

relative to the war in Southeast Asia and national priorities; to the Committee on Appropriations.

475. Also, petition of a meeting of the faculty, students, and staff of the Department of City and Regional Planning, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, relative to the war in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

476. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors, County of Los Angeles, Calif., relative to impeachment of the President of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

477. Also, petition of the 12th district, Department of Louisiana, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, relative to the President's actions on Cambodia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

478. Also, petition of Norman M. Gelfand, Chicago, Ill., relative to impeachment of the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

479. Also, petition of the Canaveral Port Authority, Port Canaveral, Fla., relative to designating Cape Kennedy as the operational base for the space shuttle system; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE OUTLOOK FOR A MORE DYNAMIC TRANSPORT ACTION SYSTEM

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on May 5, 1970, Mr. Robert E. Redding, the Housing Director in the Office of Facilitation located within the Department of Transportation spoke before the Middle West Shipper-Motor Carrier conference in Springfield, Mo. Mr. Redding's speech entitled, "The Outlook for a More Dynamic Transport Action System," sets forth the ideas and policies the Nixon administration is proposing and implementing, so as to provide the United States with an efficient transportation system. I certainly feel Mr. Redding's remarks merit the attention of both the House of Representatives and the American public.

The text follows:

THE OUTLOOK FOR A MORE DYNAMIC TRANSPORT ACTION SYSTEM

I

When President Nixon on March 26 approved the official observance of National Transportation Week, to be observed later this month, its significance to the nation's economy took on new meaning.

Transportation becomes even more impressive when you realize that 13 percent of the nation's work force is engaged in some form of transport-related business. Significant also is the fact that some 20 percent of the nation's Gross National Product emanates from transportation goods and services!

A few years ago, some 10 percent of our total U.S. net civilian investment was in privately owned transportation facilities. It is estimated that public and private investment today amounts to more than one-half trillion dollars.

What a wonderful tribute it is to private enterprise that the world's finest transportation system exists in a nation—our very own—which possesses the world's only privately owned and operated inter-city transportation system!

Yet, as Transportation Secretary John Volpe says, "We are suddenly aware that our transportation system is not good enough. We have now come face to face with the inescapable fact that there is a vital public responsibility in this traditionally autonomous industry."

The Department of Transportation was established in April 1967 to develop an efficient, economical and safe national transportation system. That is quite an order.

And I doubt that anyone in those early months of the Department fully realized the broad dimensions of such a task. In fact, much of our effort in the last three years has been consumed by the simple need to define the properties of a national system.

We studied present transport operations and projected future needs. We developed policies which give direction to planning a total and balanced transportation system.

And we have now reached the point where systems implementation must begin—where we must apply our knowledge to produce constructive change.

As we enter the decade of the Seventies, we are prone to think of "technology" in rather glamorous terms. After all, we just left a ten-year period which included development of the space ship, the jumbo jet, the laser, and the mini-skirt.

The Seventies will, no doubt, contain similar advancements. But if we are to really begin putting the pieces of our transportation system together, the next ten years will have to produce some comparatively pedestrian advances—such as automatic signaling devices, rapid excavation equipment, and safer highway guard rails.

II

By far the largest portion of the transportation services we use in this country is provided by highways.

In 1968, the latest year on which we have information, total transportation costs throughout the nation were \$171 billion—highways accounted for \$142 billion, or 83 percent of the total.

Breaking it down further, we find that truck movements account for \$55 billion, or 73 percent of the total transportation freight bill, while movements by automobile and bus account for \$87 billion, or 90 percent of the cost of passenger transport.

In intercity travel in 1969, it is estimated that of 1,130 billion person miles of travel, 977 billion were by automobile and 26 billion by bus, for a total of 1,003 billion, or 88 percent of the intercity total. Air travel was second with less than 10 percent of the total.

Urban areas are almost totally dependent on highway transportation. In 1968, in urban areas of more than 50,000 population, over 97 percent of all persons miles of travel were by highway vehicle.

In smaller urban areas the proportion of travel by highway is practically 100 percent.

In the movement of goods, virtually all movement within urban areas is by truck. In intercity movement, highway transportation is larger than many realize. Of a total of some 1,850 billion ton miles of goods movement in 1968, 430 billion, or about 23 percent, were by truck. Rail movement, with its longer haul distances, accounted for 41 percent.

However, the value of truck transportation is considerably greater in proportion, as indicated by the fact that regulated and private truck carriers together accounted for 73 percent of the freight transportation bill.

In presenting these figures, I do not mean to minimize the contributions of any of the other modes in our transportation system. All of the transport modes are needed to provide the mobility of people and goods our nation requires, and each of the modes should be encouraged to do the job it does best as complementary—not competing—elements of the total transportation system.

But, the figures are evidence of the fact that within our national transportation system, highways are the predominant mode.

They provide the overwhelming proportion of the transportation services used by Americans today. They are the backbone of our whole mobility network.

There is every reason, also, to believe that highways will continue to be the predominant mode in the future. There is no alternative in sight which can provide either the volume or the variety of transportation services which are so indispensable to the way of life we Americans have chosen.

Motor vehicle travel now exceeds a trillion vehicle miles a year, and is expected to reach 1.5 trillion miles in 1985, or about a 50 percent increase in 15 years. This would follow a 100 percent increase in the preceding similar period of time.

This gives some indication of the dimensions of the challenge facing the highway program.

III

Our Federal Highway Administrator recently told Congress that the motorist driving on the Interstate Highway System "is probably the only taxpayer who gets his dollar back, with interest."

In the DOT stewardship report to Congress, the following major accomplishments and contributions were listed:

A relocation housing program that assures persons forced to move because of highway improvements decent, safe and sanitary housing. This means better housing for some 25,000 families annually.

Training programs which lead to permanent jobs for more than 60 percent of the minority persons who participate.

A nation-wide planning program which has helped 233 urban areas of 50,000 population or more to achieve comprehensive plans for their communities.

A renewed emphasis on highway safety. Every 1,000 miles of Interstate highway opened to traffic means 200 fewer traffic deaths had older roads been used. Also, a special "spot safety improvement" program of the past few years has seen 7,158 projects costing \$1.06 billion completed. At the same time, the States, with their own funding, have improved some 18,500 such spots. These are small projects which produce dramatic reductions in accidents.

A survey of all bridges in the Nation and establishment of national inspection standards for these bridges. Programs to train bridge inspectors are underway.

A number of transit improvement projects, ranging from exclusive bus lanes and extra median width for rapid transit facilities to a series of special feasibility studies and an urban corridor demonstration program are being conducted jointly with the Urban Mass Transportation Administration.

Twelve percent of all highway program funds now are directly associated with social and environmental factors and at least that much again is indirectly concerned with environment.

The Department of Transportation, under Secretary Volpe, is setting the pace. We are working to bring about a new vitality, a new concern, a new dedication.

IV

I would now like to conclude my remarks today with a brief description of my Office of Facilitation which is responsible to DOT

Assistant Secretary for Policy and International Affairs, Charles D. Baker.

It is our responsibility to assist the Secretary of Transportation, in carrying out the statutory mandate of the Transportation Act of 1966, "to facilitate the development and improvement of coordinated transportation service, to be provided by private enterprise to the maximum extent feasible. . ." This means that we shall help to develop and implement policies, practices, and procedures to expedite, to the maximum degree consistent with the public interest, the flow of domestic and international commerce, including the vitally important containerization resources.

We have recently tried to develop a description of our planned activities in terminology readily understandable to the general public, which includes the following aims and objectives:

- Prevent unnecessary delays to passengers, baggage, cargo, mail, equipment, and crews;
 - Provide optimum ease and more reliable connections for passenger traffic;
 - Reduce paperwork volume and documentation costs for industry and government;
 - Realize more efficient, secure, and economical storage and transportation services to shippers at lowest total cost;
 - Enhance reliability and schedule regularity of common-carrier services;
 - Shorten elapsed transit time for domestic and international traffic;
 - Enlarge the capacity to handle domestic and international passenger and cargo traffic;
 - Increase the productive use of commercial vehicles;
 - Stimulate continued technological improvements in transport services;
 - Accomplish more productive utilization of carrier, terminal and government personnel;
 - Improve transportation of domestic and international mail;
 - Promote exports from the United States; and
 - Foster foreign tourism to the United States.
- In a realistic sense, the challenge to the Office of Facilitation is to become an ACTION OFFICE, in facing the container problems of today, and helping provide leadership to solve them. Government stands ready to participate actively on the firing line, and I am proud to serve on the Department of Transportation team.

Our 1970 facilitation program includes a 30-point package of problems, grouped into general categories of passenger and baggage facilitation, cargo terminal congestion, documentation management, intermodal transportation management, including container problems, facilitation education, and several additional projects including cargo security and the Trade Simplification Act.

Our basic plan oriented to "getting results," is to apply an *ad hoc* approach to each of these areas, using various techniques of implementation which can best be applied. We shall attack these facilitation areas with in-house two-man coordination teams, supplemented by selective task forces, research studies, consultant support, and the educational and promotional values we foresee from our National Transportation Facilitation Committee.

We shall invite and encourage the interested industry groups to develop facilitation committees in order that we may have their latest thinking as to *factual input, needs, desirable programs, and proposed solutions* in the weeks and months ahead. We will share the responsibility and whatever credit is due, not only with the private enterprise sector, but also with international, Federal, State, and local government interests. We contemplate our responsibility to be coordination *in fact*, not in name only.

The dictionary is the only place where "success" comes before "work"—we have much work ahead!

If I had to pick two overriding concerns which will have the most influence on our

systems development and technology in the Seventies, they would be safety and environment. These two elements are relative to all modes. They are basic to this Administration's stated goal of improving the quality of life. They are basic to the Department's goal of improving the quality of transportation—of making transportation responsive to the needs of the people.

As we enter a new decade—we enter it running. We will be building—adapting—growing—planning—and building some more. I believe that, with your help, we can and will have that transportation system which is safe, economical and efficient, and will adequately serve the needs of our citizens.

A "NO" VOTE ON DIRECT ELECTION

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, since consideration of electoral reform by the House of Representatives and subsequent passage of legislation for direct election of the President, I have continuously and consistently opposed this reform. When I was invited to present my case before the Senate Judiciary Committee in its latest public hearings, April 15, I accepted—in order that I might once again document my case against direct election.

My concern runs deep and my conviction is sincere. At this point in the crucial consideration of electoral reform by the Senate, I again request audience for my views. It is my hope that my Senate and House colleagues will examine my position and consider my thoughts as they formulate final positions on electoral reform.

The testimony I presented before the Senate Judiciary Committee follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. WILLIAM L. CLAY

Mr. Chairman: My opposition to the proposed "direct election of the President", simply stated, is predicated on the conclusion that such a system will inhibit the political influence of minority groups.

It is uncanny that the "burden of proof" in this debate—has been assigned to those of us who defend the electoral system which has served us well—and that the proponents of such sweeping reform as "direct election"—which is untried and necessarily unproven, do not discuss the "need" for change, but only change itself.

Direct election spokesmen recommend abolition of the electoral system solely because they fear the possibility of it failing us. But when I express my "fear" that direct election forecasts the demise of the two-party system, I am dismissed with some "reasonable assurance" that my fears are totally unwarranted.

I take no real pleasure in opposing my liberal colleagues on this issue—but the mere fact that most liberals hold a view contrary to mine in no way affects the validity of my argument. Truth does not demand unanimous acceptance or majority approval.

I firmly believe that the direct popular vote would inhibit the political influence of minority groups. The present system maximizes the importance of urban regions and especially of the high cohesion minority groups. The black vote presently and potentially registered—is more effectively applied within the two-party system which has evolved from

the electoral system. And I am convinced—that the minority vote would likely follow a separatist trend without the cohesive influence of that electoral system.

The electoral system is not an archaic appendix—it cannot be removed without inducing grave problems throughout the entire governmental structure. Much of our system of political balances and alignment has evolved around it, and its sudden removal will create dangerous consequences for all the remaining parts.

Proponents of direct popular vote contend that the "one-man, one-vote" is a basic principle of democracy which must be extended to the office of the Presidency. I sharply disagree and vigorously oppose any effort to alter one of the checks or balances of government without relating it to the total system of checks and balances.

Extension of the one-man, one-vote theory to the election of the President totally ignores the problem of voter registration, voter qualifications and a surveillance of the casting of between 70 and 90 million votes, any of which are likely to be contested if we place this premium on one vote.

The futility of talk about the equality of each man's vote should be obvious—when each State will retain its jurisdiction to determine, within certain bounds, the eligibility and registration of voters—and when each State will continue to administer the election process.

Four States now provide for voting by citizens under the age of 21—Georgia and Kentucky at 18, Alaska at 19 and Hawaii at 20. Some votes in some States are cast and counted as honestly as possible—but in far too many instances, a vote is a result of a purchase, a deal, a steal or a calculated miscount. These realities cannot be shirked off in our search for pure democracy—when they color and distort the sanctity of the argument for the direct vote.

I resent the implication that the black man's vote in Mississippi—will suddenly become equal to the black man's vote in New York. Such a statement results only from naive theorists who concentrate on computer run-outs and ignore the realities of racism. The fact that many citizens are presently denied the right to vote is beyond dispute. The incentive, under a direct popular vote for the Presidency, to further deny voting rights in some States—makes the pious position for pure equality by direct voting even more ridiculous.

It has been pointed out that two votes in every precinct would have made Nixon the President in 1960, had the direct election been in operation. When you put that sort of premium on one vote—compound it with an absence of any federal uniform voting regulations—and fail to provide any reasonable means by which national surveillance of these votes would take place—it is an absurdity to speak of equalizing the citizen's vote.

I wholeheartedly support the position taken by Clarence Mitchell, director of the Washington Bureau of the NAACP—when he testified before the House Judiciary Committee this year. He stated:

"Such things as abolishing offices sought by Negro candidates, omitting names of registered Negroes from voting lists and disqualifying ballots cast by Negro voters on technical grounds are among the many devices used to restrict voting. Obviously, until the last vestiges of discrimination in voting have been eliminated, we dare not make sweeping changes in our method of electing the President."

As long as 2½ million black people are denied the right to vote in this country, it is not the extension of democracy but the ultimate in hypocrisy to talk about "one man, one vote."

The likelihood of division and splinter parties within an already divided American

public would be encouraged by the direct popular vote. The factions of the present parties who do not compose the majority—but a large minority at their respective conventions and within their party structure—would likely feel compelled to strike out on their own to reap the sentiment which exists for their position and candidate. If it were unnecessary to win the individual States to win the Presidency, the mere possibility of winning by precluding another candidate's majority would prove too irresistible to pass up.

I believe, that in 1968, had the direct popular vote been utilized—Eugene McCarthy, Nelson Rockefeller, Ronald Reagan and George Wallace—would have campaigned under individual banners against Humphrey and Nixon.

It has been pointed out that the old political alignments which formed during the Roosevelt era are breaking down. Proponents of direct election use this premise to denounce the instinct of the two major parties to protect their traditional interests in his debate. Consequently, direct election proponents see little substance to the concern of some Democrats for the "urban vote" or of some Republicans for the "rural vote." They carry it a step further and say direct election would serve as a healthy antidote to a special-interest oriented Presidency—since the President would not really "know" who elected him.

This is a most politically naive argument. A President may not know who cast the votes—but a President will definitely know who paid the bills, who printed the brochures, who went into the field and canvassed and spoke in his behalf. As for the realignment of the political parties and their constituent structures—this is a testimony to the trend of factionalism outside and within the two parties which will lead us to a multi-party system under direct election.

The flinch of fear which provides the momentum for this proposed revision of the electoral system flows directly from the scare instilled in us by Wallace. But responding to this fear through an elimination of the electoral system in favor of the popular vote—will actually promote and reward the factionalism and sectional movements which now divide this Nation.

It is not an instinctive desire for unity—but a fear of losing all impact outside the two parties—which keeps this delicate machine together and which promotes compromise, cooperation, and accommodation of the diverse interests and views which must be reflected in the two major political parties. Give those factions the chance for impact outside the two parties—whether or not victory is a realistic objective—and common-sense dictates the development of many parties. I feel certain that a conservative, a liberal, and a black separatist party would spring forth.

These are the possibilities which should instill fear—if fear must be the guiding light for our decision on electoral reform. It is clearly the element of fear upon which the current popularity of the popular election rests—not understanding or analysis.

The most powerful objections to the electoral system arise from the present likelihood that human electors can deal and wrangle and not reflect the vote of the people—and that the House of Representatives, voting by States, can deal and wrangle and further distort the will of the people.

A system of direct election is not required to meet these objections. By removing the human element from the electoral system and revising the means whereby Congress proceeds if there is failure by one candidate to produce the required electoral votes, these objections will have been met.

I introduced legislation in the House providing that the electoral votes should be cast automatically for the winner of each State's popular vote, and that the entire Congress,

with each member voting individually would, when necessary, determine the President and the Vice President. This Committee has such an alternative before it today.

To benignly presume that direct voting is the only way to purify democracy implies that there should be no "student councils" but total student governments; that there should be no Congress—but total American participation. It is the problem faced by the Greeks when they crowded the overflowing citizenry into the decision-making arena. The process became impractical and the result chaotic. To follow this one-man, one-vote argument into the upper house of our national legislative body would eliminate or severely alter the composition of the U.S. Senate. Why should Delaware or Alaska have two Senators when New York and California have only two?

The push for direct election does not reasonably assess the precarious structure of our federal system as it has served us these many years. There is only hope, and not reasonable assurance, that the transplant of popular election will not be instinctively rejected by the other moving parts. Unfortunately, the nature of our revision would preclude rejection of the popular election—but it would require that the other supporting parts undergo severe adaptations to support it.

If I were not deeply and sincerely concerned with this issue of electoral reform, and its potential for affecting the struggle of black citizens for equal rights and opportunities, I would not be before you here today. When "direct popular election" came before the House of Representatives September 18, 1969, I stood in opposition with only two other liberal-oriented colleagues among the 70 House members who voted against passage.

This effort to perfect our system by thinking in terms of pure democracy borders, in my opinion, on the realm of insanity. Democracy, to be meaningful, effective, and just,—must first be practical. To perfect the system of government and at the same time diminish or eliminate the voice of minorities within that system is a perfection we cannot afford.

POSTAL REFORM

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of hot air, pro and con, about postal reform is now flowing out of Washington at the present time and the big question is: Will Congress vote to take the Post Office Department and put it into business for itself?

The President has made the promise that such a new arrangement will bring superior mail service.

Under the proposal, the new postal service that would emerge comes in a package with the 6-percent wage increase recently voted by the Congress and which is so needed by our postal workers, and if what is promised is true, it would give to postal workers greater job opportunities, civil service status, greater opportunity for promotions, better hours and working conditions.

It would seem that one of the chief advantages of the new U.S. postal service, as proposed would appeal to every taxpayer, and that is the promise that

mail delivery will eventually be placed under a pay-as-you-go plan. If true, we could look forward to an end of the postal deficit that has resulted from the past failure to match postage rates with cost of mail delivery. It is noted, however, that the user will be expected to meet the cost of the service he demands and the taxpayer would ostensibly save the hundreds of millions of dollars he was forced to shell out in the past to insure the delivery of mail to others.

As proposed it is also argued that the new and independent postal service would be self-contained and post office professionals would have the authority needed to apply their personal skills. Employees would become unionized and engage in collective bargaining over wages, hours, and working conditions. If, however, things reached an impasse it would be resolved by binding arbitration which might preclude the possibility of further crippling strikes in the future.

In addition, the postman's civil service status would remain the same as the date of the law, with full benefits continued and he would be protected under the National Labor Relations Board.

As can be noted, however, Postmaster General Blount took the unusual initiative of introducing the controversial issue of both compulsory unionism and compulsory arbitration into the bill as an expedient to its passage. Opposition to compulsory unionism has been the Government policy for a long time and opposition to compulsory arbitration has been the forte of union members for just as long.

As a matter of fact, the Republican platform of 1968 states:

Healthy private enterprise demands responsibility—by government, management and labor—to avoid the imposition of excessive costs or prices and to share with the consumer the benefits of increased productivity. It also demands responsibility in free collective bargaining, not only by labor and management, but also by those in government concerned with these sensitive relationships.

The Republican platform then further goes on to say:

We will bar government coerced strike settlements that cynically disregard the public interest and accelerate inflation. We will again reduce government intervention in labor-management disputes to a minimum, keep government participation in channels defined by the Congress, and prevent backdoor intervention in the administration of labor laws.

It must be noted therefore, that the so-called "postal reform" bill will brew controversy as the Congress gets closer to making its final decision. The Congress may well have to decide whether it will choose between postal reform or freedom for the worker as well as preserving the right to free collective bargaining.

However it is organized, the Department itself would follow the pattern of NASA, the Federal Reserve, and SEC. It would no longer have Cabinet status and the Postmaster General—long a purely political figure—would be elected by a nine-member appointed commission and serve at their pleasure. He would be insulated from the present controls of the

President, the Bureau of the Budget, and Congress.

It will be a nonprofit corporation and, hopefully, a nonloss one. The beginning will be costly since the new 14-percent, two-step pay raise would result in an estimated \$2.5 billion deficit in 1971, but the proposed new postal rates will bring more than \$1.5 billion over the next year which would help during the organizational and transfer period.

From my correspondence with postal employees in the District, I know that there is a new pride of service and determination by the postal workers to take the politics out of the Post Office and to make a success out of the politically free, businesslike type of operation.

But even though there are further inducements for the postal worker, since the time to reach the top step in each pay grade has been cut down to 8 years, there are still questions and doubts.

There certainly is no question that this postal reform bill is far reaching. It is innovative and it should streamline the outmoded procedures in this department of Government.

President Nixon states that it will "bring a new measure of fairness to the postal employees, a new efficiency to the system itself, and long overdue equity to the taxpayer."

It will be debated and studied and at the present time it appears that it will soon come to the 91st Congress for action, unless it is sidetracked.

What will the outcome be? It undoubtedly will not pass the House and the Senate in its present form since there are sure to be amendments.

Its final outcome is anybody's guess, but one thing is certain, it is bound to become very controversial before the year or may vote is requested.

ISRAEL'S 22D BIRTHDAY

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the modern chronicle of the Hebrew Nation now covers 22 years. The most convincing reasons for assuring the continuing future of this beginning may be found in the pages of what many of us respectfully refer to as the Old Testament:

How excellent is that history!
How marvelous is Thy Name!

May I commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial in today's Atlanta Constitution, published in Georgia's largest city, and another editorial in today's Columbus Enquirer, published in Georgia's second largest city. Both reflect the sincere sentiment of Georgians:

[From the Atlanta Constitution, May 11, 1970]

ISRAEL—AGE 22 TODAY

Today is the 22nd anniversary of the founding of the state of Israel.

The new government issued a hopeful

proclamation at its founding, a call to the new nation's Arab neighbors.

"We extend the hand of peace and good neighborliness to the states around us and their peoples..." it read in part, continuing, "The State of Israel is prepared to make its contribution in a concerted effort to the advancement of the entire Middle East."

The new nation began with the support of the United Nations and the United States... and, at the beginning, the support of Russia. Those early hopeful words of the proclamation now ring hollow.

The Arab nations violently protested the formation of a Jewish state in the Middle East. That protest has been translated into war and continuing incidents of bloody armed conflict. The Soviet Union has thrown its backing to Arab nations intent on destroying Israel, first with massive economic and military aid and, more recently, by actually supplying Russian jet pilots.

The nations of the world supported the formation of Israel as a Jewish state partly from a sense of guilt. Adolph Hitler, in the heyday of his madness, had led a nation in the systematic murder of millions of Jews. The sheer horror of it, the sense that maybe something could have been done to prevent it, no doubt prodded many people to support the idea of the new Jewish state.

It's been a remarkably successful new nation in many ways. It's developed and maintained a functioning democratic political process, despite the presence of near-war-like conditions for almost all of the last 22 years.

Yet, the opportunity to develop in peace has eluded the new nation of Israel. Its Arab neighbors have sought consistently to destroy the new nation. Destroy, literally. That is the stated—the consistently repeated—policy of Arab leaders.

We would hope at some point that Arab leaders would sit down with Israeli spokesmen to negotiate a long-range peaceful settlement in that troubled part of the world. The prospects are not hopeful.

Meanwhile, we would note only that the U.S. commitment to support the free nation of Israel is a deep and significant commitment. It should remain one of the cornerstones of our foreign policy.

[From the Columbus Enquirer, May 11, 1970]

LITTLE ISRAEL AT 22

Israel became an independent nation May 11, 1948, 22 years ago today, after a harsh and brutal battle to even begin its existence. The terms of that existence have been as harsh and brutal ever since. There has been no rest, no peace, no moment of security in the country's short lifetime.

It is typical of her short time as a nation that today, on her anniversary, she still holds her borders by military prowess, not so much borders as active combat perimeters, and that the brutal force of Soviet power is now being thrown into the balance against her.

During the coming months decisions will have to be made in the United States as to whether Israel's compellingly admirable progress in peaceful endeavors will be lost because of overwhelming force brought against her by the Egypt bloc with Soviet assistance and at Soviet behest.

On her 22nd birthday, Israel can see her enemies given unfailing and reliable support and assistance and guarantees. She can look to the Free World and find not a single firm friend. Britain? France? They help her enemies and deny her even cash sales of weapons needed for her defense. The United States? We temporize, we talk about some obscure "balance of power" from afar, we do not know the feeling of being surrounded by populations which would inundate and annihilate.

Israel's 22nd year cannot be her last. So-

viet machinations must not be allowed to run their course. Israel can defeat Arab aggression if she is given access to buy the weapons she needs to do it. She cannot defeat Soviet Russia, but she would not have to do that if the United States took a clear and positive stand on her behalf.

If there was any good anniversary gift this nation could send to the one spot of Western style democracy in the entire Middle East, the one spot of real hope for betterment of the people of all the countries in that part of the world, it would be to guarantee that there will be a 23rd anniversary celebration in Tel Aviv next year.

THE 22D ANNIVERSARY OF ISRAEL

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today ceremonies are being held throughout the world commemorating the 22d anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel. Freedom-loving people everywhere are inspired by this brave country whose valiant people have borne persecution, separation from their homeland, and bitterness for 2,000 years. This day will be a tribute to the patience, courage, and perseverance of Israel's people.

President Harry S. Truman, as soon as the United Nations had voted for partition, recognized the new nation of Israel, making the United States the first nation to do so. In the ensuing years, the bond of affection between our two countries has grown. We recognize in Israel the same pioneering spirit which formed our great land. We see Israel as a model of democratic society with an enlightened government that has continued to respond to the needs of its citizens.

Israel has an amazing history of outstanding accomplishments. The remarkable political, social, and economic achievements of this small, yet determined, nation are admired by all people who revere the ideals of freedom and respect initiative and valor. I ask my colleagues to join me in saying "mazel-tov"—congratulations to the people of Israel on the anniversary of their independence.

In addition, I commend to my colleagues' attention an article appearing in today's Miami Herald entitled "Israel's Birthday":

ISRAEL'S BIRTHDAY

A mighty mite among nations, Israel celebrates today the 22nd anniversary of its independence. The setting of the celebration has become mournfully familiar in recent years; A nation still at war.

In the 22 years Israel has increased its agricultural production 40 times and its industrial output 18 times. With much of the desert tamed and city walls raised in the oldest of civilizations, it is the only truly modern country on the southern shore of the Mediterranean. And yet it is the home of less than 3 million people.

On this significant anniversary Israel's friends can only hope that it finds peace with its neighbors through recognition in the

coming year of independence and that this fruitless quarrel of cousins is resolved.

The whole world admires courage. Men and nations respect enterprise. History smiles upon the keeping of tradition.

These are among the qualities of the largely refugee population now augmented by the native Sabra born in a country so new that its survival is a miracle. We salute it and look to the day when the Fertile Crescent gives birth to peace in the Middle East, the crossroads of the world.

DEMONSTRATORS SHOULD PONDER "OXFORD OATH"

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am inserting in the RECORD the column by Joseph Alsop entitled, "Demonstrators Should Ponder British Students' 'Oxford Oath,'" which appeared in the Washington Post last Friday.

DEMONSTRATORS SHOULD PONDER BRITISH
STUDENTS' "OXFORD OATH"

(By Joseph Alsop)

In 1933, with Adolf Hitler already in power in Germany, a substantial majority of the members of the Oxford Union voted that they would never "bear arms for king and country."

This "Oxford Oath," as it was called at the time, must be wholly unknown to the young antiwar demonstrators, since they are also antihistory. But they will do well to ponder it, all the same.

The vote of the Oxford Union undoubtedly reflected the views then held by most British undergraduates. For that very reason, and also because it had a certain dramatic succinctness, it made a lot of noise in the world.

Among those who remember the "Oxford Oath" today, the customary thing to say is that the very same undergraduates who swore they would never bear arms in Britain's defense, then went out and fought like hell in Hitler's war. This is true, in the main, but it is also completely unimportant.

It is most important, however, that the "Oxford Oath" made a tremendous impression upon Hitler himself, as the archives reveal. In fact Hitler customarily cited the oath, whenever the German general staff warned him of the risks of his next move forward. It was proof, Hitler said, that Britain was rotten to the core, which meant that the risks were being exaggerated by the general staff.

In this manner, in fact, the "Oxford Oath" even played a certain role in bringing on the Second World War. Even more important, it was also a mere reflection of the condition of moral and material disarmament into which Britain had fallen at that time.

It revealed the climate that left Britain almost unarmed, while Hitler built up Germany's armed might at a furious rate. It forecast the impotence of Britain's response to the invasion of the Rhineland, when Hitler's rule would have ended if the English government had been vigorous and firm.

In sum, the "Oxford Oath," the climate that produced it, and the other results that climate also produced, add up to a grim textbook case for today's young demonstrators to study. If they study the case carefully, they will learn exactly how to blunder into a third world war by being antiwar. And that is precisely where we are tending.

It is just this aspect of the American situation that most disturbs a traveler, like this reporter, who has just returned from an intensive inspection of two wars, in Vietnam and in Israel. The war in Vietnam is going very well indeed, as President Nixon quite truthfully informed the country.

It will go even better if the President wins his Cambodian gamble. Without Cambodian supplies and Cambodian bases, in fact, Hanoi must eventually abandon the war altogether in the richest and most important part of South Vietnam, the two big Southern Corps areas. And if this happens, American lives will indeed be saved, just as the President said.

But in the Middle East, it is very different indeed. Here the Russians have now taken over Egypt's air defense, pretty nearly lock, stock and barrel. They have thereby placed the hate-swollen Egyptians in a position to wear down Israel by slow stages, until Israel is destroyed. And let no one deceive himself: Israel's total destruction is Gamal Abdel Nasser's real aim.

It remains to be seen what the Israelis will do about this. Since they are too few to fight a purely defensive war, whatever they do must involve really desperate risks. There is something else, however, that most emphatically does not remain to be seen. The new Soviet step in the Middle East implies a drastic Soviet change of course toward a much bolder, more aggressive national policy.

It can be said on highest authority that this ominous Soviet change of course was very much present in the President's mind, when he made his Cambodian decision. Looking at the toughness the President showed in that decision, the Kremlin leaders must naturally recalculate their risks all over the world.

But it is now a contest between the President and the antiwar demonstrators. Let us suppose the demonstrators win, by senatorial fat-headedness or in some other way. The United States will then sink into the condition of moral and military disarmament which these young people have been taught to regard as the national ideal.

Israel's destruction will be among the first consequences; in fact the demonstrators and their older inspirers will be Nasser's partners in the murder of Israel. One could go further with the lessons of the "Oxford Oath," but this should be sufficient.

ISRAEL MARKS 22D ANNIVERSARY

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today is the 22d anniversary of Israel's existence as a state—but it is in a somber mood that she marks this date. At best, her peace has been a tenuous one; today she is faced with the most profound crisis in her short history.

President Harry Truman was the first to recognize Israel; each successive administration has reaffirmed our commitment to Israel because we share a common belief in democracy and the rights of man.

I salute the proud Israeli people who, besieged and beleaguered, have withstood countless assaults.

In a world which has grown increasingly small, it is our fervent hope that

men might draw together to conquer the ills of the earth rather than each other. Israel asks only that she be accepted in the community of nations.

Mr. Speaker, although Israel is in one sense a relatively new nation, in a larger sense, the concepts of social justice and democracy upon which she was founded are among our most cherished ancient traditions.

One of the cornerstones of the Jewish faith is the obligation of mankind to love justice, to practice mercy, and to walk humbly with God. It is the recognition of this obligation which has been a major source of spiritual strength for our own Nation.

In addition we should also recognize the fact that many of the social and political forces which caused Israel to come into being are not unlike the forces which caused countless numbers of oppressed peoples to seek freedom here in the United States.

The bonds which unite us with Israel are the love of justice and commitment to a free, democratic, political system.

THE 179TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATED

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1970

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in commemorating the anniversary of the May 3 Polish Constitution. This day marks the 179th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of 1791 and represents an important and cherished part of Poland's history.

The Constitution was written at a time when Poland was in danger of having parts of its territory appropriated by the three surrounding powers in the area, Austria, Prussia and Russia. The Polish Constitution initiated far-reaching reforms and established democratic institutions of government. Unfortunately, Poland's experience as a free and independent nation was cut short by the aggressive policies and actions of its neighbors. Poland was partitioned by Russia and Prussia at the beginning of 1793 and again in 1795 and 1836. Following World War I, Poland again was able to attempt a restoration of a democratic form of government, but this attempt was brutally halted by the occupation of the country in 1939. Since that time, Poland has existed as a captive nation. However, the principles embodied in the May 3 Constitution have endured as a part of Poland's heritage and have sustained the Polish people during their many years of oppression.

The courage and determination with which the Polish people have struggled to regain their independence is an inspiration to all freedom-loving countries. Today, Mr. Speaker, we pay tribute to these people and wish that soon they will live again under democratic principles and ideals such as those expressed in the Constitution of May 3, 1791.

BLACK COLLEGES MAJOR FORCE FOR INTEGRATION OF AMERICAN LIFE

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of the controversy and debate centered about higher education, there has been a great deal of discussion centered about "who should attend." The white supremacists' view that black youth are more in tune to vocational and trade schooling is clearly rooted in their desire to keep black citizens in the lower income scales of this economy.

The effects of higher education on black Americans have now been documented. It can be shown that black colleges have clearly been the major force in the integration of American life at all levels.

The emergence of the black college resulted from the refusal of other schools of higher education to accept black students. Black youth—restricted by the absence of finances or meager finances—have sought education where they could find it. And the excellence of the black college in providing that education has never been sufficiently or appropriately recognized by this Nation. Still, these schools exist without the benefit of the funds they need from either State or Federal sources. They specialize in educating the disadvantaged who go on to assume major roles in the struggle for equal rights. In so doing, they have demonstrated an expertise which the academic community has yet to tap.

The discrepancies which still exist in educational opportunities afforded black and white students are deplorable. We have exerted efforts to impress all institutions of higher learning with the necessity for meeting the financial and educational needs of minorities. Some colleges are now exhibiting a social and economic conscience in their enrollment and teaching policies. This progress is noteworthy.

We must not, however, overlook the importance of the black college which has for so long been the sole force behind what economic integration of black and white that has occurred. Now, as these schools enter another decade, they must be rewarded and assisted in their efforts to meet the ever-increasing needs which only they, for many years, felt compelled to meet.

With this thought in mind, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following background paper on the traditionally Negro college. It was presented by the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education to the Special Subcommittee on Education in hearings held before the committee February 25, 1970. I also commend the efforts of Elias Blake, Jr., of the Institute for Services to Education, who prepared the paper for the presentation. It follows:

BACKGROUND PAPER ON THE TRADITIONALLY NEGRO COLLEGE. PRESENTED BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION TO THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 25, 1970

(The paper was prepared by Elias Blake, Jr., of the Institute for Services to Education for the National Association for Equal Opportunity. The findings are those of the researcher.)

The traditionally black college was and is the major force through which a black middle class was created in America. The society neither particularly wanted nor made provisions for the higher education of former slaves. The whole question of college and professional training was caught up in the racist assumptions about the intellectual capabilities of black people. In the South there was a conscious effort to suppress education while in the North no particular notice was taken of the educational needs of black people, except for certain philanthropic and missionary impulses.

The research on these colleges has developed the following picture:

1. Historically, black colleges were producing college graduates when no viable alternatives existed for getting black youth into and through college. From the early patterns of higher education in the 1860's up through World War II, it is likely that, of the 492,000 black college graduates, over 20 in the population in 1967, about 80 percent came out of Southern black colleges.

2. Though public colleges now enroll about 60 percent of the students enrolled in black colleges for a period of 80 years after the end of the Civil War (1865), private black colleges produced the overwhelming majority of black college graduates. This was necessary in the absence of any national commitment to higher education for black youth.

3. Into the modern period black colleges still carry a disproportionate share of the burden for educating black youth. They enroll about half of those in four-year colleges and universities (160,000 of about 350,000). It is estimated that they produced about four out of five of the baccalaureate degrees awarded to blacks in 1968. Without continued strong production from these colleges in the next decade, higher education for black youth could face a crisis. National trends may depend on their increasing their enrollment.

4. Only about half of the black youth who ought to be enrolled in college are enrolling annually. The 1969 freshmen entrants showed black students as about 6 percent of those enrolling. Without the black colleges, only 3 to 4 percent would be enrolled. A sharp increase in enrollment must occur in the next five years; that should triple the number of black youth estimated to be in college now.

5. If the enrollment in black colleges could be tripled in the next ten years, this might provide the national stimulus to enrolling more black youth. The trend between 1968 and 1969 is too slow to be satisfactory. They would be enrolling about 500,000 students at that point. If the goal of 1.8 million black youths enrolled in college by 1982 is reached, tripling their enrollment should be no problem. The high school graduates will be available out of which the goals could be reached.

6. The major problem for expanding these colleges is in the area of the availability of greater resources. They educate the poorest college-going population in the country with some success. Parental financial support is minimal and non-existent for most students; their parents earn too little. This is not a question of the "wrong" students enrolling; they are typical of the income patterns in the country among black people. These colleges work with these students with less resources for educational programs when compared to national norms.

7. The fact that these colleges are already in existence with a long history of educating

the disadvantaged should be capitalized on. No other group of higher education institutions have yet proven as capable as these schools in producing graduates from among a disadvantaged minority group. Enrollments have been increasing nationally but the meanings of those increases are not yet clear. Not who gets in but who gets out of college is the crucial question. Heavier support of these colleges given their history, traditions, and current performance would seem to be a rather low-risk investment with the potential of great return in equal opportunity and a concomitantly more stable social order.

