid, the space program and the military. They agreed more dollars should be allocated for pollution control and crime prevention. Three-fourths of those who replied favor abolishing the Electoral College and replacing it with direct election of the President. A majority endorsed a national primary.

Not surprisingly, 70 percent of the young people urged that the voting age be lowered to 18, while only 32 percent of the adults thought it a good idea. More than half of the students who replied said they favor more spending on education but only 44 percent of the adults indicated agreement.

Revenue sharing, your plan to return a percentage of Federal taxes to states and local governments, was endorsed by 57 percent of the adults but only 21 percent of the young people. Welfare reform got strong backing from 77 percent of the adults but only 44 percent of the teenagers. A majority of both groups agreed on the need for draft reform, linking Social Security benefits to the cost of living, stiffer penalties for drug sellers and cuts in Federal spending to curb inflation.

The opinions of people in my District are important to me. I know you will be as in-

terested as I was in their views on these important national issues.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

[In percent]

	Adults	Students
Vietnam: Do you favor—		
Increased military action in an effort to end the war.....	19	12
Gradual withdrawal of U.S. forces and Vietnamization of the war.....	54	61
Immediate and complete U.S. withdrawal.....	24	26
Which new national policies would you favor?		
(a) Draft: Additional reforms including the establishment of an all volunteer army after Vietnam.....	54	61
(b) Welfare: The President's new plan to make basic changes in the present system with emphasis on the work incentive.....	77	44
(c) Voting age: A constitutional amendment lowering the voting age to 18.....	32	70
(d) Social security: Benefits linked to the cost of living so they would increase automatically in an inflationary period.....	71	56
(e) Inflation: Cuts in Federal programs and spending to balance the budget and slow inflation.....	74	49
(f) Revenue sharing: A return to State and local governments, for use as they see fit, of a percentage of the money now collected in Federal income taxes.....	57	21
(g) Drugs: More flexible legal penalties for possession and sale of marijuana provided sellers are subject to more severe penalties.....	69	52
(h) Electoral college: Abolish it and replace it with direct election of the President.....	77	73
(i) Primary: Establishment of a national primary to nominate candidates for President.....	58	44

	Adults		Students	
	More	Less	More	Less
In which 3 of the following categories would you spend less (more) tax dollars?				
(a) Education.....	44	10	54	27
(b) Foreign aid.....	2	74	4	60
(c) Housing.....	22	10	20	8
(d) Welfare.....	6	38	12	23
(e) Space exploration.....	8	47	10	54
(f) Conservation, natural resources.....	53	6	38	6
(g) Military expenditures.....	6	57	4	64
(h) Crime prevention, control.....	61	5	49	2
(i) Transportation, ground and air.....	14	11	5	30
(j) Pollution abatement.....	65	2	60	2
(k) Health services.....	19	5	17	4
(l) Antipoverty programs.....	14	24	31	8

Source: Tabulated by Data Management, Inc.

POLISH GOVERNMENT IN EXILE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, may I remind the Members that the Polish government in exile continues to function in London on behalf of the oppressed people of Poland as its legitimate and proper voice.

Therefore, I insert into the RECORD at this point, the address of His Excellency August Zaleski, President of the Republic of Poland, on April 11, at the opening of the fourth session of the Council of the

Republic of Poland, a body which functions as a parliament in exile.

The text of President Zaleski's speech follows:

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT IN EXILE OF THE
REPUBLIC OF POLAND

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Council: In opening the fourth session of the Council of the Polish Republic in its present term I have to state at the outset that there has been no improvement in the political situation of our country. Poland is still not an independent state and remains under the domination of Russian imperialism which has forced upon the Polish people an alien Communist system. Throughout the thousand years of her history Poland has given innumerable proofs of her love of freedom and justice which were always the cornerstones of the Polish system of government, until our imperialistic neighbours formed an alliance designed to partition the Polish Commonwealth. The purpose of this alliance was not merely territorial aggrandizement. It aimed at the total destruction of a neighbouring state in whose system of government they saw a threat to their own autocratic systems. And there is no doubt that even today Russian policy towards Poland is motivated by the same two aims.

Russia has made full use of the agreement which our Western allies signed with her, without our knowledge and in contravention of their treaties with us. This agreement, which gave Russia direct possession of the Eastern part of Poland and established in the remaining part an allegedly independent state within the Russian sphere of influence, has in fact given her effective control over the whole of Poland.

No wonder that the Polish people view this political reality with unabated hatred. The recent trials of Polish intellectuals accused of reading emigre periodicals are evidence of this. When young people in Poland read foreign newspapers the regime feels itself threatened and thinks it necessary to put them on trial and send them to prison. This, on the one hand, shows how little support the regime has among the people; on the other, it is evidence of an all-important positive fact: that it has proved impossible to eradicate the Polish aspirations to freedom, to freedom of thought in particular. Poles are faithful to their age-long tradition and are willing to fight for it.

The younger generation in Poland have to cope with other difficulties and anxieties as well. It is difficult for them to find work for which they are qualified. In every walk of life they have to struggle against overwhelming economic difficulties caused by a slavish adoption of foreign economic patterns. We hear that the regime is now trying to overcome these problems by way of some new, as yet unspecified, methods of economic planning. But we know only too well the results of this kind of bureaucratic planning, rigidly tied to an inflexible doctrine and ignorant of the basic drives of human action. Communist planners are unable to concede that their doctrine is by no means universally applicable.

As the capitalism of Marx's time a hundred years ago was found wanting, so the new state economy has also been found wanting. This so-called socialism has shown itself to be not only economically wasteful, squandering human and material resources. It is also a new form of exploitation of the workers which, moreover, cannot function without compulsion and suppression of economic, as well as political and cultural, freedom.

It is true that nowhere in the world has a system been found which would satisfactorily reconcile the age-long aspirations of mankind to social justice and freedom. But it is also true that many democratic coun-

tries of the free West have evolved far better solutions to the problem of an equitable distribution of their wealth and income.

In the international field we also find little reason for comfort.

The concept of spheres of influence evolved in the wake of the last war and the subsequent division of the world into West and East, a world of freedom and un-freedom, a world of private enterprise and state enterprise, has failed to give mankind the security and peace it so ardently desires. The Soviet Union, adopting the well-tried methods of Tsarist diplomacy, has a hand in every conflict and international tangle which abound in the post-war age. Whether it be in the Middle East, in the Arab-Israeli war, or in Vietnam, or on the continents of Africa and Latin America, Russia is now appearing as a champion of nationalism, now as an anti-colonialist power; at one time she is the advocate of the oppressed, at another's defender of peace standing for law and order; often she plays several parts at once. But the real purpose is always the same: an increase of her own power and influence.

To us Poles, it is astonishing that there are so many people in the free world who purport not to see this. Russian politicians managed to mislead many Western statesmen at Tehran and Yalta, and today they are no less successful at misleading credulous politicians and intellectuals of the free world.

The agreements of Yalta of 25 years ago are not binding us Poles, because the Polish Government was not a party to the conference and has not accepted its decisions. These, from the point of view of the Polish people, are invalid. This must be clearly stated now, as it was stated 25 years ago by the Polish Government which was then still a Government fully recognized by the Allies. Nevertheless it remains a fact that the Yalta agreements have sanctioned the influence of Russia over an enormous area with a population of some hundred million. This has led directly to the present situation in which two super-powers, the United States and Soviet Russia, are confronting each other, and to the belief that all other international relations are dependent on the state of that confrontation. There is a great deal of truth in this. Let us not forget, however, that Russia, notwithstanding her size, is not on the same level of development as the United States, whether in the economic or cultural field. There is, of course, fear of Russian aggression. But we are rightly outraged when we find that there are people who consider that the best way of countering Russian aggression is an atomic destruction of Poland. Are they not aware that Russian aggression proceeds along many other avenues? It is no exaggeration to say that wherever in the world there is strife, Russia immediately finds a way to take part in the struggle, either directly, or through arms deliveries, or any way of diplomatic intervention.

It is just 30 years since that tragic year of 1940 when 15,020 Polish officers were murdered in POW camps in Soviet Russia. This terrible crime against Poland and the whole of mankind is one that has still to be tried. We believe, however, that justice will triumph in the end and that the perpetrators of this heinous crime will be punished.

Recalling now this painful anniversary of the Katyn massacre, I call on all those present to rise and honour the memory of all our innocent countrymen who met a martyr's death in Soviet Russia in 1940 by a minute of silence.

The Government will report to the Council on its activities and will present its plans for further action.

I declare the fourth session of the Council of the Polish Republic open and I pray God that He may bestow His blessings on its proceedings.

WATERVLIET ARSENAL AIDS
POLLUTION FIGHT

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, in February of this year, the President of the United States issued an Executive order which expressed grave concern for the environmental pollution that is affecting our country. Subsequent statements by the President pointed to the need to correct air and water pollution by Federal installations.

In my district, industrial operations at the Watervliet Arsenal have historically contributed to the pollution of the Hudson River. However, positive steps were initiated by the Army several years ago to neutralize the contaminated wastes. Construction of a water pollution control plant has recently been completed and will be placed in operation within a few weeks.

The material follows:

WATERVLIET ARSENAL AIDS POLLUTION FIGHT

This action places the arsenal among the first of the Federal and industrial installations in the upper Hudson River Valley to take definite steps to end water pollution. The facilities, involving the most modern waste treatment technology, have been installed at a cost of approximately \$1,700,000.

Watervliet Arsenal started planning for antipollution measures immediately after the State of New York established the pollution control laws. In 1967, Congress approved the project to build the facilities for halting pollution of the Hudson River.

Two waste treatment plants are used to neutralize contaminated water. One facility treats cyanide and is located adjacent to the main heat treat building at the center of the arsenal. The other facility treats all other liquid wastes, except nonsoluble oils, and is located near the southeast corner of the arsenal. Nonsoluble oils are collected separately and hauled away from the post. Future plans call for the construction of an incinerator that will burn oils and solid wastes.

MAIN TREATMENT PLANT

The main treatment facilities are designed to treat a total of 35,000 gallons of waste per day. Two separate pipelines have been installed to collect and carry the wastes from various buildings in the arsenal to the treatment plant. One line carries only cleaning solutions and solutions of soluble oils used in machining operations. The other line, made of corrosion resistant material, is used to carry acid and metal-bearing solutions which come from metal plating operations. Each of these lines discharges to a separate storage tank of sufficient capacity to handle a wide range of production rates.

VERSATILITY

The treatment facilities are completely versatile and can be automated to run on a round-the-clock basis, or can be set to run on a shorter time basis. The facilities will handle a variety of wastes over a wide range of production rates.

A modern control laboratory is used to ensure that proper dosages of treatment chemicals are maintained. In addition, constant surveillance of effluent streams are made to insure that all standards and public health regulations are met or exceeded.

DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION, OPERATION

Design and construction of the plant was accomplished through the New York District, Corps of Engineers. Project criteria, coordination and control of design and construction was the responsibility of the Post Engineer and Engineering Branch of Watervliet Arsenal. Operation of the plant systems is placed in the Utilities Branch of the Post Engineer organization. Consultant services to the arsenal and the District Engineer were provided by Dr. W. W. Shuster, chairman, Department of Environmental Engineering, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.

The treatment facilities were constructed by Thompson Construction Co., Albany. Waste treatment equipment was supplied by the Graver Water Conditioning Co., controls by Robertshaw Control Co.

PROJECT DATA

Types of wastes: Water soluble oils, vapor degreasers, cleaning solutions, chrome plating solutions, lead plating solutions, salt solutions, sodium cyanide, surface treatment, and plating solutions.

Treatment rates: Soluble oils, miscellaneous wastes, 1,000 gallons per hour. Acids, 5,000 gallons per hour. Cyanide, 300 gallons per hour.

Holding tank capacity: Soluble oils, miscellaneous, 6,000 gallons. Acids, 40,000 gallons. Cyanide, 13,000 gallons.

Treatment plant processes: Main plant—Oils: Coagulation and sedimentation. Acids: Neutralization and coagulation of heavy ion metals.

Second plant—Cyanide: Oxidation of cyanides by use of hypochlorite.

Piping: Oil carrying, 6,200 linear feet. Acid carrying—specially lined—4,800 linear feet.

Cost: \$1,700,000.

In observance of this accomplishment, a nationally significant event is planned for May 9 to call attention to the Army's concern and contribution to the battle against pollution.

At this time, I wish to cite particularly the personnel at the arsenal who, under the commandant, Col. William Mulheron, Jr., have completed this important installation in the national interest—a role to which the Watervliet Arsenal is, in fact, of course dedicated.

RONALD MASELKA HONORED

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, last December I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a series of 22 articles on campus unrest which had been written by Ronald J. Maselka of the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News Washington bureau.

I commended those articles at the time as being an excellent interpretation of conditions in colleges and universities in various parts of the country. Mr. Maselka visited 10 campuses and interviewed students, professors, administrators, and others on campus matters.

This year, the American Association of University Professors sponsored for the first time an education writer's award to be given for the best interpretive report on higher education.

Winner of the first award is Mr. Ma-

selka for his series last fall on "College Campus Unrest." He received a plaque at the association's 56th meeting held in Los Angeles last week.

The award is well deserved. Mr. Maselka, an able reporter and writer, offered for his readers an excellent interpretation of the problems on the Nation's campuses. The award is an appropriate recognition for a fine newsman who is a credit to his profession as well as to his newspaper.

NATIVE OF BUFFALO

Mr. Maselka is a native of Buffalo who graduated from Fordham University in 1961 and received a master's degree from the Columbia School of Journalism the following year.

He worked as a general assignment reporter, Federal court reporter, and night city editor of the Buffalo Evening News before being assigned to its Washington bureau in 1968.

The Education Writer's Award is presented by the American Association of University Professors in recognition of outstanding interpretive reporting on higher education in radio, television, film, and printed media.

Entries were judged on objectivity, timeliness, and significance of content to the public.

The American Association of University Professors has over 85,000 members in 1,200 chapters at colleges and universities throughout the United States. Founded in 1915, the AAUP has worked to establish the principles of academic freedom and tenure throughout American higher education.

Mr. Speaker, for reference, the Maselka articles appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 115, part 28, pages 37434, 37453, 37786, and 38059.

RESERVISTS' COMMITTEE TO STOP THE WAR CALLS FOR IMMEDIATE WITHDRAWAL FROM VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, opposition to the war in Vietnam increases daily. Opposition to our involvement in any more Vietnams is close to unanimous. And this opposition has not gone unheard. Responsible and concerned dissent has helped to turn this Nation around on this issue.

Opposition has not been limited to the civilian population. Many within the armed services have expressed, and continue to express, their opposition to the Vietnam war under circumstances certainly not conducive to disagreeing views.