HISTORICAL NOTE ON THE HIGHER EDUCATION OF BLACK PEOPLE IN AMERICA

Before 1876 it was estimated that 208 Negroes in America had received Bachelor's degrees, and about 96 professional degrees; 89 of the 208 came from one Negro college¹ and it is likely that almost all of the 208 came from Lincoln University (Pa.) established in 1854 and Wilberforce University (Ohio) established in 1856. This was a small beginning in higher education. The fact that half of the 488,000 free Negroes, North and South were illiterate and almost all of the four million slaves were illiterate² in 1860 made it rather dramatic. (See notes at end of paper for documentation. The numbers correspond to the references with page numbers at the bottom of the page on which the reference is noted. Thus, 1 p. 244 is in Bond and 2 p. 215 is in Logan.)

The first public colleges were established during reconstruction while black people had more political power in the South. The Alabama Colored Peoples University (which is now Alabama State College) and Alcorn University in Mississippi in 1871 were two of the earliest. As the political fortunes of blacks declined in the midst of the post-reconstruction period, these state schools fortunes also declined. No one intended that black people should have higher education, and least of all the expense of the state. These state schools have moved since World War II to enroll a majority of black students enrolled in Negro colleges.

For more than eighty years following 1865, however, private colleges supported the bulk of the higher education of Negroes in America. From 1854 to 1890 only the normal schools such as Alabama Colored Peoples University and Alcorn existed in the public sector. In the period following 1890, after the second Morrill Act, seventeen southern states established land grant colleges for Negroes. Ten of these were privately supported colleges taken over by the states (p. 218).³ It was in the period of World War I before these schools were offering collegiate work.

Thus, though public higher education for whites was in full development, black people had to depend primarily on private, independent and sectarian schools for their education. In 1936 2,108 college degrees were reported as earned among black people. Almost all of these were from traditionally black colleges. In 1947 the black colleges produced 7,698 Baccalaureates and 352 graduate degrees and 415 professional degrees (pp. 212-214).⁴ This total of 8,465 was split about evenly between public and private schools, though the professional education was almost totally in the private schools.

It is estimated that given the distribution of black population (77 per cent was in the South in 1940 and 68 per cent in 1950), these 8,465 graduates were eighty to ninety per cent of the graduates being produced in 1947. Outside of New England and a few schools such as Antioch, Oberlin and Berea, most of white higher education was not particularly hospitable to black Americans, nor were they being prepared for standard admission practices in the segregated public schools in the South.

Footnotes at end of article.

Now in the latest figures, March 1968, there are 492,000 (table I) ⁴ Negroes twenty years and older in the population having completed four or more years of college. The following generalization seems warranted: *For the last hundred years there would have been almost no college graduates except for black colleges. These schools then are the foundation stone of much of what is called "racial progress" in America. Without them there would have been few black people to be a part of the "progress."*

CONTRIBUTIONS OF BLACK COLLEGES TO AMERICAN LIFE

The following data are illustrative of the contribution of these colleges and reinforce the generalization made in the first section about the high proportion of the 492,000 black college graduates in America that came from these schools.

The United Nations: 50% of the fourteen black U.N. appointments graduated from black colleges. These are ambassadorial and major executive positions.⁵

Ambassadors: Four of the eight most recent black ambassadors graduated from black colleges and were appointed to Luxembourg, Patricia Harris; Syria, Hugh Smythe; Ghana, Franklin Williams; and The United Nations, James Nabrit. Two others of the eight, Mercer Cook and Elliot Skinner made their academic careers in black colleges and universities before going into foreign service posts after World War II. The current Ambassador designee to Sweden, Jerome Holland was President of Hampton Institute a black college.

Army officers: At least 75% of the black army officers commissioned each year come from black colleges. A poll of black military instructors in ROTC programs estimated at least the same percentage of the 5,594 black officers now on active duty graduated from black colleges.⁶

The executive branch of Government: 64% of eighty black federal officials (GS 14 up to Cabinet Level) were produced by black colleges, including Robert J. Brown, Special Assistant to the President (North Carolina A & T State University); James Farmer, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (Wiley College); and Elizabeth Koontz, Director of the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor, and former President of the National Education Association (Livingstone College).⁷

Congress of the United States: Three of the nine black Representatives in the House attended or graduated from black colleges as well as Senator Edward Brooke of Massachusetts, Charles Diggs (Mich.); William Dawson (Ill.) and Robert Nix (Pa.) are the three members of Congress.

State legislators: 64% of the black state representatives and senators who went to college went to black colleges. This is based on a sampling of 110 of 166 legislators from across the nation,⁸ including Otha N. Brown, Representative in Connecticut; Lloyd Barbee, Assemblyman in Wisconsin; John J. Miller, Assemblyman in California; James P. Davis, Representative in Kansas; and Charles Chew, State Senator in Illinois. In the deep South, 83% of the black legislators attended or graduated from black colleges; 100% of those who attended college went to black colleges.

Professions: 74% of a sample of 1,000 Black Ph.D. holders took their baccalaureate degrees in black colleges.⁹ 83% of all the black physicians in America graduated from two black schools—Howard University and Meharry Medical School.¹⁰ They still enrolled about 68% of all black physicians in the country as of 1969.¹¹

The black colleges have clearly been the major force for the integration of American life at all levels. Too often competent and capable black Americans are taken for

granted and viewed as proof of the fairness of the system. This competency, however, might well have been untapped and undeveloped but for the network of black colleges. The current dialogue about who should get in college should benefit from a look at the history of these schools.

THE TRADITIONAL BLACK COLLEGE TODAY

There are 111 of these colleges; 88 are four year colleges and universities plus one medical school, and 22 junior colleges. Of the four year colleges and universities 37 are public and 51 are private. All of the junior colleges except six are private. Though these schools are located in Southern and Border states, 40% of the 1968 entering freshmen in the four year colleges were from outside the South.¹² These schools enrolled 161,496 in the Fall 1968 term. This is estimated to be about one-half of the black students enrolled in four year colleges.

A great deal of publicity has focused on black students on white college campuses. This has tended to obscure the fact that though the publicity is great the numbers are small. 61% of all institutions enrolled 2% or less black students among their freshmen in 1968. Overall, only 5.8% of the freshmen in 1968¹³ were black and there was no appreci-

able change in 1969¹⁴ despite the seeming emphasis on enrolling more black students.

Some commentators assume the changes are more rapid than the figures bear out. The traditionally black college not only remains important but is the most dependable vehicle for ensuring upward mobility for black youth. The fact that enrollments in white institutions may be increasing does not focus properly on the need for graduates. Some performances sampling needs to be made of how many young people are getting out of college as well as being enrolled.

COLLEGE DEGREES EARNED BY BLACK AMERICANS, 1968

Fully 79 percent of all baccalaureate degrees earned by black Americans in 1968 were earned at 88 black four-year colleges and universities.

Black colleges awarded 20,000 bachelor, graduate, and professional degrees in June 1968. This represents 73 percent of an estimated 27,275 degrees of all types earned by black Americans in all of American higher education.

About 4,458 baccalaureate degrees were earned by blacks in white institutions and 7,277 degrees of all types.

TABLE I.—DEGREES EARNED BY BLACK AMERICANS IN BLACK AND WHITE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ¹

	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Total—	
					Number	Percent
Bachelor's degree.....	17,242	79.5	4,458	20.5	21,700	100
Graduate and professional.....	3,756	49	2,819	51	5,575	100
Total.....	19,998	73	7,277	27	27,275	

¹ John Egerton, "State Universities and Black Americans," SERS, May 1969. Egerton found 0.7 percent of the baccalaureate degrees earned by blacks in 39 of the 100 largest State universities. Public institutions give 61 percent of all degrees. 0.7 percent of 636,863 bachelor degrees awarded in America in 1968 is 4,458 degrees. He found 1.2 percent of the graduate and professional degrees going to blacks. $1.2 \times 234,969$ gives 2,819 degrees. The national data on earned degrees comes from "Earned Degrees Conferred 1967-68," pt. A. Summary data, National Center for Educational Statistics, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The main finding is that the black colleges are now and will be for some time into the future the most productive institutions for producing college graduates out of a largely disadvantaged racial minority.

It is estimated that 1.2 of the 34,728 degrees in professional schools such as medicine, law, dentistry, architecture, and pharmacy in 1968 were earned by black Americans. This is a total of 416 black graduates in all these professions.

Black colleges and universities gave 460 degrees in these areas or more than all of the rest of American higher education combined. In medicine and dentistry the figures are especially dramatic in 1968 with Howard University and Meharry Medical School producing 108 doctors and about 47 doctors being produced elsewhere in the country (p. 97, Table I).¹¹

Based on these estimates, 761 blacks earned degrees in New York and 636 in California. (Continuing use of Egerton's data for California, we get 370 baccalaureates (0.7 x 52,925) and 256 graduate and professional degrees (1.2 x 21,355) for a total of 626. For New York it is 419 (0.7 x 59,865) and 342 (1.2 x 28,534) for a total of 761. From Table 7 in *Earned Degrees, Part A. Summary Data, 1967-68, NCES*.) A single black university, Howard, gave 1,420 degrees in 1968, more than both of these major states combined. Several other single colleges such as Florida A. & M. University, Prairie View A. & M. College in Texas, and Virginia State College approach the production of the entire state of California.¹⁵

It is clear that in the next decades, if these institutions are not strengthened to better perform their tasks, enrollment and graduation figures could begin to level off and decline for black youth when the enrollment curve should be climbing sharply.

Any sharp reversal in the fortunes and functionings of these institutions will be immediately reflected in national figures for black Americans in colleges.

While we are creating new institutions, it would be unwise to overlook a proven instrumentality for extricating southern-rural and urban-ghetto black youth from the entanglements of racism and its attendant economic and educational deprivations. As we look for "new" ways and "new" patterns, we cannot afford to overlook the fact that under handicaps of neglect and under capitalization, these schools have done and are doing a remarkable job.

To better understand the complex and difficult role of these colleges, one must know the kinds of students who come to these colleges.

ENTERING STUDENTS' BACKGROUNDS AT BLACK COLLEGES

The income distribution of entering students' families has a median of \$3,900 with a range as follows: 18% less than \$2,000 per year, 16% \$2,000 to \$2,999—34% below \$3,000; 17% \$3,000 to \$3,999, 14% \$4,000 to \$5,199—65% below \$5,200; 13% \$5,200 to \$6,199, 13% \$6,200 to \$9,999—19% below \$10,000; 7% \$10,000 plus.

About a third of the mothers are domestic servants and a third of the fathers laborers; 51% of the mothers and 55% of the fathers have less than a high school education.

This income distribution in black colleges compares with 40% of the entering freshman nationally, with incomes above \$11,580 a year. Thus we see that 40% of the freshmen in predominantly white institutions are in the top 23% of family income with 65% of the freshmen in black colleges in the lowest quarter of family income.¹⁶ 68% of the freshmen nationally are above \$7,970 income which is at the national median of \$7,974.

Footnotes at end of article.

About 85% of the black freshmen in black colleges are below that \$7,974 figure.

Thus we see white colleges dealing with an essentially middle class population and black colleges dealing with an essentially low-income population.

Families which with little money and little education send their children to college raise provocative questions about motivation. Certainly a young person must be extremely motivated to go through high school and then with no dependable financial backing go on to college. There must be tremendous drive generated in these families to have their children succeed. Some psychologists say these youth lack "realism" in their aspirations. More likely than not, they refuse to accept so called "realistic" goals which limit their potential.

A look at a large state university, North Carolina A. & T. State University which a black Presidential Special Assistant attended, gives a view that is typical of the kinds of families which send freshmen to college: 18% less than \$2,000, 22% \$2,000 to \$2,999—40% below \$3,000; 27% \$3,000 to \$3,999—67% below \$4,000; 7% \$4,000 to \$5,199, 9% \$5,200 to \$6,199—83% below \$6,200; 9% \$6,200 to \$9,999; 7% \$10,000 plus.

(The income distributions are from a sample of fourteen black institutions, 7 public, 7 private, enrolling 37,000 students and in 1968 producing 4,500 graduates. These figures have been replicated for three years, 1967, 68, 69, and are very close to the more elaborate sampling of the American Council on Education. The three year sampling was done by the Institute for Services to Education.)

Out of these kinds of families, the black colleges in North Carolina produce 2,200 graduates. A total equal to about half of the production of all of American higher education outside of black colleges.

The income patterns in these schools are not a function of regional patterns. The students are poorer even by regional standards.

FAMILY INCOME BY RACE, 1967¹⁷

	Black	White	Percent of black population
United States.....	4,939	8,318	53
South.....	3,992	7,448	53
Northeast.....	5,764	8,746	18
North central.....	6,540	8,414	22
West.....	6,590	8,901	8

Whites in the South earn 89% of the national median; thus, income patterns are fast approaching the national standard for them. It is becoming less and less true that the income pattern for the South is the cause of the low-income pattern for blacks. The fact that despite migrations a majority of the black population is still in the South and has increased in number, reinforces the need for financial aid programs that completely support the students. The problem of higher education for black youth is one of finding enough money to attend college from non-family sources and then getting into a college responsive to his educational needs.

FINANCIAL AID PROGRAMS IN A LOW INCOME POPULATION

Very little comment has effectively portrayed the effects of inadequate financial aid programs in low-income populations like those in black colleges. In thirty-six private black colleges, 61 percent of the students are on some combination of financial aid. The average amount of aid per student is \$950.¹⁸ In a sample of ten of thirty-four public black colleges, 73 percent of the students are on some combination of aid. The average amount of aid in public colleges is \$539.

TABLE II.—PARENTAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO COLLEGE EXPENSES IN A NEGRO PRIVATE COLLEGE, 1968-69

Parents' contribution	Freshmen	Sophomores	Juniors	Seniors	Total	Percent
None.....	270	185	148	108	711	62.1
\$100.....	70	25	18	21	134	11.7
\$200.....	30	20	23	8	81	7.1
\$300.....	20	15	14	11	60	5.2
\$400.....	15	18	8	6	47	4.1
\$500.....	10	6	7	5	28	2.4
\$600.....	5	5	4	8	22	1.9
\$700.....	5	3	1	0	9	.8
\$800.....	2	6	3	3	14	1.2

Parents' contribution	Freshmen	Sophomores	Juniors	Seniors	Total	Percent
\$900.....	1	4	2	0	7	0.6
\$1,000.....	1	3	1	2	7	.6
\$1,100.....	1	0	0	1	2	.2
\$1,200.....	1	1	2	1	5	.4
\$1,300.....	1	0	0	0	1	.1
\$1,400 and over.....	8	5	3	1	17	1.6
Total.....	440	296	234	175	1,145	100.0

Table IIA. Average savings from summer earnings

Freshmen.....	225
Sophomores.....	275
Juniors.....	325
Seniors.....	375

Even with these substantial amounts of aid, most students find it difficult to meet expenses. Let us suppose a student at a private college, with a yearly cost of \$1,672 (average cost for private black colleges),¹⁹ received a \$950 financial aid package. In the typical case he is still short of all of the \$722 difference. His family can contribute nothing. Let us assume he brought \$300 from a summer job, that still leaves \$422 for the year in school. The chances are two out of three that his parents can put up a little money since their income is less than \$5,000 a year.

What often happens in a case like this is that, even if he is on work-study at school, he may seek further employment or his family will seek a loan. In their income bracket, it is likely to be a high-interest short-term loan from other than a bank for a few hundred dollars.

A public college is similar because, though the charges are less, about \$1035,²⁰ the income distribution is lower. The average of \$539 in aid leaves about \$491 on the average to be found for school expenses with work-study often already included in the package.

A summer job is more likely to help a student survive here; but if the family has been making financial sacrifices during the academic year, it is difficult not to help out with expenses at home in the summers. With so many students coming from small towns, the \$300 figure is optimistic for summer work.

Another implication of these factors is that a significant proportion of student

charges may go unpaid, especially if the student flunks out of college.

Any program of financial aid that assumes a significant contribution from parents will be ineffective in a low-income population. The difference between available aid and school expenses is often too great to be covered by working except at the peril of declining school performance. It is generally assumed that financial problems are a major cause of withdrawals and indirectly the cause of academic problems.

The best solution is to develop aid programs to give freedom from working in the first year at the very least and preferably for the first two years. These are the crucial years of college survival. Given the under representation of low-income minority youth in the current college population, maximum chances to survive must be given to those who do enroll. Without a free education available, it is unlikely that poor youth will increase their enrollment and graduation from college rapidly enough.

EDUCATIONAL SERVICES AND EDUCATIONAL EXPENDITURES

One of the common indices of quality of education offered in a college is the Educational and General (E&G-Exp.) expenditure. The E&G-Exp. includes all of the college's outlays for its basic educational program. Included in this figure are general administration, student services, instruction (teachers' salaries), library services, and operation and maintenance of the physical plant. Auxiliary enterprises such as dining facilities, dormitory rentals, and student financial aid are not included.

The per-capita or per student E&G-Exp. can be computed by dividing the total outlay by the number of students. Thus, if a school has 500 students and has \$1,000,000 E&G-Exp., the per capita figure is \$2,000 per student.

A study of thirty black private schools

showed the average E&G-Exp. to be \$1,364 in 1966-67.²⁰ The listing of the E&G-Exp. for 15 public schools averaged \$1,273,²¹ in 1967-68. Though these two estimates are for different years they show the essential fact that each time these figures are examined, public and private black colleges are at a disadvantage.

TABLE 3.—Comparison of per capita educational and general expenditures in traditionally black colleges to national averages, 1966-67

National average ²²	\$1,772
Private schools.....	1,364
Public schools.....	1,273

The E&G-Exp. for both public and private schools is \$1,313. This is a rough index but it shows the basic relationship. Using these estimates the deficit is \$459 per student on the average.

Though these schools have functioned well up to this point in terms of furnishing education to a group no one else was interested in, they cannot continue to do so at a disadvantage. In fact for the kinds of students who come into these schools from a generally inferior primary and secondary education, superior educational services ought to be available.

The main point of this analysis is that these schools can not be expected to produce large numbers of competitive graduates at bargain basement prices. This is a national problem and some substantial part of this burden must be carried at the national level. The same point can be made about any institution already heavily involved in moving large numbers of disadvantaged students out of the reach of dependency, frustration and bitterness.

The national problem of educating black Americans has remained submerged in the history of these schools. They have been a part of the solution while more generally higher education institutions have been a part of the problem of educating low-income youth.

THE FUTURE OF THE TRADITIONALLY BLACK COLLEGE

The question of viability is usually raised about these colleges both in terms of their problems with available resources and in terms of the social goal of racial integration.

The future of these schools must be placed in the context of needed places for a sharply increased number of black youth in higher education over the next decade. Table 4 shows the numbers and percents of non-whites in the population 3 through 17. Because of differences in birth rates the non-whites are an increasing proportion of their age groups reaching 16.6 percent at age 3. A child of age 3 in 1968 will enter college in 1982.

TABLE IV.—WHITES AND NONWHITES IN THE POPULATION 3 THROUGH 17, AS OF OCTOBER 1968 AND YEAR OF POTENTIAL COLLEGE ENTRANCE¹

Age, October 1968	Years of college eligibility	Whites ¹ (thousands)	Non-whites ¹ (thousands)	Nonwhites as percent of whites
16 to 17	1969-70	6,282	983	13.5
14 to 15	1971-72	6,651	1,068	13.5
10 to 13	1973-75	13,960	2,327	14.3
7 to 9	1976-78	10,687	1,900	15.1
5 to 6	1979-80	6,952	1,311	15.9
4	1981	3,351	649	16.2
3	1982	3,177	634	16.6

¹ Adapted from Preprimary Enrollment of Children under Six, October 1968, table 1, p. 7, and School Enrollment, October 1968 and 1967, U.S. Bureau of the Census Current Population Reports, Series, P. 20, No. 190, table 1, pp. 10-11.

TABLE V.—PROJECTED EQUAL ENROLLMENT OF NONWHITE STUDENTS IN COLLEGE BASED ON PERCENT OF NONWHITE YOUTH IN COLLEGE ENTRANCE AGE GROUP

Year of entrance	Total enrollment ^{1,2} (thousands)	Percent of nonwhites	Number of nonwhites (thousands)	Nonwhite freshmen ³ (thousands)	Nonwhite high school graduates ⁴ (thousands)	Freshmen as percent of high school graduates
1970	7,181	13.5	970	224	407	55
1972	7,925	13.5	1,070	246	437	56
1975	9,056	14.3	1,295	319	503	63
1978	10,033	15.1	1,515	330	561	59
1982	11,218	16.6	1,862	390		

¹ Adapted from Projections of Educational Statistics to 1977-78, National Center for Educational Statistics, 1968.

² Table 2, p. 19.

³ Table 5, p. 13.

⁴ Table 17, p. 30.

TABLE VI.—STUDENTS OF THE OPPOSITE RACE IN BLACK AND WHITE 4-YEAR COLLEGES¹²

Race	Black colleges		Race	White colleges	
	Number	Percent		Number	Percent
Nonblacks	11,460	4.0	Blacks	47,987	3.5
Blacks	36,071	96.0	Nonblacks	1,386,369	96.5

¹ This is a conservative figure based on taking all the responses under "other" in the nonblack category. If the 1,100 others are assumed to be nonblack, the percentage of blacks in the black 4-year colleges is 6.8 percent.

By 1985 the traditionally black college could be enrolling 480 to 500,000 students. If most of these students were black they would constitute only about twenty-eight per cent of the projected 1.8 million black youth enrolled in college by then. In terms of the diversity of choices in higher education, a black youth should be able to choose an institution with a large proportion of blacks enrolled. If this is less than one out of three, the growth of these schools should be dramatic never the less.

These projections assume the resources in financial aid to sustain a rapid increase in low-income students and the necessary institutional support for educational services to enable the enrollees to survive. This last point is crucial because the young people in the projections up through 1978 are already enrolled in school. Most of them have missed Head Start or, if they were enrolled, are moving into a primary and secondary school system not very successful with poorer children.

If these youth are written off, they will be a very uneasy presence to be accumulating in our cities and towns.

In 1968 there was a maximum of 434,000 negroes in college between the ages of sixteen and thirty-four; 352,000 were between the ages of eighteen and twenty-four, the normal base for college enrollment. If twelve per cent (the proportion of blacks in the age group) had been enrolled, 811,000 should have been enrolled. There was, then about a half-million deficit enrollment.

In terms of Freshmen, about 84,000 blacks enrolled in 1968; 180,000 should have enrolled to reach twelve per cent of the Freshman enrolled. A maximum of 100,000 enrolled in 1969 with about 40,000 of those enrolling in black colleges.¹⁴

Using the percentage of non-whites in the age groups up to 1982, Table V shows that for equal enrollment of non-whites, the current enrollment pattern needs to double as of 1970 for entering Freshmen, and triple by 1975 for total enrollment.

From these projections, the magnitude of the numbers involved in equalizing educational opportunity—means every available place now in higher education will be put to good use. Though black colleges may enroll a decreasing percentage of all the blacks in college, the absolute numbers in them could triple by 1982. In the short run they maintain an essential flow on which the increasing enrollment of minority group youth could build.

be true, however, that black educators, through racist actions, are not left in charge of rapidly desegregating institutions.

Without the kinds of constraints under which they operate and with appropriate subsidies to increase their educational services, these institutions could well be in the vanguard of pioneering exportable educational practices bearing on getting all disadvantaged groups in and through college.

Leadership has to come from some source to avoid the probable dislocations created by the inability of higher educational institutions to be as successful with the advantaged as the disadvantaged. It seems reasonable that some of these black colleges are by history, tradition, and current circumstances admirably suited to assume that leadership.

There is clearly an approaching crisis of opportunity in higher education. If the country takes advantage of these schools as a resource, the crisis might be mitigated.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Horace Mann Bond—"The Evolution and Present Status of Negro Higher and Professional Education in the United States", *J. of Negro Educ.* V. 17, 1948, p. 224-235. Based on the work of Charles S. Johnson, *The Negro College Graduate*; Chapel Hill, Univ. of N.C. Press, 1938.

² Rayford W. Logan—"The Evolution of Private Colleges for Negroes", *J. of Negro Educ.* V. 37, 1958, p. 213-220.

³ Martin D. Jenkins—"Enrollment in Institutions of Higher Education of Negroes", *J. of Negro Educ.* V. 37, 1948, p. 206-214.

⁴ Current Population Reports: *Educational Attainment*, March, 1968, series P-20, No. 182, April 28, 1969.

⁵ The U.N. Appointments were either staff positions or delegates at large including such persons as Frank Montero, Ernest Grigg, Robert Broken Burr, as well as Franklin Williams who later became an ambassador.

⁶ Based on total male seniors in ROTC colleges of 185,000, 10,902 commissions were awarded in 1966: from Office of Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, Military Education Branch. This was compared to a ISE Survey of fourteen black colleges giving commissions with 3,771 male seniors and 298 commissions. Out of an estimate of 106 commissions for blacks in white schools about one per cent of the total of 10,604 (10,902-298) was made. The 1.0 per cent is in excess of the 0.7 per cent Baccalaureates awarded to Blacks in Edgerton's study of State Colleges (see Table I), done in 1968-69. The 5,594 black army officers is from the Office of Veterans Affairs, H.E.W.

⁷ This list was compiled from polling knowledgeable former federal officials and then checked against biographical data for those on the list. The list is not exhaustive. It is available upon request.

⁸ List compiled from *National Roster of Black Elected Officials*; Metropolitan Applied Research Center, Washington. Eighty of the one hundred ten sampled went to college, fifty-one to black colleges, twenty-nine to white colleges. In eleven Southern States with thirty legislators, twenty-five went to college, all of them attended black colleges.

⁹ James Bryant, *Survey of Black Earned Ph. D.'s*; Division of Special Projects, The Ford Foundation, 1969.

¹⁰ M. Alfred Haynes, "Distribution of Black Physicians in the United States, 1967," *J. Am. Medical Assn.* V. 210, Oct. 6, 1969.

¹¹ Ann E. Crowley and Hayden C. Nicholson, "Negro Enrollment in Medical Schools", *J.A.M.A.* V. 210, Oct. 6, 1969.

¹² Alan E. Bayer, Robert F. Boruch, Black and White Freshmen Entering Four Year Colleges": *Educational Record*, Fall, 1969, p. 371-386.

¹³ "The Black Student in American Colleges"; American Council on Educ., Research Reports Vol. IV, no. 2, 1969.

¹⁴ John A. Craeger and others "National Norms for Entering Freshmen, 1969"; ACE, Research Reports. Vol. IV, no. 7, 1969, p. 22.

¹⁵ The article by Crowley and Nicholson in note 11 above shows the actual percent of black 1968 medical graduates to be 0.20 of the total in California, and 1.06 in New York, as compared to the 1.2 per cent used to estimate the graduate and professional school degrees in the two states. In 96 medical schools of 98 in the country 328 blacks were enrolled.

¹⁶ Current Population Reports—Income in 1967 of families in the United States, p. 60, no. 59, April 18, 1969.

¹⁷ Recent Trends in Social and Economic Conditions of Negroes in the United States, July, 1968. BLS report, no. 347, p. 7.

¹⁸ Statistical Information United Negro College Fund Member Institutions 1967-68, New York, p. 33-34.

¹⁹ Student Charges at 113 State Institutions. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 29, 1969. The table included 18 predominately black public colleges of 34.

²⁰ "A Comparative Study of Thirty Private Negro Colleges," Special Projects in Education, Division of Education and Research 1968 Limited Distribution, The Ford Foundation, New York.

²¹ Voluntary Support of Education 1967-1968", Council for Financial Aid to Education, Division of Research, New York. The report surveyed 861 colleges and universities and the 15 schools are a good cross section of the 37 public colleges. An earlier estimate based on a less representative sample of nine schools placed the public school E&G exp. at \$1334 per student.

²² Current Funds Revenues and Expenditures 1966-67. Financial Statistics of Institutions of Higher Education, N.C.E.S. Dept. of H.E.W., p. 10, table C. The average is for all schools public and private. The figure is \$1,551 for Public Schools and 2,243 for Private Schools. Since these are estimates the National average is the most useful index.

²³ Projections of Educational Statistics to 1977-78, National Center for Educational Statistics, 1968.

INFLAMMATORY STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS OF "CHICAGO 7" PROMOTING DISCORD AND VIOLENCE

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I continue to be deeply concerned by the nefarious activities of various members of the so-called Chicago 7. Five of these individuals are currently on bail after having been convicted of crossing State lines to incite riots, specifically the violent disruptions during the Democratic National Convention in Chicago during August 1968. All seven have been sentenced for contempt of court during the trial.

Several members of this group have been roaming the country making inflammatory speeches on college campuses, promoting discord and violence. Law-abiding Americans everywhere are asking why the Government permits them to remain at liberty to create chaos in view of the conditions imposed in connection with their appeal bonds. Justice and reason cannot prevail in circumstances exacerbated by their constant stream of rhetorical incitement. Justice Holmes long ago declared that it was impermissible to falsely shout "Fire!" in a crowded theater—freedom of speech un-

der the first amendment notwithstanding. History will not judge us as sensible, responsible guardians of the public trust if we permit this Republic to be reduced to rubble by open and sworn foes of constitutional government. While they have seemingly radicalized thousands of the Nation's youth, there are many times more who have a dedicated belief in orderly dissent. The will of the majority must not be perpetually frustrated.

I recently inserted in the RECORD remarks concerning recent statements made by two members of the "Chicago 7." I also included a copy of my letter to Attorney General John Mitchell requesting initiation of measures that would require members of this group who are in apparent violation of their bail stipulations to show cause why their bonds should not be revoked.

Today, I want to call attention to other incendiary statements by "Chicago 7" members to show their relentlessness.

David Dellinger, in a speech at Marquette University on January 29, 1970, told his audience that confrontations cannot be avoided. He remarked:

We are people who feel that institutions with built-in violence and injustice . . . must be challenged, must be fought and must be done away with . . . If you're real, you're going to be involved in inevitable and necessary confrontations.

Rennie Davis, in a speech on March 17, 1970, at Columbia University, declared that if the 1960's were a time of sit-ins, the 1970's would be a time to "burn banks." Immediately after Davis' speech, some 300 student radicals held a rally at the university and did not disperse until the school president, Dr. Andrew Cordier, promised he would consider demands that the university provide bail money for Black Panther Party members on trial.

Jerry Rubin, in a speech at the University of Pennsylvania on March 19, 1970, urged cheering students to "move into the streets." In a speech littered with obscenities, Rubin declared:

There won't be any school system left in this country in another five years.

In a speech on April 8, 1970, at American University in Washington, D.C., Rubin denounced the university as a "babysitting agency" and declared that the "court system ought to be disrupted." Afterward, Rubin was asked if he was "willing to get busted—arrested" for inciting to riot if American University students took any action. Rubin replied, "I didn't tell you to do anything you weren't going to do anyhow." Following Rubin's talk, students went on a rampage and did extensive damage to university property.

On March 31, 1970, Thomas Hayden spoke on the campus of Stanford University at Palo Alto, Calif. Following his speech about 200 students began a demonstration protesting the presence of ROTC on campus. More than 100 windows in university buildings were smashed before the demonstrators were brought under control.

In the light of the foregoing activities of these defendants it is exceedingly difficult for me to understand why action to bring about a revocation of their bonds has not been initiated.

MODEL UNITED NATIONS

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in this day when we are hearing so much about student activities I thought it appropriate to call to the attention of my colleagues the efforts of one group of students to better understand our foreign policy.

Recently a group of some 800 northern California high school students participated in the third Sacramento State College High School Model United Nations. This practical exercise in government was sponsored by the college and the Sacramento Bee, Radio Station KFBK and Channel 13, who have taken the leadership in the promotion of constructive student activity. Filling the post of Secretary General was J. Michael Korff of my home town, Roseville, a graduate student of Sacramento State College, who is indeed a fine, dedicated young man.

A summary of the activities of the Model United Nations is found in two reports carried in the Sacramento Bee, which I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD.

MODEL U.N. PROVIDES LESSONS FOR 800 NORTH STATE STUDENTS

(By Sigrid Cayting)

An estimated 800 high school students from throughout Northern California had an exercise in international diplomacy today during the third annual Model United Nations at Sacramento State College.

The all-day event, sponsored by The Bee, KFBK and KOVR, saw an immediate confrontation on the issue of racial discrimination in South Africa during the first General Assembly session this morning.

A motion by South Africa to exclude discussion of racial separatism from the agenda on the grounds that it violated the country's "internal sovereignty" was almost unanimously defeated.

PEACE, UNDERSTANDING

In other discussion, representatives from the Soviet Union and the United States made brief presentations calling for international peace and understanding.

James Holmes, 16, a junior at Redwood High School in Larkspur and acting permanent representative of the USSR, said peace would be impossible "as long as the world remained an armed camp" and called for "general and complete disarmament throughout the world."

The representative from the USSR also condemned racial separatism in South Africa—describing the latter nation as "the arch-fiend of racism" and calling upon the General Assembly to "act accordingly."

Mike Ellis, 18, a senior at Clayton Valley High School in Concord and permanent representative of the United States, said the UN labors "in an atmosphere of frustration—unsure of its goals and purposes."

He said the primary objective of the UN should be "preventing conflict by solving the issues rather than merely stopping the fighting."

Committee sessions convened 45 minutes behind schedule at 10:15 a.m. and dealt with such topics as political and security questions, environment, human rights and racial discrimination, disarmament and economic affairs.

Discussions in committee continued this afternoon with committee reports to be pre-

sented to the full General Assembly later today.

It is also expected that student complaints concerning the presence of faculty advisers on the General Assembly floor—which is prohibited in the model UN—will be raised at the afternoon session of the General Assembly. One student said this morning that a faculty adviser was preventing student delegates from speaking.

DISTRESSED BY DETAILS

Some students were also distressed over the amount of time devoted to administrative details of agenda order, luncheon procedure, seating, and other items not directly related to issues confronting the UN.

Some of the liveliest discussion occurred in the committee on human rights and environment. Among resolutions introduced in the committee was one censuring the Republic of South Africa for its apartheid policy and calling for economic sanctions in some cases. A similar resolution condemning racial discrimination in South Africa and Portugal was introduced by the delegation from Sweden.

Heading the conference as Secretary-General is J. Michael Korff, a student at Sacramento State College. Dr. William Dillon, a professor of government at SSC, served as president of the General Assembly.

STUDENTS GET IDEA OF U.N. POLITICS

The complexities, trials, tribulations and utter frustration of the politics it takes to run a country are etched in the minds of more than 800 high school students from throughout Northern California today.

The students, all delegates to the Model United Nations held at Sacramento State College yesterday, ran the gamut of emotions from despair to ecstasy as, one by one, they saw their favored bills defeated or passed by the General Assembly of the Model UN during a day-long session sponsored by The Bee, KFBK and KOVR.

After a morning devoted to discussion of racial separatism, international peace and understanding, political and national security questions and international economic affairs, the students settled down for an afternoon General Assembly session highlighted with a debate on Red China.

An expected heated discussion on the inclusion or continued exclusion of Red China from the General Assembly never materialized, however, when the resolution to admit it for discussion lost by a slim two votes.

The General Assembly took a stand on disarmament by adopting a resolution prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons and recommending prohibition of flights by bomber aircraft carrying nuclear weapons beyond national boundaries.

The assembly rejected a resolution on the question of international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space which, among other items, suggested that all countries be investigated in reference to their outer space programs and planned space projects.

Yesterday's Model UN was the third annual such event and was directed by J. Michael Korff, secretary-general, and Dr. William Dillon, professor of government at SSC, who served as president of the General Assembly.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. LEONARD FARBSTAIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 4, 1970

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 3, many Polish Americans celebrated Constitution Day. One of the

most important holidays for the Polish people it brings with it happiness and joy. Yet this time also brings about a sense of mourning.

The sadness and sense of loss is a direct result of the coldblooded murder of Polish leaders and citizens in the Katyn Forest by the Soviets 30 years ago. The murders of these Polish prisoners of war still shock the civilized world today. However, in their sadness the Polish people look toward the future with a strong sense of dedication that is to be free. I am certain that in the future they will become the masters of their own destiny. For a proud and brave people this is only a matter of time.

ISRAEL'S INDEPENDENCE

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, in reverence, I join my colleagues, and freedom-loving peoples everywhere, in tribute to the State of Israel on the anniversary of their independence.

On this date in 1948, the British mandate in Palestine ended, and Israel was proclaimed a free and independent state. Significantly, the United States recognized the new State in a matter of hours after the proclamation of independence. In the ensuing years, the bond of affection between our two countries has grown, and today we look to the young and energetic State of Israel as a shining example of what can be done with imagination, determination, and talent.

In the 22 years of her existence as a free state, Israel has become a model of courage, prosperity, and progress. Against seemingly unsurmountable odds, and in the face of constant danger, yet, from hostile neighbors, Israel will not be deterred from the course she charted 22 years ago, when in her Declaration of Statehood she stated:

It (Israel) will foster the development of the country for the benefit of all inhabitants; it will be based on freedom, justice, and peace as envisaged by the prophets of Israel; it will insure complete equality of social and political rights to all its inhabitants irrespective of religion, race, or sex; it will guarantee freedom of religion, conscience, language, education, and culture; it will safeguard the holy places of all religions; and it will be faithful to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

History has recorded the fulfillment of these ideals. Israel's achievements in social, economic, and political areas have been lauded worldwide with deep admiration, not only for the accomplishments in themselves, but for the faith, courage, and perseverance which made them possible.

Sterile wasteland has been transformed into fertile farming acreage; and economic potential has been further realized to the extent that for several years now, Israel has been lending technical assistance to less advanced countries. Militarily, she has developed and maintained a large and efficient armed

force, the might and strength of which could well be unparalleled for a state the size of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, the history of this democratic state, in an area where democracy is the exception rather than the rule, has been truly remarkable, and on this occasion, we wish her a future of continued growth and productivity, while saluting her adherence to the ideals which have made her development such an inspiration to all of us.

A TRIBUTE TO MEXICAN AMERICANS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, on May 5, Mexicans and Mexican Americans celebrated "Cinco de Mayo"—a day dedicated to the courage and fortitude of our neighbors to the South.

However, when we consider the conditions in which many Mexican Americans are daily exposed, we ought also to revere their great patience. For many of these people, life in America is a life of abuse and prejudice. They, like other minority groups, have yet to be allowed the human privileges afforded in America. They have been a poor and, heretofore, reticent people, suffering the scorn and bias of our society.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to join me in congratulating the efforts of the Mexican American people for organizing in efforts to "confront and change the powers and institutions that deal with them so unfairly either directly or indirectly." We all recognize the right and necessity for peaceful assembly and redress of grievances. I support the Mexican American people in their expression of these privileges.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to my colleagues the following editorial from the Washington Post of May 6, 1970. It calls attention to the plight of our fellow citizens and to their efforts to organize. The context of the editorial deserves careful consideration by all of us.

The editorial follows:

THE RISING MEXICAN-AMERICANS

Among the nation's minorities who are increasingly less silent about their lot is the one of 6½ million Mexican-Americans. The poverty they suffer is as bad or worse as the bleakest conditions endured by the blacks, Appalachians or Indians. Unemployment is roughly twice the rate of white Americans. In the Southwest, more than a third live below the poverty level. In 1968, only 600 of 22,000 graduates of the Southwest's five main universities were Mexican-Americans. Last week, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights added another dismal fact about Mexican-Americans: they suffer large amounts of abuse and violence from law enforcement agencies, ranging from casual insults to brutal beatings. The commission's survey covered the Southwest, where more than four million Mexican-Americans live.

None of this information is new, either to the victimized themselves or to those who work to help them. What is new is that a growing number of organizations are being

formed by Mexican-Americans to confront and change the powers and institutions that deal with them so unfairly either directly or indirectly. The more well-known include MAYO (Mexican-American Youth Organization), a three-year-old movement largely in Texas which is seeking, and gaining, an economic base as a means for political action; OMICA (Organized Migrants in Community Action), a Florida group that helps migrant workers deal with state and federal assistance agencies, insurance companies, and, most important, the employers.

The test of the coming years is not so much how the Mexican-Americans will use their growing power—violently or non-violently—but whether the larger white society continues to ignore their rights and needs. Commissioner Vicente Ximenes of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunities Commission warned last June, "You must have a rising awareness in the nation, and especially in the Southwest, of the obligations of government officials and certainly the people, the obligation to a very important segment of the population. It would seem to me that we are taking five million people in this area for granted at our own peril. It would be a tragedy if we had to wait for something explosive to happen before we acted."

The Mexican-Americans are basically the old story of the poor wanting in, the longest running drama on the American stage. The hope this time around is that perhaps the old story, through public legislation and private compassion, will have a new ending.

V-E DAY, HAS IT COME TO THIS?

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a veteran of World War II, I cannot help but remember May 8 of 25 years ago when I was in Europe at the war's end. I look back with pride at our hard-won victory in Europe and the defeat of Hitler.

There was pride in being an American. Throughout our Nation, not only the men in Europe, but here at home also, there was a strong feeling of patriotism for our country and pride in its men, women, and children who had contributed so much to the cause of freedom.

Today, I pause to reflect on our accomplishments. We who served in the armed services in Europe and around the world must now take time to look inward at our country and examine the path we have followed since that day of victory.

Much that we see is good in many ways. We have a prosperous America. We have many of the good things to enjoy and which lend to our comfort. We did not have peace of long duration, for we fought another in Korea, but it did end with freedom for the Korean people.

Now, although we are in Vietnam, our troops are being withdrawn from this war in the southeast, and the President has pledged to end the war and help the South Vietnamese to become able to defend themselves against communism.

Now, not only I, but all of us must pause and reflect on the American scene, as we see it today on the streets of our cities, and on our college campuses.

Every American must, in the confusion of today, ask, "What is happening and why?"

Has the sacrifice of the thousands of our brothers, sons, and fathers who laid down their lives for freedom and the defense of our democracy been in vain? Is it fair on the day of remembrance of our victory in Europe that we find our institutions of learning burned, our flag desecrated by wild-eyed anarchists, and irreverence for the Almighty?

I am angry at those who would undermine from within this country of ours that has given us respect and freedom. They who preach anarchy are enemies of our society the same as those who would attack us from abroad.

There is no place in our Nation for the use of violence, the use of fire bombs or of riots, disobedience and the violation of every principle of democracy in the name of constitutional or academic freedom. These are not the ways to correct our wrongs or to expand upon our democratic way of life, the way of life that many dedicated and determined men and women fought for so that our children today could enjoy freedom and comfort.

The hearts of most Americans—by far a great majority—are filled with pride and respect for the deeds of valor and of the dedication of our veterans living and dead who recognize our country as the hope of the free world.

I hold in utter contempt the demonstrators who would attempt to overthrow this Government of ours hewed by the sweat and dedication of our forefathers.

These dissenters have the right to speak out; yes, even protest, but not in the dictatorial words of Mein Kampf, the socialism of Lenin, or the sadistic dogmatism of Mao.

We will not listen to their filthy cries, nor will we submit to their acts of terror.

This America is free and it must remain so. We must state loudly for all the world to hear: America is our country, a nation under law which we will move toward more liberty, greater happiness, and the insurance of security for our lives and our children's lives.

Our destiny will not be that of the Roman Empire, because we are a nation under God, dedicated to the greatness of our people.

May every true American pause and pray for the dream that came with the victory of V-E Day, 25 years ago for the restoration of common decency with respect for law and order by our young Americans and restore confidence and pride in ourselves and in our Nation.

THE PROUD RECORD OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, recently the Reader's Digest published an article

in its May edition, "Time To Say No to Big-Farm Subsidies," that misrepresented the facts regarding the impact and effect of agricultural programs.

My colleague, the distinguished Representative from Kansas and the largest wheat-producing congressional district in the country, KEITH SEBELIUS, answered this article in a letter to the Reader's Digest that provides many facts that were ignored in this article.

I have read his reply and endorse the facts he presented which "tell it like it really is" on the farm and in agriculture today. In view of pending agriculture legislation, it is important that everyone fully understand the role of agriculture in our economy and the present economic outlook in agriculture.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1970.

Mr. C. R. DEVINE, V.P.,
The Reader's Digest,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. DEVINE: Thank you very much for sending me an advanced copy of the article "Time to Say no to Big-Farm Subsidies," by Eugene H. Methvin. Since I represent a predominately rural district, this article was of considerable interest and concern to me.

I am concerned by what this article failed to say about the present farm income situation and the cost of food. The American farmer is proud of his contribution to American economic development, providing food and fiber for himself and the needs of 43 other persons. He is also proud that his production provides \$5 billion worth of dollars exchange in world trade and a \$3.466 billion contribution to a favorable balance of payments so important in maintaining a stable economy. The American farmer is proud that agriculture is a foundation for a \$273 billion industry but pride alone does not pay the bill for increasing production expenses, nor does it alone keep farmers in our rural and small town areas.

A one pound loaf of bread, which sold for 13.5 cents twenty years ago brought the farmer 3.3 cents, now sells for 22.9 cents on the average and still returns 3.3 cents to the farmer. In 1951 the price of choice live steers was \$35.96 per hundred weight in Chicago and today the price of choice live steers is from \$30.00 to \$32.50 per hundred weight in Chicago. These figures dramatically illustrate that the farmer is not receiving his fair share of income from the market place and is having difficulty surviving.

In effect, the farmer has subsidized American economic development by allowing the American consumer in 1969 to spend 83.5 per cent of his disposable income for non-food items. This "farm subsidy" has provided boundless employment opportunity for a rapidly expanding population and unlimited economic development potential for our affluent society, yet the farmer only receives 41 per cent of the consumer's food dollar or 7 per cent of his total disposable income. A revealing comparison regarding the price of food consumed at home, based on the 1957 through 1959 base period, is 127.4 while the unit cost of labor is 127.7 on an index based on the same 1957 through 1959 base period.

Farmers who do not have the mechanisms to adjust and to keep supplies in line with needs must receive an adequate return from our affluent society to continue to provide this service to the American consumer and to promote continued economic development. Also, many people are beginning to realize that the problems of the cities lie in an

agriculture and rural America that does not provide adequate economic opportunity to keep its people. In view of the 100 million population increase projected for the next 30 years, this economic opportunity in rural and small town America is of paramount importance.

In discussing postal reform legislation with the Post Office Department, I discovered that if the Reader's Digest was charged 6 cents per piece of mail rather than the present 2.6 cents per copy for postage, the postage expenses would amount to an additional expenditure of at least \$543,422 per month or approximately \$6,521 million per year. I think it is apparent that agriculture and the farmer are not the only enterprises in America that are subsidized. Maybe we should limit government payments and subsidies to \$20,000 per enterprise.

In consideration of the farmers position in the market structure, agriculture's contribution to a favorable balance of payments and agricultural productivity that allows 83.5 per cent of disposable income to be spent on non-food items, you can see why farm payments should not be viewed as a subsidy but should be considered a fair return to the farmer for his contribution to American economic development. Your close study and review of these points that help to paint the rest of the picture of agriculture and the present farm income crisis will be most appreciated.

With very best wish,

Sincerely yours,

KEITH G. SEBELIUS.

A TRIBUTE TO OUTSTANDING JOURNALISM

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, Publisher Richard H. Blacklidge of the Kokomo, Ind., Tribune has brought great honor to his newspaper and the entire State of Indiana by his recent election to the presidency of the American Newspaper Publishers Association.

The reputation and impact of the Tribune on the Kokomo community has been recognized throughout the newspaper industry.

The accomplishments of the Tribune are the direct result of the leadership of publisher Blacklidge and his respected editor, Dow Richardson, who capped a double sweep of honors for the Tribune by winning the Indiana State Bar Association's Liberty Bell Award for his contribution to greater respect for the law.

Blacklidge and Richardson are a tremendous team which have not only produced saturation coverage for the Tribune in the Kokomo area, but more important to its citizens, have offered positive and progressive leadership to one of our State's most productive and vital urban cities.

I wish to join in this tribute to these outstanding journalists by inserting into the RECORD for the examination of the entire Congress, laudatory editorials and an article about their achievements from Indiana's two largest newspapers, the

Indianapolis Star and the Indianapolis News.

Perhaps the most rewarding compliments are those from one's competitors and colleagues.

The editorials follow:

[From the Indianapolis Star]

KOKOMO TO THE FORE

Friends and colleagues gathered the other night to honor Richard H. Blacklidge, publisher of the Kokomo Tribune and the new president of the American Newspaper Publishers Association.

He is the first Indiana publisher to hold that post, which is earned by demonstrated ability in the business and leadership in the organization. The ANPA is a substantial association, with an annual budget of more than \$2 million and an array of research and other activities related to newspaper publishing. Its presidency is both a genuine honor and a responsible job.

And now comes Dow Richardson, editor of the Tribune, to win the Indiana State Bar Association's Liberty Bell Award for contributors to greater respect for the law. The award was made on the basis of editorials and a supplement for teen-age readers.

We congratulate both men. The Kokomo community is fortunate to have such leadership.

[From the Indianapolis News, Apr. 30, 1970]

SALUTE TO BLACKLIDGE

A dinner at Purdue University's Union Building Tuesday night was public recognition of a fact long known to Indiana newspapermen—that Richard H. Blacklidge is one of the nation's top-flight newspaper executives.

The occasion was known as "Dick Blacklidge Night," at which members of the Hoosier State Press Association saluted one of their colleagues, the publisher of the Kokomo Tribune and new president of the American Newspaper Publishers Association.

Blacklidge dropped out of Purdue in 1936 to begin selling advertising for the Tribune. Two years later he became general manager, then publisher, and only last week was elevated to the presidency of the American Newspaper Publishers Association.

Indiana has produced many notable newspaper men but this was the first time a Hoosier has ever held the important and influential post of ANPA president.

It is an honor truly deserved, for Dick Blacklidge as a newspaper executive and citizen has served his community and the surrounding area well. The Tribune, which he seeks constantly to improve, has a circulation that brings it into 98 percent of the homes in the Kokomo metropolitan area, which is believed to be the best record of any daily newspaper in the United States.

Blacklidge has recognized and accepted the responsibility of a publisher to his community. Kokomo business and civic leaders have learned to turn to him for help which is always forthcoming.

If one is inclined to believe that the old-fashioned combination of hard work and ability has no place in today's world, he has only to look to Dick Blacklidge as a refutation of his skepticism.

[From the Indianapolis News, Apr. 30, 1970]

BLACKLIDGE RISE TO PRESS PINNACLE WILL BE HONORED

(By RALPH KRAMER)

KOKOMO, Ind.—Richard H. Blacklidge was a 23-year-old college dropout when in 1936 he started selling advertising for the Kokomo Tribune.

Those were the waning days of the Great

Depression and Blacklidge was just "Dick" to the Kokomo merchants he called on.

Two years later, Blacklidge was named general manager of the Tribune in what was to be his first step up the ladder to publisher that led last week to the very pinnacle of American newspapering.

As of last Wednesday, he is president of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, and the only Hoosier ever to be so honored.

It's still just "Dick," however, and that's why more than 300 of his friends will get together with him tonight in the Memorial Union at Purdue University to celebrate the occasion.

SCOTT TO SERVE AS TOASTMASTER

John A. Scott, editor and publisher of the Lafayette Journal and Courier, will be toastmaster.

Sen. Paul J. Fannin, R-Ariz., will be the principal speaker.

Stanford Smith, general manager of the ANPA, will be there. So will J. Howard Wood, publisher of the Chicago Tribune and past president of the ANPA; Paul Miller of the Associated Press, and William Murray of the Lawrenceburg Press, president of the Hoosier State Press Association.

Hosts are Scott, Eugene S. Pulliam, assistant publisher of The Indianapolis Star, and Franklin D. Schurz, publisher of the South Bend Tribune.

But it will be Blacklidge's evening, whether he likes it or not.

He'll get a citation from Purdue President Frederick L. Hovde, who came on the scene quite a while after Blacklidge, a Phi Gamma Delta Fraternity man, parted company with the school in 1936.

He'll also be honored by Col. C. A. Whitney of the Culver Military Academy, who was a teacher there when Blacklidge was a member of the famed Black Horse troops.

FONDNESS FOR SPORTS KNOWN

There will be considerable reminiscing, particularly about Blacklidge's fondness for almost all sports but baseball, which he detests, about his grandstand coaching prowess, about the stunt-flying in his younger days and about the African safari where he and a pride of lions passed a few feet from each other in the tall grass—neither side taking advantage of the situation.

(Blacklidge says he didn't see them and he assumes they either didn't see him or they did and considered him no threat.)

Blacklidge is a past president of the Hoosier State Press Association and the Inland Daily Press Association. He is a director of at least three corporations.

His was one of the first newspapers switching to offset printing and to do it, Blacklidge personally designed some of the equipment, including a computer.

He has been instrumental in promoting newspaper-in-the-classroom programs in Indiana and across the country.

He has built the Tribune into a seven-day-a-week publication with 30,000 circulation that finds its way into almost 98 per cent of the homes in the Kokomo metropolitan area.

That's the best of any daily newspaper in the nation, it is believed.

ROLE IN RACIAL PEACE UNKNOWN

He has helped build school buildings and radio stations, too.

But perhaps his finest hour came when he led a behind-the-scenes move to bring quiet to racially troubled Kokomo last year.

Hardly anybody knows Blacklidge largely was responsible for bringing segments of the black community together with more than 100 business and civic leaders at two different times.

"That's when I found out what Dick

Blackledge was really like," a Kokomo clergyman said.

"Take him a problem and he'll solve it."

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 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?

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE: THE FOLKS AT HOME EXPRESS THEIR OPINIONS

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my feeling that, too many times the opinions of the people have been overlooked or disregarded by their elected representatives. Too often, I fear, we are inclined to let those immediately surrounding us—the professional pollsters, the news writers, interpreters, and columnists, and the bureaucrats—have more influence on our decisions than the folks back home. With this thought in mind, and with the help of volunteer

workers, I recently mailed out my second annual legislative questionnaire to the citizens of the Second Congressional District of New Mexico, inviting them, individually, to advise me of their views and opinions on some of the major issues facing Congress and the Nation.

The response to this questionnaire was tremendous. Over 33,000 answers have already been received, and approximately 10,000 of them had additional comments attached. Answers came from every single community and all of the 18 counties in my district—from people in all walks of life—from Democrats, Republicans, and independents alike. Because of this diversified and widespread response, I believe that this poll is a reasonably accurate expression of public opinion. I am pleased to report the results of these replies for the information and review of my colleagues:

[Answers in percent]

	His	Hers		His	Hers		
1. Do you think it is important to have a balanced National Budget?			7. Vietnam, which do you favor?				
Yes.....	92.6	93.7	(a) Increased military action in an effort to end the war.....	40.0	42.0		
No.....	7.4	6.3	(b) Gradual withdrawal of U.S. Forces and Vietnamization of the war.....	49.0	46.0		
2. Even if it may mean curtailment of some New Mexico programs?			(c) Immediate and complete U.S. withdrawal.....	11.0	12.0		
Yes.....	92.0	93.3	8. Priorities, please number, in your order of importance, the problems which are facing our country today:				
No.....	8.0	6.7	Inflation.....	50.0	40.0		
3. Do you favor a government guaranteed annual wage as a means of attacking poverty?			Vietnam.....	20.0	20.0		
Yes.....	7.0	10.0	Pollution.....	10.0	2.0		
No.....	93.0	90.0	Hunger and poverty.....	3.0	7.0		
4. Should Federal welfare programs:			Crime.....	16.0	30.0		
(a) Emphasize work as a condition for assistance?.....	80.0	75.8	Other.....	1.0	1.0		
(b) Require job training when appropriate?.....	49.2	48.2	9. Do you think Federal spending for the following categories is:				
(c) Be limited only to the sick and disabled?.....	41.0	39.4		Too low	About right	Too high	No opinion
(d) Provide benefits to all with incomes below the poverty level without any condition?.....	3.2	3.8	(a) Defense.....	13	47	30	10
5. Federal farm control should be:			(b) Space program.....	7	40	48	5
(a) Phased out within 5 years.....	75.0	65.0	(c) Foreign aid.....	1	7	89	3
(b) Continued substantially as is.....	22.0	26.0	(d) Poverty program (OEO).....	8	18	65	9
(c) Made permanent with increases subsidies.....	3.0	9.0	(e) Federal Aid to Education.....	26	39	25	10
6. How would you rate President Nixon's overall performance since he took office:			(f) Overall spending for all purposes.....	1	9	83	7
Excellent.....	18.7	20.0					
Good.....	65.5	64.9					
Poor.....	15.8	15.1					

Note: Some questions total more than 100 percent because some persons selected more than 1 answer.

Mr. Speaker, these views and results speak strongly and forcefully for a concerned American people—God-fearing, taxpaying citizens—people who believe in the free enterprise system and in the preservation of our representative form of government. They are the kind of people who believe two and two still make four, and that all that glitters is not necessarily gold.

From the results of this questionnaire, it is evident that the people of New Mexico fully realize that every dollar that is received from Washington must be paid for by them or borrowed and paid for later by their children or grandchildren, with interest added. They know, too, that government has no money or income that it does not first take from the people. Most of these folks feel that they are getting more government than they need, and more government than they want.

I hope Americans never forget, or stray away from these fundamental, basic principles that made us what we are today. New Mexico folks have not, and I do not think the American people have, or will, but we could fail if we

every stopped relying on ourselves and started looking to government to solve all our problems and make all our decisions for us. Yes, America could go down, but if we ever do, it will not be because the world developed a hydrogen bomb—it would be because we have developed a philosophy that says the individual is no longer economically responsible for his own welfare, or morally responsible for his own conduct.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge my colleagues in the Congress and our national leaders, regardless of their political party affiliations, to give heed to these opinions, this feeling, this voice of the American people. Let us rededicate ourselves to the task of preserving our freedom, our heritage, our constitutional rights and principles and our great Nation "under God." Let us stop our continually increasing Government spending programs, let us initiate some tough, tight-fisted management over our wasteful, irresponsible foreign aid give-away programs, let us get back in balance again, economically and spiritually, and let us place the welfare of this great country ahead of political considerations.

PROFITABLE WASTE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, economic factors accounted in large part for the emergence of our huge environmental problems; now, there is hope that these same factors can be utilized for solving the problems.

One area for which there is great prospect is that of solid waste disposal. Recently, Dr. Donald E. Garrett, head of the Garrett Research and Development Co. in La Verne, Calif., testified before the Senate Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee, and in his statement, Dr. Garrett outlined a feasible program for turning waste into profits.

I found Dr. Garrett's approach fascinating, and I am now inserting his statement and other items into the RECORD for others to read:

TESTIMONY OF DR. DONALD E. GARRETT, OCCIDENTAL PETROLEUM CORP.

Senator Muskie, Senator Boggs, it is a pleasure to be here today to discuss the

technology required for the recovery of useful materials from municipal solid wastes. I am Donald Garrett, Executive Vice President for Research and Development, Occidental Petroleum Corporation. I also head the Garrett Research and Development Company, the central research and development division of Occidental Petroleum.

Occidental, as you may know, is a very large natural resource-based company. Its total sales were approximately \$2.1 billion last year and it is a major producer of petroleum and petroleum products, phosphate and phosphate products, sulfur, coal and other natural resources. It has a large mineral exploration and development group, and of course a large research and development organization.

One of our major areas of technical activity is in the field of environmental control, primarily through research, develop-

ment, and engineering for our operating divisions, but also on a Government contract basis. Consequently, because of solid wastes' potential as a major future resource, and because of our Corporate desire to assist in the country's environmental control programs, we have been interested in solid wastes for some time. We have done a considerable amount of engineering and experimental work on the subject, and discussed with the Government our suggested technology for recovering essentially all of the resource values for solid wastes. We sincerely believe that processing methods are presently available that will allow the recovery of much of the value from solid wastes on a profitable basis, and that only a comparatively modest development program is required prior to designing and operating the first prototype unit to test and demonstrate the process on a commercial, widely applicable scale.

FIGURE 1.—TYPICAL MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE

	Composition, weight/percent	Commodity value/dollars/ton	Possible recovered value, dollars/ton waste		Composition, weight/percent	Commodity value/dollars/ton	Possible recovered value, dollars/ton waste
Iron.....	6-8	\$35-\$40	\$2.20-\$3.20	Pyrolysis products:			
Other metals.....	1-2	100-200	1.00-4.00	Char at 9,700 B.t.u./lb.....	20	\$4-\$5	\$0.80-\$1.00
Glass.....	6-10	15-20	.60-1.30	Oil at 14,700 B.t.u./lb.....	16	12-15	1.80-2.40
Sand, dirt.....	2-4	0	0	Gas at 260 B.t.u./cu. ft.....	14	4-5	.50-.70
Paper.....	48-55	25-30	5.20-8.20				
Other organics.....	20-35			Total.....			12.10-20.80

A second factor of importance in analyzing this problem is that the present methods of treating solid wastes generally consist of burning or burying it, and that both of these methods are becoming much more expensive and difficult to do. There are strict air pollution requirements on burning, and the unavailability of suitable burial sites is making the disposal problem increasingly difficult. The collection of the trash, even though capable of considerable technical improvement is always going to be expensive, while disposal methods should be much more amenable to technical improvement, and perhaps the generation of some income to help off-set the collection and processing costs. Such processing improvements should at least help solve the municipalities' handling-logistics problem.

The final and perhaps most significant factor in the waste disposal problem is related to America's large consumption of natural resources, and the fact that these resources are becoming either exhausted, more expensive, or have a limited supply. Ultimately, and as soon as possible, we should recover all the resources possible after their first intended use so that future generations will have an adequate supply.

With these three factors in mind it is apparent that any solid waste treatment process should attempt to recover all of the values possible in their highest value form. Considering the very complex mixture and heterogeneous and changeable nature of the waste it is also essential that any process be highly flexible and contain processing steps that recover each of the values as independently as possible. Furthermore, looking at the content of solid wastes, paper is the largest single component, and it has the greatest potential salvage value, so any process must make an effort to salvage as much paper as possible. This also becomes true of each of the other components, and even glass or the miscellaneous organic material can contribute to the profit of an operation.

If processing solid wastes is considered as a mineral dressing or chemical processing problem, it is apparent that most of the required separations are already practiced on a fairly large scale, or have been tested in large pilot plants. The sequence of connecting the processing steps has not been done,

and needs to be tested, but this generally should not raise insurmountable problems. One such assembly of processing steps is shown in Figure 2 (not reproduced), and is the process we propose for a large scale testing for solid waste recovery. Please bear in mind that this is a very simplified flow sheet for this discussion, and only shows the major steps, and not anywhere near the detail that would be required in a final design.

The first step, iron removal, is one that is important in the Western United States, but may better be placed later in the sequence elsewhere in the country. Here in the West there is a large and quite attractively priced market for tin cans and thin sheet metal for the copper mining industry. Consequently, it is important to recover tin cans before they have been flattened and put in a form that would be difficult to de-tin and clean. The first operation is one that is commercially and profitably practiced here in the West, where at least 6% of the total weight of the solid waste is recovered as iron. This removal should facilitate later grinding steps since large pieces of iron would otherwise take excessive power and be more difficult to handle. This step consequently can be considered as well known and comparatively inexpensive, and producing a totally saleable product.

It is suggested that the second step be crushing to perhaps minus four inches, and then a bulk repulping operation to allow all of the organic materials to be floated from the predominately inorganic materials. There is no great complexity to this step since the hydraulics of water circulation and agitation can be fairly readily established to make such a bulk separation, especially when it is considered that most of the organic materials float, while the inorganics do not. It is possible that some dry separation of paper should be conducted prior to the repulping step to obtain a higher grade paper pulp, but rather surprisingly the equipment shown in the next step, that of shredding the organic material and then separating the saleable pulp from it, has been demonstrated on a fairly large scale in rather conventional paper making equipment. Large pilot plant operations have shown that at least 50% of the pulp can be recovered in a saleable form and separated

As we first became involved with the study of processing wastes, and began to assemble the rather large amount of literature on the subject, we became impressed with the comparatively great value of the mineral content of solid wastes and the comparatively large tonnage available. As seen from a typical composition of solid waste, Figure 1, the value of various components on an estimated reasonable recovery basis is somewhere between \$12 and \$21 per ton of waste treated. Assuming an average rate of five pounds of solid waste generated per person per day this would mean that any city with over 400,000 people would produce more than 1,000 tons of such solid wastes per day. These figures on a normal mineral processing basis are truly impressive, for there are a great number of mineral operations in the world with a much smaller operating basis.

from the mass of the other organic materials. Considerable progress has been made in de-inking and bleaching waste paper, and there would appear to be little question that this step can be done profitably and produce a quality, highly competitive, paper product. Considering the rapidly growing world population, the increased demand for pulp and paper, and the limited forest production, it would appear that the installation of recovery plants might keep step quite well with the increasing demand.

Perhaps the key step in the process is the disposal and recovery of valuable commodities from the bulk of the rather anonymous organic material and the unrecovered paper pulp that is contained in the solid waste. It is hoped that some of the plastics can first be recovered as such, and there are some techniques which would appear to offer promise in this area. However, on a general basis, the highest value that might be assigned such materials as coffee grounds, orange peels, wood, and other miscellaneous organic solid wastes would result from pyrolysis, or the thermal decomposition of these organics. It is proposed that all of the waste not collected as paper be sent to a pyrolysis furnace, along with the slimes and soluble solids accumulated in the process. Tests have been made in our laboratory on equipment similar to that which we are testing for the large scale conversion of coal into oil or gas, and we find that solid wastes are quite amenable to such pyrolysis, and do indeed provide what appear to be good yields of oil and gas. The oil of course may be fractionated into chemical components, but in a broad sense it should be considered only as synthetic crude oil. The char would be a low-sulfur substitute for coal, and could be further leached for its mineral content if desired. This step is the least certain of the recovery operations shown, but there is very little doubt of its technical feasibility. The problem lies more in its engineering complexity, and obtaining reasonable costs and yields. The bench scale tests conducted by our laboratory indicated that there is considerable promise, but it does need to be tested on a larger scale.

The next steps of the process become more involved with conventional mineral dressing techniques for which there is consid-

erable precedent. It is proposed that glass (which has only been crushed to a minus four inch size) be separated first in a heavy liquid media, such as that produced by a suspension of iron oxide or other relatively cheap inorganic material in a slurry. The glass with all of the sand and other inorganic materials of that density will be floated off, but then a screening step will allow the coarser glass particles to be separated directly with fairly good purity. It is quite possible that flotation or other separating means may be used to recover more glass from the fines that are produced, but this has not been considered in the economic estimates. The fines would make an excellent sand for concrete or land fill.

The metallic fractions would next be separated into at least two fractions, that of the lighter metals, magnesium and aluminum, and the heavier metals such as zinc or stainless steel. Techniques presently used in the automobile salvaging business would allow the zinc to be sweated from the heavy metals in fairly high yields, and after vaporization, in excellent purity. An ammonia leach should allow the complete recovery of the residual copper and zinc, leaving a stainless steel mixture that should be directly saleable. Separation of the aluminum and magnesium in the float portion is a more difficult job, but there are some promising techniques available to separate or up-grade these metals.

To summarize, it is the feeling of our engineers and scientists that essentially all of the processing know-how is now available in either commercial or pilot plant stage to process solid wastes for their complete disposal and recovery. There is a good probability that for the larger cities this processing can be done at a profit. Such a profit would not only allow a credit to be taken for the presently incurred disposal cost, but might be enough to pay for the collection costs of these solid wastes. Even more important, however, it will allow a comparatively complete recovery of the mineral and resource values of the solid wastes, and thus be a very powerful step toward the conservation of these resources.

We feel that only a modest experimental and development program is required to demonstrate the principles discussed here, and that a one-year research and engineering study costing about \$.5 to 1.5 million would lead to adequate design data for the construction of a demonstration plant. We would suggest that this demonstration plant be of a size to completely handle the solid wastes from a moderately large city and thus serve the multiple purposes of supplying design and performance data, solving the disposal problems of that city, and producing enough by-products to help defray the cost of the operation. It might cost about \$15-20 million for a city the size of San Francisco. After the first demonstration plant, a comprehensive market survey should be made of the by-product sales, and then other plants built throughout the country as fast as they could be authorized, engineered, and financed on a sound economic basis.

[From the San Francisco Examiner,
Mar. 31, 1970]

WASTE CAN BE USED, MUSKIE TOLD HERE
(By Alan Cline)

Processing methods to recover much of the valuable materials in solid wastes are already available, an oil research executive testified at a hearing by Sen. Edmund S. Muskie (D-Maine) here today.

But they aren't in operation because some of the mechanics haven't been worked out, including the need for separating hard wastes from wet garbage at the housewife level, said the witness, Dr. Donald E. Gar-

rett, executive vice president of Occidental Petroleum Corp.

CONSERVATION AID

And Supervisor Robert Mendelsohn, another witness, quipped that if the supervisors required this, they could hardly expect to be reelected.

Dr. Garrett said the reclamation of solid wastes would alleviate soil and water pollution, and, further, would conserve dwindling supplies of natural resources.

A suitable plant to serve San Francisco would cost about \$15-\$20 million, he said, but the reclaimed material would be worth \$12-\$21 per ton.

In the processing system such materials as metals, glass, sand, dirt and paper would be separated, crushed and treated to extract their reusable substances, he explained.

"MAMMOTH CRISIS"

Mendelsohn told Muskie that the Bay Area "is heading rapidly toward a garbage crisis of mammoth proportions," and some kind of permanent solution is mandatory within two or three years.

He said no real solution has yet appeared, but "we must cease dumping our garbage into any bay, river, lake or canyon which may be handy."

He suggested one approach might be to attack waste at the source—such as in the no-deposit, no-return bottles which now add to its volume.

Muskie, sitting as a one-man Senate subcommittee on air and water pollution, said that immediately available methods such as land fill, by fill or incineration are "short-sighted."

"San Francisco, which has already overtaxed its air, water and land resources, provides an excellent opportunity to examine alternatives to traditional methods of waste disposal," he said.

The independent approach was demonstrated by witness Randy Shaw, an Arizona State College student. He testified he made \$389 by collecting 80,000 aluminum cans, crushing them by driving over them with a truck and selling them to an aluminum firm in Los Angeles.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Apr. 1, 1970]

A GLOWING FUTURE FOR S.F. TRASH (By Michael Harris)

Today's solid waste—the four pounds of trash and garbage left over every day by the average resident of San Francisco—was described with great enthusiasm yesterday as tomorrow's solid asset.

Like so many things, garbage isn't all it used to be.

Leonard Stefanelli, president of the Sunset Scavenger Company, said the city's garbage-men use to redeem \$500,000 worth of bottles a year before the no-deposit, no-return idea of packaging took over.

But despite recent setbacks, a series of witnesses told Senator Edmund S. Muskie there is a bright future in what Stefanelli called "the newly formed field of solid waste management—or what historically is known as the garbage business."

FUEL

Until the Marine Democrat began a hearing of his Senate pollution subcommittee, it was not realized how many Bay Area residents have developed an abiding interest in what happens to last night's dinner scraps.

"I thought it was fascinating," Supervisor Robert Mendelsohn said when Muskie asked him if he had looked into a South German plan to use garbage as fuel for an electric power plant.

But Mendelsohn declared he still retains a preference for the proposed Western Pa-

cific garbage flyer, that would transport the city's wastes to be buried beneath desert land in Lassen county.

RETURN

"In a sense, our garbage would make Lassen county bloom," Mendelsohn said. "Such a landfill in this desert area would be a crude return of the solid wastes to the environment. A thin layer of solid waste material, underlying the sandy soil, would help leach out some of the alkali content and allow for growth of grass for grazing."

The train trip up the scenic Feather river route is still a possibility for the future, Mendelsohn added. For the next five years San Francisco will send its garbage and slurry scooped from its sewage treatment plants to Mountain View to form the underpinnings of a splendid new regional park.

MINERALS

The most imaginative offering of all came from Donald E. Garrett, executive vice president for research and development of Occidental Petroleum Corporation. He said San Francisco's garbage contains more minerals than some commercially successful mines.

Depending on the market, a ton of garbage might contain \$12 to \$21 worth of metal, glass, synthetic crude oil and gas, sand, paper pulp and char, Garrett said. Char, he explained, is a low-sulfur substitute for coal that could be burned in furnaces with minimal air pollution.

Since an average family of four persons turns out three tons of garbage a year, the salvage value would amount to about \$35 or \$60 a household per year—not counting the slurry of sewage residue, which in Milwaukee is converted to a well known fertilizer called Milorganite.

EXTRACTION

Unfortunately this would not be pure profit because the cost of extracting the residue would be expensive, Garrett said. In fact, the whole thing might even require a subsidy.

Frank M. Stead, retired chief of the State Division of Environmental Sanitation, said the major gain would not be in dollars and cents in ending the destruction of vitally needed organic material.

"We are in effect stripping the very land of its productivity," Stead declared in describing the present system of using incinerators and land-fill.

Because old newspapers can be reprocessed again into fresh newsprint (an entire edition of the New York Times was recently printed on second-hand paper), Stead said he believed it would be particularly valuable to salvage old newspapers instead of mixing them with the garbage.

San Francisco scavengers already take away bundles of newspapers from residences, but it was suggested that in the suburbs the same newsboy who throws today's paper in the bushes could carry away the discarded older copies.

PROGRAM

Muskie, who hopes to win approval of an \$800 million program for improving waste disposal over the next five years, reported he was pleased to hear the proposals for the future. But said he was worried about the fact that land-fill garbage operations are still taking place at five points in the shallows of San Francisco Bay.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle,
Apr. 1, 1970]

EXPLORING A TON OF WASTE

The method described by Donald E. Garrett for extracting \$12 to \$21 worth of material from a typical ton of San Francisco garbage can be understood easily by anyone who has ever admired the work of the late Rube Goldberg.

In brief: A standard American garbage truck dumps its load into a dump pit, whence it goes up a moving belt to a hammer mill to get broken up into little pieces. Then a magnetic separator, which works with electricity, picks up the tin cans so they can have the tin removed by a chemical process and be stripped down to the bare iron.

The rest of the garbage goes into a repulper, or a liquid bath, where the heavy stuff drops to the bottom and the light stuff floats to the top.

Taking the bottom first, we find the inorganic material going left into a pair of heavy fluid separators from which aluminum and magnesium and other heavy metals are separated. The rest of the inorganic material goes right to a screen, where the glass stays on top and the sand falls through.

Let us return to the repulper and watch the organic material flow right to the shredder, which shreds the materials, and to the fiber separator, which separates the fibers. At this point the paper pulp is pulled out and the rest drops into a pyrolysis furnace, which heats the material but does not burn it. Synthetic gas and oil emerge from the top of the furnace and char is left over at the bottom. It is possible to process the char even further, but that's another story.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 1, 1970]
THERE'S PROFIT IN TRASH, SENATE UNIT
TOLD—WASTE RECOVERY FOR REFUSE EX-
PLAINED

(By Philip Hager)

SAN FRANCISCO.—Randy Shaw, 22, told Tuesday how he helped pay his way through Arizona State University at Tempe, by using his father's truck to collect empty aluminum cans to sell to Reynolds Aluminum in Los Angeles for 10 cents a pound.

"It isn't really a lot of fun going around to dumps and separating aluminum cans from steel cans," Shaw told a Senate subcommittee on air and water pollution.

But he did note that in three hours he had grossed over \$400.

"I used the money to pay my tuition and housing this semester," said Shaw. He said he planned to resume his beer and soft drink can business during the summer.

Dr. Donald E. Garrett, executive vice president of the research and development division of Occidental Petroleum Corp., told the subcommittee that American cities can recover their garbage for reuse at a profit.

He said these solid wastes should be reused to make up for a rapid exhaustion of the country's natural resources.

His testimony was described by Sen. Edmund Muskie (D-Me.), subcommittee chairman, as "one of the most useful discussions we've ever had."

Muskie is conducting hearings on legislation to assist local government in handling a major environmental problem: The disposal of solid waste—cans, paper and plastic—in ever-increasing amounts. This city alone generates 1,500 tons of such material daily.

"Our scientists believe that processing methods are presently available that will allow the recovery of much of the value from solid wastes on a profitable basis," Garrett said.

He showed the subcommittee a chart listing the possible recovery value of metals, glass, paper and other materials and explained how they could be processed into usable form.

For example, he said, laboratory tests indicate that a variety of wastes could be transformed into a synthetic crude oil through a process of thermal decomposition.

"There is a good probability that for larger cities this processing can be done at a profit," Garrett said. "If all worked well such a profit . . . might be enough to pay for the collection costs of the solid wastes."

AMERICAN DRAFT DODGERS A PROBLEM TO CANADA

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I read a story in the Bangor, Maine, Daily News recently about the problem that the estimated 7,000 to 8,000 young American deserters are causing the Canadian Government, already plagued with the highest unemployment rate in many years—6.7 percent of their total labor force. I realize that the 7,000 to 8,000 deserters is very small—one-half of 1 percent—in proportion to the number of Americans serving honorably—1,367,626—in the Armed Forces in many places all over the world; however, this group is a source of concern to responsible officials of both Governments. The story follows:

[From the Bangor Daily News, Apr. 30, 1970]
AMERICAN DRAFT DODGERS CREATING LARGE PROBLEMS FOR CANADIANS

(By Michael Cope)

TORONTO.—A Canadian detective found the young American draft dodger lying in a pool of blood. His wrists had been slashed and on the floor lay the razor blade he had used to do it.