Certainly, one of the prime safeguards against a military attuned solely to its own interests—which may not always converge with those of the public—is disavowal of unthinking, automatic response. This country, committed above all to individual rights, can never accept the premise that the freedom to think and to speak are barred to men and

women in our armed services, who are charged with defending those very rights.

The Reservists Committee To Stop the War, composed of more than 500 Reservists and National Guardsmen throughout the country, is sponsoring a statement calling for total withdrawal from Vietnam.

I am including the text of the statement in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

RESERVISTS AND NATIONAL GUARDSMEN SAY "NO" TO THE WAR

P.O. Box 4398, Berkeley, Calif.

We, the undersigned, are officers and enlisted men of the United States military Reserve forces.

We wear the same uniform as the American troops being killed and maimed every day in Vietnam. We want those soldiers home—alive.

We demand total withdrawal of all our fellow American soldiers from Vietnam now. Not just combat troops, not just ground forces but all troops.

We demand total withdrawal now of all the American soldiers advising the armies of dictatorships throughout Latin America and Asia. We don't want Guatemala, Thailand, or Bolivia to become the Vietnams of the 1970's. One Vietnam is enough; too many people have been killed already to preserve America's overseas empire.

As men who have served in the armed forces, we have seen first hand the dangerously growing power of American militarism. As soldiers and as citizens, we believe we have a special obligation to speak out against it.

RESERVISTS' COMMITTEE TO STOP THE WAR.

ECOLOGY "IMPACT"

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, April 22 marked the observance of Earth Day—a nationwide demonstration indicating man's concern for the earth's natural environment and, indeed, for man's future on this planet.

The Tattler, Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School's newspaper in Bethesda, Md., published a most appropriate and informative "impact" issue on ecology. This newspaper was judged good enough to be reprinted and distributed to 12,000 Montgomery County, Md., schoolchildren.

I am inserting in the RECORD several articles from the Tattler's ecology "impact." I strongly recommend them to all of my colleagues as an excellent example of responsible student journalism. I wish I could insert the issue's fine photographs and drawings, too.

Mr. Speaker, I would especially like to commend the Tattler's editor in chief, Peter A. Dratch, and the entire staff of the B-CC newspaper for a job well done.

The articles follow:

SENATOR GAYLORD NELSON PROPOSES

ECOLOGY DAY

(By Peter Dratch)

"I think of all the problems the world faces—whether it's a matter of hunger, civil rights, or peace—none of these, as serious as they are, are as important as the environ-

mental problem. Because it is a question of survival."

In these words, Wisconsin Senator Gaylord Nelson emphasizes the threat he sees in environmental pollution. He maintains that all other world crises will become irrelevant "unless we make a commitment to save the quality of the environment in which we live."

It was Senator Nelson who conceived and proposed next Wednesday's E-Day. He thought of the idea last fall while traveling from Santa Barbara to make a speech on ecology in Berkeley.

Senator Nelson then proposed his idea to the Senate and set up a national E-Day office. William Proxmire, Wisconsin's senior Senator, praised Nelson's legislation, saying, "In my twelve years in the Senate, I have not heard or read a more important speech."

The E-Day movement has mushroomed even before Senator Nelson's expectations. Over 7,500 high schools and 2,000 colleges will participate in the teach-in.

The Senator is a veteran in the fight for an ecological balance. He has been actively concerned for the past twenty years, all of his political career. Having spoken on the problem on college campuses all over the United States, he says "the interest and concern among students on this issue has been high."

Senator Nelson attacks all types of pollution in all areas of the nation.

Automobile exhaust is one of the most dangerous pollutants in large cities. The Senator points out that in major urban areas "automobiles produce 70, 80, in some places even 90 percent of all air pollution."

Nelson believes that there are already too many cars in this country and attributes our inability to solve the problem to "America's great love affair with the automobile."

"What we need to do is slow up the production of cars, reduce their power," he suggests. "We then must build mass transportation systems—railroads, busses."

As far as water pollution, Senator Nelson sees the need for an immediate financial commitment. "We can develop the equipment, install the equipment and set the standards that would reduce the amount of pollutants going into the water quite dramatically." The senator has legislation pending that would stop all new underwater drilling "until we need the oil and have the technology to extract it without threat to the environment."

Nelson points out that Earth "is a very limited planet with limited space and finite resources. There is only a certain amount of air, water, and soil." Realizing the limitations of the Earth, he advocates birth control.

"The growth of population is putting pressure on the planet that it can not sustain," Nelson says. "Unless the population stabilizes at what it now is or less, I don't think there is any way to save the livability of the planet."

Refuting the argument that an ecological crisis won't develop for 35 years, Senator Nelson asserts, "We are in an environmental decline right now. The serious question is whether people are prepared to spend the money and make the sacrifices necessary to do something about the environment before we face a catastrophe."

The senator calls for a complete revision in national philosophy to one that values quality of life higher than quantity. "But you can't be effective in doing something about a serious problem unless you understand it," according to Nelson.

The Wisconsin Democrat believes that ecological reform is the responsibility of Congress and the President as well as the citizens. "We will have to make a commitment to preserving our environment that is as great as developing a military machine or exploring space," he says.

"There is no way for this issue to disappear

because every day, when you walk outside, the quality of the air is lower; every day the water quality is lower; every day our scenic beauty is destroyed. So the problem can't go away. It will be present with every generation."

CARS POLLUTE AIR (By Sally McLean)

Automobiles contribute between 60 and 85 per cent of the air pollution in major American cities and cause a nuisance and possible health hazards from noise.

The percentage may be higher in the Washington area because the metropolitan area has proportionally less industry than most major cities.

However, according to Mr. Lou Hastings of the Automobile Manufacturers Association, "air pollution generated in one area does not necessarily stay there." It is difficult to measure pollution from any one source in a city because pollution may be coming on the wind from other places.

In 1968 there were 224,000 cars registered in the District of Columbia. Each car contributed to the 8,000 to 10,000 tons of pollutants put in the air over the United States each day.

Cars create noise as well as pollute the air, despite the fact that each car is required by law to have an operating muffler. Scientists estimate that if the noise level in large cities continues to rise by an average of a decibel a year, as they do now, all urban dwellers will be deaf by the year 2000.

In 1968 national legislation was passed requiring equipment on all cars controlling air pollution. Different companies use different methods to meet national standards. By 1971, all new cars will have to have an evaporation control to keep gasoline from entering the atmosphere.

Extensive use of buses and public rapid transit systems has been suggested to alleviate the problems posed by cars. An automobile uses an average of four or five times as much fuel per passenger as a bus.

However, Mr. Hastings said that the AMA estimates that the decrease in the use of cars resulting from the installation of a rapid transit system would only compensate for the five per cent annual increase in the number of cars in the Washington area.

Several specific steps have been suggested to cut down on the pollution caused by automobiles:

Bond issue for public transit.
Tax money from gasoline sales to be used for rapid transit systems.

The ending of the oil depletion allowance.
More bicycle and walking paths.
Better train service.

Increased power rates when power is used for luxuries and an end to the present system whereby large customers pay less.

Cars not only contribute greatly to air pollution but they necessitate vast numbers of highways which use valuable land. In addition, cars use huge amounts of fuel, helping to deplete the nation's reserves.

PHOSPHATES THREATEN FISH

Although they may clean clothes effectively, Axion, Biz, Oxydol, Tide and Ajax are killers.

These detergents contribute significantly to eutrophication, a major cause of the water pollution which killed 15 million fish in 1968.

Eutrophication is the process in which the number of nitrates and phosphates from sewage run-off, detergent components, and farm fertilizer run-off increase. Too high a concentration of these nutrients in the water causes the rapid multiplication of algae and other bacteria.

The bacterial plants require great quantities of oxygen. The supply of oxygen in the water becomes so depleted that other life forms can no longer survive.

"Very recently," Senator Edmund Muskie (D-Me.) said, "the soap and detergent industry contended that because it is not the only cause of lake eutrophication, it should not be asked to find substitutes for phosphates in its detergents."

R. M. MOUNTCASTLE EULOGIZED AT HISTORICAL SOCIETY MEETING

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, one of Oklahoma's most distinguished lawyers and leaders, R. M. Mountcastle, who died last February 11 after a brief illness, was appropriately eulogized last week in the auditorium of the Oklahoma Historical Society by an old friend and associate in the legal profession, Earl Boyd Pierce.

Mr. Mountcastle, affectionately known as "Mounty" and as "Bob" by a host of friends, was one of the most unforgettable men I have ever known—a warm, generous, and loyal friend who was a veritable giant in the courtroom and a valiant and courageous warrior in political battle.

"Mounty" was a man who thoroughly enjoyed the battle of wits in the courts and the heated exchanges of public debate, but he was also a man who possessed a keen sense of right and justice and a fierce love of his country. In the plainly stated eloquence of Mr. Pierce he "was a true patriot of Fort Gibson."

He was also a patriot who believed in speaking out, firmly and without qualification, for what he believed. Politically and personally, he was a man without fear—and America has need of all men who answer that description.

"Mounty" will be missed by many who admired his legal scholarship, his courage, his industry, and his integrity. Those of us who knew him as a friend are keenly aware that something very strong and good has gone out of our lives—although the memory of this fine man will always be with us.

To "Mounty's" lovely partner in life, Margaret, who helped so significantly to share and strengthen his constructive role in the community and the State, many Oklahomans have already expressed their deep sympathy.

Earl Boyd Pierce's eulogy, which follows, is an eloquent new monument in oratory to our fallen friend:

ROBERT MILLIGAN MOUNTCASTLE, 1888-1970,
EULOGY DELIVERED BY EARL BOYD PIERCE,
OKLAHOMA HISTORICAL SOCIETY, OKLAHOMA
CITY, OKLA., APRIL 23, 1970

Mr. President, Governor Bartlett, Fellow Members of the Society, Distinguished Guests and Friends: It is an honor for me to express the admiration and respect we have for the memory of a worthy associate and friend. Excepting only one other, Dr. Edward Everett Dale, Judge Mountcastle had served our Society longer than any other member of the present board. He was chosen to serve on our Board at the request of the late Honorable Robert L. Williams, whose signal service to our Society, the State of Oklahoma, and to the United States of America is renowned.

Mr. Mountcastle was one of the very few men who enjoyed the absolute confidence of Judge Williams, under whom he dutifully served as United States Commissioner for twenty years. Of all men in high public office in our State and Nation with whom Mr. Mountcastle was acquainted, without doubt, Judge Williams knew him best and gave to him more of his trust than to any other man.

Judge Williams knew that Mr. Mountcastle as an Attorney was inferior to no lawyer in Oklahoma, just as every lawyer and every client with whom he dealt knew that he possessed as pure and incorruptible integrity as any man who ever practiced law in Oklahoma.

It was my good fortune to enjoy his friendship and affection for over 57 years. He was an intimate friend of members of four generations of my family. While his loss to the State of Oklahoma, to Muskogee County, and to Ft. Gibson is irreparable and great, to those who depended upon him for so long a time, their loss almost approaches in poignancy that of his beloved and talented widow. His close friends and associates in our noble Society, his colleagues at the Bar, and his fellow citizens who were his clients and friends perhaps will welcome a bit more knowledge of his origin and background.

Robert Milligan Mountcastle was born in historic Jefferson City, East Tennessee, March 17, 1888. He died at Muskogee February 11, 1970; aged 81 years and 11 months.

He was the beloved son of W. H. and Maude C. Mountcastle, whose forebears were pioneers in Eastern Tennessee. After finishing local public schools, he graduated from Carson-Newman College in Jefferson City in 1909 with an AB Degree. He was a stellar baseball player at Carson-Newman and throughout his life was an ardent follower of the sport. In 1912 he received his L.L.B. and Doctor of Jurisprudence degrees from the University of Chicago. Here he had been a classmate of another former colleague of our Board, the late Honorable Kelly Brown, who, it is said, as a fellow student, enlisted Mr. Mountcastle's interest in far off Oklahoma.

In early summer, 1912, Mr. Mountcastle arrived in Oklahoma City and was one of 208 attorneys admitted to practice in this State between May and August of that year. And, unless I am mistaken, the distinguished Veteran Attorney, Mr. Roy Frye of Sallisaw, is the sole survivor of this large roster of Oklahoma Attorneys who began their practice in 1912.

After his admission, Mr. Mountcastle, together with his cherished, widowed mother and only sister, chose to settle in Ft. Gibson, and there the devoted son and brother entered the first of his two law partnerships in his lengthy career. You are acquainted with his second partnership with our colleague, Mr. Q. B. Boydston, who at the suggestion of Judge Williams in 1919 formed a law partnership with Mr. Mountcastle in old Ft. Gibson. This partnership continued until 1928 when Mr. Boydston was elected to the Legislature. Judge Mountcastle's first law partner, like Mr. Boydston, was also a distinguished and able Attorney who came to Ft. Gibson in 1909 from his native State of Ohio, Earl H. Ortman.

Mr. Mountcastle, a life-long Democrat, was a leader in political affairs in Oklahoma. He was a friend of Eastern Oklahoma's long-time Congressman, W. W. Hastings, who in January, 1917, tendered to Mr. Mountcastle the office of Postmaster of our beloved little city. He served in this capacity, by name at least, throughout World War I; although in January, 1918, he volunteered as a Buck Private in the United States Army, and before the War ended he had achieved the rank of Sergeant and continued to serve overseas until he was

honorably discharged at the end of May, 1919. Upon his return to Oklahoma, former Governor Williams, then Federal Judge at Muskogee, appointed Mr. Mountcastle United States Commissioner, in which office he served the United States and the citizens of Eastern Oklahoma until 1939.

As an admirer and observer of his conduct and effort as a citizen and lawyer for over fifty years, I am happy to attest that it was the long considered judgment of the Muskogee County Bar that no lawyer consistently worked longer and harder in preparing his cases and no lawyer came to Court better prepared. His good habits in this important respect inspired our younger attorneys who strove to emulate his example. His energy and industry, as well as his unique business ability, earned for him the confidence and respect of citizens generally and especially the top leaders in business and financial circles throughout Oklahoma.

Furthermore, no citizen of our County regarded our land and other natural resources better than this great lawyer. He was the owner of two fine bottom farms and a considerable amount of improved pasture land in eastern Oklahoma. He husbanded these land resources intelligently and successfully. In a word, his business sagacity was unexcelled among the members of our Bar.

His long and active professional and business career under the admiring gaze of his neighbors convinced us all that Mr. Mountcastle was a man of high principle, who in early life had been taught that the best way to help others, the community at large, is to do one simple duty in one's proper sphere. Many will affirm that he was correct in this, as we reflect how the unsuccessful man frequently clogs his immediate surroundings, and all are aware how this can be costly to a community, when call is made for help for others. We simply cannot rise in this world without helping others to rise, just as it became a maxim to our friends, it all comes back to ourselves first. We ourselves must learn before we can teach others.

In departing this life, our good friend is survived by his beloved widow, Margaret Haney Mountcastle, with whom he was united in marriage in Muskogee on October 15, 1931, and who together developed one of Oklahoma's finest historical ornaments, their home at the top of the Garrison in old Ft. Gibson.

Mr. Mountcastle served as Executive Secretary to a noble Governor of Oklahoma, the Honorable Henry S. Johnson.

In later years, he served in the State Legislature from our County, the 18th and 19th sessions, and was elected Speaker Pro-Tem of the latter by that body.

Mr. Mountcastle was a true patriot of Ft. Gibson. Although he resided in Muskogee for many years he never changed his voting precinct, the Town hall, in Ft. Gibson.

He was admitted to practice before all State and Federal Courts, including the Supreme Court of the United States, and was a member of the County, State, and American Bar Associations. He was a charter member of the Frank Gladd Post of the American Legion.

His Masonic affiliations consisted of Membership in Alpha Lodge #12, his hometown Blue Lodge at Ft. Gibson. He was a 32nd degree Mason and Shriner (Bedouin Temple) Muskogee, and was a member of the Royal Order of Jesters.

He was an active life-long member of the Baptist Church.

He became a member of the Board of Directors of the Oklahoma Historical Society on the 28th day of October, 1943, and as its records will disclose, he faithfully attended the quarterly meetings of our Board, contributing greatly to the success of the Society. May his good name and worthy deeds be held forever in respectful remembrance.

OBJECTIVE CRITICISM

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in many of the radical left escapades, individual clergymen have become prominent participants. It is obvious that the inherent respect the public has for religious leaders has served to shield this type of radical from public criticism and even punishment of the law that their lawlessness would merit. Therefore, I feel a column in the New World, Friday, April 24, by Father Andrew Greeley which is a very thoughtful, objective criticism of radical clergymen, deserves special attention.

The item follows:

COUNTERPRODUCTIVE MOVEMENTS—BOMBS—
RADICALS

(By Fr. Andrew Greeley)

I heard recently that an editor of a prominent liberal journal, which printed on its cover a formula for making a Molotov cocktail, is afraid to go into public buildings in New York for fear there will be an explosion. When someone suggested there might be a connection between the legitimization his journal had given to violence and the activity of the Weathermen, he was outraged and horrified. Such an idea was absurd!

And one reads in the New York Times that the tenured faculty at Columbia is now organizing to combat student unrest. Well they might, since apparently some of their former SDS heroes were planning to blow up Columbia when they blew themselves up instead.

It apparently does not occur to the Columbia professors that their actions are a bit tardy. They made Mark Rudd a national personality two years ago to engage in their vendetta with President Grayson Kirk and now are surprised that Rudd is coming back to haunt them.

It is fashionable in some circles to argue that the whole U.S. government (if not the whole nation) is responsible for the ugly murders at My Lai.

One could use the same line of reasoning to assert that those liberals who have thrown the cloak of sanctity around the student radicals are equally responsible when the radicals begin to throw bombs.

Indeed the government never distributed to its soldiers a formula for killing natives, though the New York Review of Books was only too ready to pass about its instructions for making fire bombs.

Liberals are also busy wringing their hands over the possibility of a "reaction" to the extremism of the bomb-throwers. We are told that a "reactionary wave" led by Attorney General Mitchell may sweep the country. It is surely a marvelous bit of magic! The threat to the Republic comes not from the bomb throwers but from those who are going to try to stop them.

I make no case for Mr. Mitchell, but I think he is far less dangerous, than the flabby-minded, guilt-ridden liberals who have provided justification for the insanity of the Panthers and the Weathermen.

Neither group speaks for those they claim to represent. The SDS is abhorrent to most students and the Panthers to most blacks. To identify the extremists with the just causes of the young and the black is an act of lunacy, yet if the liberal journalists and intellectuals who have cooperated in this lunacy have any regrets for providing legitimacy to the extremists, they certainly do not show it.

Quite the contrary, they are busy making folk heroes out of the so-called Chicago Seven, quite oblivious to the fact that if the advice of some of the Seven were taken literally, young people would be shooting their parents.

The liberals reply that of course the Seven ought not to be taken seriously. But that's what they said about Mark Rudd.

Probably, too, they are not likely to face the mass of data piling up about the harm the autumn moratoria did to the peace movement. Forty-five per cent of the public approved the handling of the war before the moratoria, 65% approved after them.

The percentage has fallen to 48%, but the "spring offensive" of the New Left darlings might be a big success and boost the percentage back up again. With enemies like that, Mr. Nixon hardly needs friends.

I would make the same charges against the Catholic liberals who idolize the kooky antics of the Berrigan brothers. The "liturgical gestures" of the Catholic radicals may contribute to their feeling of moral superiority and to the guilt feelings of Catholic liberals (and a party-line liberal is overjoyed when he can feel guilty).

But Father Daniel Berrigan has made it quite clear that he is not interested in making converts to the cause of peace (see the New Yorker profile, shortly to appear in book form). And those of us who are not ready to display our moral purity by going to jail are told we have no right to sit in judgment.

Well, I'm not ready to go to jail just yet, but I'll sit in judgment: It is immoral to engage in activities in the name of the peace movement that are clearly counterproductive to the cause of peace.

It is equally immoral to engage in politics and then choose techniques which are explicitly designed to defeat the cause one is allegedly fighting for.

It is immoral to pursue political defeat in the name of one's own moral self-righteousness when the way to victory may be open to those who are willing to wait for the proper time and the proper coalition.

And it is equally immoral to support what Irving Howe, that grand old radical (and a real one, not a phony), calls the Kamikaze radicals. It is time that all of them, including the sainted Berrigan brothers, be exposed for the frauds that they are.

PARENTS BEREAVED, BUT PROUD OF SON

HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a letter written to the editor of the Morning Pioneer of Mandan, N. Dak., by Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence Kelsch of Selfridge.

As a father of an only son who has been serving in Vietnam since last summer, I know the pride they feel for their son, Larry. I know the heartfelt thanks they feel each and every time someone goes out of their way to help our young men who are giving so much.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I include the April 26 letter to the editor:

PARENTS BEREAVED, BUT PROUD OF SON
SELFDRIDGE.

Letter to the Editor:

On April 13th, we received word that our son Sp-5 Larry Lee Kelsch, was wounded in action in Vietnam, and lost his left arm,

while on a military mission. The message read, "do not phone, report delivery in person." We live 6½ miles out of town, the roads were blocked with heavy snow and now a week later are still blocked. Our local city sheriff received the message, and made every effort to deliver it. County equipment was available to open the road, but the snow plow operator refused to open the road and suggested other means. The sheriff then sought a friend with a four wheel drive and managed to get the message to us.

To the people of our little community of Selfridge, who made very little effort to help, and to the ones that made this remark, "he was over there and served his time, why did he go back?" we would like to take this means of letting them know what type of youth went back to Vietnam and why we are proud of what he did.

Larry enlisted in the army on July 18, 1968. He came home last Christmas on a surprise visit back. When he rang the door-bell at 3 a.m. in the morning, I was the one that answered it. Tears of joy were shed, and I felt all over him to see if all of him came back. With a sigh of relief all of him came back, he threw his arms around me, hugged and kissed me and said, "Mom, I am home." Bubbling over with happiness, he hugged Dad, kissed his little brother, and almost in the next breath told us.

"I am going back to Vietnam on January 7th." In sad thought and my own selfishness I looked at him and asked.

"Why?" He replied, "I have twenty five very good friends back there, who did not get to come home for Christmas. If I go back and help, maybe next year we will all be home for Christmas."

On September 18, 1968 he wrote, "I had the honor of raising the flag on the post this morning. After I had finished I stepped back to salute the flag, and they played the National Anthem, cold chills went up my back and for the first time, I realized why I was in the Army."

On May 5th, 1969, for Mothers Day he wrote, "Dear Mom and Dad, I want to take this chance to tell you that I am very sorry in any way, that I have ever hurt either one of you, I may never ever have the chance to tell you, as I never know when "charlie" will be waiting around the corner for me."

This is what Larry stood for, he left our little community with a clean slate, and to our knowledge never hurt anyone. He grew from babyhood to manhood here, but somewhere along the line, someone didn't find the time or make the effort, to try and help bring a wounded soldier boy's message to his parents. May our letter be a message to others, please humble yourselves a little, give a little of your time, our boys over these are giving so much.

Mr. & Mrs. LAWRENCE KELSCH.

THE FORTUNE SOCIETY

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, it is usually accepted as common knowledge that our prison system falls far short of serving the people in the greatest possible way. Prisons, while successfully isolating criminals from the masses, are not performing satisfactorily in other areas. Specifically, the prisons should be rehabilitating criminals to the point that when they finally leave their walls of confinement they will be able to become productive members of society.

The system not only does not accom-

plish this; it serves to make prisoners less fit for life outside prison walls.

Prisons are degrading and dehumanizing. Men are crowded into undersized cells and are forced to live under poor and inadequate health and sanitation conditions. In the few cases where vocational programs are being employed, the prisoner often leaves with no place to go. He leaves poor and jobless. Therefore it is no surprise that many immediately return to criminal acts as a means of support soon as they are set free.

Fortunately, there are those who are not willing to merely accept the poorer aspects of the system. The Fortune Society was formed only a few years ago for the purpose of making weaknesses in the system known to the public. The society is composed mainly of ex-convicts but membership is open to all. It is dedicated to improving the life of the convict both in and out of the prison. The society is a nonprofit, tax exempt organization, and based in New York, with members all over the country.

I include an article taken from the April 1970 edition of "Fortune News," the official newsletter of the Fortune Society. The article, written by an inmate's wife, deals with degrading and dehumanizing effect which is felt not only by the convict, but by his wife and family as well. I am also including the full newsletter of the Fortune Society for February 1970 which I believe may be of special interest to my colleagues:

PRISON VISITS

(By Barbara Allen)

It's not easy to be married to a man in prison. We survive the financial hardships, the lonely isolation, frustrations, guilt feelings, etc.—but we are prisoners in our own little world. We, who have never committed a crime—are kept prisoners when we sentence ourselves to wait for our loved ones.

But why does the state of New York add to the burden we carry by insisting on the most dehumanizing conditions for a visit to an institution. I'll go even further—the counties and the cities, as well as the State, stand accused. It is such that I share equally the punishment the court meted out to my husband. Each time I try to visit him, archaic rules and regulations, screens, glass windows, unreasonable visiting hours, telephones that seldom work (the only means of communication in county jails), being kept waiting, being searched, rude correction officers—this all tears at my heart.

The same bad conditions do not exist at all institutions. Some have one, some have another and a third may have both. In New York State, Sing Sing visiting conditions are much more humane than others which only makes me wonder why others can not implement that which is used at Sing Sing. At Sing Sing, no screen is used to separate a man and his wife. I was able to bring my children there to visit their father so they could be assured that he was not dead.

My husband is kept in a cage during most of his imprisonment. But when I go to visit him, why must I visit a zoo? Do my children have to equate their father with the monkey they saw at the Central Park Zoo?

Please don't answer my questions with "security." I'll answer that one into the ground. Don't answer me, "no coddling the criminal." I am not asking for coddling. I ask for me to be treated as a human and for my children to be given that. We have not been convicted of committing a crime.

Do not alleviate overcrowding in city jails by sending my husband to an institution 300

miles away. How can I afford to go visit him? And I need to visit him. That's all I have left in my life.

How can you talk rehabilitation? What is more important to rehabilitation than family stability. I will try to do your job of rehabilitation through "love"—if you'll allow it. I'm not asking for conjugal visits and I'm not asking for weekend passes. I'll start by asking you to tear down the screens, have more realistic visiting hours for the wife who must work to hold the family together. Don't force me to go on State welfare so I might have a day per week to visit my husband. One Saturday or Sunday visit per month will not suffice.

My husband must be reassured that his family is surviving, that his wife is being faithful, that his children remember him. Without that, you can take your schooling, your job training and your other token programs and junk them. You will not begin to rehabilitate the man unless you understand the key words in rehabilitation are human contact and love. I can give him that.

You worry about security. My husband will be less apt to cause you any trouble if he knows that his children are going to be up to visit him. If you are worried about him receiving contraband, I think you'll find your correction officers are more likely to be the carriers than the wife who does not want to endanger her visiting privileges.

We should have a common goal—to rehabilitate my husband. Try for some continuity. I'll help if you'll let me.

I'M COMING OUT

(The author of this article has just been released from a state prison in New Jersey)

Have you ever been in a penitentiary? Have your eyes ever rested on the inside of those high, guntowered, grim walls where so many human lives are packed to vegetate and decay; awaiting the hand of time to spring the rusty gate that will release them to prey once again amongst you?

And I ask you, were you ever forced to live with three other men in a cubicle built to accommodate one? Or forced to smell the dirty, stinking, sweat of unwashed bodies because of lack of ventilation?

You speak rehabilitation to me but don't offer me a trade to learn. You force education down my throat as though I were a goose being fattened for market and ask me to think in terms of "redeeming human values." But are you aware, I wonder, that in this subhuman world I live in—there are no values but that the strong shall survive? Where men compromise their very manhood for a sandwich to ward off hunger?

I'm sure you didn't have the slightest idea that prison grinds every ounce of initiative from a man; or that he loses pride in productive work, and his most trivial affairs become tinted with an underworld viewpoint—a world that thinks like a wild beast rather than a productive human being.

You have placed us here for punishment (you say) but the quest for revenge lights your lectures. Even so, if prison is for punishment and the method derived to inflict that punishment is calculated to strip us of our initiative, decency, pride and respect then you have failed miserably—and you have.

After many years of degradation, humiliation and living a life of intrigue and perversion, you ask me to step from my "den of iniquity" into your paradise; to obtain gainful employment in industry and you expect me to make this transition overnight. I marvel at your naivete.

Do you honestly believe that a man such as I can make this transition? Have you ever considered the idea of preparing us during the last year of servitude for the challenge awaiting us? No, you didn't; you were too

apathetic—so smug in your belief that we were safely tucked away. But now I hear that rusty, steel door inching open.

Keep your jobs and handouts, and most of all—your rehabilitation, it reeks of hypocrisy; like this prison reeks of human excrement; where love and kindness are weaknesses; and where human values are non-existent.

Fate stirs the finger of fear within me. Like a wild beast, I shall soon be unleashed to prey amongst you. Did you know that here in prison men have knifed each other over a pack of cigarettes? How will I react to seeing you with so very, very much—when I have so little? And will your wives and daughters be safe from my lustful and carnal desires?