The police questioned other young Americans, some of them deserters, but most of them draft dodgers, and eventually a coroner's inquest recorded a finding of death while the balance of the mind was disturbed.

DISCLOSED BY HEARING

It didn't make even a paragraph in the big city newspaper. But the case, and others like it, did come to light when a Canadian Government Committee on Youth, traveling across the country, paused to hold hearings in Toronto on April 23.

One of the witnesses was Mrs. Naomi Wall, who works voluntarily for the Toronto Anti-Draft Program which helps young Americans who flee to Canada rather than answer their draft call in their homeland.

She bitterly attacked Canada's policy of allowing deserters and draft dodgers into the country as "hypocrisy unless the government will do something to assist them in getting settled."

Most of the estimated 7,000 to 8,000 young Americans who have fled to Canada since the Vietnam War crossed the border as temporary visitors and, once in Canada, then applied for landed immigrant status. While Ottawa considered their application, and that process varied from a few weeks to a few months, they were forbidden to work or apply for welfare.

DRIVEN TO CRIME

This waiting period, said Mrs. Wall, herself an American immigrant to Canada, has driven many draft dodgers to crime, despair and suicide, like the one with his wrists slashed.

"There are no facilities for aiding the exiles when they first arrive," she said. "They are afraid to ask 'establishment' agencies like the Salvation Army for help because it would define them at once as undesirable candidates for immigration."

"A few of the exiles get a small measure of help from the various groups here—particularly among student organizations—ready to help these people, but there are others who today are starving on the streets of Canadian cities. The Toronto Anti-Draft Program is constantly having to bail out U.S. exiles charged with drug offenses, vagrancy and such crimes as shoplifting."

The plight of the draft dodgers is accentuated by the fact Canada is now undergoing a tough anti-inflation recession and unemployment is now at 6.7 per cent of the labor force; the highest level in several years. There are too few jobs available anywhere in Canada nowadays and the draft dodger finds it impossible to get even the occasional casual job which paid enough with no questions asked for essential food.

SOME AID CASTRO

Some of the American exiles have relieved the boredom and cashlessness of waiting for immigration clearance by shipping to Communist Cuba and helping cut the sugar cane harvest there for Fidel Castro.

Some deserters who had the money have gone on to Sweden—the other major haven in the western world—where the government is prepared to house and feed them for a while.

But an interesting section of Mrs. Wall's submission to the Canadian government committee revealed that the caliber of draft dodger and deserter coming to Canada these days has slipped badly in the past four years or so.

"The TADP office (on Toronto's busy Yonge Street) is visited by an average of 15 new exiles every day now. The type of person contacting them has changed considerably.

"Four years ago most of them were middle-class, college-educated draft dodgers.

"Today, about 60 per cent are deserters from the U.S. armed forces and many have only eight to 10 years of formal education. With the deteriorating economic situation (in Canada), it is difficult to find them jobs.

"Exiles such as these should be granted landed immigrant status on humanitarian grounds," she suggested.

ANGRY LETTER SENT

But there are many Canadians who are opposed to their country being used as a haven for young Americans. The nationally-circulated Weekend Magazine recently ran this irate letter from Ronald Foster, a former Canadian Army paratrooper and Korean War veteran who is now a fire department captain in Toronto's suburban Etobicoke:

"To run when there is a chance to present an objective criticism labels the deserter as a hypocrite and coward.

"This type of person will no more defend Canada than the country of his birth, as he will find that many of the reasons he left the United States exist here as well, including a reasonable and honorable request to defend the principles of its existence.

NO GLAMOROUS REBEL

"The draft dodger is not a glamorous rebel, but a running, frightened coward, and the world has seen many of these.

"A parasite in paradise."

With growing unemployment across Canada, there is also growing resentment against the thousands of young Americans competing for the all-too-few jobs.

No matter how sincere or well motivated the principles of the deserter and draft dodger may be, they don't cut much ice with an unemployed worker in Toronto or a nearly bankrupt farmer on the prairies. Much of the earlier Canadian enthusiasm for the American exiles has now gone sour.

VIETNAM VETERAN SUPPORTS NIXON

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize Dr. James W. Ralph, a good

friend and great American. I have just received a letter from him which is typical of those I have received from other Vietnam veterans and embodies the spirit of letters I have received from members of the adult community throughout the First Congressional District of New Jersey. Essentially, it concerns the very difficult decisions which our President has had to make in an effort to expedite the safe return of American troops from Vietnam.

Dr. Ralph's letter follows:

TENAFLY, N.J.,
May 2, 1970.

HON. JOHN HUNT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HUNT: "I support the President's stand on Vietnam and I also support the action in Cambodia.

"I spent a lot of my tour in Vietnam chasing the Viet Cong into Cambodia, adjacent to Tay Ninh Province. We have suffered enough casualties at the hands of enemy troops who have been able to run to their sanctuaries. It is high time we hit their hiding places.

"I urge members of the House Armed Services Committee to be present when the President meets with the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Sincerely,

JAMES W. RALPH, M.D.

P.S.—I would like to have taken part in the Cambodia raid.—JWR.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Rumanians have lived on the eastern half of the Balkan Peninsula for centuries. They have tilled their fertile land and at times have made Rumania the breadbasket of eastern Europe. There these sturdy and hard-working peasants have also lived in freedom, and have always done their utmost to safeguard their independence. In this they have not always been successful. Early in modern times the Ottoman Turks overran and conquered the country, and made it a province of their empire. Thenceforth until mid-19th century the Rumanians lived under the rough and cruel Turkish regime, and they struggled hard for their liberation without success. On numerous occasions they revolted against their oppressors, but these revolts ended in bloody massacres.

In the 1870's the Balkan Peninsula was once more in political ferment; unrest was brewing in many parts, and peoples were rebelling against the once powerful Turkish regime there. Rumanians began their revolt, and on May 10, 1877, proclaimed their national independence. In the ensuing war they were victorious with the effective aid of the Russians, and the subsequent peace treaty guaranteed Rumania's independence. Thus that daring act of May 10, 1877, marked the independence of the Rumanian people.

Since those distant days Rumanians have had their joys and their woes, and today they are again deprived of their freedom in their homeland. Communist

totalitarianism, established there with the aid of the Red army, holds down all vestiges of freedom. Happily, however, even under communism the Rumanian people still preserve a sense of independence, and cling to their national heritage. On their Independence Day I wish them peace and fortitude in their struggle for genuine freedom and independence.

ACTION FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on April 22 of this year millions of Americans observed Earth Day. In doing so we recognized that ordinary measures are no longer adequate for the protection of the world in which we live. It is safe to say that almost every American must have been aware of this event. And there can be no doubt that there will be renewed effort to combat water pollution, air pollution, and the many other threats to our natural surroundings.

More, however, is needed than the normal level of energy devoted to the protection of the environment. Every American must involve himself directly in the pursuit of an environmental balance, a pattern of living that does not destroy the elements that we need for survival. As some have put it, each of us must live ecologically—that is, live in concert with our natural environment. There are several ways in which this can be done, legislative, individual action, a change in our pattern of productive growth that devotes more effort to insuring environmental safety, all are important.

There have been a number of bills introduced in this Congress that deserve particular attention. Senator WILLIAM PROXMIER's bill to place a tax on all products creating solid wastes within 10 years deserves the most careful consideration because it may help solve our problems of disposing of growing amounts of trash. Representative HENRY REUSS's bill that would eliminate phosphates from detergents is aimed at a most serious problem, the elimination of one of the elements that is the principal cause of pollution of our waters. Phosphates have been identified as a major source of fertilization of our rivers and lakes. By limiting phosphates in detergents we can materially reduce our requirements for sewage treatment. Fortunately, there are soaps and detergents that are low in phosphates available on the market now. But we also know that some detergents are high in phosphates and that industry can make changes to eliminate this component. Obviously there are many other important bills that deserve attention.

Also needed is a national willingness to devote that portion of our annually increasing productive capability necessary to protect the environment. We do not need to stop producing steel or aluminum. What we do need to do is to include in the costs of those metals the price of insuring that the byproducts created dur-

ing production of these metals do not pollute our surroundings. This principle must be applied in every phase of our economic activity.

Finally, each individual and every group must take those actions needed to create an awareness of environmental problems and solutions. By example and through education Americans can be shown techniques and practices that will reduce the pollution of our environment. In western New York a number of people have introduced the Citizen's Committee on Pollution. This group has initiated an effective and noteworthy effort to alert citizens to pollution problems. They have distributed, for example, a list showing the amount of phosphate in a number of commercial detergents. I am including a brief summary of their work to date as well as the list of detergents that they have distributed. I wish to commend the Citizen's Committee on Pollution for their activities on behalf of a cleaner environment. Their progress means that Earth Day will have meaning in the years to come.

The summary follows:

CITIZEN'S COMMITTEE ON POLLUTION HISTORY

The Citizen's Committee on Pollution began on September 21, 1969 when some 30 interested citizens gathered at a private home for the express purpose of seeing what they could do to provide a cleaner, healthier environment. Two of the group were appointed as co-chairmen, a name was chosen, and a set of objectives was agreed upon. This informal gathering has grown to be the most viable organization of citizens in Western New York devoted to eliminating pollution.

PURPOSE

The CCOP's primary belief is that a better environment can be best achieved via an informed and dedicated citizenry. To this end we have formulated these specific objectives:

1. Educate our group and the public on environmental issues.
2. Establish the CCOP as a significant force in the efforts to achieve a better environment.
3. Take action on pertinent issues, including: reporting of pollution violators, attending public hearings and meetings, corresponding with legislators, publicizing group activities, and exercising legal avenues of recourse.
4. Expand our active membership and encourage formation of other citizen's groups.

ORGANIZATION

As the original informal group grew, both geographically and in number, it became apparent that a more formal organizational setup was needed. Accordingly, a general membership meeting on January 25, 1970 decided to elect 10 members to a board of directors who would constitute the officers of the CCOP. Besides serving as an executive body, members have specific individual areas of responsibility:

Chairman—group representative and administrator.

Secretary/Treasurer—minutes, correspondence, and money.

Publicity—arrange publicity for group.

Public Relations—prepare and provide speakers—membership.

Local Industry—communication source with industry and follow-up.

Watchdog—stay aware of important happenings and arrange CCOP representation.

Liaison—coordinate telephone and worker lists.

Research and Records—collect, study, and report information.

ACHIEVEMENTS

In less than eight months of existence, the CCOP has sponsored two public meetings. At the first of these meetings, county health officials spoke to an audience of 125 on present and future air pollution laws and their enforcement. At the second meeting, attended by about 200 people, representatives of three local industries spoke on their present and future air pollution control equipment and their plans to comply with the January 1971 and June 1, 1972 deadlines.

The CCOP sponsored a poster-slogan-essay contest in the North Tonawanda schools to gain the interest and help of our youthful citizens in the fight against pollution. Prizes totaling \$215 will be awarded in this contest on April 24 at our Boulevard Mall Exhibit.

During Environmental Week, April 20-25, we have organized an Exhibit at the Boulevard Mall to emphasize the need for pollution control. The Exhibit features: speaking engagements by Richard McCarthy and Jack Kemp, a question-and-answer session with representatives of Erie and Niagara Health Departments, anti-pollution art work of students from Buffalo, Amherst, and North Tonawanda, and dissemination of pertinent information by the CCOP.

Members of the CCOP have attended numerous meetings of other groups concerned with air pollution. These have included information-type meetings and those of appointed officials reporting to local governing bodies. The CCOP is preparing an all-out effort to present their views at the next public hearings where ambient air standards for carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, and oxidants will be set for Niagara and Erie counties.

Meetings and other activities of the CCOP have been reported in four of the largest newspapers in the two-county area. At least two editorials were written commending the intelligent, informed, positive attitude of the CCOP in their fight against pollution.

THE FUTURE

It is up to the citizens! Do you wish to aid the Citizen's Committee On Pollution? Call Gene Ogilvie, Chairman (692-4140) or Carol Fiorella, Publicity Director (694-1719).

Phosphate content of detergents and household cleaning aids by Limnatics, Inc., 6132 West Fond du Lac Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.:

	[Percent]	Phosphate
Detergent:		
Ajax	28.2	
Axon	43.7	
Bio-Ad	35.5	
Biz	40.4	
Blue Luster	0	
Bold	30.2	
Bonus	22.3	
Borateem	0	
Breeze	22.2	
Cheer	22.0	
Cold Power	19.9	
Cold Water All	9.83	
Diaper Pure	5.0	
Dreft	24.5	
Drive	25.3	
Duz	23.1	
Fab	21.6	
Gain	24.4	
Ivory Snow	0	
Lux	0	
Lux Flakes	0	
Oxydol	30.75	
Punch	25.8	
Salvo	35.3	
Tide	30.6	
Trend	1.49	
Vel	0	
Wisk	7.63	
Bestline Liquid Concentrate	1.63	
Bestline B-7 Powder	25.1	

Additional information from the Rochester Committee for Scientific Information, P.O. Box 5236, River Campus Station, Rochester, N.Y.:

	[Percent]	Phosphate
Detergent:		
Calgon	25	
Ivory Liquid	1	
Low Suds	17	
Spic and Span	10	
Surf	7	
Ivory Flakes	7	
Culligans (sold by Lan-o-Sheen Inc.)	11	
Instant Fels	6	
Downy	0	

THE WILL TO BE FREE

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, events of the past week have illustrated clearly America's deep concern with the President's decision to commit troops to military confrontation in Cambodia. The most obvious issue, of course, is related to the threat of further expansion of the war in Southeast Asia and the prospect that the evacuation of American troops will end and that more men and materials—possibly more than at any time past—will be required to meet the expanded commitment.

But recent events evince an even deeper concern than this—the erosion of a principle as old as our Nation: The real and present prospect that one man or one institution can “impose an unrestrained will on the decisions that shape the Nation.”

The words of the Constitution make it clear that the war power is almost completely vested in the Congress of the United States. Congress is charged with the sole power to declare war, for example, and is additionally entrusted with the authority to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, to make the rules governing land and naval forces, to call out and take charge of disciplining the militia, and to make all laws requisite to the execution of these powers.

In recent years, however, Presidents have claimed the exclusive right to commit the Nation to foreign wars under a sweeping interpretation of their powers as Commander in Chief. The contemporary nature of foreign-policy making, with its crisis-oriented overtones, has, perhaps, lent itself to this interpretation of the Executive's role. But the resultant state of affairs, with a large and ill-defined proportion of foreign-policy matters escaping the process of congressional and, therefore, public scrutiny, is indefensible.

The Congress must reassert its prerogatives with respect to the formulation of foreign policy and the exercise of constitutionally assigned war powers. The President should have to consult with and abide by a decision of the popularly elected Congress before taking any action to

enlarge the U.S. commitment to Southeast Asia.

It may well be that the President's recent decision will prove to be in our Nation's best interest. It may well be that the President's ordering of U.S. troops into Cambodia will facilitate the Vietnamization program and hasten American troop withdrawals in the long run. But these prospects do not comprise the main issue.

What is principally at issue is the unchecked Executive discretion to order our military forces into offensive action in foreign lands whenever and wherever the President chooses. What is principally at issue is the unlimited Executive prerogative to alter constitutional intent and avoid congressional process at his option. What is at issue is the very undemocratic prospect that one man can declare himself superior to the people, the legislature, and the law of the land.

Mr. Speaker, the May 16 issue of The New Yorker magazine, in its “Talk of the Town” section, contains an excellent appraisal of the issue underlying our Nation's present concern, outlining what the American people, the American Congress, and the U.S. Supreme Court can and should do in the face of the threat of one man's “unrestrained will.”

I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I hope that its warning be kept in mind in the days immediately ahead and ever thereafter by those of us privileged to serve in this body. The warning is this: That if the American people now permit the erosion of the concept of government by separation of powers and the principle of participatory democracy, while the capacity for resistance still remains, then we will have lost the ultimate protection of liberty—stronger than governments, more enduring than constitutions—the will of a people to be free.”

The item referred to follows:

THE TALK OF THE TOWN

As the defeated British regiments marched past the files of French and American troops at Yorktown, the British bands, in detached resignation, played “The World Turned Upside Down.” The same tune would have been an appropriate accompaniment to the events of last week. For the two-hundred-year-old American system came under its most serious attack in modern times, not from the poor, the blacks, or the students but from the White House—the fount, the pinnacle, the keystone of the established order. President Nixon became the first President in the history of the United States deliberately to order American forces to invade another nation on his own, without seeking congressional approval or support. This order was in disregard of the Constitution, the tempering strictures of our history, and the principles of the American democracy. It was, therefore, an act of usurpation.

Few prohibitions are more clearly set forth in the Constitution. It makes the President Commander-in-Chief, and explicitly states that only Congress shall have the power to declare war or raise armies. The Federalist Papers reaffirm what the law makes clear: the term Commander-in-Chief meant only that the President could direct the conflict after Congress had decided to make war. Hamilton wrote that the President's power

would be much less than the power of the British King, for "it would amount to nothing more than the supreme command and direction of the military and naval forces, as first General and Admiral of the Confederacy; while that of the British King extends to the declaring of war and to the raising and regulating of fleets and armies—all which, by the Constitution under consideration, would appertain to the legislature." This was no casual division. The fear of military power under the control of a central government was one of the most serious popular objections to the establishment of the new nation.

The only way this could happen, the founders responded, was by a "continued conspiracy" between the executive and the legislature. In this case, Hamilton advised, "the people should resolve to recall all the powers they have heretofore parted with out of their own hands . . . in order that they may be able to manage their own concerns in person." As sophisticated men, the Founding Fathers foresaw some of the dangers that lay ahead. They recognized explicitly that formal declarations of war were going out of style, but they still required our legislature to declare war. They saw "how easy [it] would be to fabricate pretenses of approaching danger," but they said that this would demand "a combination between the executive and the legislative, in some scheme of usurpation." In other words, the Constitution would protect the American people against the misuse of military power by prohibiting the executive from going to war without congressional approval and prohibiting Congress from directing the war it had started. Even this was dangerous, they acknowledged, but it was the best that could be done.

For over a hundred and sixty years, the Constitution was followed. Congress declared the War of 1812, the Mexican War (even though they had been a somewhat provoked attack on our troops), the Spanish-American War, and both World Wars. In the period after the Second World War, things began to change. The development of Soviet atomic power, the military impotence of Western Europe, and the shock of Korea impelled us toward the creation of a large peacetime standing Army—the first in our history. It was seen that a sudden emergency might require instant action, with no time to go to Congress. This implied exception to Constitutional principle was based on the technological realities of atomic war, and it has been invoked only once—when we intervened in the Dominican Republic. That intervention, however, was based on the claim that action within hours was necessary to protect the lives of Americans trapped between the contending forces—simply a traditional rescue operation. This claim may well have masked other motives, but American forces were not committed to combat, and support of the congressional leadership was sought and received within hours of the order to intervene and before the Marines had actually landed.

In Korea in 1950, President Truman acted pursuant to a resolution of the Security Council, whose powers had been confirmed by the Senate when it consented to ratification of the United Nations Charter. In addition, Truman met with the congressional leadership of both parties before ordering combat forces into action, and received their unanimous support, along with that of the defeated Republican nominee, Thomas Dewey. Nor was there any doubt of the overwhelming public and congressional approval of his action—at least in the beginning. (The same week the draft was extended with only four dissenting votes.) Still, the Republican candidates in 1952—including Senator Nixon—were critical of Truman's failure to get more formal congressional approval. So President Eisenhower sought, and received,

congressional resolutions authorizing him to act in the Middle East and in the Formosa Strait. President Johnson himself asked for a resolution at the time of the Gulf of Tonkin incident, and it was the literal verbal scope of this resolution that was construed as authorizing all subsequent action in Vietnam. Yet such a construction was clearly an evasion, and it was at this point that the great Constitutional principle began to decay.

Now President Nixon has taken a giant step. Not only has he evaded the spirit of the Constitutional division of powers but he has deliberately ignored its plain meaning and intent. He has decided that he will go to war in Cambodia because he feels it necessary, no matter what Congress wants or what the people think. He has even implied that such willful disregard of the people and their elected representatives is an act of noble self-sacrifice, and has hinted that we should admire his courage in exceeding the limits of his Constitutional powers.

The war in Cambodia was not an emergency. There was time enough to present the matter to Congress for a swift decision. Indeed, unceasing debate with the executive branch went on long enough to permit the Vietcong to evacuate the threatened area. But the President did not follow the precedent of all his postwar predecessors by seeking assurance of congressional support, either formally or through meetings with the leadership. Rather, he made war by fiat. He has thus united in himself the powers that the Constitution divides and that have remained divided through our history. This comes from an Administration that proclaims its devotion to "strict construction."

This is not a technical, legal question. In Import, it transcends the question of the wisdom of the war itself. The President, in effect, says, "I, and I alone, have decided to go to war in Cambodia." Where does he get that power? The Constitution denies it to him. He is not acting under the necessity of instant reaction. He has the power only because he asserts it, and because the armies follow. In a world in which conflicts are interrelated, there is no limit to the possibilities of his reasoning. He can invade Laos and Thailand, in both of which countries Communists are active. He can enter North Vietnam itself. He can attack China, which is both a sanctuary and a source of supply for the North Vietnamese. Nor is the Soviet Union exempt, since it, too, helps our adversaries in Vietnam. Such an assertion of authority is not among the prerogatives of a democratic leader in a republic of divided powers.

Our democracy is not an elective dictatorship. It is a government in which all elected officials have carefully limited powers. Suppose the President said he was going to change the tax laws, because the rates were unjust. What an outcry we would hear. Yet how trivial such an act would be, compared to concentrating the power over war and peace in a single office. The light of democracy depends on a common acceptance, by people and government, of the limits of power. What if, two years from now, the President should cancel the elections, on the ground of national need? Would it be easy to revolt against an armed force of three and a quarter million men if they remained obedient to their Commander-in-Chief? The possibility now seems absurd. But it illuminates the fact that our system works only because men have felt constrained by its assumptions; courts and legislatures have neither guns nor treasures to enforce their will. Now one of the most basic of these liberating assumptions has been swept away. It must be restored.

The first duty of resistance lies with the legislative branch. For years, its members have been abdicating their responsibility, watching almost without protest while their

authority was eroded and their mandates were evaded. They have allowed their power to be usurped. Now they are scorned and ignored, because the President is confident that they have neither the courage nor the will to challenge his action—that each, looking to his own interest, will allow the common cause to decay. If this is a true judgment and the President's act is not repudiated then they will have denied the oath they took to uphold the Constitution. For Congress is the people's guardian. The authors of the Federalist Papers reassured the doubtful that "in the only instances in which the abuse of the executive authority was materially to be feared, the Chief Magistrate of the United States would . . . be subjected to the control of a branch of the legislative body. What more could be desired by an enlightened and reasonable people?" What more indeed?

The other possibility is the Supreme Court. In 1952, President Truman seized the steel mills, because, he claimed, a steel strike was endangering the war effort in Korea. The Supreme Court decided that he had no such power and ordered him to return the mills. That opinion concluded, "The Founders of this Nation entrusted the lawmaking power to the Congress alone in both good and bad times. It would do no good to recall the historical events, the fears of power and the hopes for freedom that lay behind their choice. Such a review would but confirm our holding that this seizure order cannot stand." How much more does this invasion transgress those same hopes and fears.

There are many ways to bring the issue to the Supreme Court. The Senate itself might instruct its leaders to bring an action to restrain the President or the Secretary of Defense from ordering further combat in Cambodia. This would be an unprecedented response to an unprecedented act. The issue is Constitutional, and is thus within the jurisdiction of the federal court. And surely no individual or institution has greater standing to bring such an action than the very body whose powers have been taken away. Another route lies through the recent Massachusetts statute that makes it unlawful to require any resident of that state to serve outside the United States in an undeclared war. The Attorney General of Massachusetts has been instructed by the law to bring an action in the Supreme Court in order to prevent such service from being required.

In relation to Vietnam, the passage of the bill was a symbolic action. In the case of the Cambodian invasion, the law could be a vehicle for resolving a momentous issue. Would the Court decide? No one can be sure. But it alone can decide, and that is its responsibility. Discussing the Supreme Court, Hamilton wrote that it must have the power to invalidate all acts by the other branches of government which are contrary to the Constitution. "To deny this," he said, "would be to affirm that the deputy is greater than his principal; that the servant is above his master; that the representatives of the people are superior to the people themselves; that men acting by virtue of powers may do not only what their powers do not authorize but what they forbid."

The President has now declared himself superior to the people, to the legislature, and to the laws. We have lasted as a functioning democracy for almost two hundred years. The foundation of that democracy has been a vigilant regard for the principle that no one man or institution shall impose an unrestrained will on the decisions that shape the nation. If the American people now let this principle be eroded, while the capacity for resistance still remains, then we will deserve our fate. For we will have lost the ultimate protection of liberty, stronger than governments, more enduring than constitutions—the will of a people to be free.

WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH IMPORTANT

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Peter C. Klingeman is director of the Water Resources Research Institute at Oregon State University, and in this capacity has expressed strong support to increase the authorization for research and institutes in this vital area. He has asked specifically for favorable consideration of three measures—H.R. 15957, H.R. 16279, and H.R. 16285—now before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I am pleased to be able to include his remarks on the importance of such legislation to the State of Oregon in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY, WATER
RESOURCES RESEARCH INSTITUTE,
Corvallis, Ore., May 4, 1970.

Representative WENDELL WYATT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WYATT: The Water Resources Research Act of 1964 (PL 88-379) established an annual allotment program under Title I of \$100,000 to each state institute. Inflation has substantially reduced the amount of research and training which can be conducted with this amount. Moreover, the Act makes no provision for proper interpretation and dissemination of research findings by institutes. The bills now in Committee seek to redress these shortcomings by raising the Title I annual allotment to \$250,000 and authorizing appropriate information programs.

Oregon has directly benefited by research projects and related training conducted with funds from the annual allotment. Research has led to specific recommendations regarding the state's water-management districts. Publications regarding large-scale water diversion plans have been made available to and have been used by state agencies seeking to ensure that the Pacific Northwest will always have sufficient water supplies. A comprehensive survey of Oregon Water Law is nearing completion and is expected to be of great significance to federal and state agencies, as well as private firms and individuals. As a first step in assessing Oregon's assets for recreation and future requirements, the allotment is financing a survey of Oregon's lakes and the status of their water quality.

For many years, the annual allotment has made it possible for faculty members and graduate students to be part of a task force conducting studies in the Alsea River experimental watersheds. The study group includes members of federal and state agencies as well as representatives of the timber industry. Research results are helping to set standards for proper road building, logging practices, and stream management so as to reduce and control water pollution.

In addition to this research training for students, the Institute sponsors seminars each term on important aspects of water resources preservation and development. Seminars are widely attended by representatives of industry, state agencies, and the Oregon State legislature as well as by the academic community. Proceedings are published to make the seminar subject matter available to the interested public.

Recognizing the need for improving communications between researchers and research users, the Institute publishes a newsletter on a periodic basis giving the results

of investigations. Reports concern projects not only within Oregon but also those studies from all over the nation which are pertinent to conditions in Oregon. Distribution is to federal and state agencies, legislators, public officials, private industry, and appropriate individuals and committees—especially at municipal and county levels. The objective is to reach most of those who are active in the planning or decision-making aspects of water development. The limitations of the current annual allotment make it impossible to expand the service into a monthly publication as deemed desirable.

Research and education alone cannot solve water problems, but they can provide the knowledge necessary to understand the problems and suggest possible methods for solutions. It is vital that those charged with responsibilities in the field of water resources recognize the humanitarian and sociological aspects as well as the scientific and technical factors. The state Institutes represent the ideal means of bringing to bear on problems the required mixture of talents and disciplines. This is accomplished through the effective federal-state partnership which has been established under PL 88-379. However, there is a distinct need to increase the federal funding.

Very truly yours,

PETER C. KLINGEMAN,
Director.

WO WILLIAM NOETZEL

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, WO William Noetzel, a fine young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

WARRANT OFFICER HELICOPTER PILOT KILLED IN VIETNAM ACTION

The Defense Department announced yesterday that WO1 William W. Noetzel, 20, of Lutherville, Md., was killed in action in Vietnam.

He was a helicopter pilot with the 176th Assault Helicopter Company, which was based at Chu Lai along the central coast of Vietnam. He died Saturday after his helicopter was hit by enemy ground fire and crashed. The department did not disclose any further details, nor did it indicate where the action had taken place.

Mr. Noetzel was the son of Mr. and Mrs. Louis G. Noetzel, Jr., of Greenspring drive, Lutherville.

GRADUATE OF POLY

He was a 1967 graduate of Poly and had worked as a draftsman for the C. & D. Engineering Company and the Baltimore Gas and Electric Company.

He enlisted in the Army in January, 1969, and received his wings in December. He left for Vietnam January 20, 1970.

"His letters from Vietnam during the three months he was there were cheerful, but he was close-mouthed about the war," his father said yesterday.

After graduating from Poly, Mr. Noetzel became an avid scuba diver and in one of his letters home he said that he wished he had his scuba gear with him and could dive in the South China Sea.

SURVIVORS LISTED

He also wrote that "8 to 10 years from now people will be vacationing here, because this is such a beautiful place," he father recalled.

In addition to his parents, his survivors include two sisters, Mrs. Robert Wall, of Glen-coe, Md., and Miss Mary Beth Noetzel, of Lutherville.

POSTAL REORGANIZATION

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, our first Postmaster General, Benjamin Franklin, said:

Never leave that till tomorrow which you can do today.

I think it is well to recall his words to this House at this time, because there are those who would leave till tomorrow—or next year—the matter of postal reorganization so urgently recommended by the President.

Another bit of wisdom from Ben Franklin: "A little neglect breeds mischief." Postmaster General Winton M. Blount spoke before the National Press Club on April 27, 1970, and I believe every Member of Congress should heed his remarks which follow:

REMARKS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL WINTON M. BLOUNT

My subject today is postal reorganization and many of you have heard me speak on the same subject when I was here a year ago. It reminds me of the story of an Indian chief, head of a tribe in Nevada, who drove into Las Vegas for a little gambling. He ran into a bad streak and was wiped out. He then climbed to the top of Mount Charleston and sent smoke signals to his tribe, asking for more money. The tribe signaled back: "For what reason do you need money?" Before the chief could reply, a group of scientists from the Atomic Energy Commission detonated an atomic charge in the desert. A tremendous mushroom of smoke rose from the earth, darkening the sky.

Promptly, the tribe signaled: "All right, all right, sending money. Just don't holler."

I've been hollering for a year about postal reform and today I'm going to holler some more.

We hoped reform would come sooner than it has. But there were the necessary adjustments to be made, as with any dramatic change. There were those who opposed it because they thought the process of rate making was best handled by compromise between lobbyists and the members of Congress.

I have to confess that I have been baffled as to why those who stood to benefit most from postal reform opposed it the most. I realize it takes time to adjust to a new idea—although the idea itself was not particularly new. Somebody back in 1906 proposed putting the Department in the hands of a government-regulated corporation. I know it takes time to study the legislation, and I fully endorsed this process of careful study. But the process took far longer than it need have taken, in my view.

And I must say it seemed odd to find business people so concerned with rate increases struggling against a measure designed to bring some long-range stability to postal rates of all classes, and people who complain constantly about the postal service fighting every effort to improve it. I neglected to read Alice in Wonderland when I was young, but I feel that hole in my education has been adequately filled now.

But after all the political posturing, and all the "viewing with alarm," and all the

"pointing with grave concern;" after all the hearings, and all the testimony; and finally, after a crippling work stoppage, we still don't have a reform bill.

I don't know how I can make it any plainer than the work stoppage made it.

During the work stoppage, we got thousands of letters from the public; I got letters and telegrams and phone calls from Congressmen, and all of them were urging me to do something, urging me to settle the work stoppage. And we worked on it around the clock, because when the chewing gum hit the fan, it wasn't Congress that had to deal with it. It was the Post Office Department and the President.

There was a tremendous sense of urgency then. Everybody agreed we had to get this problem settled once and for all. Now that the men are back to work and everything is serene again, there is danger of complacency and politics as usual in the matter of postal reform.

I would hope that the Congress and the public can recapture the sense of urgency that prevailed in the month of March.

Because, make no mistake, the situation is urgent, and we are going to have more difficulties.

We are going to have chaos, and it's going to be widespread, in the postal system, if we don't change the system.

And, we are *not* going to be able to get through the next upheaval as quickly as we got through the last.

I'm not being an alarmist. This matter has been thoroughly studied and restudied for many years. We know what we're talking about. We anticipated the recent difficulty, and we anticipate further difficulties if nothing is done about it.

I'm sure the public thought that our negotiations with the postal unions made reform an accomplished fact. We tried to prevent that impression. We've tried from the beginning to make the public understand where the authority lies in this matter—that it lies with Congress, and there's nothing I can do, there's nothing the President can do, there's nothing anyone else can do more than we have; we can advise, suggest, recommend, and we can plead, and we've done all that, but only Congress can decide.

Our present situation is reminiscent of a story involving the National League umpire, Charlie Moran. Charlie has a pretty high regard for himself and his decisions. He makes it clear he's the boss. In one close play, the runner and the catcher were both waiting for Moran's decision. Moran hesitated a bit, and the catcher shouted: "Well, is it safe or is it out?" And Moran roared back: "Till I call it, it ain't nothin'."

That's about the status of our bill right now. Till Congress calls it, it ain't nothin'.

The recommendations which were arrived at both through independent study, and through negotiations, involved four key elements:

A provision for continuity of postal management, with insulation from the political pressures. This will give the policy continuity essential to proper long-range planning and efficiency.

A provision for collective bargaining and binding arbitration. I don't think I have to justify that after the events of the past month.

A provision for rate-setting by postal management with the advice of expert rate commissioners. This will give us a rate schedule far more professional than those which have resulted from the usual jockeying around on Capitol Hill by special interest groups.

And a provision for the authority to issue bonds to finance those necessary improvements in the postal service which have previously been sacrificed to other matters. With these improvements we can realize economies which are going to reflect in postal rates.

This bill will mark an historical forward step in the history of the Post Office. But there is one provision that will mark an historical forward step in labor-management relations in America. The provision for collective bargaining and binding arbitration, it seems to me, is going to set a precedent for what I believe is going to be a whole new era of labor-management relations for government. And I mean government at all levels, right down to the municipal level.

The significance of the negotiations which followed the postal work stoppage of mid-March resides in the fact that both sides faced each other across a table for the first time and hammered out a solution to a problem.

The postal unions had never engaged in collective bargaining. I think it is accurate to say they were apprehensive. George Meany came in to sit with these people, to guide them and give them the benefit of his considerable experience. And out of this we got a mutually acceptable result. We are pleased with it. I think the unions were pleased to see how the process could work. I think we established precedents to stand each of us in good stead, and I think we laid the groundwork for whole new Federal career relationships.

To fully understand what this means, let me just point out how bad the labor-management relationship is at present.

The postal worker's wage is set by Congress, not by postal management. The wage-setting process is essentially political. It doesn't work. Wage-setting is subject to the constant pull and tug of politics and other national priorities with the Administration on one end of the rope and the Congressmen on the other end. And the rope is wrapped around the postal worker's neck. And inevitably, you have lobbyists trying to foil both sides.

Grievance procedures under the present arrangement we found are meaningless. If the Postmaster General wanted to accept a grievance or reject it, he could. The workers had no recourse. Most agreements I can void with a stroke of a pen. I can be arbitrary, indifferent, ineffective—it makes no difference as long as the President is satisfied with the job I'm doing.

On the other hand, I can be the best damned Postmaster General in history, and when the Administration changes, out I go.

Small wonder the labor-management relationship is uneven. We have 750,000 employees spread all over the country. It's difficult to manage anything so big and so dispersed in the best circumstances. The Post Office Department has always had to do it in the worst circumstances.

Those of us who have come to government from business have had the experience of being prodded and pushed for years on behalf of labor, by accusation, exhortation, and legislation, always pressing the case for the worker before us—sometimes justifiably, sometimes not. Labor swings more votes than management, and the better part of political wisdom dictates that the worker is blessed and the businessman damned.

So after all these hymns to the working man, we expected to find the lot of the Federal employee a virtual paradise. We were prepared to be instructed by the absolutely Platonic ideal of what the labor-management relationship should be.

Instead, we found the nearest thing to feudalism imaginable. What goes on here is something modern management wouldn't recognize and modern labor wouldn't tolerate. And I might add it's the damndest bit of hypocrisy I know, short of the Senate's new Supreme Court confirmation procedures.

I am not suggesting that the procedures we have devised for redressing the labor-management relationship will work everywhere else. These procedures will have to be

tailored to the individual needs of the agency involved, the sort of government involved, the level of government and so forth.

What I *am* suggesting is that there must be procedures that insure to those workers in essential public services who are prohibited from striking a process that they feel is fair. We have had strikes against the public all over the country. It is clear that men will not tolerate a law which denies them recourse where there is injustice.

Willful disregard of the law is abhorrent to all thoughtful Americans, but free people cannot be governed, in the last analysis, unless they consent to be governed. If the law that prohibits strikes by Government employees is to be effective, it must find general acceptance among the employees themselves; and that acceptance is far more likely to be achieved, in my opinion, where the employees know that their government, acting as an employer, has a process for resolving impasses that the worker feels treats them fairly. I think we have devised a way to do this.

I hope the Congress will agree that it should be done.

We are buying time in this matter of reform, and the account is overdrawn. We're not looking for another opportunity to say I told you so. We're looking for a postal system that works, before the one we've got stops working. Once again, I urge Congress to move in this matter.

MINSHALL OPINION POLL

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert at this point in the RECORD my May 1970 questionnaire:

MINSHALL OPINION POLL

1. Do you approve of President Nixon sending U.S. troops into Cambodia?
2. Should the United States:
 - (a) Continue Vietnamizing the war while gradually withdrawing our troops?
 - (b) Step up efforts for an all-out military victory?
 - (c) Pull out all U.S. military forces at once?
 - (d) Other?
3. Should the U.S. increase arms aid to Israel?
4. Do you support the Safeguard Anti-Ballistic Missile program?
5. Are you in favor of an all-volunteer Army?
6. Should college draft deferments be phased out so that all men of eligible age are selected by lottery?
7. Do you think 18-year-olds should have the right to vote?
8. Should the House of Representatives bring impeachment proceedings against Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas?
9. To control inflation, do you favor:
 - (a) Wage and price controls?
 - (b) Credit controls?
 - (c) Reduced government spending?
10. In the fight against environmental pollution would you support:
 - (a) Higher taxes at all governmental levels for an all-out crash program?
 - (b) The President's Great Lakes Clean-Up proposals?
 - (c) Strong local enforcement of more strict regulations governing municipal and industrial pollution?
 - (d) Strong enforcement of more strict

regulations governing motor vehicle and airplane pollution?