I have survived my ordeal in this concrete and steel jungle and I am ready for the hunt...

Knowing this, which of you, my "fellow brethren" will now invite me to live and work in their community?

GRAND HOTEL, 1970

Many men who come out of prison have virtually no money. Inmates released from New York City prisons are given \$1.00; inmates released from New York State prisons are receiving \$40.00.

In either case, the man is a likely one to resort to crime since he has the need as well as the knack. Some men, exhausted from prison, motivated by themselves and wanting a change in their life pattern, go to Welfare. And a new problem arises.

In addition to the inevitable bureaucratic indignities and changes that are often suffered, one complaint is heard over and over again. Welfare assigns men to specific hotels with their welfare check. Time after time, men visiting at the Fortune Society tell us that welfare has sent them to hotels inundated with winos, drug addicts, petty thieves and prostitutes.

While men are questioned about associating with ex-convicts for positive reasons, they are placed in a living situation which, if not dangerous to the man, is a severe challenge.

Consider the reality. Paul Jones, 11 years in prison, knows no one on the street except ex-cons from state prison. (He can't associate with them because of parole stipulations.) All of his straight friends he lost contact with many years ago. Their lives have gone separate ways.

A welfare person then assigns him to the Dippity-Do Hotel. The room is bleak with an unshaded light bulb, a broken paper shade, and a prison-like cot. There are people roaming the hallways, people shooting drugs, people offering 14 things which could constitute a parole violation.

Paul Jones hasn't enough money to go to a movie, buy a book, nor does he know anyone to visit. He locks himself in his room (frequently interrupted by tappings on the door with illicit and illegal requests) and he lies there with his eyes open wide, his needs no less than any other man.

Paul Jones is a fictional name. The situation isn't. We have it told to us at least once a week, from a man who comes to the Fortune Society. What happens to the thousands who don't find a group to whom they can relate. What do they do on their third night or fourth night?

Perhaps some committee investigating crime might consider this.

ON STAGE—T.F.T.F.

An actor, Akila Couloumbis, and an actress, Beverly Rich, decided that they could affect change and the Theatre for the Forgotten was born. The pair of young actors, with the help of other professionals, have set up a drama workshop amid the inherently dramatic surroundings of Rikers Island.

Weekly, they meet with a group of 25 young inmates. These men study with professionals—and four times a year—present a play to the entire population. The plays enlist the talents of professionals as well as inmates, with the convicts making up most of the backstage crew.

Is Theatre for the Forgotten the answer to the drudgery and absurdities on Rikers Island? Mr. Couloumbis and Miss Rich would be the first to say—"Of course not." But—on the other hand—one inmate in the group recently stated at a rehearsal attended by us—"This is so important. It's contact."

If TFF is not the answer, it is part of the working out of a solution. It permits caged men, cut off from the world, to come in touch with honest emotions which they must control through acting skills. It also permits them to create, to participate in something positive, to have something to anticipate.

In addition to its work on Rikers Island, TFF conducts drama workshops at Hart Island, as part of the Phoenix House program and at State Prison of New Jersey in Rahway.

Ironically, at Rikers Island, correctional staff members give little support to the visiting artists who donated their time to TFF. They are often kept waiting; the inmates cannot be located; the facilities are not usable, and much of the allocated time is lost. The inmates suffer though it is evident that the program is important to the two dozen or so inmates who participate in it.

Here is a perfect example of concerned outsiders providing a meaningful service, at no cost to the city, at no extra trouble to the correctional staff, and they are confronted with the administrative indifference and obstacles.

But the Theatre for the Forgotten will survive the correctional game. Because, already men returning to the streets from the program, are getting involved in the after-release workshop of TFF.

Miss Rich and Mr. Couloumbis and their dedicated staff need support, help, involvement and concern. They are pioneers in the penological future—concerned citizens preparing inmates to return to society, rather than adjusting to their primitive prison surroundings.

Power to the Playcrafters!

PAROLE CHANGE

The New York State Division of Parole has informed the parolees of this state that there has been an alteration of policy concerning association with the Fortune Society. It has been stated that "... this is to advise that parolees are not considered to be guilty of association if they (1) visit said organization, accept offers of help by way of counseling, job or residence reference, etc. (2) Accept passes of free tickets from said organizations to sporting events or theatrical productions, etc. and attend such affairs in the company of other ex-offenders. (3) When unemployed or during leisure hours, visit said organization to await job referrals or to volunteer their time and talents for 'the good of the organization.' These visitations naturally would not be acceptable if they interfered with parolee efforts to obtain employment or in any manner prevented him from fulfilling obligations to work and family."

A complete copy of the Parole memo can be had by calling or writing to us.

WHAT WE CAN USE

There are many things which we can use to distribute to men coming out of prison, for families of inmates and to help the Fortune Society function. Items should be brought or sent to our offices at 1545 Broadway.

NON-PERISHABLE FOODS

We distribute foods to families of the men still in prison and to men just returning to the streets.

CLOTHING

Particularly adult men's clothes are needed for men just coming out of prison.

OFFICE SUPPLIES

Index cards, onionskin paper, mimeo paper, pens, pencils, stencils, In and Out boxes for the Fortune Society office.

FORTUNE HIGHLIGHTS

It was inevitable that a monthly highlight column came to be in the *Fortune News*. There is enough news data which cannot be reported in detail that we will pass on to you in capsule form. If more information is needed—call or write us. . . . Mell Rivers, president of the Fortune Society, will be a consultant for the Safe Streets Program in Philadelphia.

The New York Civil Liberties Union will soon have a full time attorney whose responsibilities will deal solely with prison conditions, inmate rights, etc. Professor Herman Schwartz of the University of Buffalo Law School is slated for the post.

"Max-Out," a documentary film about a man being released from prison—and featuring Fortune Society members, will be shown Friday eve., Feb. 20 (8:30 P.M.) at the Ethical Culture Society of Bergen County.

William Statsky, recently a VISTA-lawyer and administrator of Reality House, a rehabilitation program under the New York State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission, is now devising a program at Columbia University School of Law whereby law students will be driven to prison once a week to provide legal assistance to the inmates. It appears that the program will first be tried at Green Haven Prison in Stormville, N.Y.

Fortune Society members participated in a conference in January at Columbia Teachers College, sponsored by the National Educational Program for Institutionalized Children. . . . Former Arkansas prison head, Thomas Murton has authored a book called "Accessories to the Crime" published by Grove Press.

The off-Broadway production of "The Concept," created and acted by residents from the Daytop Village community is an effective and important offering. It reveals dramatically much about the drug situation and the effective efforts of therapeutic communities such as Daytop Village.

The Fortune Society's Greenwich Village shop, the Fortune Store, is now seven months old. When it first opened, it sold goods representing the talents of 3 ex-convicts and one inmate. It now has representative crafts of a dozen inmates and ex-inmates.

Law students can be helpful to the Fortune Society by doing valuable research on test cases or proposed legislation. At present, research is being done by students from NYU and Columbia. If you're a law student and can help, please write or call and offer your services.

Fortune Society members will have another opportunity to meet with Dr. Karl Menninger. Fortune members will participate in a three-day session at Illinois Institute in Chicago at the end of this month, under the auspices of the Stone-Brandel Center. The program will be under the Correctional Authors and Artists program.

Friends of Fortune now are flourishing in Bergen County, New Jersey and has begun in Garden City, Long Island. Each group will continue probing into conditions of prisons in their own geographical area as well as working with families of inmates and men released from prison.

FORTUNE SOCIETY MEMBERSHIP

The Fortune Society newsletter is now received in 48 states (none in Oklahoma and Utah and in 14 nations. Readers might be interested in who is where, particularly when

it is recalled that two years ago, 37 persons received our first one page mimeograph sheet. Our 7600 readers are from—

New York—4439; New Jersey—1012; Pennsylvania—299; Massachusetts—228; Connecticut—119; and California—118; Illinois—85; Colorado—58; Ohio—47; Washington, D.C.—40; Maryland—36; and Michigan—35; Florida—34; Wisconsin—34; Delaware—30; West Virginia—34; Washington—25; and Texas—21.

GOD'S HUSTLER—SPIRITUAL BELLHOP

When members of the Fortune Society speak to suburban religious and civic groups, one question is frequently posed. That question is, "What spiritual guidance did you have in prison?" One man answered; "My spirit was destroyed, therefore, it couldn't be guided."

But religion's role of indifference in the prisons is being confronted in many locales. Rev. Ron Bell, the prison chaplain at Somerset County in New Jersey, is one challenger who came to our attention over a year ago.

An inmate at state prison in Rahway, New Jersey first told us of Rev. Bell. He was in his cell at the county jail and a young man came to the bars and extended his hand for a shake and said, "I'm Ron Bell." The inmate was sent from county jail, to state prison, and was recently released after serving 30 months. He never lost contact with the chaplain who extended his hand. On his day of release last month, the Rev. Bell was at the gate with his hand extended. The inmate's family was in continual contact with Rev. Bell—and the man confronted his past life and began preparing for his future.

No traditional religious magic has been extended by the Illinois born and reared pastor. Rather, he is a man who helps men. He recognized that men in prison, like all men, have needs, desires and dreams.

In his own Somerset County, Rev. Bell has organized community support for his beliefs. Citizens have joined with him to help families of inmates.

The concern and involvement of one man in a position to reach the inmate has had an enormous impact. Rev. Ron Bell has had a positive effect on many lives. Men, who were previously anti-social, have been returning to a community that has shown concern and understanding.

Rev. Ron Bell is one of a new breed in religion. He is serving his community in a manner new to penological pastors.

All the political solutions offered for fighting crime have not come as close to the truths—probed and confronted—by concerned men such as this spiritual bellhop.

FEBRUARY SPEAKING ENGAGEMENTS

- Feb. 3—Tappaqua H.S., N.Y. (Noon).
- Feb. 4—Birch Wathen H.S., N.Y. (2 P.M.).
- Feb. 5—Sid Rose AZA, Little Neck, N.Y. (8:30 P.M.).
- Feb. 6—Tenafly H.S., N.J. (8:15 A.M.).
- Feb. 7—Princeton Univ. (4 P.M.).
- Feb. 9—Masonic Hall, N.Y.C. (9 P.M.).
- Feb. 10—Montclair Rotary, N.J. (Noon).
- Feb. 12—Brandels Univ., Boston.
- Feb. 13—Emerson College, Boston.
- Feb. 16—St. Francis Cabrini, Bklyn (9 P.M.).
- Feb. 17—Saddle River Lions, N.J. (9 P.M.).
- Feb. 18—Marymont College, N.Y.C. (12:45 P.M.).
- Feb. 19—Hunter College, N.Y.C. (6:10 P.M.).
- Feb. 20—Princeton Day School, N.J. (11:30 A.M.).
- Feb. 20—Princeton High School, N.J. (2:30 P.M.).
- Feb. 22—St. Peters Church, N.Y.C. (5 P.M.).
- Feb. 24—Sacred Heart Church, N. Merrick (7:45 P.M.).
- Feb. 25—Harrison H.S., N.Y.C. (10 A.M.).
- Feb. 26—Jamaica Lions Club, L.I. (Noon).

Feb. 27 & 28—Correctional Authors and Artist Program, Chicago, Illinois.

SKYROCKETING COST OF MEAT

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 19, the office of the mayor of New York City made public the contents of a letter from Mayor John Lindsay to members of the New York City congressional delegation, in which he expressed concern over what he termed "the skyrocketing cost of meat to New York City consumers."

Mayor Lindsay stated his belief that "The price of meat is kept artificially high because of a restrictive meat import formula which guarantees that demand will outstrip supply and which insures inflated profits for the Nation's ranchers exacted at the expense of the Nation's consumers."

The mayor recommended that "Legislation repealing the meat import quotas should be passed."

Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that the mayor was unable to research the subject of his letter more thoroughly, for his statements reflect incomplete and inaccurate statistical information as well as an inadequate understanding of the facts.

Mayor Lindsay's allegations do a disservice, not only to the U.S. beef industry, but to the American consumer as well.

I certainly share the mayor's concern over the additional financial burdens imposed by inflation, not only on New Yorkers, but on all Americans. And, I fully support President Nixon's efforts to bring these inflationary forces in our economy under control. The costs of everything, from garbage collection to medical care have increased significantly in recent years, but food prices have increased much less than most other items. And, little of this increase has been returned to our Nation's farmers and ranchers who have been plagued with price and income levels far below those received by other segments of our economy.

One study which came to my attention recently, indicates that while wages have increased some 94 percent, transportation costs 48 percent, medical care 98 percent, and housing costs 41 percent from 1951 to 1969, retail prices for chuck roast and hamburger have risen only 15 percent. The study shows that at the same time, the costs of operating a cattle ranch have gone up some 110 percent.

This report also reveals that 1 hour of labor in 1951 would have bought 3.2 pounds of chuck roast or 4.2 pounds of hamburger, but that in 1969 an hour of labor could purchase 5.3 pounds of chuck roast or 6 pounds of hamburger. In other words, since 1951, chuck roast and hamburger have become relatively less expensive in terms of the purchasing power of average hourly labor.

Mr. Speaker, the facts simply do not bear out Mayor Lindsay's charge of "inflated profits for the Nation's ranchers." The American National Cattlemen's Association reports that "the average return on investment for the Nation's basic beef cattle producers is somewhere around 1.5 percent annually." By no stretch of the imagination could this level of return be considered "inflated profits."

In addition, I question the mayor's contention that lifting our meat import quotas would have the "beneficial" effects of "streamlining of the domestic meat industry, through the elimination of non-competitive fringe producers and of unnecessarily high distribution costs that now plague producers and consumers alike."

Elimination of any noncompetitive fringe producers would have little effect other than reduction of total domestic beef supply, but the elimination of competitive producers which would accompany increased beef imports would have much more significant and adverse long range consequences. And, I think "deterioration" of the domestic meat industry is a more appropriate term than "streamlining." Reduction of domestic supply would also tend to increase, rather than decrease industry distribution costs because when supply goes down, per unit costs go up.

Beef producers in this country have been supplying the American public with high quality beef at reasonable prices and can continue to do so in the future if they are provided with adequate economic incentives. Unrestricted meat imports into this country would erode those incentives, and threaten our future domestic beef supply—a situation which could result in far higher retail meat prices in the future.

Repeal of meat import quotas might cut retail meat prices by a few cents temporarily, but would be much more expensive to consumers in the long run.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I include in the RECORD a copy of the press release issued by the office of the mayor of New York City, and a response to Mayor Lindsay's letter, from Mr. W. D. Farr, president of the American National Cattlemen's Association. I am sure that Mr. Farr's sound and considered comments will be of interest to my colleagues in the House.

The press release follows:

SKYROCKETING COST OF MEAT

In letters to the members of New York City Congressional delegation, Mayor John V. Lindsay today expressed his concern over the skyrocketing cost of meat for New York City consumers.

The Mayor said he is particularly troubled because meat prices are kept artificially high by government import quotas.

The Mayor said that if action was not taken, it will soon be the case that hamburgers meat "is going to be as costly as a cut of porterhouse" and "even such a universal American food as frankfurters" will be considered in the luxury class.

While the Mayor's letter dealt specifically with costs in New York City, he said the implications of Federal import quotas affect prices for all American consumers.

In his letter the Mayor said:

"The Commission on Inflation and Economic Welfare, which I appointed last August, has reported that the price of meat, fish, and poultry in New York City has risen by 18 percent in the last year.

"For a family of four earning \$6,000, the additional cost per year to put meat on the table is \$101; for a family of four earning \$9,500, the additional cost is \$135.

"The meat import quotas must be revised, if not lifted altogether, to cut consumers' prices."

Following is the text of the Mayor's letter: "I am writing to urge you to give your attention to a very serious problem affecting all New Yorkers. That is the highly inflated price of meat, particularly manufactured meats such as hamburgers and frankfurters, now prevalent in all the grocery stores and supermarkets of New York City.

"The Commission on Inflation and Economic Welfare, which I appointed last August, has reported that the price of meat, fish, and poultry in New York City has risen by 18 percent in the last year. For a family of four earning \$6,000, the additional cost per year to put meat on the table is \$101; for a family of four earning \$9,500, the additional cost is \$135.

"As we all know, these are substantial increases in necessary expenditures, which are borne by the average citizen regardless of how much he wishes to economize or how carefully his wife shops in her local supermarket.

"The Commission correctly observed that numerous factors have contributed to this extraordinary price increase, many of which are also influencing other sectors of our economy.

"At least one important factor, however, is unique to the price structure of meat. The price of meat is kept artificially high because of a restrictive meat import formula which guarantees that demand will outstrip supply and which insures inflated profits for the nation's ranchers exacted at the expense of the nation's consumers.

"That restrictive formula was passed into law in 1964, the only year in the last eight in which domestic production rose more rapidly than domestic consumption. Moreover, the formula is keyed not to the level of consumption, which would ensure a stable price for consumers, but to the level of production, which allows the cattle industry to increase meat prices simply by holding down production and has a multiplier effect on prices by keeping imports down when domestic production is down.

"Consider for a moment the incredible arrogance of the American Cattlemen's Association representative when he had the audacity to testify before a Congressional Committee that in slowing down production by 5 percent: 'We were attempting to balance supply with demand hopefully so we could improve our income position.'

"The time has come for the representatives of our nation's big cities, both in City Hall and in the Congress, to exert leadership on behalf of all our citizens and consumers.

"If we do not act, it will not long be hyperbole to say that a hamburger is going to be as costly as a cut of porterhouse and that even such a universal American food as frankfurters will become so expensive that a large percentage of our citizens will consider it a luxury to purchase them.

"The meat import quotas must be revised, if not lifted altogether, to cut consumers' prices. Coincidentally, the side effects of lifting the embargo will also be beneficial. We will establish better trading relations with our allies in Australia, New Zealand and Ireland, and we will bring about the streamlining of the domestic meat industry, through the elimination of non-competitive fringe producers and of unnecessarily high

distribution costs that now plague producers and consumers alike.

"Our case here is irrefutable. Our cause is one dear to every housewife who watches her nickels and dimes and to every workingman who likes his three square meals a day.

"Legislation repealing the meat import quotas should be passed."

AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION,

Denver, Colo., April 24, 1970.

HON. JOHN LINDSAY,
Mayor of New York City,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: It is unbelievable that you, holding a respected and high office, would write a letter full of erroneous information such as contained in your April 19, 1970 communication directed to the New York City congressional delegation. It also is unbelievable that you should attack the largest segment of American agriculture, representing approximately 25 percent of the sales of all agricultural products, which has operated free of government subsidies, therefore never being a drag on the nation's taxpayers.

Whoever supplied your Commission on Inflation and Economic Welfare with statistical information did not have the right facts. For example, you state "... in 1964, the only year in the last eight in which domestic production rose more rapidly than domestic consumption." I call your attention to a table attached to this letter ... dating back to 1940 ... illustrating beef cow population, commercial beef production, and beef per capita consumption.

Note particularly the column on beef per capita consumption. In 1964, the year you cite, consumption was 100.1 pounds. It dropped one-half pound in 1965 and has steadily shown an increase since that time. Also please refer to the annual increase in commercial beef production. This shows a steady increase in every year since 1951!

These figures factually prove beef production has risen at a more rapid rate than human population and this is why there has been a continual rise in per capita consumption.

You also cite the American National Cattlemen's Association as being "arrogant." Obviously, the quote attributed to our organization, when appearing before a subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, was taken out of context. Our testimony made very clear the beef cattle industry since 1951 generally has not been making a net profit. Inasmuch as we operate in the free-market system, free of price support programs, we must rely solely on supply and demand to establish our price. Since this is the case, our recommendation to the cattlemen of the nation ... millions of them ... was to voluntarily cut back on beef tonnage ... not numbers ... thereby accomplishing two things: 1) Balancing supply with demand, just as any other soundly run business would do; and 2) cutting down on the over-finishing of cattle which would provide the consumer with a more desirable product as it would be more lean and have less waste fat. How can anyone find fault with those recommendations?

Your statement with respect to the relative cost of porterhouse steak and hamburger is "hyperbole" and nothing more. Please refer to the April 4, 1970 Wall Street Journal where a story appeared with respect to retailing. Quoting from the story, a retailer made the following statement: "There is more profit in hamburger than sirloin steak." Has it occurred to you that you are blaming the wrong industry when your April 19 letter said: "... inflated profits for the nation's ranchers exacted at the expense of the nation's consumers"?

The average return on investment for the

nation's basic beef cattle producers is somewhere around 1.5 percent annually. Do you consider this an "inflated profit"? I ask you to look only around the City of New York where you will find almost every business expecting and insisting upon a return on investment far in excess of 1.5 percent.

The retail price of beef has increased far less than the cost of other consumer services or goods. From U.S. Department of Commerce and U.S. Department of Agriculture figures, using 1957-1959 as a base of 100 percent, in 1969 public transportation was 148.9 percent; medical care—155 percent; reading and recreation—135.5 percent, while retail beef prices were 124.4 percent. This was in 1969! And, I strongly suspect that with the transportation difficulties you have experienced in New York City your public cost of transportation is far in excess of the 148.9 figure now. Meanwhile, beef prices are unquestionably lower nationally today than the average for 1969.

You should also be aware of a serious consequence contained in your letter which could be the basis of a critical crippling of the food supply of the United States in the future should be the intent, at least as you implied, be carried out. You said: "We will establish better trading relations with our allies in Australia, New Zealand, and Ireland, and we will bring about the streamlining of the domestic meat industry through the elimination of non-competitive fringe producers..."

The only assumption from the above is that you favor the elimination of "smaller" beef cattle producers, many of whom are of the family-type. It occurs to me that if this were the case you merely are asking for a compounding of the problems currently existing in the metropolitan areas of the U.S., including New York City, where the mass immigration of rural people who have been put out of business has been causing many of these city's financial problems. It is better for these smaller operators to continue to operate without the unfair competition created by excessive beef imports, and thus automatically eliminate many of the city problems, by allowing them to remain on the farm or ranch.

Finally, I want you to be perfectly aware of the facts as to the consist or "mix" of the beef being shipped into the United States. You have been led to believe that the beef arriving here is of so-called manufacturing quality. I am sure you will find that the importers are bringing in cuts of beef which do not find their way into hamburger or frankfurters. This compounds the problem of hamburger and frankfurter prices, as you cite. Due to the importer's own selfishness, they are handling as much as 40 percent of the beef imports in the form of cuts because they can obtain much wider margins and profits on this type of product. If this problem alone were eliminated, you would find hamburger prices should respond accordingly.

Because of your high office and responsibility to the public, we implore you to look at the facts before permitting your name to be placed on a letter that is extremely damaging and not factual. The long range implications are great. The U.S. domestic beef cattle industry is pledged to producing supplies of the finest quality, most wholesome beef available anywhere in the world at reasonable prices. There is only one critical factor... the economic incentive which made America so great... is the basis of our industry. If unlimited beef imports are permitted, the economic and psychological incentives to produce beef cattle are destroyed. Because of this, in the long run, it will be the U.S. consumer who will suffer the consequences of unrestricted imports.

Sincerely,

W. D. FARR,
President.

Year	Total beef cows 2 years and older ¹	Percent of change ¹	Annual change in commercial beef production ²	Percent of change ²	Total beef per capita consumption (pounds) ³	Percent of change ³	U.S. population ⁴	Percent of change ⁴
1940	10,676	+6.9	6,948	+2.4	54.9	+0.4	132,594	+1.2
1941	11,366	+6.5	7,858	+13.0	60.9	-11.0	133,894	+1.0
1942	12,578	+10.7	8,592	+9.3	61.2	+5	135,361	+1.1
1943	13,980	+11.2	8,306	-3.3	53.3	+13.0	137,250	+1.4
1944	15,521	+10.2	8,801	+6.0	55.6	+4.3	138,916	+1.2
1945	16,456	+6.0	9,936	+12.9	59.4	+6.9	140,468	+1.1
1946	16,408	-3	9,010	-9.3	61.6	+3.7	141,936	+1.1
1947	16,488	+5	10,096	+12.0	69.6	+13.0	144,698	+1.9
1948	16,010	-3	8,766	-13.2	63.1	-9.3	147,208	+1.7
1949	15,919	-6	9,142	+4.3	63.9	+1.3	149,767	+1.7
1950	16,743	+5.2	9,248	+1.2	63.4	-8	152,271	+1.7
1951	18,526	+10.6	8,549	-7.6	56.1	-11.5	154,878	+1.7
1952	20,863	+12.6	9,337	+9.2	62.2	+10.9	157,553	+1.7
1953	23,291	+11.6	12,055	+29.1	77.6	+24.8	160,184	+1.7
1954	25,050	+7.6	12,601	+4.5	80.1	+3.2	163,026	+1.8
1955	25,659	+2.4	13,213	+4.9	82.0	+2.5	165,931	+1.8
1956	25,371	-1.1	14,090	+6.6	85.4	+4.1	168,903	+1.8
1957	24,534	-3.3	13,852	-1.7	84.6	-0.9	171,984	+1.8
1958	24,165	-1.5	12,983	-6.3	80.5	-4.8	174,882	+1.7
1959	25,112	+3.9	12,233	-5.9	81.4	+1.1	177,830	+1.7
1960	26,344	+5.0	14,370	+17.2	85.2	+4.7	180,684	+1.6
1961	27,102	+2.8	14,930	+3.9	88.0	+3.3	183,756	+1.7
1962	28,305	+4.4	14,931	+1	89.1	+1.2	186,656	+1.6
1963	29,960	+5.9	16,049	+7.5	94.6	+6.2	189,417	+1.5
1964	32,794	+9.5	18,037	+12.4	100.1	+5.8	192,120	+1.4
1965	34,238	+4.4	18,325	+1.6	99.6	-8	194,590	+1.3
1966	34,433	+0.6	19,493	+6.4	104.2	+4.2	196,920	+1.2
1967	34,685	+7	19,991	+2.6	106.3	+2.0	199,100	+1.1
1968	35,300	+2.1	20,662	+3.4	109.0	+2.5	201,100	+1.0
1969	36,227	+2.3	20,953	+1.4	110.0	+1.0	203,200	+1.0
1970	37,433	+3.2						

¹ Livestock and Meat Statistics, 1962, table 7.
² Livestock and Meat Statistics, 1962, table 113.
³ Livestock and Meat Statistics, 1962, table 209.
⁴ Business Statistics, 16 biennial edition, 1967, p. 65.

EAST STREET VALLEY EXPRESSWAY—BOONDOGGLE OR BONANZA FOR THE PEOPLE?

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, if it is true, as they say, that the object of government is the welfare of the people, then somewhere along the way our priorities have become lost in the pell-mell shuffle to construct Interstate Highway 79. Of specific concern to me is the part known as the East Street Valley Expressway which directly affects some 8,000 of my constituents on Pittsburgh's North Side.

Long, arduous efforts to try and resolve their dilemma have given me ample opportunity to understand the problems involved in this bureaucratic charade.

At various times I have worked singly or in concert with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads of the House Public Works Committee; the Bureau of Public Roads of the Federal Highway Administration, and other officials in the Department of Transportation; the State highway department; an extremely concerned and active citizens' group on the North Side called HEART; local Pittsburgh officials; and my own Housing Subcommittee to try to help the residents of the East Street Valley area receive favorable and just treatment.

I include in the RECORD a recent article by Ralph Hallow of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette which accurately and dispassionately depicts the sorry plight of the homeowners and businessmen located in this area.

State and Federal officials have as-

sured me that safeguards in the State and Federal laws that are designed to avoid precisely what has befallen some residents of East Street will be employed in carrying out the final phases of the highway construction program.

In addition to relocation assistance guarantees, property acquisition rights, and appropriate consequential damages payments, the citizens have been assured that their position will be heard at the forthcoming "design public hearing" scheduled for the North Side late this summer.

I only hope that for the balance of the East Street Valley citizens and for future participants in highway relocation plans, these assurances do not come too little and too late.

The article follows:

I-79 HAS SPELLED TROUBLE FOR EVERYBODY: NORTHSIDE'S EAST ST. VALLEY IS A MESS: WHO'S RESPONSIBLE?

(By Ralph Z. Hallow)

Thanks to a conspicuous lack of leadership and sensitivity to people's needs by bureaucracy at the federal, state and local levels, the 6,000 to 8,000 Northside citizens who live in the path of the proposed East Street Valley Expressway (Interstate-79) are in a mess.

The federal government pays 90 per cent of construction and relocation costs for I-79; the State, 10 per cent. The State Highways Department, acting as agent for the U.S. Department of Transportation hired the Urban Redevelopment Authority to appraise property in Phase I (one-third of the affected area) and Phase II, but largely because URA Director William Farkas and his staff tried to get liberal compensation for displaced businessmen, the Highways Department fired URA from involvement in Phase II.

Meanwhile, instead of coming up with complete plans for relocating every affected person before going ahead with appraisal and acquisition, the State and its agencies seem

to have gone "cherry picking"—buying up a few houses in selected blocks.

Since the State announced property acquisition plans four years ago, residents have seen some properties bought up and razed, others boarded up and still others sold to the State for what they consider unfairly low prices.

As increasing numbers of tenants and homeowners fled the doomed area, businesses—robbed of their former customers—have teetered on the edge of bankruptcy or have gone under.