11. Should the U.S. proceed with more exploration of the moon and deeper probes of outer space?

12. To halt student violence, what policies should be adopted in riot situations on campus?

CORPSMAN CARON

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Hospital Corpsman Wayne M. Caron was posthumously awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for his heroic attempts to aid wounded comrades in Vietnam. No homage we render can adequately express our profound admiration for Corpsman Caron's gallant self-sacrifice in the course of battle.

The morality of war is a question that history has never adequately resolved. We abhor its existence, and despise the inexorable violence and atrocity that follow in its path. We are consoled only by the hope that the initial disruption and loss of life will be vindicated by the ultimate triumph of our ideals and concept of freedom.

While the Nation as a whole searches desperately for a new definition of our international role and a viable concept of our priorities, the youth of America bears a disproportionate burden of the sacrifice. The concepts of justice, equality, and dignity have a more direct and constructive meaning to our young than we as a Nation are sometimes willing to acknowledge.

Naval Corpsman Caron was indeed representative of this role of American youth. The citation accompanying the award is adequate testimony to his "inspiring valor, steadfast determination, and selfless dedication." We can only hope to further the manifestation of selflessness that Corpsman Caron courageously demonstrated.

Two articles follow:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Apr. 19, 1970]

AGNEW TO PRESENT TOP MEDAL

Vice President Spiro Agnew will present tomorrow the Congressional Medal of Honor, the nation's highest award for heroism, to the wife and parents of a 23-year-old Navy medical corpsman from Middleboro who gave his life in Vietnam trying to save his comrades.

Hospital Corpsman 3/c Wayne M. Caron was killed July 28, 1968, while treating wounded Marines.

"Wasn't my son something?" his mother, Mrs. Aimie Caron of 48 East Main st., asked yesterday. "We're so proud of him."

"But he knew he wouldn't be coming back. He told us before he went to Vietnam that he had a premonition of death."

Mr. Caron, her husband—a corrections officer at Bridgewater State Hospital—will fly to Washington today with their daughter-in-law, Teresa, and her 17-month-old son, Scott Wayne, born three months after his father was killed. They will be joined by their daughter, Mrs. Janet Ann Rowe of Millersburg, Pa.

The vice president will present the Medal of Honor to them and to the families of 14 other servicemen killed in Vietnam.

Corpsman Caron enlisted in the Navy soon

after he graduated from high school in 1966. He was sent to Vietnam to serve with the First Marine Division in April 1968.

According to the official citation, on July 28, 1968, he was accompanying his platoon on a sweep through an open rice field when the unit was ambushed.

He was wounded three times in the arm and leg, but continued to hobble and crawl to the aid of two wounded Marines. He was trying to reach a third when he was killed by an enemy rocket round.

"His inspiring valor, steadfast determination and selfless dedication in the face of extreme danger sustained and enhanced the finest traditions of the U.S. Naval Services," the citation said.

CORPSMAN CARON

Caron was killed July 28, 1968, by enemy gunfire while treating wounded Marines of the First Marine Division in the Republic of Vietnam.

His heroism was noted during an encounter against enemy forces in Vietnam's Quang Nam Province.

As platoon corpsman with Co. K, 3rd Battalion, 7th Marines, 1st Marine Division (Reinforced), Caron accompanied his group on a sweep through an open rice field.

Seeing two Marine casualties fall from enemy small arms and automatic weapons fire, Caron immediately ran to render first aid only to find they were already dead. By this time the platoon was under intense fire and had suffered additional casualties.

While moving to the aid of other wounded comrades, Caron was hit in the arm by enemy fire and knocked to the ground but regained his feet and reached a seriously wounded Marine. His medical treatment was instrumental in saving the man's life. He then ran toward a second wounded Marine and was again hit by enemy fire, this time in the leg. Unable to run or even walk, he crawled the remaining distance and treated the Marine.

As Caron started to make his way to yet another wounded Marine, he was hit a third time by enemy small arms fire. Unmindful of his own wounds, Caron continued his attempt to reach the third Marine until he was killed by an enemy rocket round.

"His inspiring valor, steadfast determination, and selfless dedication in the face of extreme danger, sustain and enhance the finest traditions of the United States Naval Service," the citation said.

Caron was born in Middleboro, Mass., on Nov. 2, 1946. He was graduated from Memorial High School in 1966, and enlisted in the Navy in Boston on July 12 of that year.

Upon completion of recruit training at Great Lakes, Ill., he was assigned to the Naval Hospital Corps School there, graduating in January 1967. He was attached to the Naval Hospital at Great Lakes for 15 months before receiving in April 1968 a set of orders to duty with the 1st Marine Division in Vietnam.

Caron had been awarded the Purple Heart, Combat Action Ribbon, National Defense Service Medal, Vietnam Service Medal and Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal.

In addition to his widow, Caron is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Aime Joseph Caron of 48 East Main St., Middleboro.

NATIONAL HOLIDAY OF THE RUMANIAN PEOPLE

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to call the attention of my col-

leagues to the national holiday of the Rumanian people. May 10 marks the historic anniversary of three great events of its history.

On May 10, 1866, the Rumanian dynasty was founded. Eleven years later, in 1877, Rumania acquired independence from the Ottoman Empire. Four years later, on May 10, 1881, Charles I was crowned King of Rumania.

Despite foreign oppression and domination, the spirit of this people and this nation has prevailed.

We American friends of the Rumanian people know what good friends they have been over the years and how they have expressed that friendship to the people of the United States.

As Americans, we must renew our hope that our concepts of freedom and liberty be extended to the Rumanian people.

AN EYEWITNESS AT KENT STATE SPEAKS OUT

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the loss of human lives at Kent State College was tragic. It was, however, reasonably foreseeable that if hordes of persons attacked armed troops with rocks, and pipes and bottles, that at some point such violence risked response.

One of the questions, of course, assuming those whose emotions are at tension levels are still interested in the facts, is what, if anything, the victims of the shootings were doing when they were shot? Another extremely relevant question is who actually did the shooting if any shots were fired by other than members of the Guard?

In connection with the situation that prevailed at the time, the following Associated Press report appearing in the Boston Herald Traveler of Friday, May 8, 1970, is worthy of consideration:

GUARD NOT TO BLAME, KENT STUDENT DECLARES

WHITE RIVER JUNCTION, Vt.—A student who said he saw four of his classmates killed when National Guard troops fired on demonstrators at Kent State University in Ohio on Monday says the Guardsmen were not to blame.

James Young, 20, of White River Junction, said in an interview yesterday with radio station WNRV that the Guardsmen "had to fire to defend their lives."

Young, who said he watched the incident from a dormitory window 150 yards away, said the students were an angry mob.

"I really believe the crowd would have—if they had tried hand to hand to fight their way out—would have beaten them to death," Young said.

"The news reports sort of give the impression that the National Guard was entirely wrong," he said. "But that's not true. They were defending their lives. They had no alternative but to shoot."

He said that from his vantage point, he saw about 30 Guardsmen come up a hill from a green and down the other side to a football field where they confronted more than 2,000 students.

The Guardsmen formed a protective circle

with tear gas launchers in the middle, Young said.

"I saw one tear gas grenade tossed back and forth several times between students and Guardsmen," he said.

Young said 50 to 100 students were throwing rocks, pieces of concrete and lengths of pine at the troops.

"And they were only about 20 feet away from the soldiers," he said.

THE 22D ANNIVERSARY OF ISRAEL'S DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as a proud American, native born, and who has the great honor of being a Member of this House of Representatives, I rise for a twofold purpose.

First, I wish to express our congratulations and felicitations to a democratic nation, the Republic of the State of Israel on the occasion of the 22d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence.

Second, after quickly reviewing its ancient history, I wish to alert my colleagues in the House that this very friendly nation with which we have close ties is facing a serious danger by our Communist enemies.

The history of Israel spans more than 5,000 years and the Middle East is accurately called the cradle of civilization. The world's three great monotheistic religions—Judaism, Christianity, and Islam—were nurtured along the fertile crescent running up the east coast of the Mediterranean Sea and bending down through the valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers.

It was in 1917, in return for international Jewish support for the Allied cause to make "the world safe for democracy" that Great Britain issued the Balfour Declaration favoring establishment in Palestine "of a national home for the Jewish people." Five years later, in 1922, Great Britain's allies, which of course included the United States, approved the Balfour Declaration, and it was incorporated into the League of Nations mandate for Palestine.

It is worthy of note that in 1944, the Congress of the United States called for unlimited Jewish immigration into Palestine and the reconstitution of the Holy Land as a Jewish commonwealth so that it could continue to be a haven for poor, persecuted, and homeless Jews, just as it had been for those who were fortunate enough to have somehow escaped from the German Nazi concentration camps with their gas and torture chambers of planned total extermination and brutal murders.

Today, we here in the Congress of the United States are glad to take full cognizance of the Independence Day of Israel. According to our calendar, it was on May 14, 1948, that the new State of Israel was reborn. The first country to officially recognize this new nation was,

as we know, the United States under the wise leadership of President Harry S. Truman.

It is needless for me to restate the great change for the better, that this new country has wrought; how it made the arid desert bloom and bring forth food for its people; how it brought science, education, and democracy to a region where ignorance, superstition, illiteracy, and feudalism once reigned. And above all things, we here in our United States, have a true friend and a sister Republic in a vital and strategically important part of the world—the Middle East. What could be more important for the entire free world than to lend encouragement and material support to such a nation? Should we not, as Americans, fully aid and assist our ally against the growing Communist menace? To these questions, the answers must be an emphatic affirmative yes.

History has a way of repeating itself. We all remember during February 1957, when the Eisenhower administration, which included the then Vice President Richard M. Nixon, actually threatened the State of Israel with punitive sanctions as a result of the Israel victory over the hostile Arabs who would destroy Israel.

Just recently, we know that President Nixon refused to permit the sale of American planes to Israel which desperately needs them to fend off Egypt and other Arab war planes. But what do we clearly see now?

The new Russian threat to the State of Israel has been unhappily confirmed in the most menacing possible manner. Squadrons of Red Communist fighter-pilots are in Egypt flying Mig 21's in a combat role for the Arabs against our friend Israel. I maintain that these hostile Russian pilots in Egypt present a danger to the United States and the free world as grave as during the Cuba crisis.

It has been reliably reported that the atheistic Russians have taken over a large part of Egypt's air attack planes, and also manning the SA-3 missiles and batteries of 23-millimeter radar-aimed guns that are mounted in groups of four on tank chassis, as well as flying the Mig's for the Arabs against Israel.

Today on Israel's anniversary we find her in deadly peril from those who are our enemies. Today our brave American men are fighting in Vietnam, and only last week President Nixon escalated the war to a neutral country—Cambodia. And still, the Chief Executive steadfastly refuses to supply a country much nearer in every way to the United States than is Vietnam or Cambodia, with war planes to protect itself.

In these troubled times, we pause in our deliberation to take note of an important event; namely, the declaration of independence of the State of Israel. We offer our sincere congratulations and best wishes. However, I urge something far more meaningful than mere words.

As an American, and I am speaking solely as such and as a Member of Congress, I most strongly urge and recommend that our congratulations be coupled with pressure upon the President

that he reverse his apparent hostile attitude toward a small republic that thousands of years ago gave the world its three principal religions, the Ten Commandments and the Holy Bible.

May the future for Israel be bright. May she long continue to be a source for peace, enlightenment for mankind, and a center for spiritual inspiration. In the words of the language of the Scripture: "Shalom."

GENERAL OF THE ARMY
OMAR N. BRADLEY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 8, 1970, Congressmen HALL and HUNGATE of Missouri, Congressman GOODLING of Pennsylvania, and myself were privileged to attend the dedication of the Omar N. Bradley Museum at Carlisle Barracks, Pa. The dedication was held on this date as it represented the 25th anniversary of V-E Day in Europe, a victory in which General Bradley played a major role.

The dedication was conducted in a way most befitting a great man who it has been my privilege to have known for a number of years. I served under General Bradley in Europe during World War II, and when I came to the U.S. Congress in 1946 and was assigned to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, General Bradley was then the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. The job he did with this Administration was not unlike his performance during the war; his good judgment, reliability, and his great compassion for the man who had borne the brunt of battle, provided the returning veteran the rewards of a grateful country.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the introductory and closing remarks of Maj. Gen. George Eckhardt, commandant of the U.S. Army War College; the major address by Chief of Staff, Gen. William C. Westmoreland, Jr., and the remarks by General of the Army Omar N. Bradley.

REMARKS BY GENERAL ECKHARDT

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: I wish to welcome each of you to Carlisle Barracks to join us in commemorating this, the twenty-fifth anniversary of V-E Day and to thank General of the Army Omar N. Bradley for his lifetime of service to the Nation.

I should like to mention a few, not by name, but by grouping. First, a special thanks to the members of Congress who have put aside important deliberations to join us. Department of the Army and Department of Defense representatives are also here on the platform and in the audience. General Bradley, I know, is most pleased to have with him a large contingent of classmates from the West Point Class of 1915. There is another special group here, members of General Bradley's command in Europe; the 12th Army Group. All of us, however, are here with the same purpose,

a purpose which is best expressed in this excerpt from the Joint Resolution of the Congress:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of V-E Day, and the formal opening of the Omar N. Bradley historical collection, appropriate ceremonies be conducted at Carlisle Barracks under the direction of the Secretary of Defense in memorial tribute to the Allied victory in Europe and in memory of those who gave their lives to attain that victory, and expressing the gratitude of the American people to one of this country's greatest soldiers, General of the Army Omar N. Bradley.

Throughout his distinguished career, Omar N. Bradley retained those characteristics and qualities which earned for him the reputation of being the GI's general, a sense of humility and humaneness, a sincere dedication to duty, a high sense of honor, and a deep-seated love of country. It is most fitting that the dedication ceremony begin with a musical tribute to General of the Army Omar N. Bradley by the United States Army Band and Chorus under the direction of Colonel Samuel Loboda.

Thank you Colonel Loboda and the United States Army Band and Chorus. Many of us who are here today have served with General Bradley. Some were his classmates at West Point. Many were his commanders or members of his staffs in the Mediterranean or in the European continent during World War II. Still others were with General Bradley in the Pentagon. One man, however, has seen General Bradley from many viewpoints. As a cadet, he first met Major Bradley when he arrived at West Point. I can assure you that there is no shrewder judge of human character than a West Point cadet assessing and appraising a tactical officer on the Commandant's staff! Less than ten years later, our speaker served under General Bradley with the 9th Infantry Division of II Corps in Africa and Sicily and as a part of the 12th Army Group in Europe. He has since followed in General Bradley's footsteps holding many of the same positions earlier filled by General Bradley, including his present assignment. Ladies and gentlemen, the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, General William C. Westmoreland Jr.

ADDRESS BY GEN. W. C. WESTMORELAND

Twenty-five years ago today, peace came to Europe. The guns of war were silenced for the first time in almost six years on that continent. V-E Day signaled the end of the costliest, most agonizing struggle in the history of man. During World War II over fourteen million men served our country in uniform. Those men served in the finest tradition of their forebears. . . . And just as their successors are now serving, they demonstrated selfless dedication to further the principles of freedom and to preserve our way of life.

Appropriately, today on this twenty-fifth anniversary of V-E Day, we remember those who in the service of their country brought peace and democracy to Western Europe. But we honor here one of their commanders—one of the great generals of our time—a dedicated professional soldier in the truest sense. He was one of the principal architects of our victory in Europe.

General of the Army Omar Nelson Bradley, a man of solid American stock, achieved greatness in World War II as the Commander of 12th Army Group—the largest American field command ever assembled in the history of the United States Army: four field armies of twelve corps and forty-eight divisions—a mighty military machine in which over 1,300,000 men fought in the common cause of freedom. Yet as General Bradley

achieved greatness leading the 12th Army Group to victory across Western Europe, his humility was never lost in the fame that was accorded him as a professional soldier—for he became known among those whom he commanded as "the GI General"—a man whose love and affection for his men never dimmed.

I have been privileged to know General Bradley over the years as a close personal friend as well as a professional soldier. I have always cherished his friendship and likewise have benefited from his wise counsel.

I first came to know this man as a plebe at West Point in the early thirties. I remember him from those days as a tall, athletic, infantry officer whose manner was quiet and thoughtful, but always decisive. He had established a reputation among the Cadet Corps as a true professional—positive and demanding yet always considerate and sensitive to the feelings of the individual.

During first class summer camp, Major Bradley made a lasting impression on all cadets. As a concluding field exercise, the cadets were divided into two opposing forces, each consisting of horse cavalry, infantry, and artillery. The first classmen served as officers during the field problem. Tactical Department officers under the supervision of Major Bradley acted as umpires and instructors.

As Acting Battalion Commander of the Blue Forces, I, along with Major Bradley, was privileged to ride a horse rather than walk. The first tactical situation was the defense of a key terrain feature against the Red Forces. Because I had deployed my forces poorly, the battalion was mauled somewhat severely by the Red Forces.

After the attacking forces had withdrawn, we moved into the next situation . . . pursuit of the withdrawing enemy. When we had advanced to the terrain feature from which the Red Forces had attacked, Major Bradley rode up alongside me and said quietly, "I want to talk to you." What followed in the next few minutes has remained indelibly stamped on my mind ever since. It was my most vivid and lasting lesson in one of the fundamentals of tactics. Major Bradley pointed out the situation as the enemy forces had seen it the day before—the routes of approach, the strengths and weaknesses of the terrain, the commanding ground, and the vulnerabilities of the positions my forces had occupied the previous day. All of these key points suddenly became apparent when seen from the enemy's vantage point. Without a word of criticism, Major Bradley emphasized to me my errors in deploying the Blue Forces the previous day. This was a lesson never to be forgotten.

I did not see Major Bradley again until we met at El Guettar in North Africa . . . when as a Major General, he was General Patton's deputy. And then again as a Corps Commander in General Patton's Seventh Army in Sicily, General Bradley could frequently be found among his forward combat elements directing his forces only as he knew how—with a firsthand, personal knowledge of the combat situation.

As First Army Commander on June 6, 1944, he led his forces against the Atlantic Wall in the invasion of the continent of Europe. And a little over a month later he split his forces into two armies and assumed command of 12th Army Group. But as General Bradley assumed greater responsibility in commanding larger units, he never lost his respect and admiration for the men he commanded. Nor did his style of leadership change.

Historians will probably never write of a Bradley legend. . . . Nor will they ever likely describe him as a dashing warrior. But they have written and will continue to write about him as the outstanding professional soldier . . . one of the great tacticians in the art of

warfare—a general whose reliability and steadiness never wavered, whose good character and sound judgment were without question, whose calm demeanor inspired confidence among his subordinates, whose dependability always insured success in the toughest of situations, and whose compassion for those whom he led earned him the highest accolade from them—"the soldier's soldier."

What is truly a paradox in the history of the United States Army is that many of our great captains have had no military lineage but have entered the profession of arms almost by chance. General Bradley is no exception to this pattern.

Born in the small town of Clark, Missouri, he was only fourteen years old when his father—a country schoolteacher—died. His mother supported him through high school working as a seamstress. And while working at the Moberly, Missouri shops of the Wabash Railroad, the young boy applied for an appointment to West Point . . . convinced that a military career was one way to further his education.

General Bradley graduated from the United States Military Academy in 1915. The *Howitzer* of that year prophetically stated that "his most prominent characteristic is 'getting there'." But he never saw service overseas during World War I. He was destined to spend twenty-eight years as a soldier before he was off to war.

Traditionally, the professional soldier in our country spends his peacetime years as a member of an organization that is portrayed by many as a burden on the society which it has sworn to defend. Accordingly, our Armies during peace have shrunk in size, their equipment has been allowed to grow obsolete, and the professional has oftentimes been shunned. Yet during each of these low periods, the dedicated professional has remained loyal to his obligation—preparing for the inevitable—knowing well that in time of war, the country turns to him to perform in the finest tradition that has typified the American soldier.

General Bradley was a product of this mold. During the years between the two world wars, he attended and graduated from the Infantry School in 1925, the Command and General Staff School in 1929, and this institution, the Army War College, in 1934. Yet just as General Bradley learned the art of warfare from the Army School System, he also imparted his knowledge to others who followed in his steps. They also were to be tested later in the same war. General Bradley spent four years at the Military Academy as an instructor in mathematics, four years as an instructor in tactics and weapons at the Infantry School at Fort Benning, and four additional years at the Military Academy as an instructor in tactics and as plans and training officer. Just prior to our entry into World War II, he became Commandant of the Infantry School. There he established the Infantry Officer Candidate Program in which more than 45,000 combat leaders were commissioned before the end of World War II.

The three decades General Bradley spent preparing himself and his associates for combat paid rich rewards during World War II. His accomplishments during the campaigns in North Africa, Sicily, and Europe need no testimonial from me, nor from those whom he led, nor indeed from the American citizenry. All hold General Bradley in the highest esteem. All of us share in the gratitude he so richly deserves. Yet perhaps the finest tribute to General Bradley comes from his own pen . . . a humble disclaimer in his book *A Soldier's Story* where he states:

Generals are human; I know of none immune to error. We may have erred in discretion and in judgment, but because we were more often right than wrong in Europe, we

can take pride in that campaign and in those colleagues whose judgments we sometimes disputed but whose achievements vastly outweighed their mistakes.

Within four months after the end of the war in Europe, General Bradley was appointed as the head of the Veterans Administration during a period that was to see over thirteen million men shed the uniform of their country to take up again peaceful pursuits as citizens. This selection was a logical choice. Who else could better look after the welfare of former members of our Armed Forces than the man who had led more than a million of them during the War? General Bradley said this about his appointment:

I don't think there's any job in the country I'd sooner not have, nor any job in the world I'd want to do better. For even though it is burdened with problems, it gives me the chance to do something for the men who did so much for me.

A little over two years later, General Bradley relinquished his post as Administrator of Veterans Affairs to become Chief of Staff of the United States Army. On August 16, 1949, he was sworn in as our first Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and later become the first Chairman of the Military Committee of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

On September 22, 1950, General Bradley was promoted to his present rank—General of the Army—making him one of four in our Army who have attained that rank.

Today we honor this great soldier in dedicating the Omar N. Bradley Museum. But as we anticipate the future of this repository for General Bradley's papers, historical documents, and memorabilia, let us also look forward to the day we may live in peace—a peace for which this great man devoted his life, but a peace he realized was not easily sustained.

His own words on Memorial Day in 1946 at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier are a testimonial to this dedicated profession. He said:

"We shall have to see that peace can only be created by intelligence, by realism, by sacrifice, and by the will to see it achieved."

"But if war is costly, so also is peace. Until nations know that peace demands its price, they shall risk future conflicts."

REMARKS BY GENERAL OF THE ARMY OMAR N. BRADLEY

Mr. Secretary, Distinguished guests, Ladies and Gentlemen: Mrs. Bradley and I would like to express our appreciation to the Congress of the United States, to Secretary of the Army Resor, and to General Westmoreland for helping to create this repository so generously founded in my name. Here, and in other archives of our American heritage throughout our land, are recorded the deeds and sacrifices of the men and women who have fought for the freedom we hold so dear. They have fought for it on the battlefield, they have fought for it in the Chambers of the Congress, in the Halls of Justice; they have fought for it in dedicated homes from the White House to the farmhouse. The memory of these valiant men and women is a national treasure; the perpetuation of that memory is a national obligation.

On this twenty-fifth anniversary of V-E Day, we recall that many times in the past we have had to fight to defend our freedom, with its rights and privileges—and its obligations. Perhaps present and future scholars may learn here, from the set-backs as well as from the advances, lessons which will insure for the future the freedom for which almost every generation since 1776 has had to fight.

Some years ago I was asked to define what freedom means to me. My answer, which I have had occasion to quote recently, was:

"Freedom—no word was ever spoken that

has held out greater hope, demanded greater sacrifice, needed more to be nurtured, blessed more the giver, damned more its destroyer, or come closer to being God's will on Earth. May Americans ever be its protector."

At some future date, when I have joined General Marshall, General Eisenhower, General MacArthur, and others who have gone before, and when Mrs. Bradley has joined me, all the records, artifacts, and memorabilia of my own fifty-nine years of military service which have not been given by then, will become a part of this collection, and the remainder of our worldly goods shall become the property of the Omar N. Bradley Foundation. When that time comes I hope that, through this Foundation, we shall be allowed to continue to serve the cause of freedom and the country we love so well.

REMARKS BY GENERAL ECKHARDT

General and Mrs. Bradley we deeply appreciate your generosity in donating your papers and memorabilia to the Military History Research Collection. These research materials will be of great value to scholars of the future. I am somewhat at a loss to find words to fully express our thanks for the endowment to come at a later date, a day I hope sincerely is many years away. I can assure you that as long as there is a United States Army with its Military History Research Collection, the resources you have provided will indeed serve the cause of freedom and the Nation you serve and love so well. I thank you, not only for the Research Collection and the War College, but also for the entire United States Army and a grateful government.

Ladies and gentlemen, twenty-five years ago several million Americans were serving in the Armed Forces of the United States. In Europe, and in Africa, in Asia, from the Arctic to the tropics, these men and women fought to rid the world of tyranny and oppression and to make available to others those freedoms Americans have come to accept as commonplace. It is most fitting and proper that we pause while The United States Army Band and Chorus salute the Veterans of World War II.

Once again, I thank all of you who come from near and far. General Westmoreland, thank you for an inspiring dedicatory address. The Omar N. Bradley Museum will be open from immediately after the ceremony until four o'clock this afternoon. I hope that all of you will visit the Museum. General and Mrs. Bradley will be in the Reading Room in Upton Hall shortly after one o'clock to greet you informally.

This observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of V-E Day and the Dedication of the Omar N. Bradley Museum will conclude with the Benediction.

ATHLETES' STATEMENT

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon is probably the Nation's No. 1 sports fan.

He said he was watching football during the massive moratorium march against his Vietnam policies last November.

When he paid a surprise visit to demonstrators sleeping at the Lincoln Memorial early Saturday morning, the students said he was more interested in talk-

ing about their football teams than about the issue that had brought them to Washington.

As a sports enthusiast, the President should be interested to learn that college athletes are no less disenchanted by his handling of the war and other issues than other members of their generation, as evidenced by the following statement supported by the track teams of the eight schools in the Ivy League:

ATHLETES' STATEMENT

We, the athletes assembled before you, members of the Ivy League teams competing here today, seek to call attention to our belief that business as usual is not sufficient. As athletes and trackmen we understand that our sport is not, and must never become a hideout from our basic responsibilities as human beings.

Since the last outdoor Heptagonal meet, thousands have been killed in the unending war in Southeast Asia. Within that year, student opposition to the war has increased while the Administration continues to listen to a postulated "silent majority." Still there has been no Congressional decision to enter the war, no less to pursue it across international frontiers.

Since our last encounter, the spirit of division and intolerance separating us from our national leaders has grown. The Administration has resorted to name-calling and worse, in an effort to ignore and silence the legitimate opposition to war, conscription and senseless violence.

We decry the killing of fellow students at Kent State University as a national tragedy and a focus of shame. We decry the growing intolerance which permits some to accept those sacrifices as necessary or justified. We further deplore the growing tolerance for repression directed against political and racial minorities, such as the Black Panther party and people of radical disposition in general.

Those of us who compete here today do so in the hope that our concern with these vital issues will be expressed to all spectators, and to all who have found pleasure in track and field. We respect and acknowledge those members of our teams who have felt that they cannot in conscience participate in this meet.

ISRAEL'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, the birth of the State of Israel was a significant event in the turbulent history of the Middle East. And this significance is of such momentous importance today in the larger field of international relations that it transcends Israel's geographic boundaries and the whole Middle East region.

For almost 2,000 years Jews were practically excluded from their ancestral homeland, and at the beginning of the 20th century only a small minority of Jews lived in Palestine. The preponderant majority of the Jewish people lived in what has been known since ancient times as "the Diaspora"—the dispersion of Jews around the world. During all that time, while they cherished the dream of returning to the Promised Land, the idea seemed to be more than a dream to most of them and with the passage of centur-

ies, it receded into the distant past. But the views of a few dreamers for the future State of Israel prevailed, and in the end they became new Israel's 20th century prophets. These dreamers were men of vision, and through sheer power of persuasion and persistency, they were able to pass on their idea to their successors. And these great and gifted leaders moulded and forged the image of the State of Israel, whose birth was proclaimed 22 years ago.

Today this 22-year-old State of Israel has grown in size and has become a powerful force in the Middle East. It has become the home for more than 2 million refugee Jews, and these have made it a progressive, prosperous, and industrious state.

Yet, this tiny fortress of democracy will only continue to exist in the threat of Soviet-Arab aggression if the United States will supply it with economic, military, and political support. The United States should not continue to aid and train Arab military personnel while refusing to sell jets to Israel.

On the observance of Israel's Independence Day, let us hope that the Israeli people will be allowed to enjoy their freedom in peace and the full measure of American friendship.

MR. NIXON'S CRITICS AT HOME

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most penetrating interpretations of the decision of the President to remove Communist sanctuaries in Cambodia and the resulting furor that has developed on college campuses was carried in the Tuesday, May 5, Chicago Today.

The point effectively made in the editorial is that the President deserves the time that he has established by which the soundness of his decision could be determined. This, I believe, is presenting all of us with the opportunity to thoughtfully appraise the conclusion of the Cambodian operation. The article follows:

MR. NIXON'S CRITICS AT HOME

Anti-war feeling in the United States, particularly on university campuses, is probably of more concern to President Nixon right now than the attitude of the Soviet Union. He must have anticipated both. But it's normal to meet criticism from the other side of the fence; in Mr. Nixon's case, it is embarrassing and politically dangerous to get it from his own side.

The war critics have a right to express their views. We don't believe for a moment that dissent equals treason, or anything remotely like it, simply because it differs from the official point of view. Campus rioting, however, is something else. It has nothing to do with responsible dissent, and must not be allowed to divide the nation. We can't afford repetition of the Kent State university tragedy, in which 4 students were killed and several injured.

Even the peaceful critics, however sincere in their beliefs, are adding to the risk of the

President's gamble in moving troops into Cambodia. And his gamble is the country's gamble. No one doubts that Mr. Nixon was aware of the hazards. He went even further out on the limb by giving himself a deadline of 6 to 8 weeks to get results.

Herein is something the anti-war protesters have overlooked: Since the President himself set the deadline, why not give him the benefit at least of that doubt? He believes, as we do, that taking the initiative in this war of attrition is the most promising way to end it, and he should be given the chance to prove it.

Mr. Nixon has already demonstrated one salutary effect of taking the initiative. The bumbling, ineffectual reaction of the Kremlin, as evidenced by Kossygin's speech, showed that the Soviet Union was caught off guard. That change in balance, with the United States calling the shots instead of reacting to communist moves in Indochina, is the only hopeful sign in a war that seems almost devoid of hope.

MOORHEAD EVIDENCES ISRAELI CONCERN

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, 22 years ago, the State of Israel became a nation. This valiant outpost of productivity and advancement, in an otherwise barren region, is a shining example to the world of what national effort and dedication can produce.

The fruits of Israel are amazing all the more in light of the almost constant state of war in which this land found itself. Defending their right to exist, the Israelis have fought three major wars with the Arabs in 22 years.

Even now, with the support and prodigal of the Soviet Union, Arab terrorists and military units make daily forays against Israel. This embattered nation, determined not to retreat in the face of Arab hostility, has stood its ground and hit back at the aggressors.

Three times in the past year, I have introduced resolutions aimed at extending American aid and support to the Israelis.

I introduced the strongest of these resolutions just 6 weeks ago. Today, I reintroduce this resolution as evidence of my continued concern over the hostilities in the Middle East:

H. CON. RES. 556

Whereas the close relationship between Israel's survival and United States national interests has been recognized by five successive Presidents; and

Whereas the Soviet Union continues to supply the Arab nations of the Middle East with modern arms; and

Whereas France has contributed to the tension in the Middle East by selling jets to Arab interests; and

Whereas the United States has over the past ten years supplied extensive arms, material, and military training to the Arab nations, while providing considerably less aid to Israel; and

Whereas the United States continues to train Arab officers this year while not training a single Israeli officer; and

Whereas the President has failed to act on an Israeli request for additional jet aircraft essential to its defense; and

Whereas a balance of power is the best available deterrent to full-scale war in the Middle East; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that (1) the President should take immediate steps upon the adoption of this concurrent resolution to terminate every form of military assistance to any belligerent Arab nation, including those aligned with the United Arab Republic and those harboring or assisting Arab terrorist groups or guerrillas, and (2) the President should, as soon as possible after the adoption of this concurrent resolution, negotiate with the Government of Israel an agreement to sell to Israel the requested United States military aircraft in amounts necessary for the security of Israel.

AIR SERVICE TO SMALLER COMMUNITIES

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John G. Adams, a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, was kind enough to furnish me with a copy of a speech he made before the Association of Local Transport Airlines. I believe his comments on the subject of all service to smaller communities are worthy of note and I would like to call them to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

REMARKS OF JOHN G. ADAMS

I would like to talk to you for a few moments about the changing pattern of air service which may be ahead of us during the next ten years—that is, during the decade of the 1970s. And particularly I want to talk a bit about the commercial aviation future of about 100 cities. I'm not talking about cities like New Orleans, and Atlanta, and Seattle, and Boston. I'm talking instead about four or five score towns and cities whose populations vary from perhaps 15,000 to 50,000. Towns in which the trunks lost interest one or two decades ago, and which many of you now, in your planning for the 70's, are speculating about abandoning.

The air carrier industry has problems today, not just your segment, but all of it.

One segment says the government has put too much competition against it and thus reduced profit opportunities. Another says that illegal charters are killing them. A third one says that it needs a protected market and broadened authority.

Look at the local service sector of the industry. Your troubles are not minor. Your investment in flight equipment rose from \$133 million at the end of 1965 to \$541 million at the end of 1969, a quadrupling of the original level. Your debt rose from \$110 million in 1965 to \$550 million at the end of last year, a four-fold increase. Interest expense during the period increased by a factor of eight, rising from \$5 million in 1965 to \$41 million in 1969. These sizable increases in the flight equipment and related accounts reflect, in the main, the continuing acquisition of new jet powered aircraft throughout the period.

The law makes clear that the Board may not control air carrier equipment acquisition. Admittedly you often come in and make a presentation of your plans, but you are not seeking Board permission; you are just telling us of your program.

And, in moving as you did to an inventory of turbo props and pure jets, you increased your investment base, and thus your return requirement significantly. Thus in today's

climate the \$400 million increase in the investment base attributable to purchases of flight equipment over the past four years would, in theory, generate an additional subsidy requirement for return and taxes of between \$50 and \$60 million. This, obviously, has much to do with the economic pinch so prevalent among the local carriers today.

These equipment decisions also brought on other problems. In your case, too much competition has not been put against you. Rather, you are the competition put on previous non-competitive trunk segments of others. Nor are excessive or illegal charters to dilute your loads a problem with you. Rather, you suffer from decreasing load factors caused by the new equipment just referred to, plus other things. The average passenger load factor of your segment, which had reached 50.2% in 1966, dropped to 43.1% in 1969, with individual carriers ranging from 39.4 to 47.4%. And then the whole problem was compounded by three unexpected new factors. These were the staggering increase in the cost of money, and in the cost of services and labor, plus the unforeseen fall-off in traffic growth we have seen in the past year.

Clearly the present economic situation, whatever its various causes, is the most important single problem facing the local service industry.

What steps has the Board taken and can it take in the future to ameliorate the situation? What steps can and should be taken by the industry and by the Congress?

I am inclined to believe that short-haul fares are approaching the top limits to which they can reasonably go for the immediate future.

At least one of your presidents is of the firm view that the higher fares have driven passengers off the airlines and back to the highways in many short-haul markets, and I think he may be right. I have been told this in very harsh terms by Chamber of Commerce representatives in some of the smaller cities I have visited this past winter. So, where else do we look?

The Board's route strengthening policy has resulted not only in granting new routes in the local carriers' own general areas, but also, in many cases, in extending the local carrier out of its territory and into a major hub.

In 1969 Mohawk was extended from upstate New York points to the Twin Cities and to Chicago; North Central was given Twin Cities-Denver authority; Ozark was brought from Iowa and Illinois to Washington and New York; Piedmont was given a route to Chicago; Southern saw added to its system St. Louis, Chicago and Miami; and Texas International was extended north to Denver and west to Los Angeles. A year earlier Allegheny had been extended north to Albany, and southwest to Memphis, and somewhat earlier Piedmont and Southern reached Washington and New York.

The theory behind such awards was supposed to be that they would be highly profitable and would in part make up for losses sustained by the carrier in serving small communities and short-haul routes.

But what bothers me is what appears to be a tendency of some carriers to accept these lucrative awards and at almost the same time seek to get out altogether from the towns the award was supposed to pay them to serve. One of your members was before us a couple of months ago, within weeks of having begun such a new service, and said that he would concentrate on building this route but would probably shortly be before us for permission to drop some loss towns. In my opinion this just won't do.

To me "dropping" is not the solution; but "remodeling" may be.

There is no escaping the fact that services

to large numbers of towns are going to be loss services at any reasonable fare, and many would be even at unreasonably high fares. The question presented is, who will pay the piper? If these loss services are to continue, they must be subsidized directly or indirectly by someone: the U.S. Government, the local community, or the stockholders. I think you will agree that in 1969 your stockholders provided a very substantial portion of this subsidy. We, that is, we the regulators, you the carriers, and the towns who are the users, are faced with a four-pronged dilemma—either raise fares to make the route profitable; let the carrier lose money on it; get out of the town; or subsidize it in some form or other.

If we can raise local fares no further, as I think we cannot on any broad scale sufficient to make a dent in the problem; and if your stockholders' ability to absorb these losses has reached its limit, as I think it has, we have before us only two other choices, discontinuation of service, or some more successful and satisfactory type of subsidization.

One of your presidents told me recently that if he could choose 15 towns on his system at which to discontinue service he could go off subsidy. And I suspect he was correct.

But if we did that—if we let him out of those 15 towns, and then did the same thing for eight other carriers, we might fairly quickly discover around 100 towns which would lose air service altogether.

This is not a solution I would favor, but it probably would end the federal subsidy program. And the primary purpose for which your segment was certificated—to bring air service to smaller cities—would disappear.

Further, I don't believe that the Congress which appropriates the subsidy funds, nor any of the involved state governors, nor the communities who depend on the service, are ready suddenly to reduce the total number of towns in this country which receive air service by about 20%. There must be some other way.

The two most promising things that I have been able to think of involve the extensive use of small aircraft. One would be by the massive substitution of a third level of service over loss segments and to loss towns with some sort of subsidy type support involved. The other, of course, would be an expansion of the sort of small aircraft program within your own system that at least two of you have already started.