With tenants deserting, building owners have found it difficult to lure new tenants who know they'll have to leave soon anyhow.

Many residents say the State and its agencies have not lived up to the intent of the Federal Highways Act of 1968 and the State enabling legislation of 1969. The legislation provides that displaced property owners may be compensated up to \$5,000 more than the State-determined market value of their property. The idea is that replacement value or what it costs to find a comparable, safe, decent and sanitary home will be more on an inflated market than the present property is worth. The law allows tenants up to \$1,500 over two years to find comparable living space near where they work.

The so-called cherry picking tends to prod the remaining residents to sell out to the State for less than they are entitled to, the psychology being, as disgruntled citizens see it: "It's worth taking a loss just to get out of this deteriorating neighborhood quickly."

In addition, unhappy residents say the State appraisers seem to make arbitrary appraisals, and the complaint seems justifiable. After the State Highways Department determines that the market value of your home is \$10,000, for example, four State "fee appraisers" fan out to find comparable homes—not necessarily on the Northside. They may find that these "replacement" homes are worth \$10,000, \$11,000 and \$12,000. So the Highways Department passes the word to the Pittsburgh Relocation Agency which in turn passes it to you: You've been awarded a "replacement value" bonus of \$2,000 (\$3,000 less than the maximum the law allows).

Fine for everybody—except for you. You were led to believe that you could get up to \$5,000 over market value. Being of sound enough mind, you naturally figured—like most of your neighbors—that any fair appraisal would award you \$5,000 or close to it (you, after all, have a lot of time and love invested in your home).

Worse still, the State tells you that you can replace your \$10,000 home with one for \$12,000 but doesn't tell you where that pie-in-the-sky house is. Or it won't tell you unless you refuse to sign a form saying you accept the amount offered. You may then appeal the appraisal before a three-man, State-appointed appeals board which then tells you which houses the fee appraisers looked at.

But so what? The appraisers dug up three homes comparable to yours, but nobody said the owners would be willing to sell—now or ever, to you or anybody else.

You've lived and worked all your life on the Northside. Your kids go to school there. Then the highway comes through, but nobody makes sure that when you're uprooted, you'll have a place to go that you can afford. Understandably, you may feel that you've been unfairly evicted and cheated by the inexorable workings of an indifferent state in the name of transportation progress.

Businessmen in the valley, are, moreover, at least as badly off as homeowners. In four years, the State has yet to make an offer to any of the approximately 185 entrepreneurs in Phase I. Yet these business people have been suffering because their former customers have been leaving the area.

Part of the problem seems to be that layer after layer of government agencies are involved, with no single body empowered to

force decisions in the people's interest. Concerned with I-79 planning and construction, for example, are the federal Bureau of Public Roads under the U.S. Department of Transportation; the State Highways Department and its central highways office in Harrisburg; the State district highway office; and in Pittsburgh, the City's Urban Redevelopment Authority, Relocation Agency and Planning Department. Then there's the Congress itself, the State Legislature and the Pittsburgh City Council (which, partly because of the complexity of the problem, has not asserted itself on behalf of the East Street citizens).

Few persons involved seem to like the way the State Highways Department and its head, Robert G. Bartlett, have handled the requests and complaints of the East Street citizens. Secretary Bartlett's department, understandably—in terms of conventional governmental priorities—sees its main job as one of getting the expressway link of I-79 built as expeditiously and inexpensively as possible.

Citizens organizations such as HEART (the Highway Emergency and Relocation Team led by East Street Optometrist Dr. Martin Krauss) have worked long and hard to publicize the residents' plight. Their efforts helped produce the 1968 federal and 1969 State highway legislation, HEART believes, moreover, that Mr. Bartlett's concern is exclusively with getting the construction done and therefore in buying the property as cheaply and quickly as possible, regardless of the hardships wrought on businessmen and residents.

So who's really to blame? It's not the Relocation Agency's fault. It just passes the State's replacement-value figures on to property owners. Nor is the Highways Department out to rob the people. It's merely following the letter—if not the humane intent—of the law. After all, bureaucrats traditionally believe that if they were to interpret the rules liberally, they'd only be making trouble for themselves. Apparently, nobody has told them to give every businessman or homeowner the benefit of the doubt.

Wiser legislation would have eliminated the "replacement value" hassle simply enough. Instead of a sliding scale of up to \$5,000, the law should now be amended to give all displaced home and business property owners a flat bonus fee of, say, \$3,000 or a \$3,000 minimum and a \$5,000 maximum.

Secondly, new houses and apartment and business complexes should be constructed before acquisition. Last month, Secretary of Transportation John J. Volpe said, "Housing must be provided, built if necessary, before approval will be given for any construction project."

Then, property acquisition should proceed smoothly, quickly and evenly.

Since businessmen are the first to feel the brunt of highway displacement, the State should buy out and compensate the local entrepreneurs first, before beginning to deal with homeowners (you can replace a home much more easily than you can relocate and build up a business). Liberal compensation for business machinery and equipment—a concession which URA's Bill Farkas has tried to win from the State Highways Department—should be built into the acquisition system.

Finally, a single agency such as URA should be legally designated to quarterback the work of other agencies and to represent the citizens' interests. Community groups like HEART and the East North Side Citizens Council should be able to elect full-time, State-paid representatives to work with the agency.

A highway coming through your neighborhood is not a natural disaster, like a flood or a twister. It is a socially planned disruption, and it's unacceptable that citizens should be uprooted willy-nilly. Government has a responsibility not to wreak havoc on a community in the name of progress.

THREE CAGE STARS HONORED

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the basketball season for 1969-70 is behind us and it is baseball time again.

But back in my home city of Buffalo, N.Y., we are still talking basketball. We just have not run down yet—and we are not going to right away; for good reason.

Tomorrow night—Wednesday, April 29—in Buffalo's Statler-Hilton Hotel, the community will gather to pay honor to three basketball stars who had us literally on the edge of our seats throughout the recent season.

Two of them—6 foot 11 Bob Lanier of St. Bonaventure University and 5 foot 10 Calvin Murphy of Niagara University—made the all-America team, a well-deserved and coveted honor.

The third cager being feted attends a school not associated with the NCAA, but he ranked high in the running for the little all-America. He is Randy Smith of Buffalo State College.

COMMUNITY TESTIMONIAL

Arrangements for the community testimonial were made by a local committee of which Dick Fischer and Arthur Eve are cochairmen.

Buffalo and all of western New York are proud of these fine athletes. It marks the first time that two athletes from the Little Three—St. Bonaventure, Niagara, and Canisius—made the all-America. Bob Lanier is the first Buffalonian to make the first team.

At a time when there is frequent criticism of certain of our college students, it is indeed an honor and a privilege to bring to the attention of the Members three outstanding college students who have made their college name on the basketball court.

I know that I speak for all western New Yorkers in paying tribute to these three fine athletes on this community occasion. Our hearts sank when Bob Lanier was hurt in the semifinal of the playoffs, but thankfully he is doing fine again.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I am including three newspaper articles about our two all-Americans:

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, Mar. 4, 1970]

BON'S LANIER RATES WNY CAGER OF CENTURY
(By Cy Kritzer)

St. Bonaventure's Bob Lanier, named today to the All-America team as the center, could be the greatest basketball player produced in the city of Buffalo or Western New York.

And, who knows, maybe the greatest of the 1970s?

Buffalo Bob is averaging 30.05 points a game for 22 games, shooting 58.2 per cent from the field and 73 per cent from the free throw line; six weeks ago he set Bona's all-time record for rebounds. He is the leading scorer in Western New York.

Statistics don't half-way measure why he will be a 1-2 choice in the National Basketball Association draft March 30 and why he may become a millionaire on his first pro contract.

Lanier is a big man who can shoot outside with the accuracy of a back-court star.

He intimidates the opposition because he blocks so many shots.

He wrecks a passing attack because he deflects so many passes.

He has the quick hands and the physical power to dominate the backboards, and rebounding is the name of the game.

SCHOLARSHIP OFFERS

Buffalo's scholastic scoring champion at Bennett High, he had dozens of scholarship offers but chose Bona because it was near his home.

His parents are Mr. and Mrs. Robert J. Lanier, 478 Northland Ave. His father owns and operates a small trucking business and his mother, a teacher in the city schools for 14 years, is a social worker.

As a boy, Buffalo Bob won attention with his ambidexterity in winning table tennis championships and as a baseball player who can hit the ball a "mile" and as a pitcher of no-bitters in the boys' leagues.

Lanier took the Bonnies to the National Collegiate Athletic Association as a sophomore when he averaged 27 points a game; he was the star as they had another winning season in his junior year. But the Bonnies were barred from postseason play because of a recruiting violation.

Now they're on their way to the NCAA again, and the Bona partisans are sure they'll reach the national finals if Buffalo Bob stays healthy.

As a co-captain of the Bonnies, he has proved a natural leader whose dressing-room talks will be long remembered by his teammates.

GOOD STUDENT

He also has distinguished himself as a sports dinner speaker. But above all, the genial giant is a humorist who keeps life happy for those around him.

He's a better than average student, too.

Lanier is modest about his ability because of his exposure to the pros when he was a camp counsellor last Summer.

At the camp of Willis Reed, the star of the New York Knickerbockers, Lanier went head to head against such established pros as Reed, Johnny Green, Walt Frazier, Dave Stallworth, Bill Bradley and Cazzle Russell.

"People tell me that I look a lot like Willis," said Bob. "But he's a lot better than I am."

They have one asset in common, that soft left-hand jump shot. Bob may be more accurate with it than Reed from outside.

Lanier thinks that Pet Maravich of Louisiana State is the best shooter he's seen.

"I couldn't believe it when I saw Pete in a tournament at Oklahoma City, Man, he is tremendous!"

"I'm not taking anything away from Calvin Murphy, but Maravich is something else."

SHARES CREDIT ON TEAM

Buffalo Bob is Billy (The Kid) Kalbaugh's No. 1 booster.

"Billy never gets enough credit," said Buffalo Bob. "He can really handle the ball. They press and double team the little guy but he takes the ball up the floor without help. He doesn't shoot a lot and goes unnoticed."

"Look at his shooting percentage, right up in the 50 class."

"We have great unity on this team, and Billy does a lot to make it that way. The coach (Larry Weise) gives us the privilege of calling a meeting whenever we think there should be one, and of giving pep talks to the younger players."

Billy is special to Lanier because being an All-America does have its drawbacks.

"People hold you in awe," said Lanier. "It's not easy to have a friend for just a friend outside of the basketball team."

"Somehow, people think I'm different because I'm a big fellow (6 feet 11 inches, 270 pounds). But basketball players are just as normal as anyone else."

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, Mar. 4, 1970]

CHEERS HAVE NOT CHANGED CALVIN—NOR HAS "LAST HURRAH" SOUNDED

(By Larry Felser)

NIAGARA UNIVERSITY, March 4—The manner is more self-assured, the clothes more fashionable and the outlook more sophisticated.

But basically it's the same Calvin Murphy who brought along his baton when he visited Niagara University for the first time to talk about playing basketball. He was a senior in high school at Norwalk, Conn. The varsity was playing a game in the Student Center and Calvin was introduced at halftime.

The crowd gave him an ovation.

They haven't stopped cheering him yet.

Today he was named to the All-America team for the second consecutive season and soon he will finish his college career in the National Collegiate Athletic Association Tournament.

The other day he chatted about that career, which went through a period of depression, another of individual success and finally, this year, blossomed into a triumph for both Murphy and his team.

NO REGRETS ANYMORE

"Do I have any regrets about coming here?" he answered. "If you had asked me that in my sophomore year I would have given you a lot of regrets."

"But everything worked out. One day I sat down and thought about it. I received much more from Niagara than I gave it."

"On May 30 I'm going to receive my degree. We're playing in the NCAA Tournament. I met and married a very lovely girl here (Vernetta Sykes of Buffalo). I learned a lot about life at Niagara."

For a time it seemed Murphy would learn nothing but controversy. There was an unhealable friction between the former basketball staff and the school administrator. It received wide attention in the national press and gave birth to rumors that Calvin would transfer to another school.

But in two years Niagara basketball changed. From an erratic loser featured by an incredible shooter, the Eagles became a cohesive unit which won 20 games, won the All-College Tournament at Oklahoma City and earned its first berth in the NCAA Tournament.

"No one ever did more for me than the two coaches who recruited me for Niagara (Jim Maloney and Ed Donahue)," he says. "They were wonderful and they still are. But the turning point for us came when they left. The feud between them and the administration had gone too far."

"What we needed was a new atmosphere."

NEW ATMOSPHERE

What accounted for the new atmosphere was a dynamic new coach, Frank Layden. But even Layden's first season was a losing one. Before his senior season, Murphy was called in for a talk with the coach.

"He told me that for us to be a winning team, everybody had to sacrifice," says Murphy. "My particular sacrifice was in not shooting as much as I had been."

"Well, I like to win, just like everybody else. It's a lot more fun. It was a brand new experience, too, playing defense for 40 minutes, from end line to end line setting up my teammates around the basket."

But as Niagara started to play sound, all-around basketball, Murphy's chance to challenge Pete Maravich of Louisiana State for the national scoring championship evaporated.

He couldn't care less.

"Pete's a great All-America," he says, "but personally, I can't see how his teammates can enjoy playing with his taking 55 shots a game. It's not basketball. I just couldn't shoot as much as Pete does."

HIS SOCIAL LIFE

As Murphy settled into his career at Niag-

ara, he found his social life, too—in Buffalo, not neighboring Niagara Falls.

"The black community didn't take to me too well," admits Murphy. "They've said that I'm an 'Uncle Tom' who was used by the white people in the school up on the hill."

"I've never tried to explain things to the people in the Falls I grew up in a ghetto, too, and I didn't feel I had to explain myself."

Instead he spent most of his time in Buffalo where he made friends like Gene Roberston and Roger Brown, before they were basketball players at Canisius, and later, Bob Lanier.

"As you can tell, there's no love lost between Bob and I when we're on the basketball court, but I know him quite well and we're friends off the court. He has a wonderful mother and father."

CLOSE TO FAMILY

Family means a lot to Murphy, who is extremely close to his own mother and stepfather, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Murphy of Norwalk.

"They're just beautiful people," he says. His "substitute parents" in Buffalo for the last four years have been Mr. and Mrs. John Ogden. The Ogdens told him to make himself at home with them when he was a freshman and he took them up on it.

"I just moved in," he laughs. "They've seen me grow up. They've heard my gripes and heard my pleasures. They've been great to me."

And now it will be over for Calvin Murphy at Niagara.

"But the game doesn't end for Niagara without Calvin Murphy, or without Bob Churchwell or without Mike Brown."