The beginnings of a "subcontract" type arrangement were first authorized in October 1967 when Allegheny was permitted to suspend at Hagerstown. Its service was replaced by Henson Aviation. Since then, Allegheny had made similar arrangements at 11 other points, Mohawk at two points and North Central at three points. Frontier had been authorized to suspend at two points, until three weeks ago, when the Board authorized that carrier temporary suspension at seven points in Montana and one in North Dakota. But this is only a scratch on the surface, and in each instance has been developed entirely by the private sector.

We remember when the appellation "feeder airline" was applied to the local service carriers. But you cannot economically "feed" thin markets with a DC-9, a Boeing 737, or even with a Convair 580. Your equipment acquisition program of the past five years has completely changed your identity. What must be done is to find a way to utilize economically small aircraft such as the Carstedt, which Apache is using at the Frontier points in Montana; the Twin Otter, used by Executive; or the Beech 99. And of course there are many other types of low cost small aircraft still in the developmental stage.

What I am suggesting is either a large scale use of small aircraft by your own company, or, and equally as interesting, a

stronger movement in the direction of relieving the locals of service at loss points and the substitution of commuter type airlines in their stead, but with the local service carrier retaining the certificate responsibility, and required to resume service if the substitute faltered. And I think some sort of financial incentive both to the local carrier and to the substitute carrier would make sense.

What kinds of additional points would be suitable candidates for this type of substitute service? First we might look at the number of cities which generate less than 15 passengers a day. Of the 517 points served by the local service carriers, at last count 120 points were generating less than 15 passengers a day. We are therefore talking about approximately 20% of the air transportation system of the 48 contiguous states.

In some cases a third level carrier could eventually operate these substitute services profitably, with an increase of schedules for the traveling public and to the advantage of the certificated carrier which is relieved of a loss segment.

In many other cases, however, owing to weather, terrain, sparse population and traffic patterns, such carriers cannot operate at a profit while charging any reasonable fare. I suspect this would be particularly true in some of the sparse areas of the southwest and west. And so I wonder if a plan could not be devised to recognize reasonable subsidy payments or guarantees by local carriers to commuters as legitimate operating costs of the local carrier. I think it would be simpler if the Board could avoid moving to a large scale subsidy program of an entirely new class of carriers. The local service carrier would have the responsibility of administering the payments and of ensuring that the air taxi was performing the agreed level of service, agreed to both by the communities, the carriers and the Board. The local service carrier could be paid for administration, and the total subsidy figure could be an amount necessary to make the air taxi whole, with a reasonable profit. The incentive to the local carrier would be his opportunity to get rid of the drag on profits these loss points now place on him. The plan could go even one step further by some sort of community participation in the subsidy through favored treatment of the commuter at municipal airport facilities.

In advancing this thought I do not mean that every town under a certain size or quantum of traffic should immediately be transferred from a route operator to be a commuter-served community. Many of them are part of strong segments and probably will and should stay as they are. But what I am talking about is the many towns where two round trips (four departures) of a very heavy airplane, 737, DC-9 or a turbo prop, may be boarding only two or three people each departure, and where the traffic support on either or both sides of the town is equally sparse. Their problem is often further complicated by stage lengths of less than 10 miles.

It is possible that such a proposal, if widely used, would require some re-examination of current statutory authorities, but I would hope that a sound program would receive sympathetic hearing in the appropriate forums.

Also I am not unaware of the difficulties inherent in such a program due to the uneasiness of your pilots who may think their long term job opportunities are threatened by the elimination of heavy aircraft in favor of smaller, or, even, by the transfer of route segments in toto to non-company operations.

But all of these problems must be faced and somehow solved.

I want to make it clear that I am not advancing any CAB approved plan for changing the type of service to 20% of our towns.

These thoughts are purely my own. I am very uneasy about what appears to be a steady, piecemeal, and uncoordinated leaning by local service air carriers away from their service obligations to smaller cities, and I'd like to see it reversed before it becomes of runaway proportions.

Had I been a local service airline president in the era 1965-67, I am sure that I would have been in the forefront of those moving to jets. And were I a local president today, I would most likely be trying very hard to exploit those dandy new route awards the Board gave me, and at the same time I'd be trying to get out of loss segments and unproductive towns. I would be, just as you are, responsive and sensitive to the demands of your lenders and your stockholders.

But I am not so situated. My mandate is different from yours. The law imposes on me, and on my four colleagues, a requirement to foster development of an air transportation system best suited to the needs of commerce, the postal service, and the national defense of the United States. At least from my point of view, such a pattern would require a continuation of some satisfactory type of air service to smaller cities, particularly those in some isolation who may already have lost their historic public transportation with the steady decline of rail service and, more recently, of bus service as well.

For us at the Board to meet this transportation mandate successfully in an era where tremendous financial stresses are being placed on the viability of all segments of the air transport system is not easy. And in the specific area I have been talking about today it will be particularly hard. No community wants to lose its airline, its airmail, its sign of progress. Yet no airline can go on forever losing money and in the massive amounts that some of you have experienced and can easily see continuing if there are no changes in the costs and losses inherent in your present route obligations and responsibilities. Federal subsidy was supposed to be a temporary developmental support, not a permanent way of life, so your problem is further complicated by the logical Congressional goal of seeking the reduction and ultimate disappearance of subsidy.

On April 13 I asked the Board to undertake an in-depth study looking towards the development of a nationwide plan for keeping air service in as many of the smaller towns as possible, a plan which may include subsidized third level service to many towns now boarding too few passengers to support service by large aircraft.

I am particularly aware of the problems of the small cities because I have visited many of them in the past two years. Moreover, either because of these visits or perhaps because I come from one of the less populated states, countless representatives from the western states and from small communities stop by my office when they are in Washington. And I don't sleep very well at night after a representative from a small city like Williston very bitterly talks to me about the time, money and effort they have put into developing a quarter million dollar annual market for a local carrier, then to be abandoned in favor of a third level operator of whose viability they are uncertain. Nor do I like to walk out of a Senator's office after hearing from him that a fine town like Jackson, Wyoming, has no rail or bus service, and only minimal air service except in the tourist seasons.

One must puzzle and worry, as I do, to see boardings at Topeka go down in five years from 60,000 to 11,000; to see all certificated air carrier service withdrawn from Waycross, Georgia, with its 20,000 citizens; to see all carriers seeking to discontinue at Wilmington, Delaware, and to see town after town—Williston, North Dakota; Burley, Idaho; Salis-

bury, Maryland; Elkins, West Virginia; Johnstown, Pennsylvania; Rutland, Vermont; Land o'Lakes, Wisconsin; and Winona, Minnesota, to name a few—disappear from the certificated airline map.

The problem of what kind of an air service pattern the 48 states will have in the next decade is before us now. No one local service carrier can solve it. But all of you can help. Bold and imaginative study, both in your own organizations, whether at San Francisco or Minneapolis, or Denver or Houston, or Utica, and everywhere else, will help. And a free flow of ideas between you, and between you and the Board, will help also.

It should be remembered that a successful pattern or small airplane operations to small cities is just as important a part of our total air transport system of tomorrow as will be the long haul routes of the 747's and the supersonics.

We must develop a logical and well understood plan to solve this dilemma; otherwise an irregular and unsatisfactory patchwork of deletion and suspension at much too high a cost in resources, with the community headache and inconvenience which will result. We must not permit this to happen.

VIEWS OF A YOUNG AMERICAN

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a short article by a young California, Mr. Paul W. Day, and because I think his views are well stated, I am now inserting that article in the RECORD so as to share it with my colleagues.

The article follows:

IDLE THOUGHTS ON THE POVERTY PROGRAM

As each year passes, our government pours more money down the same bottomless pit. "Poverty."

All the money spent in slum areas has accomplished very little. The welfare program has not improved the status of poor people since the 1930's! So we know this method won't work!

Now, I have traveled over the West many times. I see thousands of acres of State and Federal lands lying idle; for want of water. And I often wonder why, the leaders of this Nation don't divert the millions of dollars of welfare to a program of; planned communities in these areas for poor people.

A program using the poor to build and live in these communities. There are many complex problems involved. But! They can be overcome! Using very little formal education but a lot of hard earned common sense. I ask why a program of self help and co-operation, that I will outline, couldn't be conceived and accomplished by our government and private industry.

The idea is this: Government and industry finance a planned community together. The government gives land and substantial tax reduction to industry for a period of 20 years and assumes a part of the cost to lay water lines, power, rail and highways. The town could be built in 4, 6, and 8 unit apts. around a large shopping center. It could consist of many centers with housing around each. Industries could be built in one location with room to expand. Bus service between town and factories could be set up. Units could be rented at a low cost for the first two years, until the people could be trained by industry and be raised to journeyman pay. Then rent would be raised to match

income. Furnishing in Apts. could be paid for on low payments by the poor.

Only the low income and welfare families would be eligible for this community.

Industry could build new factories and training programs if they were given low price land and low taxes on that location for, say, 20 years.

This would allow the removal of slum areas in cities. Build new towns, restore respect and life to the poor, increase the productive power of industry.

Most important we would go from, stagnation to progress. Building Americans, who earn their way instead of being carried.

Local government could be set up by industrial experts and urban experts and over a period 5 years the people could learn to govern their town and become the true design of American free enterprise. In this manner or one similar; Our tax dollars would be building a future for the poor. The poor would be building for themselves and it won't smell of a handout. Because these people would be learning a trade and earning their way.

Now I know this is oversimplified, but with all the brains in private enterprise and government offices;

Why can't something along this line be done? Why must we continue to feed oats to a dead horse? What happened to the vision our forefathers had?

These are just the idle thoughts of a 33 year old, Oklahoma boy who completed 9 grades of school. I was raised by a widow mother, who had a hard time all her life. I've traveled the width and length of this nation and seen and learned much. So I wonder about the vision of our leaders.

ISRAEL'S 22D ANNIVERSARY OBSERVED FITTINGLY IN INDEPENDENCE SQUARE, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 22d anniversary of the establishment of the State of Israel as a free and independent nation.

It was my great privilege and honor earlier today to serve as principal speaker marking this observance in Independence Square, Philadelphia, Pa.

Early this morning I had flown to the cradle of American independence and participated in the observance arranged by the Zionist Organization of America.

I believe it was most fitting that Mr. Arnold R. Ginsburg, chairman of the independence day arrangements in Philadelphia, selected the site of America's own shrine of independence for today's observance.

Today's ceremony in the shadow of the Liberty Bell, which is the most popular symbol of American freedom, was most appropriate because it reminds us of the kinship in ideals which exists between the people of Israel and the people of America.

Perhaps even more significant was the fact that as we paid tribute to the 22d anniversary of the birth of the State of Israel, we were reminded that on the Liberty Bell itself is inscribed the inspiring message of human dignity and freedom taken from the Book of Leviticus in the Bible.

It was properly pointed out by Commissioner Maurice Osser, representing Philadelphia's Mayor Tate at the ceremony, that:

The human drive for democracy which led to the Declaration of Independence from this very spot almost 200 years ago in the United States, had its roots in the Hebrew Bible.

That natural love of liberty is the identical thing we were gathered to celebrate today in America's Independence Square for the independence of Israel.

I was pleased to remind today's audience in Philadelphia that our five colleagues in Congress, Congressman BARRITT, Congressman BYRNE, Congressman NIX, Congressman GREEN, and Congressman EILBERG share the great hopes and aspirations of all American people—in praying for the day when peace will again return to the Middle East.

I was also pleased in this inspiring ceremony in Independence Square to share the platform with Mr. Jacques Torczyner, National President of the Zionist Organization of America, whose dynamic defense of the ideals of human dignity have become known, not only throughout America, but throughout the world.

For 2,000 years, the Jewish people have believed that the light of learning, of freedom, and of liberty will one day come forth from Jerusalem, not alone for the people of that land, but for the entire Middle East—and hopefully—for all of mankind.

As we assemble here this afternoon, our hearts are heavy with the realization that instead of those high and inspiring ideals, the Middle East, instead, today floats on oil, is mired in blood, and threatens to be swallowed up in semantics.

Man's sensitivities are shaken to the very roots when he realizes the enormity of the problem in the Middle East, and the outrageous forces at play in this troubled part of the world to destroy Israel as a symbol of man's hopeful dream for the Middle East.

Israel today bravely and alone stands resolute in defense of those ideals.

This tiny and magnificent state which has awed the world for two decades as a free nation, stands as an oasis of life in a desert of blind hatred—a hatred being fanned in a most brutal manner by the Soviet Union and her craze for territorial expansion.

Israel is surrounded by enemies who have made a religion of plunder, theft, terrorism, and incalculable deceit.

All of these ingredients so perfectly fit into the Soviet mold of exploitation, and it is for this reason that Israel—who alone through her magnificent history, condemns man's inhumanity to his fellow man—stands out as the one nation of the Middle East which cannot be fitted into the Soviet mold.

It is for this reason that the Soviet Union has today launched its most brutal attack on tiny Israel and is fanning not only in the Middle East, but throughout the whole world an unceasing barrage of invectives against Israel, her people, her institutions, and her survival itself.

The Soviet Union has carefully created an atmosphere within the Arab world by which Arab leaders are humbled by Israel's achievements—achievements which can never be duplicated in the Arab world until a responsible social conscience becomes the core of Arab government.

So long as Arab States reject their centuries-old obligations to their people; so long as men in power prey on the prejudice of ancient times; then so long will the men and women of the Arab nations be denied even the slightest opportunity to better their tragic situation and ultimately accept peace in the Middle East.

That is precisely the grand plan of the Soviets—turmoil, more turmoil, distrust, exploitation, upheaval, despotism, and the brutality of making the Jews the scapegoats for the Arab leaders' failures.

We are witnessing in the Middle East today a monumental effort by the Soviet Union to create another cordon-sa-nitaire of Communist captive nations in the Middle East the same as we witnessed after World War II in Europe.

The Kremlin hopefully wants to plunge 110 million Arabs behind the Iron Curtain the same way they plunged 180 million Europeans into the bonds of communism following World War II.

This is what this is all about, and this is why Israel has been marked for destruction by the Soviet Union for it is tiny, but brave, little Israel who alone stands in the way of the Kremlin's grand design for Communist expansion into the Middle East and ultimately, into Africa.

Africa. That is the final prize the Soviets seek in their unceasing drive for world conflict.

There is an old saying that he who controls Africa—rich in natural resources—controls the world. Russia can bring the United States to its knees without firing a shot once it gains control of Africa and shuts off that continent's rich natural resources to American industry. Our economy cannot flourish without access to the rich natural resources of Africa—and no one is counting on this more than the Kremlin.

So the Soviet drive for domination of the Middle East escalates.

We now have proof that Soviet pilots are flying combat planes in Egypt. The United States can no longer ignore this Soviet intrusion into the Middle East, and the serious threat it poses to our own national interest in that part of the world.

At the present time, according to the best estimates we have—and they are pretty accurate—there are 120 Soviet bombers and 463 Mig Jet fighters distributed throughout all the Arab nations, many manned by Soviet pilots. Not Soviet-trained pilots, but Soviet pilots themselves.

One has a right to ask when will the free world finally understand that the survival of Israel is no longer a sentimental journey for the Jewish people alone. It is in the highest interest of all free nations and above all, the United States itself.

For indeed, as present plans continue, the Soviet Union will soon proclaim another "Brezhnev" doctrine declaring that

the Arab States are in the Soviet sphere of influence and any attack upon any of them is an attack on the Soviet Union itself.

When Soviet troops stormed into Czechoslovakia and the world expressed its concern, you will recall the proclamation by the Soviet Union of the Brezhnev Doctrine.

Unless the free world takes immediate steps to help Israel, another Brezhnev doctrine is confidently predictable in the Middle East, for the stage is being carefully set by the Kremlin for such a pronouncement.

The United States has hard-core intelligence that the Soviet Union is recruiting Soviet citizens of Moslem background in the provinces of Azerbaijan, Tadzhistan, Turkman, and other Soviet Republics that contain large elements of Moslem populations in Russia, and sending them for service into the Arab nations.

This is the identical tactic used by Russia right after World War II and which proved so successfully in ultimately plunging proud nations of central Europe behind the Iron Curtain.

Soviet Moslems are also being infiltrated into Nasser's Islamic Foreign Legion—which he recently formed at the suggestion of the Kremlin—and are also being trained to fly the more sophisticated Soviet jet fighters into the Middle East.

This is the Soviet Union's 20th century trojan horse for the Middle East and Arab leaders are too naive to see this pending danger.

Our intelligence shows a fantastic increase in arms shipments to the Arab States, especially during the last few weeks when large consignments of rockets and radar equipment have been unloaded in Egyptian ports.

Where is the equipment coming from? It comes from the Soviet Union which today is the largest supplier of arms and weapons of war to the Arab States.

At this moment, five of the most volatile Arab States are almost totally equipped with Soviet weapons—Syria, Iraq, Algeria, North Yemen, and the United Arab Republic.

The Soviets are openly encouraging Sudan and South Yemen to become more dependent on Soviet arms, and the campaign is having considerable success.

This is why the Israelis have had to pour so much of their budget into defense expenditures. Last year, \$1.3 billion was appropriated for defense, which comes out to \$1.15 per day for every man, woman, and child in Israel.

And on the other side of the coin is the dismal picture of our own Nation's inability to understand the magnitude of the problem in the Middle East.

During the past 5 years, Israel has not received a dime's worth of military aid from the United States, except what she was able to purchase, while the Soviet Union has given the Arab States a blank check for whatever they need.

Our naive policy has been to dole out even on a purchase basis to Israel, firepower that would never permit Israel to be more than one-fourth as well armed as all of its enemies combined.

Mind you, this is on the basis of letting Israel buy her military needs in the United States while during the same 5-year period, a half dozen belligerent Arab nations have received more than \$30 million of military aid free—a gift of the American taxpayer.

To add insult to this folly, we are presently training 600 Arab officers in the United States but not a single Israeli.

And to compound finally this idiocy, some people in the highest places of our Government continue to believe the Arab States are friendly toward the United States in the same way as Israel.

But these Arab States never vote with us in the United Nations, while Israel has stood resolutely with us on every major vote.

Israel supports our Vietnam policy, while the Arab States consistently attempt to discredit our efforts to bring peace to Southeast Asia.

As a columnist recently said:

The varieties of hate-America emanating out of Damascus, Algiers and Baghdad are of a stridency to defy elementary decency.

Under Secretary Sisco has yet to explain his inability to visit Jordan because of anti-American demonstrations in that country.

The free world cannot let Israel become another Munich.

In the wake of Soviet rearmament of all of the Arab States, the United States must revise its own policy and make available to Israel at least 100 additional Phantom jets to restore Israel's balance for her own defense. I honestly believe the Soviet Union is stepping up hostilities in Southeast Asia in an effort to divert American attention from Russian expansionism in the Middle East. It is now crystal clear that the Soviet Union wants America to continue being bogged down in Southeast Asia as she carefully lays the groundwork for a pro-Soviet takeover of the Middle East.

We will never have peace in the Middle East until the Arabs see the price they will have to pay for Soviet assistance and until they are convinced that Israel's defensive capability is of such magnitude that any future attack on that country will end in failure.

This is why I call upon the President to assume a bold posture in the Middle East. Declare Israel's survival in the highest interest of the free world and then give, not sell, Israel the tools she needs to defend herself.

A flicker of hope that America may finally be seeing the light is slowly working its way through Congress. The House already has approved a resolution by 365 to 50 urging that American arms and credit be provided to Israel to the extent that the President determines such assistance to be needed in order to meet threats to the security and independence of Israel. I pray that the Senate will do likewise so Israel may find some needed relief from her own defense expenditures.

I mention this because as difficult as the military situation may appear, Israel's real problem is economic. The money raised in America through Israel bond drives is not used for Israel's military struggle. It is used to fill in the eco-

nomic gap which occurs because of Israel's huge defense budget.

One cannot discuss the struggle being waged by Israel without destroying a number of myths. Perhaps the biggest myth is that economic aid to Israel hurts our own balance of payments.

Not a single cent of money raised for Israel in America leaves our shores. Last year \$128 million was raised through Israel bonds and all of it was spent right here in the United States. As a matter of fact, while only \$128 million was raised in the United States, Israel actually spent \$400 million in the United States for earth-moving equipment and other domestic needs.

Myth No. 2—that survival of Israel is a "Jewish" problem.

The world cannot successfully begin probing why it is that since intellect gained dominance over instinct, man has become the most destructive of all living creatures, until man has found a way to bring peace to Asia and the Middle East.

Man cannot start dealing in international agreements on pollution until he has resolved the conflicts in Asia and the Middle East.

This generation of young Americans could very well become the first generation to permit intellect to gain dominance over impulse, but not unless we settle the conflict in the Middle East and Southeast Asia.

Man cannot give living meaning to the high ideals of freedom until he has brought peace to his home, his Nation and his world.

I know from what I have seen during my visit to Israel and from my intimate studies of the tragically harassed Middle East, that Israel is committed to be a light unto its neighbors and to eradicate illiteracy and trachoma from their midst, and to raise the cultural, economic, and social levels of these communities.

Faced as we are in our own land by extreme revolutionary forces that seek to destroy our way of life, we must remain linked to this democratic island 8,000 miles from Philadelphia, to the people of Israel, who have remained loyal to those ideals which their ancestors accepted at Ciani almost 4,000 years ago and which inspired Israel's founding fathers just as they inspired our own Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, and the many others who sought to make our own Nation "a light unto the world."

We urge you to help Israel because she needs your help. For the doubters in her survival, let me remind them of my favorite Psalm in my own religion which reads:

Those who trouble against me, themselves stumble and fall.

As night follows day, those who trouble against Israel shall themselves stumble and fall.

And then, only then, will she bring living meaning to her great promise and the nobility of her cause.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to include at this point the remarks of Commissioner Maurice S. Osser, who represented Mayor Tate. His remarks follow:

REMARKS BY MAURICE S. OSSER

It is my honor to represent Mayor Tate and to bring you the greetings of the city of Philadelphia at this ceremony saluting the brave nation of Israel on its 22nd anniversary.

We celebrate the gesture of the United Nations, who gave Israel the privilege of fighting for its life, in solemn assembly during its own fledgling years in 1948. In a sense, the United Nations emulated the action of the Lord who gave the same land to Abraham 4,000 years ago.

However, the United Nations, without a sense of humor, bestowed the privilege on the Jews living in that sacred land. Yet the diplomats frowned, for they felt they gave the Jews only a doubtful moment in the Middle East. It was impossible.

There were the handful of Jews, standing on a seashore, almost entirely unarmed and facing the multitudes of their hostile neighbors, fully armed and attacking from the highlands. It was a completely indefensible position, militarily.

But *Am Yisrael Chai!* The Jews won and formed Israel.

A new nation was born in the turmoil of the feudal, medieval Middle East.

A new nation? Hardly!

A very old nation. A nation that has lived for 4,000 years! Israel has lived—real and vital and ever-present—in the hearts of Jews no matter where they roamed during the terrible thousand years of the exile.

A nation and a people and a concept that has helped to shape the entire world of thought. Certainly this is pertinent in this city of Philadelphia—near the hall of Independence where the American founding fathers walked in the ways of the biblical founders of democratic ideals. Certainly this is very close to us—as close as the inscription on the Liberty Bell which calls for "Liberty Throughout The Land Unto All The Inhabitants Thereof . . ." An inscription, as you all know, taken from the biblical book of Leviticus.

And then, at the turn of this century—when Jews began to return to the land of Israel—they were cautioned by the experts who said—"There is not enough land for immigration here. There is only barren rock and sterile sand." The well-known British colonization expert, Sir John Hope Simpson, reported that "There was no room in Palestine to swing a cat." In fact, he said, the "economic absorptive capacity" of the country was so limited that he suggested a halt to Jewish incoming.

In other words, it was impossible to live on that land, despoiled by centuries of Arab neglect.

But *Am Yisrael Chai!*

It is a well-told miracle story—the story of the Jewish restoration of the land of Israel—of the creation of Kibbutzim and brilliant agricultural science.

Jews as farmers and warriors?

For the many tragic years of the dispersion, as you know, Jews were forbidden to own land, they were forbidden to hold weapons. The world thought of the Jews as aliens to such matters.

But the nations all forget that the Jews of the Bible were superb farmers who irrigated and tilled the land so that it was truly a land of milk and honey. The world forgot that the world's own register of heroism and bravery starts with the names of Joshua, Saul and David, Gideon and Bar Kochba.

Israel and the Israeli people taught the world again the pride and strength of the Jews.

The city of Philadelphia, for one splendid example, listened to this lesson. Philadelphia's affiliation with Israel has been one of friendship and trust. Our city has played host to many of the leaders of Israel—David

Ben-Gurion, the late Levi Eshkol—the glorious daughter of Deborah and Judith, Rebecca and Ruth—Mrs. Golda Meir.

Again and again the enemies of Israel have attacked, seeking brazenly to drive the Israeli people into the sea, to put the Jews back into the middle ages of deprivation and despair.

Again and again—Am Yisrael Chai!

Even at this very moment in history—Israel is under the pressure of hostility. The Arab Nations—misled by their own fascist dictators and by the criminal cynicism of the Soviet Union—refuse to permit the Jews a safe homeland.

Today, the Russians have completely rearmend the Arabs. They send thousands of "advisors" into the Arab Nations—with modern jet planes and tanks. With the new installation of the most modern and terrible missile sites. And—now—even with Russian pilots over the Middle East.

It is incumbent on every one of us here—it is the responsibility of everyone who believes in democracy and dignity, in liberty and freedom—to support the heroic Nation of Israel.

As we celebrate this 22nd birthday—Israel Independence Day—we must reaffirm our obligation to genuine democracy. As we cheer the birthday, let us also do everything in our power to insure that we may say—next year again—that Am Yisrael Chai!

I thank you.

EXCERPTS FROM THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS TESTIMONY OF MR. J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, several days ago a subcommittee appropriations hearing on the Federal Bureau of Investigation was released by the House Appropriations Committee. As I have noted before, this annual testimony by the FBI Director, J. Edgar Hoover, is the most regular, comprehensive statement of the Bureau and its operations and covers topical issues in the field of crime, subversion, and so forth. Unfortunately, in some segments of the press Mr. Hoover's testimony receives inadequate notice, and one must go to other sources at times to receive this authoritative information. In the field of subversion, for instance, whether foreign inspired or homegrown, the Bureau is the chief watchdog of such activities. Although congressional investigative committees continue to make public the activities of extremist elements, their facilities are very small in contrast to the capabilities of the FBI. To illustrate, the Bureau has at present 17,345 full-year employees consisting of 7,350 agents and 9,995 clerks. Of the agents, 6,798 are in the field. This far outnumbers the manpower available to congressional committees for their inquiries. In addition, the efficient crime laboratories, its vast fingerprint files and the National Crime Information Center, among other facilities, combine to give the Bureau an unquestioned superiority in the field of crime and subversion not even remotely approached by other agencies.

As I also pointed out recently, the FBI is a fact-gathering agency responsible to the Justice Department and not a

public information agency. Even congressional committees cannot tap the vast resources of the Bureau to aid their investigations. The one agency which indirectly has access to Bureau information is the Subversive Activities Control Board, another adjunct of the Justice Department. The Justice Department refers to the SACB cases of Communist-front organizations, for example, which groups are afforded a public hearing with the right to cross-examine Government witnesses. Much of the information used by the Justice Department in these cases is supplied by the FBI, and if used in the hearing, is a matter of public record.

Unfortunately, many of the organizations listed in Mr. Hoover's testimony, and which are treated at the end of my remarks, cannot be reviewed by the SACB because they are not directly linked to the U.S.S.R. and are not, therefore, under SACB jurisdiction. The Black Panthers, the KKK, and other revolutionary disruptive groups are not completely listed by any Federal agency as a warning to the uninformed American public. At present measures are being considered to expand the jurisdiction of the SACB so that any anarchistic or revolutionary group need not be placed in the Moscow camp before the Board can act. It borders on the ridiculous to allow violence-prone radical groups to roam the country while citizens seek authoritative information as to their character.

With this background, one can appreciate the value of Mr. Hoover's annual appropriations testimony as a means of informing the public. In his following remarks you will find information on the Communist Party in the United States and its splinter groups, radical and hate groups, antiwar activities, student agitation, racial disturbances, and other issues of important topical interest today. For convenience and ease of reading, certain aspects of crime and subversion have been excerpted from the much lengthier statement by the Director which I submit at this point for inclusion in the Record:

EXCERPTS FROM THE TESTIMONY OF FBI DIRECTOR J. EDGAR HOOVER BEFORE A HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON MARCH 5, 1970

GROWTH OF CRIME IN THE 1960'S

Mr. HOOVER. The growth of crime in the 1960's is a sad commentary and a disgrace to our way of life. Just consider these statistics:

During the 1960-1968 period the volume of crime rose 122 percent. Broken down, crimes of violence increased 106 percent while crimes against property climbed 124 percent. There has, of course, been a large growth in population but this does not account for the real problem of increasing crime counts since crime has outstripped population growth during this period by 11 to 1.

Getting down to a personal basis, the risk of becoming a victim of serious crime increased 16 percent in 1968, and since 1960 the victim risk rate has nearly doubled. Among other violations, daytime burglaries of residences rose 247 percent during the 1960-1968 period.

Arrests for narcotic during law violations were up 64 percent in 1968 over 1967, influenced primarily by marihuana arrests, the 1968 arrests being over four times as great

as in 1960. Other violations show the same grim upward trend during the 1960-1968 period: Murder, 52 percent; aggravated assault, 86 percent; forcible rape, 84 percent; robbery, 144 percent; burglary, 104 percent; larceny, \$50 and over, 151 percent; and auto theft, 139 percent.

Unfortunately, the percentage of police solutions of serious crimes declined 7 percent in 1968, and since 1960, has shown an overall decline of 32 percent. There are a number of factors influencing this overall decline in the police solution rate. These include court decisions which have resulted in restrictions on police investigative and enforcement practices; a sharp increase of police workloads in criminal and noncriminal matters; the almost static ratio of police strength to population which is not commensurate with the sharp increase in crime; and, the increasing mobility of those who commit crimes.

CRIMINAL REPEATERS

Although the crime counts are mounting, they represent the acts of a relative small minority as it is well documented that the recidivist plays a large part in contributing to the growing figures.

Our "Careers in Crime Program," which began in 1963, follows through fingerprint records those offenders who become involved in the Federal process through arrest and release. Of the 18,333 offenders released from the Federal criminal justice system in 1963, the study shows that 63 percent had been rearrested by the end of the fifth calendar year after release. Rearrests in the 5-year period ranged widely when considering the type of crime originally involved, there being rearrests ranging from 19 percent for income tax violators to 80 percent of the auto thieves. This chart gives further data regarding the percentage of repeaters when considering the type of crime involved.

Mr. ROONEY. Without objection, we shall insert this chart at this point in the record. (The chart follows:)

Percent repeaters by type of crime in 1963—persons released in 1963 and rearrested within 5 years

[In percent]	
Auto theft.....	80
Burglary.....	77
Assault.....	74
Narcotics.....	69
Forgery.....	68
Robbery.....	60
Larceny.....	59
Liquor laws.....	46
Fraud.....	46
Gambling.....	43
Embezzlement.....	23
All others.....	62
Total.....	63

Mr. HOOVER. It is also well documented that the younger the age group, the higher the repeating rate. Of the offenders under 20 released in 1963, 72 percent were rearrested by 1968, 69 percent of those 20-24 years of age, and 67 percent of the offenders 25 to 29 years. This chart shows how heavily the youthful repeater contributes to crime figures.

Mr. ROONEY. Without objection we shall insert this interesting chart at this point in the record.

(The chart follows.)

Percent repeaters by age group—persons released in 1963 and rearrested within 5 years

[In percent]	
Under 20.....	72
20 to 24.....	69
25 to 29.....	67
30 to 39.....	63
40 to 49.....	54
50 and over.....	40
Total all ages.....	63

YOUTH IN CRIME

Mr. HOOPER. The heavy involvement of young people in the growing crime volume is a tragedy. In 1968, police arrests of adults increased 2 percent, while arrests for juveniles had an overall increase of 10 percent. For the period 1960-68, police arrests for all criminal acts except traffic offenses of persons under 18 years of age doubled while the number of persons in this young age group, 10 to 17 years, rose 25 percent. With arrests up 100 percent and population up 25 percent, it is apparent the involvement of young persons as measured by police arrests is escalating at a pace four times their percentage increase in the national population.

Eight teenagers from Chicago's fashionable North suburbs were charged by Chicago police with burglarizing 32 fashionable homes, stealing loot valued at \$50,000 and vandalizing the houses.

After questioning the teenagers, one detective said "They're all acting pretty 'cool' about the whole thing. They aren't fazed at all and said they didn't think they would ever get caught."

Chicago police also reported that they broke up a South Side teenage burglary ring on January 7, 1970 when they raided an apartment which contained approximately \$8,000 in loot and arrested its four occupants. It was reported that the ring had been operating for about 4 months during which time more than 100 burglaries were committed in the south shore area.

It is another sad commentary that our youths are becoming alarmingly involved in violent crimes. Juvenile arrests for violent crimes have more than doubled during the 1960-68 period, outstripping their population group increase by more than 4 to 1.

It must be remembered that these depressing statistics have been brought about by only a small segment of the young age group. The vast majority are honest, decent citizens as only about 6 percent become involved in criminal acts.

It is also important when reviewing arrest figures to keep in mind that police arrest practices and emphasis vary which will account for some variations in these statistics from year to year. For example, arrests of persons under 18 for narcotic drug law violations have increased sharply in recent years. In 1968, over one-half of the individuals arrested for violations of the narcotic drug laws were persons under 21 years of age. In 1964, only 23 percent of the persons arrested for violations of this law were under 21.

I have often spoken of the help that organizations such as the Boys' Clubs of America, the Boy Scouts, Police Boys' Clubs, and the like, are in combating juvenile delinquency. Organizations such as these help to direct youthful energy and exuberance into proper channels. With continuing increases in our young age population, our young people themselves should take a more active interest in the crime and do all that they can to persuade the small segment of their age group to turn away from criminality. Unless we can curb the growing criminality of the youthful minority, our crime courts are bound to increase.

ASSAULTS ON LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

Mr. HOOPER. There was an increase of 17 percent in the rate of assaults on police in 1968 over 1967 as they endeavored to meet the increasing law enforcement problems confronting them. This underscores one of the increasingly serious problems facing law enforcement today, that is, a growing attitude of disrespect for lawful authority and the failure of citizens to come to the aid of officers being attacked as they attempt to perform their lawful duties. These duties often necessitate confrontations with emotionally aroused citizens protesting real or imagined grievances and it is these situations which have in a large measure accounted for the upward trend of assaults on police.

Our special agents are confronted with the same problem. During the fiscal year 1969, 73 special agents were assaulted while carrying out their duties. We arrested 70 subjects in connection with these assaults. By the close of the fiscal year, 25 had been convicted, 30 others were awaiting trial, and charges against the remaining 15 were disposed of through dismissals, acquittals, or mistrials.

Another 42 special agents and one clerical employee were assaulted while carrying out their duties during the first 6 months of fiscal year 1970 (July 1 through December 31, 1969). We arrested 27 subjects in connection with these assaults and one other subject was shot and killed by local authorities prior to being arrested. By December 31, 1969, eight had been convicted, 13 others were awaiting prosecution and the charges against the remaining six were disposed of through declinations, dismissals, or acquittals.

POLICE OFFICERS KILLED

The growing violence in this country has brought death to 475 law enforcement officers while carrying out their duties during the 1960-68 period, 64 of them being killed by criminal action in calendar year 1968. Preliminary figures show another 73 police officers were killed by criminals in calendar year 1969.

During the months of January and February 1970, the police departments in the 57 cities around the Nation with populations over 250,000 reported nine police officers killed by criminal action and 2,394 assaults on police officers during the course of duty. Assaults on police officers occurred at the rate of 41 per day over this 2-month period.

A review of the criminal histories of the 626 offenders involved in the police murders through 1968 shows that 65 percent had prior convictions on criminal charges and, of this group, two-thirds had been granted leniency in the form of parole or probation on at least one of these prior convictions. As a matter of fact, almost three of every 10 of the murders were on parole or probation when they murdered a police officer.

PAROLE, PROBATION AND CLEMENCY ABUSES

As crime in recent years has become such a frightening reality to so many of our citizens who have been personally victimized by this plague, public awareness of some of the glaring deficiencies in the handling of repeating criminal offenders has been acutely heightened. An increasingly alarmed populace, fearful of the safety of their streets, neighborhoods and homes, rightfully asks when as much concern will be afforded their rights as is maudlinly lavished upon the repeating criminal offender who has by his demonstrated actions openly declared war on society. The law-abiding majority is rapidly losing patience with those whose flagrant abuse of the humanitarian principles of parole and probation makes a mockery of justice. They are properly questioning the reasoning, wisdom, motivation, and capabilities of some jurists and parole and probation authorities who appear more concerned with finding excuses and evasions for unrehabilitated repeating offenders than maintaining the welfare of the general public.

Amazed observers in the State of Washington, for example, were perplexed with the treatment afforded an individual whose criminal record for serious offenses dates back over 40 years, to the time he was 8 years old, and who in 1950 was sentenced to prison as an habitual criminal for the rest of his natural life. Released after having served only 8 years, he became involved in a

hit-and-run accident and shoplifting, for which he received a sentence of 30 days. A few months later, while free on a \$15,000 appeal bond following an armed robbery charge, he was arrested for a robbery in which a police officer was killed. This hardened criminal was subsequently sentenced to 20 years' confinement, a sentence, it is noted, less than the original sentence he received in 1959.

And, concerned citizens of Detroit, Mich., have been completely astounded by the judicial machinations of one judge who has demonstrated blatant contempt for investigative and prosecutive officials and has reportedly proclaimed he will deliver light sentence to anyone claiming mistreatment by police.

One beneficiary of this philosophy was a young thug, previously convicted of aggravated assault, interstate transportation of a stolen motor vehicle, and assault with intent to rape a female minor under 16. He had been captured by Detroit police in November 1968, following a gun battle which broke out as he fled from a \$12,000 jewelry store holdup and stole a police car to aid his flight. Although three police officers were treated for injuries received in the capture of this criminal, the judge accepted the hoodlum's claim that he had been beaten by the police, reduced the charge to assault with intent to rob while armed and sentenced the gunman to 2 years' probation, conditional on his surrendering to Federal authorities for treatment as a drug addict. When the narcotics institution rejected the criminal on the grounds he could not be rehabilitated, he was given 3 years' probation by the sympathetic judge.

The same judge outraged decent society by immediately releasing on bond a gang of trigger-happy racial militants who were arrested after two police officers were shot, one fatally, at a Detroit church building.