"The Eagles are going up. The Little Three's going to belong to Niagara from now on," said Calvin.

[From the Buffalo, N.Y., Courier-Express, Mar. 19, 1970]

WHAT'S NEW, HARRY?

(By Phil Ranallo)

The fullest hospital bed in Western New York is located in a bright corner room on the fourth floor of the Buffalo General. The bed, its springs under stress and strain, is chock-full of one fellow—Bob Lanier.

Wednesday morning, the St. Bona All-America basketball player who will miss tonight's big one—Bona's NCAA Tournament match with Jacksonville—was sitting up in bed and obliging nurses and hospital employees who streamed into his room and requested autographs.

Bob Lanier, as he scribbled away, was The Establishment's picture of the All-American boy. His strong face had that scrubbed look. The hair was cropped short. The sideburns did not extend beyond mid-ear.

A visitor studied the 6-foot 11-inch athlete. "You're amazing, Bob. In this day and age, there you are—no Afro-cut, no muton-chops, no mustache, no goatee. How come?"

The man standing beside the bed—Robert J. Lanier, Bob's father—beat his son to the answer.

BOB IS CLEAN-CUT

"His mother and I brought him up a clean-cut kid," Mr. Lanier said, "and that's the way Bob's going to stay—because I make him listen to me."

Big Bob Lanier laughed, and his hearty laugh made the bed jiggle, forcing the bed-springs to play strong defense.

A nurse appeared in the doorway, beckoned to Mr. Lanier, and Bob's dad left the room.

"My dad's old-fashioned," Bob Lanier said, chuckling. "He brought me up the old-fashioned way—and the funny thing about it is I'll probably bring up my children the same way."

The visitor noticed a large cardboard box in a corner of the room. The box measured about three feet square, and was filled to

overflowing with telegrams, letters and get-well cards.

He stuck a hand in the box to find out if it had a false bottom. It didn't.

Bob Lanier's eyes sparkled. "I just wish there was a way for me to let all those wonderful people know how much they've helped me."

BOB HAS CONFIDENCE

Lanier stared at the cast on his right leg. Then he talked about his teammates—the Bonnies, who tonight must face the nation's tallest team without him.

"They've got a chance," Lanier said, "and I'm not kidding when I say that. I'm being realistic.

"They can do it—if they put it all together. Bubba (Greg Gary) and Matt (Gantt) have got to block out underneath and make those big Jacksonville players know they're in a battle.

"And Billy (Kalbaugh) and Mike (Kull) have got to do some fabulous outside shooting—which they're certainly capable of doing.

"And all our guys have got to grab most of the loose balls.

"Our guys are gutsy. They'll play real well."

Lanier said he has not decided which pro league he will play in—the National Basketball Assn. or the American Basketball Assn.

"But I'll decide by the first of the week," he disclosed.

Which means he is within four or five days of becoming a millionaire.

BIDDING IS HIGH

It has been reported that the New York Nets, the ABA club with the rights to Lanier, have offered the Bona star \$1,300,000.

Lanier chose not to comment on the report.

If Lanier decides to cast his lot with the NBA, he probably will be corraled by San Diego, Boston or Detroit, the NBA's bottom teams.

Lanier gives indication he is leaning toward the NBA. "My decision will not be based entirely on money—regardless of what my father tells you."

Bob glanced his father's way, and laughed.

"Prestige means something to me."

Asked if he regarded the NBA as the prestige league, Lanier said, "Yes."

A man in a wheelchair and with a cast on his left leg appeared in the doorway. "How're you feeling today, Bob?" he asked.

"Much better, thank you, sir," Lanier replied.

A few minutes later, the visitor said goodbye to Lanier and left. In the corridor, he chatted with the man in the wheelchair.

"That Bob Lanier is a truly fine young man," the gentleman in the wheelchair said.

The gentleman should know. He has been a good judge for a long time. He's Judge William J. Reagan.

POSTAL REFORM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, now that the Federal pay raises have passed into history, we hear new noises about additional pay increases possibly as inducements for postal employees to rally support for a radically new postal reform scheme.

According to the proposed reform, the post office operation would become "an independent establishment, self-supporting by January 1, 1978" and "empowered to raise up to \$10 billion through the

issue of bonds"—which can be expected to have the guarantee of the U.S. taxpayers.

In the absence of contrary facts, it is safe to assume that this independent, self-supporting establishment will be tax exempt, nonprofit, and probably free from congressional investigation. It most certainly would not be entrusted to free enterprise because it would be a profitable, taxpaying venture at present postal rates.

No comment is offered that under the U.S. Constitution article I, section 8, Congress is expressly delegated by the people and the States with the responsibility "to establish Post Offices and post roads" just as we are charged with such responsibilities as regulating foreign commerce, establishing inferior courts, to raise and support armies and to declare war.

Congress has before abdicated its responsibility. In 1913 the power to coin and regulate money was conferred on the Federal Reserve—a private banking monopoly—the experience of which should by now have proven the error of Congress and the wisdom of the Founding Fathers in placing money under the control of Congress and thereby the people.

Thinking Americans are pondering over the postal situation? They wonder why salaries for some postal employees are continued at a level as if to want employee discontentment. Why a money-losing bureaucracy is continued so top heavy with management and experts? Why complaints of mediocre service are handled with such unconcerned supervision? Why illegal strikes and work stoppages were tolerated without prosecution? Why the continued threat for higher and higher postage rates? It seems almost as if a design exists to prove to the American people that the postal service is unmanageable and incompetent—that Government is incapable of discharging its responsibility.

Questions are arising. Who would be interested in operating a money losing postal department? Who could be expected to purchase \$10 billion in postal bonds? Who except for a sovereign power would have such extensive financial capital? Who would want another private monopoly?

Could it be the invisible empire of the international bankers?

Mr. Speaker I submit the White House fact sheet which follows:

THE POSTAL REORGANIZATION AND SALARY ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1970

1. Title I of the proposed legislation would provide for creation of "an independent establishment" in the Executive branch of the Government, appropriately insulated from direct control by the Congress, the White House, the Budget Bureau, or the Treasury, to be known as the United States Postal Service. The independent establishment would be charged with providing a postal system adapted to "the needs of all the people."

2. The operating head of the Postal Service would be a Postmaster General, to be named by nine "Commissioners on Postal Costs and Revenues" (not more than five from any one political party) appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Postmaster General, who would not be a member of the President's Cabinet, would become the tenth member of

the Commission on Postal Costs and Revenues and these ten would name an eleventh member, who would be designated Deputy Postmaster General. The eleven-member Commission would have broad authority over postage rates, rates of pay, postal services and postal finances. The Postmaster General would appoint a General Counsel and such Assistant Postmasters General as he deemed necessary.

3. The Presidentially appointed Commissioners would serve for nine-year staggered terms. The tenures of the Postmaster General and the Deputy Postmaster General would be fixed by the Commission on Postal Costs and Revenues.

4. A thirteen-member Advisory Council would be established to advise the Commission on Postal Costs and Revenues on postal rates, service, and compensation. The Postmaster General and the Deputy Postmaster General would be Chairman and Vice Chairman, respectively, of the Advisory Council, and the remaining eleven members would be appointed by the President. Four of the members would represent major mail users, four would represent postal employee organizations, and three would represent the general public.

5. The independent Postal Service would be required to "plan, develop, promote and provide adequate and efficient postal service at fair and reasonable rates and fees," to serve, as nearly as practicable, "the entire population of the United States." It would be prohibited from closing any small post office solely for operating at a deficit, "it being the intent of Congress that effective postal service be insured to residents of both urban and rural communities."

6. The proposed bill would authorize collective bargaining over wages, hours, grievance procedures, seniority rights, holidays and vacations, insurance, overtime, training, safety, leaves of absence, promotions, demotions, transfers and other matters subject to collective bargaining in the private sector, with final and binding arbitration to resolve impasses, in lieu of the right to strike.

7. Collective bargaining agreements would have a minimum term of two years, with negotiations on a new agreement commencing 90 days before the termination date of the then existing contract.

8. Failure to reach agreement on the terms of a new contract prior to the expiration of the old agreement would result in the appointment of a three-man fact finding board. Labor and management would each select a member of the fact finding board from a list prepared by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director and those two would select the third member.

9. At the expiration of a 90-day cooling off period, if there were still no agreement, the impasse would be referred to final and binding arbitration by a three-member board composed of a designee of management, a designee of labor, and a chairman chosen by the first two. The fact finding board would frame the issues to be arbitrated if the parties could not agree thereon.

10. Postal employees would become members of the "Postal Career Service." They would be covered by a newly developed federal merit personnel program which would retain the advantages of the Civil Service but provide for more flexible personnel procedures and greater opportunity for advancement. All employees would retain their full benefits under the Civil Service Retirement system. The provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act and the Workmen's Compensation system for Federal employees would continue to apply. Present fringe benefits would be retained as a floor, subject to improvement through collective bargaining.

11. Political influence on the selection or promotion of postal personnel or on the management of postal affairs would be pro-

hibited, but the right of postal employees to petition Congress would be expressly preserved.

12. The Postal Service would be empowered to raise up to \$10 billion through the issue of bonds.

13. Final decisions in postal rates and postal services would be made by the nine public members of the Commission on Postal Costs and Revenues, after hearings by a three-man Rate Board, subject to veto by two-thirds of either House of Congress within 60 days after the decision by the Commissioners.

14. The Postal Service would be required to be generally self-supporting by January 1, 1978.

15. Title II of the proposed bill would provide an 8% pay increase to Postal employees and would require the Postal Service to negotiate a new wage schedule compressing from 21 years to 8 years the time required for a rank and file employee to move from the bottom step of his grade to the top step.

16. Promptly after enactment, collective bargaining will be required on wages, hours, and working conditions.

HORTON SAYS UNITED STATES SHOULD BE AN INTERNATIONAL LEADER IN PROMOTING FREE TRADE, BUT NOT AN INTERNATIONAL PATSY

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 28, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, since the early 1960's when the Kennedy round trade negotiations opened up new horizons in the quest for free and fair trade among Western nations, the United States of America has taken the lead among all nations in opening its doors to foreign products under reasonable and fair terms.

It is right and proper for the United States, the world's richest market and most plentiful manufacturer, to demonstrate its sincerity to its trading partners by adopting policies which will encourage the expansion of freer trade in more and more commodities. Economic theory states that free trade, once accomplished, would provide for more efficient production and distribution of goods around the world, because eventually each nation would supply itself and the rest of the world with those products and services which it is best equipped to supply.

I applaud the leaders of our Government who have guided America along a course which has encouraged free trade. But somehow, our leadership in this area and our sincerity has not had the desired result in the world community.

Our liberal import policies on many items has not encouraged our trading partners to follow suit by lowering trade barriers to U.S. goods by a similar degree in their own countries. In fact, the effect has been quite the opposite.

Instead of a good faith reciprocity in lowering trade barriers to the mutual benefit of trading countries, our trading partners in too many instances seem bent on a policy of taking Uncle Sam for whatever he is worth.

While we have extended easier trading policies with Western European nations, their reciprocal moves to lower the barriers against American agricultural and automotive products have not been forthcoming. Despite the brisk trade across the Pacific from Japan to the United States, the Japanese have been particularly intransigent about taking steps to reciprocate. They enjoy increasing export markets for electronics, textiles, automobiles, pianos, and other products in this country, but their barriers against many U.S. products remain steadfastly noncompetitive.

The result has been a tragic one for the trend of America's economy. While once we enjoyed an export surplus which served as the backbone of our international balance of payments, there is barely a trace remaining of this surplus. Instead, our imports have skyrocketed, and this unhealthy situation has coupled with other factors to accelerate our dangerous rate of inflation over the past few years.

The rise of imports has been particularly fierce in certain product areas. Pianos and dairy products are two which I have been concerned with in the past. But even more severely injured have been the textile and footwear industries in America. A larger and larger share of the U.S. market for these items is being corralled by countries whose laborers in these industries are paid only a tiny fraction of what skilled American shoe and textile workers are paid.

The Nixon administration has recognized the serious problem facing these industries. They did not see a need for drastic retaliatory action. Instead, they have approached the countries concerned repeatedly to renegotiate the basis for trade in these products.

Not seeking or wanting to reverse the trend of U.S. leadership toward free trade, the administration has sought responsibly to work out these problems without taking countermeasures that could shatter the progress we have made over the last 10 years.

But these nations have turned a cold shoulder to administration overtures for negotiation on trade questions. They have enjoyed vast profit and economic improvement in their own countries as a result of our liberal trade policies. Now, in the face of requests that they help avoid needless damage to these crucial U.S. industries, they refuse to cooperate.

I need not launch into an extended discussion of the effects of skyrocketing foreign imports on the U.S. shoe and textile industries. The potential, and in many cases the realization of plant closings and unemployment is apparent to all of us.

I agree with the President that it would be unwise and unnecessary to slam the door against all imports of these items, even though the temptation to retaliate for inflexible trade policies of some of our trading partners is real.

We cannot abandon our long-range and present desire to further world trade, which can benefit the economic health of every nation.

Nor can we allow ourselves to be taken by any trading partner as an in-

ternational patsy for allowing our Government to demonstrate its sincere desire to promote trade by taking the lead in lowering trade barriers.

I believe the most responsible approach that Congress can take is to give the President a trump card in his attempts to get meaningful negotiations started in the footwear and textile trade questions. The esteemed chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, WILBUR MILLS, has introduced a bill which provides alternative relief to these American industries.

It provides a quota for these imports which would automatically be lifted if the President is able to negotiate an international agreement on trade policies affecting textiles and footwear.

Thus, the only instance where this quota would become effective, is where a trading partner refuses to enter meaningful negotiations. In this event, it is up to Congress to apply protections for these vital domestic industries, as a substitute for international good faith in pursuing a reciprocal and mutually beneficial course.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the prudent and responsible approach of the Mills bill, H.R. 16920. I have indicated my support by co-sponsoring this bill, and I will be glad to testify in its support when the Ways and Means Committee considers trade problems later this year.

Many businesses in both the textile and shoe fields are endangered by current import trends, and several are located in my congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD the text of letters I have received from a nationally respected labor leader in my district, from the head of an important apparel firm in Rochester, N.Y., and a letter from the mayor of Rochester, who has supported responsible legislative action in this area. In addition, I would like to include the text of the legislation I have submitted, which is parallel to the Mills bill, H.R. 16920:

ROCHESTER JOINT BOARD, AMALGAMATED CLOTHING WORKERS OF AMERICA,

Rochester, N.Y., April 24, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HORTON: I am writing in behalf of the more than thirteen thousand members of the Rochester Joint Board of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO to urge you to co-sponsor the bill recently introduced by Chairman Wilbur Mills and others to regulate imports of textiles and apparel.