Another astounding sentence by this jurist was a 7- to 10-year term for a young hoodlum who confessed beating a 75-year-old woman to death in a \$5 street robbery. The advanced age of the victim was offered as a reason for the light sentence, which could result in the slayer's release within 5 years, on the fanciful theory that if the murdered woman had been younger she might not have died from the savage assault.

Shocked response from fellow jurists and anguished pleas from an alarmed press seem to have little effect in curbing these amazing decisions which not only further embolden the criminal predators of society but likewise cause our law-abiding citizens to wonder just what has become of their rights.

Missouri residents also wondered aloud about their security with the disclosure that a convicted child molester with a 20-year record of arrests was charged with two new offenses while free on a "trial visit" to his home from a State hospital.

Another blow to the essential need for respect for our system of justice occurred in Philadelphia, Pa., where a convicted rapist of a 14-year-old girl was sentenced to a term of 9 to 23 months in jail, plus 5 years' probation, and was immediately released by the judge because the rapist had already served his minimum sentence. When a prosecutor protested that this unrealistic sentence was an open invitation for others to commit similar crimes, he was merely told by the judge that the youthful victim had the appearance of a grown woman and did not seem to be incensed.

In another Pennsylvania case in 1969 an ex-convict who was deemed by "experts" to have been "rehabilitated" reportedly broke into a home and raped a woman and her 15-year-old daughter. He had committed a similar crime just 2 years before and had a record of 16 arrests for over 30 burglaries.

In Missouri, the wisdom of releasing a 15-year-old charged with murder to the custody

of his father was severely questioned, particularly when both the father and son were subsequently arrested twice for attempted murder resulting from barroom brawls.

A 17-year-old Washington, D.C., youth, 6 feet 2 inches tall and weighing 185 pounds, who has a history of serious encounters with the law, in September 1969 robbed four FBI clerical employees as they were returning home from their tours of duty. He forced all four to disrobe and raped one of the two girls. Two weeks later officers of the Metropolitan Police Department confronted him as he was accosting another one of our young female clerks. The youth placed a gun to the girl's head and ordered the officers to surrender their weapons. As he positioned himself for an escape he stumbled and was apprehended by the officers.

At the time of his apprehension, this youth was in the custody of his parents after he had been arrested just a few days before for attempting to rob another juvenile. The record for this young man also shows he was found shoplifting in 1964 and 1969 and he attempted to obtain money through threat in 1965. In the latter three instances he was given warnings by juvenile authorities and then released. Despite this record, the juvenile court has decided to treat the perpetrator of these heinous crimes against our employees as a juvenile and not to relinquish jurisdiction to the U.S. Court for the District of Columbia where he would be tried as an adult. This means, of course, that this precludes incarceration beyond his 21st birthday if he is found guilty of the crimes.

A paroled bank robber in Virginia, set free in January 1969, after serving but 26 months of a 10-year sentence, was charged in June 1969 with demonstrating his gratitude for "another chance" by shooting to death a Portsmouth, Va., policeman during an armed robbery spree.

As more and more citizens become painfully aware of the frightening number of dangerous individuals stalking our streets as a result of sociological hocus-pocus and legal manipulations, it is timely to demand that responsible officials enforce the laws fairly and impartially, with the welfare of society as a paramount consideration. Only with such integrity of purpose and performance will we overcome a situation which has become, as a St. Louis newspaper so mildly put it, "disturbing."

This newspaper editorially summarized the situation clearly and succinctly when it stated, "The news stories reveal a shocking dereliction on the part of some judges and members of the legal profession to apply the law as it is strictly intended—to protect law-abiding citizens from lawbreakers."

Bitter experience has shown that warnings of possible habitual criminal tendencies presented before the courts are often ignored or completely disregarded. One such instance was noted in Cleveland, Ohio, when an off-duty police officer was shot and killed and another seriously wounded in a gun battle with a suspected shoplifter. Following apprehension, the suspect's record disclosed he had been arrested 32 times previously and had been released on bond twice during the preceding month, one offense being an armed robbery in which he also reportedly shot it out with police.

The severity of the crime situation has been also acutely felt in the Nation's Capital, where there were 18 rapes the weekend before last. A record number of bank robberies in early 1969 struck fear and apprehension into the hearts of our citizens. Close cooperation between Federal, State, and local authorities in the Washington metropolitan area has helped control the floodtide of lawlessness, but needless tragedy has saddened many of those cruelly victimized by this scourge. Tragically, in combating this menace, many law enforcement officers have paid the ultimate price, including two young spe-

cial agents of the FBI who were brutally slain while attempting to apprehend a bank robber.

It should be readily understood why members of the law enforcement profession shudder when they think of the perils to society posed by the many hardened criminals permitted to roam free because of the evident failures of misguided or improperly administered parole and probation policies and loopholes in existing bail procedures which an experienced chief of police has persuasively described as having plainly contributed to the rising crime rate, particularly of armed robberies.

Law enforcement and concerned citizens must stand squarely together in jointly fighting the growing crime menace which jeopardizes the peace and tranquility of our society. Only with such unity can we hope to convince those with the responsibility of administering our parole and probation and related leniency programs that the vast law-abiding public rightly demands equal consideration. In a society that has succeeded in reaching unparalleled heights in isolating dangerous germ carriers, we should be capable, with the proper will, of removing from free society those savage beasts of prey, the repeating, unrehabilitated criminal offenders, who for too long have terrorized our communities and besmirched our proud national pledge of liberty and justice for all.

INTERNAL SECURITY OPERATIONS

Turning to our work in the internal security field, this is an area where there is an array of problems, including the aggressive tactics of the New Left movement and its shift to a hard-line Marxist-Leninist ideology; much activity on the part of both black and white extremist organizations; and the continuing probes of foreign intelligence services. All of this adds up to a great deal of internal security-type work for our investigative staff to handle.

NEW LEFT MOVEMENT

During 1969, leading proponents of the New Left movement in the United States more clearly established themselves as Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries dedicated to the violent destruction of our society and the principles of free government. As a result, they intensified their efforts to foment violent disorders and discord concerning matters related to international communist objectives.

STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

The Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) had been providing the main thrust of the New Left movement. This organization now has some 225 chapters and claims 40,000 members.

During the past year, as its national leadership narrowed into a hard-core of professed revolutionary communists, a power struggle erupted which split the SDS leadership three ways with each faction posturing militantly. In addition, hard-core communist elements are intensifying their own activities in the New Left movement.

YOUNG SOCIALIST ALLIANCE (YSA)

Foremost among these is the Young Socialist Alliance. It is the youth group of the Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party (SWP). In the past year it has just about tripled its membership, which has jumped from 400 to nearly 1,200. The YSA's line of proposed Marxist reform is quite palatable to many young dissidents. The YSA has what the SDS lacked in the form of cohesive leadership and organizational structuring.

Most important of all, the YSA controls a readymade channel through which to expand its influence and develop new recruits. It is the Student Mobilization Committee (SMC), one of the major organizing groups behind antiwar demonstrations. Every national office of the SMC is communist controlled by SWP/YSA members. There are

regional SMC offices throughout the country with widespread representations on college campuses.

In short, the followers of Leon Trotsky in the United States feel they finally have an opportunity unparalleled in their historic existence and struggle in this country to make a significant gain as well as an impact on our social, political and economic policies in line with communist objectives.

In fact, they already have done so through their degree of influence on the direction of the antiwar movement. Working hand in hand with current and former members of the Communist Party-USA, the Trotskyites also have able representation on the steering committee of the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam (NMC), which played the leading role in organizing the November 15, 1969, antiwar demonstrations in Washington, D.C., and San Francisco, California.

A number of the individuals on the NMC steering committee who are or have been affiliated with old-line Communist groups are coordinating their activities with international Communist elements. They attended several meetings held both inside and outside communist countries abroad in the 6-month period preceding the November demonstrations. They conferred with communist representatives from various countries, including some from North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam.

The major emphasis in the discussions on those occasions was on the need to keep massive propaganda pressure in the form of antiwar demonstrations on the current administration in the United States to force a unilateral withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam.

It was neither by accident nor coincidence that the demonstrations held in Washington and San Francisco on November 15, 1969, had accompanying anti-U.S. demonstrations in other countries throughout the world on the same day.

This brings us to another effect of the militant course taken by the SDS national leadership. The violence produced by the young, self-professed communist revolutionaries of the SDS has by contrast permitted old-line Communist members of groups such as Communist Party-USA and the Socialist Workers Party to don a cloak of respectability.

As representatives of the NMC steering committee, for example, they throw up their hands and profess to abhor the violent-prone tactics of the New Left militant. Meanwhile, they work in a subtle manner to exploit antiwar sentiment in this country to use it as a base for continuing attacks against U.S. foreign policy—attacks which are in keeping with international communist objectives.

CHICAGO TRIAL

Eight individuals, including David Dellinger, Thomas Hayden, and Bobby Seale, an officer of the Black Panther Party (BPP), were placed on trial in Chicago, Ill., on September 24, 1969, charged with violations of the Federal antiriot statute in connection with their activities during the Democratic National Convention in August 1968. On November 5, 1969, the presiding judge declared a mistrial as to Seale and found him in contempt of court on 16 counts. He was sentenced to serve 3 months on each count, the sentences to run consecutively and he is scheduled to be retried April 23, 1970.

Dellinger, Hayden, Rennard Davis, Abbott Hoffman, and Jerry Rubin on February 18, 1970, were found guilty of violating a Federal antiriot law; the remaining two defendants were acquitted. The five convicted each received sentences of 5 years in prison and a \$5,000 fine.

The presiding judge on February 14 and 15, 1970, cited all seven defendants and two defense attorneys for contempt of court based on their courtroom conduct during the

trial. Defense attorneys William M. Kunstler and Leonard I. Weinglass were sentenced to prison for 48 months, 13 days and 20 months, 5 days, respectively, with execution stayed until May 4, 1970. The seven defendants received sentences ranging from 2 months, 18 days to 29 months, 17 days and the judge ordered immediate confinement. The sentences for the antiriot convictions are to run concurrently with the contempt sentences.

On February 28, 1970, based on order of the U.S. Court of Appeals, Dellinger, Hayden, Davis, Hoffman, and Rubin were released on \$25,000 bond each. John Radford Froines and Lee J. Weiner, the two defendants acquitted on the antiriot charges but cited for contempt, were each released on \$15,000 bond; Attorneys Kunstler and Weinglass were each admitted to \$15,000 bond although they had not been confined.

CHICAGO DEMONSTRATIONS—OCTOBER 8-11, 1969

The SDS sponsored demonstrations at Chicago during the period October 8-11, 1969, to protest this trial. Leaders of a militant faction of the SDS known as the Weatherman Group sponsored a series of violent demonstrations during the period designed, according to their spokesman, to bring the war home and to stop the trial.

These demonstrations resulted in extensive vandalism to the downtown area in Chicago, numerous injuries to both demonstrators and police, and in the arrest of 275 individuals, including Mark Rudd, the leader of the Weatherman faction.

During one demonstration the assistant corporation counsel of the city of Chicago was severely injured by one of the demonstrators. These demonstrations attracted widespread publicity and served to indicate the violent ends to which SDS is prepared to go.

NATIONWIDE DEMONSTRATIONS—FEBRUARY 14-21, 1970

The conclusion of the Chicago trial was marked by numerous demonstrations throughout the country. NMC called for demonstrations during the period February 14-21, 1970, to protest "repression" and to support the individuals on trial. In some instances these demonstrations became violent.

For example, at Washington, D.C., on February 19, 1970, protest groups, including the Washington Committee to Defend the Conspiracy (WCDC), sponsored a demonstration at the Watergate Apartments, the home of many Government officials, including the Attorney General. Approximately 250 demonstrators attempted to smash their way through police lines to reach this apartment complex, which they had threatened to disrupt. After being dispersed by police, the demonstrators split into small groups and committed acts of vandalism; 140 arrests were made and 10 people were injured.

At Seattle, Wash., 80 arrests were made on February 17, 1970, when demonstrators attempted to storm the courthouse. Almost all the windows in the courthouse were broken, as well as windows in nearby business establishments.

February 21, 1970, was designated as "Conspiracy Day" by the NMC. Demonstrations were held in many cities throughout the United States and in Washington, D.C., up to 1,500 demonstrators engaged in a rally and a march. Participants in the march became unruly, stoned police, and broke some windows. Over 100 arrests were made in getting the crowd under control. During the rally, William Kunstler, one of the attorneys for the Chicago defendants, said people must go to the streets as the Government responds only to the "power of the people." He added, "We must make the Government afraid."

STUDENT AGITATION

The street revolutionaries produced by the New Left movement were responsible for other widespread destructive acts of violence.

During the 1968-69 school year, there were over 850 demonstrations on over 225 college campuses. There were 61 instances of arson and/or bombings. Approximately 200 building seizures or sit-ins occurred. Over 4,000 individuals were arrested in connection with these disorders. Damage to campus facilities ran over \$3 million. Negro students played a significant part in more than 185 of the disturbances. One death and over 125 injuries were reported.

From September 1, 1969, to February 1, 1970, there were over 375 demonstrations on 76 college campuses. There were 30 instances of arson and/or bombings. There were over 50 sit-ins or building seizures. Over 1,600 arrests were made in connection with campus disruptions. Damage approached \$1,400,000. Eighty-two of the demonstrations were racial in nature. Approximately 150 injuries have been reported.

The demonstrations protested the Reserve Officers Training Corps, military recruiting on the campus, university research for the Government, campus recruiting by industry, school regulations and policy and the war in Vietnam.

ANTIWAR ACTIVITIES

Antiwar activities have continued on a daily basis and many are well organized. A National Antiwar Conference was held at Cleveland, Ohio, on July 4-5, 1969. The most prominent antiwar group in attendance was the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, now known as the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam (NMC), led by David Dellinger.

Under Dellinger's guidance, this organization led the march on the Pentagon in October 1967 as well as the demonstrations at the August 1968 Democratic Convention in Chicago. The National Antiwar Conference in Cleveland voted to support the SDS and the BPP by participating in the demonstrations at Chicago during the trial of Dellinger and the seven others for violation of the Federal antiriot statutes arising out of their activities at the convention.

The Cleveland conference also voted to support other antiwar demonstrations including the massive gathering at Washington, D.C., on November 15, 1969.

The NMC is planning several major nationwide demonstrations during the next several months.

On April 15, 1970, NMC will place major emphasis on economic issues related to the war in Vietnam, focusing on the question "Who pays for the war and who profits?" On this date NMC is planning visits to Internal Revenue Service offices, anti-inflation picketing, boycotting of grocery stores, group tax protests or refusal to pay taxes, support for strikers resisting the efforts of business and Government to put the burden of the war on the workers, sit-downs at offices and stockholders' meetings of major corporations with Government defense contracts and demonstrations protesting perpetuation of poverty and the low level of welfare and medical payments caused by the war.

NMC announced that the April 15 activities in dozens of cities throughout the United States will surpass last November's moratorium march in Washington, D.C. They plan to have major demonstrations in New York, Washington, Detroit and either San Francisco or Los Angeles.

On May 30, 1970, NMC plans antiwar mass actions at a number of military bases throughout the United States.

VIETNAM MORATORIUM COMMITTEE (VMC)

This organization came into being in 1969 and is self-described as an effort to maximize public pressure to end the war in Vietnam by encouraging a broad cross section of America to protest against the war. It called for a moratorium against "business as usual" on October 15, 1969, and this was scheduled to

be followed by lengthened moratoriums in the following months until a firm commitment is made by the United States to a definite timetable for total withdrawal of United States troops from Vietnam or a negotiated settlement is signed.

On October 15, 1969, demonstrations called by the VMC were held throughout the United States. It was estimated that 500,000 individuals participated in this activity on a nationwide basis. The demonstrations included teach-ins, rallies, marches and picketing. The majority of the participants were of high school and college age. In Washington, D.C., demonstrations were held throughout the city and at various Government agencies including the Department of Justice.

The NMC and the VMC cooperated in supporting demonstrations November 13-15, 1969, at Washington, D.C. The activities during this period included a "March Against Death," a march of some 225,000 people along Pennsylvania Avenue and a mass rally at the Washington Monument. These planned demonstrations were stated to be peaceful but they were far from it.

On November 14, 1969, some 3,000 individuals participated in a rally sponsored by the Revolutionary Contingent (RC), a coalition of militants from various factions of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), the Youth International Party and other groups. They attempted to march on the South Vietnamese Embassy in Washington, D.C., but were broken up by police using tear gas after they had committed acts of vandalism.

David Dellinger, one of the major speakers at the mass rally at the Washington Monument on November 15, 1969, invited those participating to a demonstration at the Justice Building. This demonstration, urged on by a group of militants including factions of the SDS and the RC, attracted between 5,000 and 6,000 persons who surrounded the building while chanting antiwar slogans.

Militants among the group broke windows, threw paint on the building, lowered the U.S. flag and unsuccessfully attempted to replace it with a Vietcong flag. Police dispersed the group with tear gas and following this, small bands of militants roamed the city causing damage to numerous businesses.

The November demonstrations in Washington, D.C., resulted in injury to 606 persons, including 26 police officers. During the period of the 3 days of demonstrations, 175 individuals were arrested. Damage to privately owned and Government property was estimated at approximately \$250,000. Overtime pay for area police departments required in handling the demonstrators was estimated at almost \$500,000. The cost of maintaining troops in Washington was estimated at about \$1 million.

FOREIGN TRAVEL OF NEW LEFTISTS

Mr. Hoover. Frequently, we find New Left-type individuals involved in organizations that actively promote travel out of the country in furtherance of revolutionary aims and in violation of travel restrictions. Organizations in this category are the Committee of Returned Volunteers and the Venceremos Brigade.

COMMITTEE OF RETURNED VOLUNTEERS (CRV)

The CRV was established in 1966 and has its national headquarters in New York City. It is composed of individuals who have voluntarily served abroad in the various countries in Africa, Asia, and South America, the so-called "Third World." The majority of the membership is made up of former Peace Corps volunteers. As of July 1969, the membership of the CRV totaled approximately 1,000 in 12 cities. The membership figure includes those who reside outside of chapter areas.

The CRV has been active in demonstrations against U.S. policies, particularly those

pertaining to the "Third World" and Vietnam. In June and July 1969 it sponsored two trips to Cuba to observe the progress of the revolution. These trips were made without the necessary State Department clearance.

The national assembly of the organization, with some 85 persons in attendance, was held in rural Minnesota during September 12-16, 1969. This group adopted a revised "statement of purpose" calling for self-determination for the "Third World," equitable distribution of the world's wealth, and conditions for a new society. According to the statement, none of these goals can be achieved "unless there is revolution in the 'Third World' and in the United States."

National Assembly actions committed the CRV to the following:

1. Support of the struggle of the Vietnamese people for national liberation and rejection of the presence of U.S. troops in South Vietnam.
2. Recognition of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam as the only legitimate voice of the South Vietnamese people.
3. Support of the Cuban revolution. The CRV "will tolerate no act of our Government against Cuba and will resist to their fullest capacity all existing and future imperialist acts of our country against the Cuban revolution."
4. Accept as legitimate the armed struggle for national liberation engaged in by the people of "white-racist-ruled Africa."
5. Opposition to the presence of U.S. troops in South Korea.
6. Abolition of the U.S. Peace Corps.

VENCEREMOS BRIGADE (VB)

The Venceremos Brigade was organized in June 1969 for the announced purpose of actively supporting the Cuban revolution by assisting in the 1970 Cuban sugar cane harvest. "Venceremos" translated is "we will win," and was a slogan of the late Ernesto "Che" Guevara, Cuban revolutionary leader.

The executive committee of this organization represents a coalition of representatives from various organizations of the New Left and has received organizational support from groups such as the Students for a Democratic Society, the Trotskyist Young Socialist Alliance and the militant Black Panther Party. At the time of its formation the executive committee announced that Brigade members, while in Cuba, would also have a chance to discuss the Cuban revolution, the Third World struggle, socialism and "the movement" in the United States. Information has been received that Brigade participants, upon return to the United States would be assigned to direct and work in bringing about a revolution in this country.

The Brigade was organized in open defiance of the U.S. State Department ban on travel to Cuba. As originally constituted, it was to consist of two contingents of 150 persons each. However, the first contingent, consisting of over 200 individuals, traveled to Cuba via Mexico during late November and early December 1969. This group returned via Canada aboard a Cuban freighter on February 12, 1970.

A second and larger contingent departed from the United States the same day aboard 11 buses, en route to Canada where they boarded the freighter for the trip to Cuba. Each group was scheduled to cut sugar cane for approximately 2 months and be given a tour of Cuba. Travel for the first contingent was made under the name "C and C Associates," which stands for "Cane Cutters Associates," while the second contingent, initially utilizing the pretext of a ski trip, traveled under the name "Skimasters International." The first bus load of this contingent was denied entry by Canadian

officials as the group obviously was not prepared for a ski trip. This fact was picked up by the press and the true purpose of this travel was publicized extensively.

Applicants were reminded that they must be prepared to respect Cuban laws against use of marijuana and drugs. It is interesting to note that the application to participate in the VB travel is detailed and requires a voluntary statement as to each individual's background and his involvement and motivation in "the movement." The completed application is ideally suited for inclusion in foreign intelligence files for possible future reference.

COMMUNIST PARTY—USA

Mr. Hoover. Having been beset by factionalist struggles for many months, Communist Party—USA leader Gus Hall at the party's 19th national convention during April 30-May 4, 1969, overcame his opposition and enabled the party to enter the fiscal year 1970 with a veneer of unity.

Prior to the convention, several prominent leaders of the party had been engaged in a prolonged factionalist struggle against the leadership over a number of issues, such as total subservience to Moscow, especially in regard to situations in the Middle East and Czechoslovakia, and the failure of the party to develop a close relationship with either the New Left or militant black nationalists.

Gus Hall's tactic of influencing the composition of most of the district delegations to the convention enabled him to whip the membership into line and rout his opposition. In the words of one observer, the party had returned to "the old time religion" in that it amended the party constitution to bring forth a more strict application of democratic centralism which, in effect, is dictation from the top. Reorganization of the party, which took place at the national committee meeting held in September 1969, removed from positions of power almost all individuals who do not openly support Hall.

Today, as always, the party is subservient to Moscow. Moscow even passed on the party's program adopted at its convention earlier in 1969 and objected to a portion which indicated communism in the United States should be so modeled as to avoid "forced march" tactics which led to unwarranted infringements on personal liberties and to bureaucratic excesses in certain other countries. These references were deleted. Apparently the Soviets objected to this portion of the program as indicating all is not perfect in the Soviet Union.

As further demonstrations of the true allegiance of the Communist Party—USA, Hall led the party's delegation to the International Conference of Communist and Workers Parties in Moscow in June 1969 and the party worked openly and behind the scenes in support of the Soviet position on all matters. In September 1969, Hall traveled via Moscow to Hanoi, North Vietnam, to attend the funeral of Ho Chi Minh. On his return journey, he stopped in Moscow and held private discussions with Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary, Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and other Soviet leaders. When he returned to the United States, Hall told a meeting of the national committee of the party in this country about his trip and some of the details of his discussions, pointing out the party here was very well thought of by foreign Communist leaders, particularly those in the Soviet Union, and that he had received preferred treatment while abroad.

Party leaders continue to make speaking appearances on school campuses, there having been 60 such appearances during the 1968-69 school year. One significant party gain in this area was made when Herbert Aptheker, publicly identified on numerous occasions as a party member and spokesman,

was appointed to the position of visiting professor of history at Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa., starting in September 1969.

I submit a list of the public appearance of party leaders on campuses during the school year 1968-69.

Mr. ROONEY. Without objection we shall insert this list at this point in the record.

(The list follows:)

PUBLIC APPEARANCES OF PARTY LEADERS ON CAMPUSES, SCHOOL YEAR 1968-69—SCHOOL, SPEAKER, AND DATE

Notre Dame University, South Bend, Ind.; Michael Zagarell; September 15, 1968.
Valley State College, Northridge, Calif.; Charlene Mitchell; September 19, 1968.
University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Charlene Mitchell; September 25, 1968.
Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, Pa.; Charlene Mitchell; September 26, 1968.
Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.; Michael Zagarell; September 26, 1968.
Standard Evening High School,* Philadelphia, Pa.; Michael Zagarell; September 26, 1968.
University of Illinois, Circle Campus, Chicago, Ill.; Charlene Mitchell; October 3, 1968.
University of Illinois, Circle Campus, Chicago, Ill.; Louis Diskin; October 3, 1968.
Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.; Charlene Mitchell; October 4, 1968.
Mundelein College, Chicago, Ill.; Charlene Mitchell; October 7, 1968.
University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.; Charlene Mitchell; October 8, 1968.
Bloomfield College, Bloomfield, N.J.; Michael Zagarell; October 10, 1968.
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.; Charlene Mitchell; October 14, 1968.
Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.; Charlene Mitchell; October 15, 1968.
Northeastern University, Boston, Mass.; Michael Zagarell; October 15, 1968.
Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.; Michael Zagarell; October 15, 1968.
Colby College, Waterville, Maine; Michael Zagarell; October 16, 1968.
University of Maine, Orono, Maine; Michael Zagarell; October 16, 1968.
University of Maine at Portland, Portland, Maine; Michael Zagarell; October 16, 1968.
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wis.; Charlene Mitchell; October 16, 1968.
Knox College, Galesburg, Ill.; Herbert Aptheker; October 16, 1968.
Northwest Missouri State College, Maryville, Mo.; Herbert Aptheker; October 17, 1968.
University of Wisconsin, Memorial Union, Madison, Wis.; Charlene Mitchell; October 17, 1968.
City College of New York, New York, N.Y.; Charlene Mitchell; October 18, 1968.
Brown University, Providence, R.I.; Michael Zagarell; October 18, 1968.
University of Rhode Island, Kingston, R.I.; Michael Zagarell; October 18, 1968.
University of Texas, Austin, Tex.; Charlene Mitchell; October 23, 1968.
Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn.; Charlene Mitchell; October 24, 1968.
San Jose State College, San Jose, Calif.; Charlene Mitchell; October 28, 1968.
Merritt College, Oakland, Calif.; Charlene Mitchell; October 28, 1968.
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.; Michael Zagarell; October 28, 1968.
Temple Buell College, Denver, Colo.; Michael Zagarell; October 29, 1968.
Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.; Charlene Mitchell; October 29, 1968.
California State College, Hayward, Calif.; Charlene Mitchell; October 30, 1968.
Lowell State College, Lowell, Mass.; Charlene Mitchell; October 31, 1968.

* High school.

Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Charlene Mitchell; October 31, 1968.

Boston State College, Boston, Mass.; Charlene Mitchell; November 1, 1968.

Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; Charlene Mitchell; November 2, 1968.

Howard University, Washington, D.C.; Charlene Mitchell; November 4, 1968.

Knox College, Galesburg, Ill.; Michael Eisenschner; November 12, 1968.

University of Delaware, Newark, Del.; Herbert Aptheker; December 12, 1968.

St. Norbert's College, De Pere, Wis.; Herbert Aptheker; January 9, 1969.

Tougaloo College, Tougaloo, Miss.; Herbert Aptheker; February 5, 1969.

California Lutheran College, Thousand Oaks, Calif.; Herbert Aptheker; February 6, 1969.

New York University, New York, N.Y.; Michael Myerson; February 13, 1969.

University of Maine, Orono, Maine; Charlene Mitchell; February 18, 1969.

Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.; Herbert Aptheker; March 3, 1969.

University of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla.; Charlene Mitchell; March 6, 1969.

University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Claude Lightfoot; March 11, 1969.

Littleton High School,* Littleton, Colo.; Robert Trujillo; March 14, 1969.

University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa; Herbert Aptheker; April 8, 1969.

Idaho State University, Pocatello, Idaho; Herbert Aptheker; April 10, 1969.

Bradley University, Peoria, Ill.; Richard Criley; April 14, 1969.

Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Ill.; Herbert Aptheker; April 15, 1969.

Marshall University, Huntington, W. Va.; Herbert Aptheker; April 18, 1969.

University of Rhode Island, Kingston, R.I.; Herbert Aptheker; May 13, 1969.

Central State University, Wilberforce, Ohio; Charlene Mitchell; May 17, 1969.

Federal City College, Washington, D.C.; Claude Lightfoot; May 25, 1969.

Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa.; Arnold Johnson; May 25, 1969.

Beloit College, Beloit, Wisc.; Claude Lightfoot; June 27, 1969.

COMMUNIST INFLUENCE IN RACIAL MATTERS

Mr. Hoover. The Communist Party—USA continues to be conciliatory in regard to the emergence of black extremism in the civil rights movement and in the educational field.

In fact, the party in recent months has become increasingly active in its support of such extreme organizations as the Black Panther Party. Although the party has had both ideological and tactical differences with the Black Panther Party, certain of its leaders feel the party must unite with them in the fight against repression, and this unity is becoming more and more evident in party literature and speeches.

PROGRESSIVE LABOR PARTY (PLP)

The Progressive Labor Party was founded in 1962 by extremists who broke away from the Communist Party—USA. Growing steadily, many of its more than 350 members and numerous sympathizers are concentrated in the labor industry where they attempt to capitalize on any employee problems or adverse working conditions which can be used to promote discontent with the object of discrediting the political, economic, and social systems of the United States.

Of equal significance is the PLP's stepped-up efforts to extend its influence on college campuses. Its ability to seize upon situations ripe for violence is revealed by its role in campus violence and disturbances, and its attempted takeover of the SDS during its national convention in June 1969 at Chicago, Ill.

The PLP maintains close contact with pro-Chinese communist groups abroad. As long ago as 1967 it became evident that the Com-

munist Party of China considered the PLP a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist Party in the United States well worthy of support. The Chinese communists subsidize the PLP through the purchase of its various publications. PLP leaders have been in periodic contact with Chinese agencies and these leaders have on occasion visited the Chinese mainland.

SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY (SWP)

Although differing from the Communist Party—USA as to the means to achieve the goal, the Socialist Workers Party also wants to achieve a communist America. It and its youth group, the Young Socialist Alliance (YSA) have been successful as previously indicated in organizing, dominating, and controlling many of the major anti-war movements. The YSA, which strikingly increased its membership during 1968-69, has been very active in establishing new chapters on or near numerous college campuses throughout the country.

In this regard, the national leadership of the Student Mobilization Committee (SMC), which evolved out of the National Student Strike for Peace Conference held in Chicago, Ill., in December 1966 is under the complete control of the YSA and/or the SWP as I mentioned earlier. Although the National Student Strike for Peace Conference was originally organized by the Communist Party—USA, it was taken over by the SWP in 1968.

"The Student Mobilizer," the publication of the SMC, sets forth the following aims of this group: Bring the GIs home from Vietnam now; end the campus complicity with the war; and win self-determination for Vietnam and black America.

The SMC has pledged itself to organize high school students, college students, future draftees, GIs and all young people to fight for these aims.

The SMC most certainly presents a broad base of operation for its SWP-YSA leaders.

EXTREMIST ORGANIZATIONS

We have continued to see intensive activity on the part of both black and white extremist organizations across the country. Their activities have placed an increasing demand upon the FBI's manpower and resources.

Significantly, black extremists are now entering into a new, more sophisticated and much more dangerous phase. Where in the past the black extremists were primarily engaged in criminal-type protest activities such as burnings and looting, they are now developing coalitions with white leftist and radical elements.

BLACK PANTHER PARTY (BPP)

The Black Panther Party, a black extremist organization, consisting for the most part of hoodlum-type revolutionaries, continues to be most active and dangerous from an internal security standpoint. Originating in 1966 in Oakland, Calif., it expanded its activities all across the country forming over 40 chapters. Following a purge of its members, it deliberately reduced its chapters to approximately 30 but now once again it is steadily growing. Its estimated membership consists of 800 to 900 hard-core guerrilla-type members with many thousands of supporters in the major urban areas of the Nation.

ATTACKS ON POLICE

A free society is in trouble when blatant propaganda so overshadows truth that the rule of law is jeopardized. Currently, law enforcement agencies throughout the country are wrongly accused of harassment by many well-intentioned but uninformed voices echoing outright lies generated by the lawless BPP.

This attack on police is not new. Since its inception, the BPP has reserved its most

vicious invectives for law enforcement officials. "Off the pigs!" jargon for "kill the police"—is a familiar shout at Panther rallies. Panther publications abound with cartoons encouraging physical attacks on police depicted as pigs. Toddlers in Panther "schools" do their exercises to the accompaniment of the chant, "There is a pig upon the hill—if you don't kill him the Panthers will."

These are not idle catchwords. The Panthers mean business—revolutionary business. Police have been lured into ambush by Panthers carrying out cold-blooded assassination plots. Negro and white police are treated alike. Panthers say they make no distinction between black and white policemen.

The Panthers' ferocious attacks on law enforcement officers are understandable since it is the police that stand between them and their attempts to rule by terror. It is difficult, however, to understand how any responsible, law-abiding persons can condone, much less lend support to, such terroristic tactics.

In keeping with its intense hatred of and vindictive hysteria against local police, two BPP chapters engaged in shoot-outs with local police during December 1969. On both occasions the police were attempting to execute duly authorized search and/or arrest warrants. In Chicago, Ill., on December 4, 1969, seven heavily armed Panthers were arrested and two were killed. One police officer was wounded by gunfire and one injured by flying glass. At Los Angeles, Calif., on December 8, 1969, three police officers and two Panthers were wounded during a 4-hour gun battle at BPP headquarters. The Black Panthers in Los Angeles were heavily armed and their headquarters was fortified with sandbags, reinforced doors and gunports, and had a partially completed escape tunnel.

Following the above shootouts between police and the BPP, the BPP's top attorney, Charles Garry, claimed that 28 Panthers have been murdered by police since 1968. In a press release dated December 12, 1969, the BPP was hard pressed to identify even 20 of the members which it claimed were "killed in cold blood" by police. Of the 20 named, four had been killed by members of a rival black extremist group of the west coast; one died of barbiturate intoxication; one was shot and killed by a store owner during a robbery attempt; one was killed by his wife over a love affair he was having with a female Black Panther; and another is alleged to have been tortured and killed by BPP members, 14 of whom, including Chairman Bobby Seale, have been indicted in connection with this member's death.

The claim of the BPP that it is an innocent victim of police persecution and genocide is rendered absurd by the fact that since 1967 at least five police officers have been killed by BPP members and 42 officers wounded. One of the officers was killed by a Panther with a shotgun blast at point-blank range as the officer lay wounded and helpless on the ground.

Attacks have not been limited to the police. While falsely claiming their intent to protect the black community, Panthers have, in fact, assaulted and threatened Negro citizens who have tried to assist the police. Neighborhood stores have been forced to "contribute" food supplies and money under fear of Panther violence. Many other persons have been the victims of these hoodlums as shown by the fact that in 1969 alone BPP members were arrested for serious crimes including murder, armed robbery, rape, bank robbery, and burglary.

ARRESTS OF BPP LEADERS

BPP leaders have been arrested for violation of Federal and local laws. Included are such national leaders as Huey P. Newton for killing a police officer; Leroy Eldridge Cleaver, on charges stemming from a gun battle be-

tween BPP members and Oakland, Calif., police; Bobby Seale, on charges growing out of activities during the Democratic National Convention at Chicago, Ill., in 1968 and more recently in connection with the alleged BPP murder of one of the BPP members suspected of cooperating with police authorities; and David Hilliard, on charges of making a public threat against the President. This occurred in a speech delivered by him before a crowd of people attending the Vietnam Moratorium rally in San Francisco, Calif., on November 15, 1969. In language filled with obscenities Hilliard stated "We will kill Richard Nixon" adding that they will kill anyone else who stands in the way of "our freedom."

Newton and Seale remain in custody. Cleaver disappeared prior to the time his parole on an assault with intent to kill conviction was revoked and fled to Cuba and then to Algeria. Hilliard is free on bond.

In spite of these arrests and BPP purges of its own ranks, the BPP continues to progress and to foment strife and turmoil. Although Cleaver is in Algeria he continues to exert a great deal of influence over the operations of the BPP and certain leaders of the BPP have traveled to Algeria for conferences with Cleaver. Cleaver has established contact with the Al Fatah, a terrorist Arab group which has engaged in sustained guerrilla activities against Israel, and the BPP newspaper has advocated active support of the Al Fatah.

STOCKPILING OF WEAPONS

In a recent television interview, a Panther leader denied his organization was storing an arsenal of weapons. Let us look at the facts. In conjunction with arrests made at Panther offices over the past 2 years, authorities uncovered 125 machineguns, sawed-off shotguns, rifles, and hand grenades, together with thousands of rounds of ammunition. They also found 47 Molotov cocktails plus homemade bombs, gun powder, and an accumulation of bayonets, swords, and machetes.

An edition of "The Black Panther," official BPP newspaper, contains an article cautioning Panthers against the use of small-caliber weapons and recommends instead a high-powered rifle with " * * * enough killing force to knock the pig out of his shoes at a distance of three or more blocks * * *." That article concludes with the statement, "The only good pig is a dead pig!!!"

REVOLUTIONARY GOALS

BPP leaders admit that they use the Marxist-Leninist doctrines as their guide to action. They have proclaimed their revolutionary intentions and have openly called for the assassination of the President of the United States and the violent overthrow of the Government. The New Left and the Communist Party have been quick to support BPP antipolice and anti-Government exhortations. Internationally, Panthers fleeing from criminal charges and seeking support for their program have been welcomed in Communist countries.

If anyone had any doubts about the revolutionary aims and goals of the BPP, they should have been dispelled by Cleaver's remarks in an interview presented on the Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS) television network program "60 Minutes" on January 6, 1970. The interview with Cleaver was taped in Algiers by Mike Wallace of CBS. Cleaver was asked about the Panther threats against our Nation's leaders. Cleaver stated: "The goal is take Senator McClellan's head. Now the process of getting his head has to rely on a strategic technique, I mean I can't just walk in and take his head and walk out. You see, I have to get past the guards and get past those who might try to protect his pighead. So to me I think that would mean shooting my way in and shooting my

way out because I wouldn't want to go in, take his head and just sit there."

Cleaver also stated the goal is to "take off the head of Richard Nixon." When asked if this was rhetoric, Cleaver replied "This is not rhetoric. I'm telling you that Richard Nixon, J. Edgar Hoover, Senator John McClelland et al. Not just them but all of the pigs of the power structure have to be apprehended and I feel myself, you see, that the fate that they receive will depend upon the resistance they put up. I feel that they are criminals. That they are the decisionmakers who are programing oppression and destruction not only in the United States but around the world.

Cleaver indicated during the interview that a war of liberation from the "fascist imperialist social order" in the United States would have to be fought and that he expected to be a part of it even if he has to slip back into the country.