The growing flood of imports from Far Eastern nations, made at wages as low as 7¢ an hour, are having a serious effect on employment and earnings of our membership. The needle trades are our nation's largest manufacturing industry, and are particularly needed for the job opportunities they provide to women and members of minority groups with moderate skills. The nation cannot afford major unemployment in the textile-apparel industry.

And yet that is precisely what will occur if imports of these items are not brought under control. Almost ten years ago the United States signed an international agreement regulating imports of cotton textiles-apparel. The agreement has served both

importing and exporting nations well, by enabling both to plan ahead and absorb the impact without disruption. In the years since, however, imports of textiles-apparel made of wool and man-made fibers have climbed at tremendous rates—from 40 percent to 300 percent a year in many categories.

If these imports are not brought under regulation, you can expect growing unemployment in this industry, among workers whose only alternative may well be the welfare rolls.

The recently introduced Mills Bill provides quotas for textile and apparel articles, with provision for exporting countries to maintain a proportionate share of our market in future years. It also provides that if the President is able to negotiate an international agreement, the quota will be dropped. In other words, exporting nations will have an incentive to negotiate such agreements—which until now, despite the government's efforts, they have refused to do.

The Amalgamated, like most trade unions, is a firm believer in international trade. But trade which goes only one way (most exporting nations don't permit imports), and which destroys jobs and working conditions cannot be defended. It is particularly vital to our community that this legislation be passed without delay, and I hope it will bear your name as sponsor.

Very truly yours,

ABRAHAM CHATMAN,
Manager.

SUPERBA CRAVATS, INC.,
Rochester, N.Y., April 23, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: I believe this is the first time that Superba Cravats has asked you to back certain legislation. This should be very understandable because basically the management of this firm has been very mindful of a free trading philosophy and because our fashion inspirations used to (no longer so), come from foreign lands.

Today we are still dependent on imports from European fashion-oriented mills to supplement the creativity of our small but flourishing domestic industry, which domestic industry we have consciously furthered over the years with total disregard for our monetary interests. Nothing is more important to us as management of a concern almost 100 years old, than the consciousness for the need of a strong domestic base on the weaving level as well as on our own, the cutting level.

We have never asked for protective measures and if we do so today we do it by backing a very carefully written law which gives minimum protection to our workers. Since there are neither wage nor price controls in effect and since the inflationary pressures of a tremendous defense budget tend to raise cost-of-living indexes, the protection of the living standard of our workers on all levels demands that indiscriminate, unhampered import of products from countries who have bowl-of-rice living standards must be stopped.

A study of bill H.R. 16920, copy of which is attached, will show that it provides for reasonable importation as well as protection against the flood of cheap labor importation.

I phoned your office yesterday and asked that if you agreed with the tenor of the bill you introduce your own bill along similar lines. I ascertained from your office that you are concerned with the problem and are working on future legislation.

In all the years you have represented this district in Congress, you know that we have never made requests of you on the legislative level. The fact that we do ask for your

help at this time will show you how concerned we are.

Thank you very much for whatever you can do in the interest of a large group of your constituents and in the interest of the whole apparel industry, the existence of which is seriously threatened at this time.

Please do not construe our attitude as being opposed to foreign competition per se. Cordially,

HELMUT HERTZ,

Chairman of the Board, Chief Executive Officer.

CITY OF ROCHESTER, N.Y.,
March 23, 1970.

HON. FRANK HORTON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: Enclosed you will find a copy of a proclamation I have issued on behalf of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers campaign to curb the flood of unregulated imports from low-wage countries. As you may know, some seven thousand Amalgamated members marched in Rochester in support of this cause.

Because of the vital importance of this subject to literally thousands of Rochesterians I will appreciate anything you can do to support their program to set reasonable limits on clothing imports.

Very sincerely yours,

STEPHEN MAY.

H.R. —

A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear and for other purposes

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

SEC. 101. The Congress finds that the markets for textile articles and articles of leather footwear in the United States have been disrupted by the large volume and increased amounts of such articles of foreign origin entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption in recent years.

The Long Term Cotton Textile Arrangement entered into by the United States and other nations in 1961 is not adequate to prevent disruption of markets for textile articles in the United States because the Arrangement is limited to cotton textile articles whereas advances in textile technology and marketing practices have made textile articles of cotton, wool and man-made fibers, as well as articles of blends of these and other textile fibers, competitively interdependent. The continuing high and increasingly disruptive level of imports of wool textiles, and the large and rapidly growing volume of imports of textile articles of man-made fibers, and of blends of these fibers with other fibers have increased the extent and severity of the disruption of markets for textile articles in the United States far beyond that which the President has been able or empowered to remedy under the Long Term Cotton Textile Arrangement or its enabling legislation.

The Congress also finds the rapidly increasing penetration of U.S. footwear markets by imported shoes to be a specific cause of footwear plant closings in the U.S. This increase has been relentless for more than 10 years. No change in this alarming trend is now foreseen.

As a result, the increasing disruption of the nation's textile and footwear markets has injured workers in the domestic textile and leather footwear industry through underemployment and unemployment. The standard of living of the nation's textile and leather footwear workers, and the economic well being of their communities, is being threatened by the ineffectiveness of present laws and international arrangements to regulate imports of textiles and leather footwear articles in a manner consistent with

continued participation of domestic producers of such articles in the growth of the textile and leather footwear markets of the United States on a reasonable and economically sound basis.

SEC. 102. It is the policy and purpose of this Act to provide for the regulation of commerce in textile articles and in articles of leather footwear among the several States and with foreign nations so as to foster the maintenance and expansion of economically strong textile and footwear industries in the United States and to avoid the disruption of markets for textile and leather footwear articles in the United States. This regulation shall be accomplished by the imposition of quantitative limitations, by categories, on imports of all textile articles and on imports of all articles of leather footwear in accordance with the provisions of Sec. 103 of this Act, or by agreement with other governments or instrumentalities providing separately for limiting imports, by categories, of all textile articles or all articles of leather footwear, or both, from such nations or instrumentalities into the United States in accordance with the provisions of Sec. 104 of this Act.

SEC. 103. Except as provided in Section 104, the total quantity of each category of textile articles and articles of leather footwear originating in any country which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during the calendar year beginning January 1, 1970 shall be limited to the average annual quantity of such category originating in such country which was entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during the two calendar years 1967-68. Beginning with the calendar year 1971 the total quantity of each such category originating in any country which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during that calendar year and during each succeeding calendar year shall be increased or decreased by an amount proportionate to the increase or decrease in domestic consumption of that category during the preceding calendar year as compared with the average domestic consumption thereof during the two calendar years immediately preceding such calendar year as determined by the Secretary of Commerce.

SEC. 104. The President is authorized to enter into international arrangements or agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities separately regulating, by category, the quantities of all textile articles or all articles of leather footwear, or both, originating in such nations or instrumentalities which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption. The provisions of each such arrangement or agreement entered into hereunder shall substantially carry out and implement the declared purposes and findings of this Act and assure the avoidance of the disruption of the markets for textile articles and articles of leather footwear in the United States. The President shall make such arrangements or agreements effective by proclamation and is authorized to issue regulations necessary to carry out the terms thereof. The total quantity of each category of textile articles or articles of leather footwear which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption from any country which has entered into such an arrangement or agreement hereunder covering that category shall not be subject to the provisions of Section 103 while such agreement is in force and effect. Nothing herein shall affect the authority provided under Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended.

SEC. 105. The quantitative import limitations on textile articles of cotton heretofore established by the United States pursuant to the Long Term Cotton Textile Arrangement or pursuant to bilateral agreements heretofore entered into by the United States as provided in such Arrangement shall super-

cede the provisions of this Act until the expiration of the Arrangement.

Sec. 106. For the purpose of this Act—

(a) The term "textile articles" includes top, yarn, fabric, apparel, household and industrial textile products, cordage products, man-made staple fiber, filaments, and filament yarns, and all other textile manufactures, whether spun, woven, knit, felted, bonded, laminated, or otherwise manufactured of cotton, wool, manmade fiber, or silk, or of any combination or blend thereof, or in combination with other fiber(s) or substance(s) including animal hairs or furs. The term "textile articles," for the purposes of this Act, shall not include natural fiber in its unprocessed state such as raw cotton, raw wool, raw silk, or raw jute; spun yarns or silk, wholly of non-continuous silk fibers, not colored; or any article which is now entitled to entry free of duty.

(b) The term "leather footwear" includes those articles of leather and of vinyl specified in Items 700.05 through 700.45, inclusive, Item 700.55, and Items 700.66 through 700.85, inclusive, of the Tariff Schedules of the United States, Annotated.

(c) The term "category" means a subdivision of textile articles, or of articles of leather footwear, as the case may be, as determined by the Secretary of Commerce for the purposes of this Act, using as a guide the five-digit and seven-digit item numbers applicable to such articles in the Tariff Schedules of the United States Annotated (1969), as published by the United States Tariff Commission, or as subsequently amended, modified, or revised.

(d) The term "textile industry" means all establishments in the United States engaged in the production of textile articles.

(e) The term "footwear industry" means all establishments in the United States engaged in the production of leather footwear.

TITLE II—ADJUSTMENT OF IMPORTS AND ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS AND WORKERS

Sec. 201. The Congress finds that the assistance which it intended be available to domestic industries, firms, and groups of workers caused or threatened with serious injury by increased imports has, in the administration of title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, been denied virtually all applicants. The Congress intends, and finds it in the national interest, that the forms of assistance specified in such Act be promptly and readily available for any industry, firm, or group of workers caused or threatened with serious injury due in any substantial degree to increased imports even though other economic factors are found in equal or greater degree to contribute to such actual or threatened injury. It is the purpose of this title to provide for a reform of the administration of title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to this end.

Sec. 202. (a) Section 301 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1901) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (b)(1) is amended by

striking out "as a result in major part of concessions granted under trade agreements."

(2) Subsection (b)(3) is amended by striking out "the major factor in causing, or threatening to cause, such injury" and inserting in lieu thereof "a substantial cause of serious injury, or the threat thereof."

(3) Subsection (c)(1) is amended by striking out ", as a result in major part of concessions granted under trade agreements."

(4) Subsection (c)(2) is amended by striking out ", as a result in major part of concessions granted under trade agreements."

(5) Subsection (c)(3) is amended by striking out "the major factor in causing, or threatening to cause, such injury or unemployment or underemployment" and inserting in lieu thereof "a substantial cause of such injury or unemployment or underemployment, or the threat thereof."

(6) In subsection (b) the paragraph renumbered (3) is amended by adding the following sentence: "For purposes of this paragraph, reports made during the 1-year period preceding the date of enactment of this Act shall be treated by the Tariff Commission as having been made prior to that period."

(b) Section 302 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1902) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (b)(1) is amended by striking out "(which the Tariff Commission has determined to result from concessions granted under trade agreements) have caused serious injury or threat thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof "have been a substantial cause of serious injury, or the threat thereof."

(2) Subsection (b)(2) is amended by striking out "(which the Tariff Commission has determined to result from concessions granted under trade agreements) have caused or threatened to cause unemployment or underemployment" and inserting in lieu thereof "have been a substantial cause of unemployment or underemployment, or the threat thereof."

(c) Section 317(a)(2) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1917(2)) is amended by striking out "by the increased imports which the Tariff Commission has determined to result from concessions granted under trade agreements" and inserting in lieu thereof "by the increased imports identified by the Tariff Commission under section 301(b)(1)".

(d) Section 337 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1977) is amended by inserting ", including training not otherwise available," after "adjustment assistance".

(e) Section 351 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1981) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a)(1) is amended by striking out "causing or threatening to cause serious injury" and inserting in lieu thereof "increased imports of which have been found by the Commission to be a substantial cause of serious injury, or the threat thereof."

(2) Subsection (a)(4) is repealed.

(3) Subsection (c)(1) is amended by striking out clause (B) in its entirety, and deleting "-(A)" in the body of the subsection and ", and" following the word "interest", and inserting a period after "interest".

(4) Subsection (c)(1) is further amended by striking out "(1)".

(5) Subsection (c)(2) is repealed.

(6) Subsection (d)(3) is repealed.

(7) Subsection (d)(4) is redesignated (d)(3), and subsection (d)(5) is redesignated (d)(4).

(f) Section 352 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1982) is amended by striking out in subsection (a) "causing or threatening to cause serious injury" and inserting in lieu thereof "increased imports of which have been found by the Commission to be a substantial cause of serious injury, or the threat thereof."

(g) Section 405 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1806) is amended by adding a new subsection 7 as follows:

"(7) For the purposes of section 301(b)(1) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1901(b)(1)), as amended by this Act, the term 'domestic industry' means the aggregate of those firms or appropriate subdivisions thereof which produce the like or directly competitive article. Where the article is produced in a distinct part or section of an establishment, whether or not the firm has one or more establishments, such part or section shall be considered an appropriate subdivision."

Sec. 203. (a) For the limited purpose of providing the President with authority to enter into such trade agreements as he may find to be appropriate in carrying out existing trade agreement obligations which he finds applicable as an incident to actions taken by him pursuant to section 351 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1981), section 201(a)(1) of that Act (19 U.S.C. 1821(a)(1)) is amended by striking out "July 1, 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1973".

(b) The limitations set forth in section 201(b) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1821(b)) shall be applicable, without exception other than as provided in section 254 of that Act (19 U.S.C. 1884), to proclamations issued pursuant to the authority granted under subsection (a).

Sec. 204. Any investigation by the Tariff Commission under section 301 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1901) for tariff adjustment under section 351 of that Act (19 U.S.C. 1981) or for a limitation of imports under orderly marketing agreements pursuant to section 352 of that Act (19 U.S.C. 1982) which is in progress on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be continued under said sections 301, 351 and 352, as amended by this Act, as if the petition had been filed originally under the provisions of such amended section. For the purpose of section 301(f) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1901(f)), such petition shall be treated as having been filed on the date of the enactment of this Act.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, April 29, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

1 John 4: 4. *He who is in you is greater than he who is in the world.*

Eternal God, our Father, we lift our hearts unto Thee in prayer and with our hearts our hands to do Thy work in this disturbed and disordered world. During this time of trouble and turmoil be Thou

our stay, our shield, and our support. Steady our minds, strengthen our wills, sustain our spirits.

Restrain those who with wild oratory and violent means would intimidate our leaders and even destroy our Government. Do Thou make strong and stable the hearts and hands of those who seek freedom for all, justice among all, peace to all, and good will by all.

May those who labor for the good of

their fellow men feel the support of Thy presence in their endeavors to make our country great in goodness and to keep her good in greatness.

In the spirit of Him who went about doing good we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.