The BPP is the source of a great deal of insidious anti-United States and hate-type propaganda. Among other things, it distributes as many as 80,000 to 100,000 copies of a single issue of its weekly paper, "The Black Panther." Issues published during December 1969 carried advertisements for BPP Christmas and greeting cards. These cards, 60,000 copies of which were printed, depicted such scenes as a Negro youth asking for guns and explosives for Christmas and violent attacks on police who were characterized as "pigs."

The BPP sponsored a revolutionary conference in July 1969 at Oakland, Calif., called the National Conference for a United Front Against Fascism. Its purpose was to form a coalition of black and white radicals who were described as "oppressed people." Significantly, the BPP was assisted in preparing for the conference by leaders of the anarchist Students for a Democratic Society and of the Communist Party—USA. The conference was attended by approximately 3,000 persons, over 75 percent of them white.

CONTRIBUTIONS

The sources of contributions to the BPP are many and varied. Numerous small contributions are regularly received by the BPP from donors in the United States and foreign lands. BPP leaders frequently fill speaking engagements at secondary schools, colleges, and universities where they receive honorariums of up to \$1,900 for each engagement as well as transportation costs. BPP speakers made 189 appearances at these educational institutions during the 1969 calendar year. This can be contrasted with the year 1967 when BPP speakers made 11 appearances at educational institutions.

SPEAKING APPEARANCES

I present a list of speaking appearances of Black Panther Party leaders at secondary schools, colleges, and universities during the calendar year 1969.

Mr. ROONEY. Without objection we shall insert this interesting list at this point in the record.

(The list follows:)

SPEAKING APPEARANCES OF BLACK PANTHER PARTY LEADERS AT SECONDARY SCHOOLS, COLLEGES, AND UNIVERSITIES DURING CALENDAR YEAR 1969

Date, school, and speaker

January 7, 1969, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; Bobby Seale.
January 8, 1969, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.; Lauren R. Watson.
January 8, 1969, Roosevelt University, Chicago, Ill.; Fred Hampton, Bobby Rush.
January 9-10, 1969, University of Illinois, Champaign, Ill.; Fred Hampton, Bobby Rush, Diane Dunn.
January 9, 1969, Wright Junior College, Chicago, Ill.; Rufus Walls, Bobby Rush, Fred Hampton.

January 14, 1969, Central YMCA Community College, Chicago, Ill.; Fred Hampton, Bobby Rush.

January 15, 1969, California State College at Long Beach, Long Beach, Calif.; Alfred Jones.

January 17, 1969, Loop City College, Chicago, Ill.; Fred Hampton, Robert White.

January 24, 1969, Nasson College, Springvale, Maine; Thomas D. Pawley, Carla Ford.

January 25, 1969, Denver University, Denver, Colo.; Joe Martin.

January 27, 1969, Western Illinois University, Macomb, Ill.; Bobby Rush.

January 28-29, 1969, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.; Aaron Dixon.

January 31, 1969, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.; Kathy Jones.

February 7, 1969, Fairfield University, Fairfield, Conn.; Jose Gonzalez.

February 7, 1969, Woodlawn Senior High School, Baltimore, Md.; Warren Hart.

February 9-15, 1969, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.; Lauren R. Watson.

February 10, 1969, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md.; Warren Hart.

February 10, 1969, Eastern Washington State College, Cheney, Wash.; Aaron Dixon.

February 10, 1969, University of Illinois Circle Campus, Chicago, Ill.; Robert Brown.

February 10, 1969, Malcolm X Jr. College, Chicago, Ill.; Rufus Walls.

February 13, 1969, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.; Joe Martin, Stanford Patton, Fred Crawford.

February 13, 1969, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Ill.; Fred Hampton.

February 14, 1969, California State College at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.; Raymond Hewitt, Elaine Brown.

February 15, 1969, Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind.; Joe Martin, Robert O'Bannon.

February 15, 1969, San Diego State College, San Diego, Calif.; Kenneth Lee Denmon, Walter Wallace, Jr.

February 16, 1969, University of Denver, Denver, Colo.; Lauren R. Watson.

February 16, 1969, Hollywood High School, Los Angeles, Calif.; Donald Cox.

February 17, 1969, Crane High School, Chicago, Ill.; Billy Brooks, Bobby Rush, Fred Hampton, Rufus Walls, Jewel Barker.

February 19, 1969, Roosevelt University, Chicago, Ill.; Fred Hampton.

February 20, 1969, Central Missouri State Teachers College, Warrensburg, Mo.; Felix O'Neal.

February 20, 1969, Chicago State Teachers College, Chicago, Ill.; Bobby Rush, Billy Brooks.

February 20, 1969, Northeastern University, Chicago, Ill.; Fred Hampton.

February 20, 1969, Roosevelt University, Chicago, Ill.; Fred Hampton, Robert Lee, Jerry Dunnigan.

February 21, 1969, Roosevelt University, Chicago, Ill.; Rufus Walls.

February 21, 1969, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo.; Lauren Watson.

February 21, 1969, Lee High School, New Haven, Conn.; Emilio Bermis.

February 21, 1969, New York State University, Brockport, N.Y.; George Mason Murray.

February 22, 1969, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.; Raymond Hewitt.

February 24, 1969, Baltimore Community College, Baltimore, Md.; Warren Hart.

February 25, 1969, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Ill.; Fred Hampton.

February 26, 1969, Midwestern College, Denison, Iowa; Eddie Bolden.

February 28, 1969, Irving High School, Maywood, Ill.; Fred Hampton.

March 5, 1969, University of Missouri, Kansas City, Mo.; Keith Hinch.

March 6, 1969, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.; Delmar Mossett.

March 7, 1969, Crossmont Junior College, El Cajon, Calif.; Kenneth Denmon, Walter Wallace, Jr.

March 8, 1969, Horace Mann Junior High School, San Francisco, Calif.; David Hilliard.

March 10, 1969, Towson State Teachers College, Towson, Md.; Warren Hart.

March 10, 1969, Morgan State College, Baltimore, Md.; Warren Hart.

March 10, 1969, Maryland Institute, Baltimore, Md.; Elijah Boyd.

March 10, 1969, Loop City College, Ill.; Fred Hampton.

March 11, 1969, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.; Warren Hart.

March 12, 1969, Bellevue High School, Bellevue, Wash.; Carnell Garden, David Hendrix.

March 12, 1969, University of Aarhus, Copenhagen, Denmark; Raymond Hewitt.

March 12, 1969, Helsinki University, Helsinki, Finland; Raymond Hewitt.

March 12, 1969, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; Jose Gonzalez.

March 13, 1969, Goucher College, Towson, Md.; Warren Hart.

March 13, 1969, Northeastern High School, Baltimore, Md.; Elijah Boyd.

March 18, 1969, Oslo University, Oslo, Norway; Raymond Hewitt.

March 18, 1969, State University of New York, Buffalo, N.Y.; Westley Brown.

March 19, 1969, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.; Warren Hart.

March 19, 1969, Central Senior High School, Kansas City, Mo.; Felix O'Neal, W. H. Whitfield, June Charles Sims.

March 20, 1969, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.; Elijah Boyd.

March 21, 1969, Mount St. Agnes College, Baltimore, Md.; Elijah Boyd.

March 21, 1969, Helsinki University, Helsinki, Finland; Bobby Seale, Raymond Hewitt.

March 21, 1969, Mills College, Oakland, Calif.; Kathleen Cleaver.

March 24, 1969, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.; Fred Hampton, Nathaniel Junior.

March 25, 1969, Barnard College, New York, N.Y.; Richard Moore.

March 26, 1969, Roosevelt University, Chicago, Ill.; Fred Hampton, Bobby Rush, Alcin Shinn.

April 2, 1969, Milwaukee Technical College, Milwaukee, Wis.; Walter Chesser.

April 4, 1969, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.; Aaron Dixon.

April 10, 1969, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.; Fred Crawford, Lawrence Roberts, Will Martin.

April 11-21, 1969, Lincoln High School, San Diego, Calif.; Kenneth Denmon.

April 13, 1969, Los Angeles Trade and Technical College, Los Angeles, Calif.; Raymond Hewitt.

April 14, 1969, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.; Lauren Watson, Russ Simpson.

April 15, 1969, Los Angeles Trade and Technical College, Los Angeles, Calif.; Bobby Seale.

April 16, 1969, St. Paul School of Theology, Kansas City, Mo.; Henry Finley.

April 17, 1969, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.; Fred Hampton.

April 18, 1969, Helms Junior High School, Richmond, Calif.; Bobby Seale.

April 21, 1969, Fayetteville State Teachers College, Fayetteville, N.C.; Carver Gene Nebitt.

April 22, 1969, Edward Williams College, Teaneck, N.J.; Carl Conrad Nichols.

April 23, 1969, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; Bobby Seale.

April 24, 1969, Englewood High School, Chicago, Ill.; Billy Brooks.

April 27, 1969, City College of New York, New York, N.Y.; Emory Douglas, Kathleen Cleaver.

April 28, 1969, Park College, Parkville, Mo.; Keith Hinch, Henry Finley.

April 28, 1969, Whitman College, Walla Walla, Wash.; Elmer Dixon.

April (exact date unknown), State University of New York at Oswego, Oswego, N.Y.; Westley Brown.

May 1, 1969, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.; Aaron Dixon.

May 2, 1969, Muskingum College, New Concord, Ohio; Carl Conrad Nichols.

May 5, 1969, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.; Warren Hart.

May 5, 1969, California State College at Long Beach, Long Beach, Calif.; Raymond Hewitt.

May 6, 1969, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.; Aaron Dixon, Anthony Ware.

May 8, 1969, St. Peter's College, Jersey City, N.J.; James York.

May 8, 1969, Lutheran Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.; Warren Hart.

May 8, 1969, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.; Elijah Boyd.

May 13, 1969, Wichita State University, Wichita, Kans.; Henry Finley.

May 13, 1969, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.; Raymond Hewitt.

May 14, 1969, Sacred Heart University, Bridgeport, Conn.; Ericka Huggins.

May 14, 1969, Morgan State College, Baltimore, Md.; Elijah Boyd.

May 15, 1969, Somerset College, Somerville, N.J.; Carl Conrad Nichols.

May 15, 1969, Central Washington State College, Ellensburg, Wash.; Aaron Dixon.

May 17, 1969, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; Lonnie McLucas, Ericka Huggins, Larry Townsend.

May 19, 1969, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; Bobby Seale.

May 19, 1969, Roosevelt High School, Des Moines, Iowa; James Drew.

May 19, 1969, San Diego State College, San Diego, Calif.; Kenneth Denmon.

May 19, 1969, Los Angeles City College, Los Angeles, Calif.; Raymond Hewitt.

May 19, 1969, Malcolm X Junior College, Chicago, Ill.; Fred Hampton.

May 20, 1969, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; Fred Hampton.

May 21, 1969, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wis.; Dakin Gentry.

May 22, 1969, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.; Joseph Brown.

May 28-29, 1969, El Camino Junior College, Gardena, Calif.; Delmar Mossett.

June 5, 1969, San Diego Mesa College, San Diego, Calif.; Walter Wallace, Jr.

June 6, 1969, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.; Raymond Hewitt.

June 7, 1969, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.; Raymond Hewitt.

June 28, 1969, University of Wisconsin-Beloit, Beloit, Wis.; Odell Montgomery.

July 10, 1969, San Diego State College, San Diego, Calif.; Walter Wallace, Jr.

August 4-8, 1969, Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa; Charles Knox.

August 6, 1969, Wisconsin State University-Eau Claire, Eau Claire, Wis.; Lovetta Brown.

August 9, 1969, Mathewson Junior High School, Wichita, Kans.; Felix O'Neal, Philip Crayton, Henry Finley, Tom Robinson, Archie Simmons, Keith Hinch.

August 13, 1969, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.; Elbert Howard.

August 14, 1969, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.; Bobby White, Earl Brooks, Roberta Alexander.

September 6, 1969, University of Missouri, Kansas City, Mo.; Felix O'Neal, Brian O'Neal, Henry Finley, Tom Robinson, Andre Weatherby.

September 9, 1969, Tufts University, Medford, Mass.; Douglas Miranda.

September 12, 1969, Howard University, Washington, D.C.; Robert Lee.

September 13, 1969, American University, Washington, D.C.; Robert Lee.

September 14, 1969, Intermediate School, New York, N.Y.; Robert Lee.

September 17, 1969, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.; Robert Lee.

September 17, 1969, University of Maine, Orono, Maine; Eugene Jones.

September 21, 1969, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; Lovetta Brown, Howard Haralson.

September 22, 1969, State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y.; Robert Lee.

September 25, 1969, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.; Donald Jackson.

September 25, 1969, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wis.; Dakin Gentry.

September 25, 1969, Yale Law School, New Haven, Conn.; Roscoe Lee, Elizabeth Bragg.

September 29, 1969, Waseda University, Tokyo, Japan; Elbert Howard, Roberta Alexander.

October 1, 1969, Memorial Junior High School, San Diego, Calif.; Kenneth Denmon.

October 3, 1969, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio; David Hilliard.

October 6, 1969, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.; Fred Hampton.

October 9, 1969, Glendale Community College, Glendale, Calif.; Elaine Brown.

October 11, 1969, Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.; Carl Conrad Nichols.

October 14, 1969, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn.; Douglas Miranda.

October 14, 1969, San Jose State College, San Jose, Calif.; Connie Matthews.

October 15, 1969, Ripon College, Ripon, Wisc.; David Young, Donald Jackson.

October 15, 1969, Leeward Community College, Honolulu, Hawaii; Elaine Brown.

October 15, 1969, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii; Elaine Brown.

October 16, 1969, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada; Raymond Hewitt, Emory Douglas.

October 21, 1969, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.; Clarence Peterson, Rene Johnson.

October 21, 1969, San Diego Mesa College, San Diego, Calif.; Otis Moran.

October 28, 1969, State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y.; James Caston.

October 28, 1969, St. Cloud College, St. Cloud, Minn.; Earl Leon Anthony.

October 28, 1969, Rio Grande College, Rio Grande, Ohio, Rufus Walls.

October 29, 1969, Ball State University, Muncie, Ind.; Donald Campbell, Robert O'Bannon, Milan Busby.

October 29, 1969, Illinois State University, Normal, Ill.; Mark Clark, Edward McChrister, Leon Harps, Fred Hampton.

October 30, 1969, University of California at Davis, Davis, Calif.; David Hilliard.

October 30, 1969, Sacramento State College, Sacramento, Calif.; David Hilliard.

October 30, 1969, Western Washington State University, Bellingham, Wash.; Connie Matthews.

October 31, 1969, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.; Connie Matthews.

November 4, 1969, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.; Douglas Miranda.

November 7, 1969, Portland State University, Portland, Oreg.; Kent Ford.

November 7, 1969, Ricker College, Houlton, Maine; James Coston, Al Carroll.

November 14, 1969, Washington State University, Pullman, Wash.; Anthony Ware.

November 14, 1969, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Ill.; Fred Hampton.

November 17, 1969, at two universities in Montreal and Edmonton, Canada; Fred Hampton, Willie Calvin, Jeri Eldridge.

November 20, 1969, Central State University, Wilberforce, Ohio; Fred Hampton, Willie Calvin, Jeri Eldridge.

November 20, 1969, Boston University, Boston, Mass.; Floyd Hardwick.

November 20, 1969, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; David Hilliard.

November 20, 1969, Los Angeles Valley College, Los Angeles, Calif.; Elaine Brown.

November 23, 1969, University of Illinois Circle Campus, Chicago, Ill.; Fred Hampton.

November 29, 1969, University of Illinois Circle Campus, Chicago, Ill.; Fred Hampton.

December 4, 1969, Malcolm X Junior College, Chicago, Ill.; Rufus Walls.

December 4, 1969, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; Bobby Rush.

December 5, 1969, Portland State University, Portland, Oreg.; Kent Ford.

December 7, 1969, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; Douglas Miranda.

December 8, 1969, Northeastern Illinois State College, Chicago, Ill.; Rufus Walls.

December 9, 1969, New Haven College, New Haven, Conn.; Charles Pinderhughes.

December 10, 1969, University of Missouri, Columbus, Mo.; Andre Weatherby.

December 10, 1969, Portland State University, Portland, Oreg.; Kent Ford.

December 10, 1969, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.; Kathleen Halley.

December 10, 1969, Niles North High School, Niles, Ill.; Bobby Rush.

December 11, 1969, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.; Robert O'Bannon, Keith Parker.

December 12, 1969, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.; Robert Webb.

December 14, 1969, American University, Washington, D.C.; Stephen McCutchen.

December 15, 1969, San Francisco State College, San Francisco, Calif.; David Hilliard.

December 15, 1969, Portland State University, Portland, Oreg.; Kent Ford.

December 16, 1969, Malcolm X Junior College, Chicago, Ill.; Bobby Rush.

December 17, 1969, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.; Charles Scott.

December 17, 1969, University of Hartford, Hartford, Conn.; Charles Pinderhughes.

December 18, 1969, College of San Mateo, Calif.; David Hilliard.

December 20, 1969, Malcolm X Junior College, Chicago, Ill.; Bobby Rush.

December 21, 1969, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio; David Hilliard.

CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. HOOVER. Public benefits are held by the BPP aimed chiefly at raising money for legal defense funds. One benefit in New York City during May 1968 to raise bail money for Elbridge Cleaver netted \$6,500.

Prominent individuals have made some substantial contributions to the BPP. A leading movie actor has contributed at least \$1,000 and a well-known movie actress has reportedly given as much as \$8,000 to the BPP. Negro entertainer Dick Gregory, in a public speech on December 10, 1969, stated that he sent \$1,500 to the BPP.

Upper echelon New Yorkers reportedly are giving legal defense fund benefits for the BPP. According to articles in the January 16, 1970, editions of the New York Times and the New York Post, the wife of composer-director Leonard Bernstein gave a cocktail party for the BPP in her home. More than \$10,000 in cash and pledges was collected for the BPP at the party which was attended by the Bernsteins and guests, including film director Otto Preminger, Mrs. Peter Duchin, wife of the orchestra leader, and Mrs. Sidney Lumet, wife of the film director. Included among the pledges was one by Bernstein himself who promised to donate the proceeds of his next concert, a sum he indicated would be in four figures.

Funds are also collected and donated to the BPP by numerous radical leftist groups. The main source of funds for the BPP in Los Angeles, Calif., is the Los Angeles Friends of the Panthers, which is a group composed of white individuals including Donald Freed, a leader of the New Left, and Shirley Sutherland, a Canadian and the daughter of the leader of a minority political party in Canada.

A \$15,000 donation to the BPP was made in December 1969 by a member of the Committee of Returned Volunteers (CRV), the protest group formed by former Peace Corps members, of which I spoke earlier.

Many contributions also have been obtained from individuals, particularly small businessmen who have been pressured to make "donations" to the BPP for its so-called community projects.

It has been reported that the Union Theological Seminary of New York City is considering plans to pledge seminary stocks and bonds in the amount of \$400,000 to be used as bail bond for three of the "Panther 21." The "Panther 21" refers to the 21 members of the Black Panther Party who were indicted on April 21, 1969, in New York City for conspiring to commit murder and arson. Twelve of the 21 are in custody in New York City in lieu of bond ranging up to \$100,000.

Let us clear away the rhetoric and confusion purposely generated to shroud the Black Panther issue and get it back into proper perspective. Under the rule of law, the laws must be enforced and violators held accountable or a free society cannot exist. An organization which stockpiles illegal weapons, trains in guerrilla warfare, and seeks confrontation with enforcement officers for the expressed purpose of killing them is certainly in violation of the law. Yet, when lawful process is applied to bring the Black Panthers under control, their cries of "genocide" and "harassment" are seemingly accepted by many without question.

This band of self-styled revolutionists must not be allowed to intimidate law-enforcement authorities, merchants, and any other citizens with their threats and phony allegations. Responsible citizens of all races have the right to demand and expect continued vigorous prosecution of any law violator—including a Black Panther!

STUDENT NATIONAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE (SNCC)

The Student National (formerly Nonviolent) Coordinating Committee has moved its headquarters from Atlanta, Ga., to New York City. Under the former leadership of Stokely Carmichael and H. Rap Brown who served as successive chairmen of SNCC, the organization developed into an all-Negro revolutionary group. Carmichael left SNCC and is in Guinea. Brown, the present chairman, is awaiting trial or free on bond on various local and Federal charges.

James Forman, a former SNCC staff member, was extremely active in the role of spokesman for the "Black Manifesto" adopted by the National Black Economic Development Conference of Detroit, Mich., which demanded \$3 billion from white churches and synagogues as reparations for injustices to blacks. He has been replaced as spokesman but remains a member of the board of the conference. It is strange that high-ranking churchmen would take Forman seriously in light of his background.

It is interesting to note what transpired in connection with the travel of two SNCC leaders to Cuba via Mexico in December 1968, allegedly to participate in a cultural congress. The travelers returned to the United States in early May 1969 by way of Canada. They had in their possession a large quantity of North Korean, Soviet, and Cuban propaganda material and souvenirs. In addition, they also had in their possession a revealing notebook and diary which indicated they were placed in contact with a North Korean in Havana and that they may have been in Moscow and flown from there to North Korea where they received training in revolutionary theory and other matters.

Notes among their effects made reference to a desire on the part of North Korea for the organization of a committee to propagandize for the withdrawal of allied forces from Korea and to discredit the U.S. position in Korea.

REPUBLIC OF NEW AFRICA (RNA)

The Republic of New Africa is the Detroit, Mich., based outfit which proposes to establish a black nation in the area covered by several Southern States. Until December 1969 its president was Robert F. Williams who fled the United States in 1961 following indictment in the State of North Carolina on a charge of kidnapping growing out of a racial incident. He engaged in publishing and broadcasting hate-type material while residing in Cuba and China until his return to the United States in September 1969.

The RNA is the organization whose members at their second national convention at a church in Detroit, Mich., became involved in a shootout with Detroit police which resulted in the death of one policeman and the wounding of another.

NATION OF ISLAM

The Nation of Islam, an all-Negro cult under the control of Elijah Muhammad, is headquartered in Chicago, Ill., and has a membership of some 6,000. Up to 520,000 copies of "Muhammad Speaks," the organization's official publication, are distributed each week in the black communities throughout the country. The paper contains details of Muhammad's antiwhite teachings as well as other items aimed at stirring up the black community against police and the white race.

WHITE EXTREMISTS AND HATE-TYPE GROUPS

There are numerous white extremist and hate-type groups requiring investigation.

Klan-type organizations: We have 18 Klan-type organizations with a combined membership of some 5,300 under investigation. Overall membership has decreased during the past few years from approximately 14,000 to its present number. Robert M. Shelton, Imperial Wizard, United Klans of America, Inc., Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, the dominant Klan group in the Nation, has since his release from prison in November 1969 stated he will undertake a countrywide speaking tour to rebuild the Klan.

Hate-type groups: Although small in number, the hate-type groups gain considerable public attention through their activities and reach many people through their propaganda. Included among these groups are the Arlington, Va., based American Nazi Party, now known as the National Socialist White People's Party; the National States Rights Party headquartered in Savannah, Ga.; the National Renaissance Party in New York City; and the White Party of America in Alexandria, Va.

Indicative of how the propaganda from these groups reaches far beyond the membership, the National States Rights Party, dedicated to white supremacy, and highly anti-Negro and anti-Semitic has an everchanging active membership of 75 to 200 persons, but the subscription list to its hate-filled tabloid, "The Thunderbolt," has reached as high as 10,000.

MINUTEMEN

The Minutemen organization, which has as its purpose the training of individuals to overthrow the Government of the United States when the Government is taken over by the Communists, was dealt a stunning blow with the apprehension by the FBI of its fugitive leaders, Robert DePugh and Walter Peyson. DePugh and Peyson, sought for months on charges of conspiring to violate the Federal Bank Robbery Statute, were apprehended on July 12, 1969, while driving on the highway near their New Mexico hideout. They are now awaiting trial on bank robbery conspiracy and Federal Firearms Act violation charges. DePugh is currently in Federal prison serving a 1-year sentence for a prior Federal Firearms Act violation. After unsuccessfully appealing this conviction he disappeared while on bond and on February 20, 1970, he was sentenced to 4 years imprisonment following conviction for bond default.

While white hate organizations are small in number, this does not mean they are not dangerous or should be ignored. In fact, the record clearly shows they are fully capable of engaging in murders, bombings, arson, and other acts of violence so repugnant to law-abiding citizens.

RACIAL DISTURBANCES

Following the rash of disturbances ranging from major riots to minor disorders which occurred in April 1968, immediately after the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., there was a decrease in frequency and intensity of racial disturbances in the latter months of 1968 and in the months that followed. The ingredients for violence remained, however, and incidents of violence throughout the country involving fire bombings, sniping, and unprovoked or ambush attacks on police officers markedly increased.

These incidents, together with clashes arising out of legitimate police action in Negro-concentrated areas, added to the already high potential for major violence in almost any area of the country and, in a number of instances, confrontations between police and disorderly crowds developed into serious disturbances. Quick and firm action by the police, in some instances assisted by National Guard troops, in all probability was responsible to a large degree in such disturbances not reaching the proportions of the riots we have witnessed in previous years.

Disruptions and growing racial tensions that sometimes explode into violence are plaguing high school and junior high school administrators in virtually every part of the Nation. No section of the country appears to be free of serious racial problems in the schools as disturbances and disorders have occurred in cities in 31 States and in Washington, D.C. During the first 26 weeks of the school year which began in September 1969, over 380 disruptions and disorders in high schools and junior high schools were reported as compared to the approximately 320 such disruptions and disorders reported during the entire 1968-69 school year.

For the most part these disturbances have grown out of actions taken by Negro students in making various demands on school authorities. These demands have included more recognition of Negro students, free lunches, and bus transportation. The protests of the Negro students have ranged from complaints that they are not being treated properly by teachers and white students and that items depicting "black culture" were removed from school bulletin boards, to the lack of "soul music" being played over the school loudspeaker systems.

In some instances white students have complained that Negro students received preferential treatment and protested the discontinuance of the playing of the song "Dixie" and the flying of the Confederate flag at school functions.

These disturbances have involved numerous confrontations and fights between black and white students and the assaulting of teachers by Negro students, as well as various forms of demonstrations, including boycotts, sit-ins, walkouts, and picketing. Firearms, chains, clubs, and knives have been used during these confrontations.

The intelligence data being developed reveal that the continuing activity of agitators and revolutionaries affiliated with black extremist groups plays a large part in the unprovoked attacks against police whom these individuals view as the first line of defense of our established Government. In many instances, members of such extremist groups have been directly involved in such attacks and undoubtedly through their promotion of lawlessness and guerrilla warfare have been responsible for open and violent defiance of the law by the young criminal element in our cities.

COVERAGE OF SUBVERSIVE ORGANIZATIONS

The several groups, organizations, and movements which I have discussed show the wide coverage we must maintain to follow on their activities and changing tactics. In spite of the proliferation of these organizations, our informant coverage at all levels has been of great value and assistance in enabling us to keep abreast of our investigative responsibilities.

Through our coverage, information is continually developed concerning matters within the jurisdiction of other agencies. This information is promptly referred to them and better enables these other agencies to meet their individual responsibilities.

TELEPHONE TAPS AND MICROPHONES

Our investigative coverage is also enhanced through the limited and closely controlled use of telephone and microphone installations. Currently—February 14, 1970—we are operating 36 telephone surveillance and two microphone installations in Bureau cases in the security field. All were authorized in advance and in writing by the Attorney General.

We are also operating four telephone surveillances and one microphone surveillance in Bureau cases in the organized crime field. These were installed under a court order obtained under provisions of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

ESPIONAGE AND COUNTERINTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS

With unabated intensity, the intelligence services of the Soviet Union and of the satellite countries continued over the past year their intelligence-gathering campaign against the United States.

Soviet bloc official personnel

The diplomatic, official, and quasi-official establishments maintained by the U.S.S.R. and its satellites in the United States serve as the primary bases for their intelligence operations against us. These establishments, and the official positions within them, provide cover for the intelligence officers and their intelligence operations. Many of the operations involve the clandestine control and direction of intelligence agents and sources in our country.

Steadily since the end of World War II, the Soviet bloc countries have increased the number of their official personnel in the United States. On February 1, 1970, there were 1,129 Soviet and satellite bloc official personnel here, accompanied by 1,497 dependents. These figures do not include couriers, members of special delegations, and other officials temporarily in our country and not assigned to official establishments. A high proportion of all of these people, those permanently assigned and those on temporary visits, are intelligence officers and agents.

The following two charts reflect the total Soviet bloc official personnel in the United States as well as a breakdown by counties.

Mr. ROONEY. Without objection we shall insert these two charts at this point in the record.

(The charts follow:)

TOTAL SOVIET-BLOC OFFICIAL PERSONNEL IN THE UNITED STATES

[Includes officials and dependents of Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, and Rumania]

	Official personnel	Dependents	Total
July 1, 1964.....	654	944	1,598
July 1, 1965.....	713	1,004	1,717
July 1, 1966.....	811	1,183	1,994
July 1, 1967.....	926	1,186	2,112
July 1, 1968.....	904	1,283	2,187
July 1, 1969.....	957	1,376	2,333
Feb. 1, 1970.....	1,129	1,497	2,626

Note: Does not include couriers, members of special delegations, and other officials temporarily in the United States and not assigned to official establishments.

Soviet-bloc official personnel in the United States

[Breakdown by countries]

U.S.S.R.	701
Poland	166
Czechoslovakia	102
Rumania	62
Hungary	55
Bulgaria	37
Mongolia	6

Total as of Feb. 1, 1970..... 1,129

Targets

Mr. HOOVER. The targets of the intelligence services of the Soviet Union and its satellites have not changed. They seek to penetrate the most sensitive agencies of our Government. They seek to collect military, scientific, technical, and political information. They seek to obtain information concerning developments in private industry. They attend conventions and conferences, they make reconnaissance trips and tours, and they subscribe to all manner of periodicals and publications.

Deep cover operations

Intelligence officers and agents, despite the ease with which they obtain much of the information they desire in our free and open society, still conduct extremely clandestine operations. The most difficult to uncover are those deep cover spies operating in our country with no ostensible connection with the foreign principal. Once within our borders, these individuals easily blend into our population, and their detection and identification require time-consuming investigation.

China

The overwhelming majority of Chinese Americans in the United States are completely loyal to this country, and only a very small percentage are sympathetic to the Communist regime in Peking. During the past year, however, we have experienced a definite increase in our Chinese investigations due to the stepped-up intelligence activities on the part of the Communist Chinese aimed at procuring highly coveted technical data both overtly and covertly, and the efforts of the Chinese Communists to introduce deep cover intelligence agents into this country.

Red China has also been active in propagandizing the efforts of the Black Panther Party and similar groups dedicated to the disruption of American society.

Newly formed Maoist groups have also emerged. One such organization, called the Red Guard, is a militant group of approximately 25 Chinese youths which maintains contact with other anti-establishment groups. The organization puts out a mixture of Chinese Communist and Black Panther Party propaganda and encourages its members to purchase firearms and train in defensive tactics. It has claimed up to 50 members at a given time, supported by another 100 persons who frequent the group's headquarters in San Francisco, Calif.

A second Maoist group of recent vintage is the Revolutionary Union (RU), also known as the Red Union and the Bay Area Revolutionary Union. It has a hard-core membership of about 50 in the San Francisco area. The members consist of old-line militant renegades from the Communist Party-U.S.A.; former leaders of the pro-Chinese Communist Progressive Labor Party; and young high school and college militants who have gained notoriety as activists in local campus and related disputes.

Our investigations have determined that members of this outfit have been accumulating weapons and have engaged in firearms and guerrilla warfare training.

RU leaders are seeking to work with other militants and to gain influence within the Students for a Democratic Society and other New Left and Negro protest movements.

There is little doubt that some members of organizations such as these will be entirely

receptive to recruitment as intelligence agents for clandestine operation on behalf of Communist China. In this regard, one of the founders of the RU is a long-time Communist named Leibel Bergman who first turned against the Communist Party-U.S.A. and then dropped out of a leadership role in the Progressive Labor Party before turning to the RU.

The approximately 40,000 Hong Kong based seamen, many of whom actually reside and have families on the mainland, continue to be an investigative problem. The majority of these seamen belong to the Chinese Communist-dominated Hong Kong Seamen's Union. Thousands of these seamen enter the United States each year when their ships dock here. A high number of them desert while here and constitute a serious security threat.

Cuba

Mr. HOOPER. Castro's Cuba has never been more brazen or persistent in anti-U.S. espionage activities. Castro has made every effort to set up an intelligence network in the United States and, as usual, Castro's only diplomatic establishment in this country, the Cuban Mission to the United Nations, has served as the center of activities. Using their cloak of diplomatic immunity, intelligence officers have carried out a continuous espionage program against the United States.

The aggressive intelligence tactics of those in the Cuban Mission to the United Nations led to two representatives being ordered to leave the United States during 1969, another was denied reentry after making a trip to Cuba, and still another was specifically warned to desist from further intelligence activity in the United States.

Because of its own unorthodox approach to the Marxist-Leninist philosophy of international communism, Castro's Cuba is looked to for leadership and guidance by the directionless revolutionary forces of anarchy and nihilism which dominate the New Left and the extreme black nationalist movements in this country. As a result, Castro is in position to catalyze the disorganized efforts of the antisocial extremist elements in the United States ranging from the misfits on college campuses, to the black chauvinists who endeavor to destroy any hope of racial harmony in this country.

Thousands of travelers have gone to Cuba since Castro seized control on January 1, 1959. Many, of course, have entirely proper reasons for such travel. Others, however, may go for other reasons. Certain new left, black nationalist, and other protest groups have been particularly drawn to Cuba and appear to be making their way there in ever-increasing numbers. Included in such groups are the Students for a Democratic Society, Student National Coordinating Committee, and the Committee of Returned Volunteers which I have discussed earlier.

The flow of refugees from Communist Cuba into the United States continues at the rate of some 3,700 a month. Despite the fact that the majority of these are disillusioned with Castro, experience continues to show that some have been given intelligence missions by the Cuban Government.

At the same time, militant Cuban exiles in this country continue their efforts to seek ways and means to mount drives that would lead to the overthrow of Castro. Some of these activities result in violations of laws of the United States.

The countering of the many and varied activities resulting from the Cuban situation places heavy demands on our manpower.

DESERTER INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. HOOPER. The location of young men and women declared to be deserters from the Armed Forces has been a responsibility of the FBI since 1945. During fiscal year 1969, a record 14,168 deserters were located, a jump of 67 percent over the number of loca-

tions the previous year. This marked the 10th consecutive year that the FBI was responsible for the location of more deserters than had been located the preceding year. The Armed Forces referrals totaled 51,545 in fiscal year 1969, up 35 percent over the 38,885 referrals of the prior year.

These cases are becoming more complicated as we continue to encounter a rising number of instances where nonmilitary persons have been responsible for encouraging and enticing desertion and for harboring service deserters. In other cases, these persons have given advice and funds to deserters fleeing to sanctuaries in foreign countries.

Selective Service Act violations

The upward trend of Selective Service Act violations continued through fiscal year 1969 when 31,831 matters were received for investigation. This compares with 29,485 in 1968 and 29,228 in 1967. Also increasing were convictions in Federal court which totaled 893 in 1969, up 10 percent over the 809 in 1968.

These two charts which I now furnish to the Chairman show the trends in violations referred and convictions for the last 4 fiscal years.

Mr. ROONEY. Without objection, we shall insert these two interesting charts at this point in the record.

(The charts follow:)

Selective Service Act: violations received

Fiscal year:	
1966	27,172
1967	29,228
1968	29,485
1969	31,831

Selective Service Act: number of convictions

Fiscal year:	
1966	353
1967	763
1968	809
1969	893

Mr. HOOPER. The complexion of our Selective Service Act investigations continues to change with a great deal of stress now having to be placed on investigations of schemes to obstruct the draft. New Left-type organizations have devoted much effort to encouraging militant resistance to the draft in college and even in high schools. The accelerated drive to resist and disrupt the Selective Service System has included such forms of protest as counseling evasion, burning draft cards, and damaging selective service records. Investigation of these incidents adds greatly to our work.

Examples of interference with selective service

Some examples will provide an insight into the types of Selective Service Act violations we have investigated.

Three young draft protesters in May 1969 broke into and ransacked the office of the Selective Service Board located in Silver Spring, Md. Desks and cabinets were overturned, typewriters were thrown out the window and ink and red liquid were thrown on the walls and floor. The three protesters were identified as Leslie Bayless, aged 22, his 17-year-old brother Jonathan, and Michael Bransome, aged 18.

All three were indicted for willful hindrance of the administration of the Selective Service Act, willful injury to property of the United States and willful mutilation of Government records. Both Jonathan Bayless and Michael Bransome entered pleas of nolo contendere and were sentenced under the Youth Corrections Act. Bayless received a suspended sentence and was placed on 3 years' probation while Bransome was committed to the custody of the Attorney General for 3 years. On February 16, 1970, Leslie Bayless, following conviction in U.S. district court in Baltimore, Md., was sentenced to 3 years in Fed-

eral prison to run consecutively with a 5-year prison sentence he received earlier in Federal court in Alexandria, Va., for failure to report for induction into military service.

During the early morning of November 11, 1969, this same Selective Service Board at Silver Spring was again ransacked. Office equipment was damaged and records were thrown about the office and along a nearby railroad track. Jonathan Bayless was one of those arrested and charged with interference with selective service operations, destruction of Government property and mutilation of Government records. As a result of this latest incident, a U.S. district judge at Baltimore, Md., revoked the probation of Bayless and ordered him to jail.

Selective Service headquarters at Chicago, Ill., was broken into during the early morning hours of May 25, 1969, and records were removed to an adjoining alleyway where they were burned. The offices of the headquarters were left in complete disarray with the records strewn about and paint poured into the filing cabinets and over the floor. Fifteen antidraft protesters, who called themselves the "Chicago 15," were arrested and have since been indicated on charges of destruction of Government property, mutilation of Government records, hindering and interfering with selective service activities, and conspiracy. All 15 are presently awaiting trial.

On March 5, 1969, Byron Allen Black, Jr., a linguistic instructor at Fresno State College, Fresno, Calif., appeared at a rally being held in the "free speech" area of the campus as part of a nationwide National Draft Card Turn-In Day. While on a raised podium, Black read to the assembled group from what he claimed was his selective service card. He then poured catsup on the card and ate it in front of the several hundred Fresno State College students. Black was indicated by a Federal grand jury for mutilation of selective service documents. He has been out of the United States since the indictment was returned and prosecution is still pending.

On the morning of January 16, 1969, David Gwyther and Kip Morgan were among a group of approximately 10 college-age youths who forced their way into the meeting room of a Selective Service local board at Eugene, Ore. Completely disrupting the meeting, they placed the members of the local board under citizens' arrest and held a "mock" trial. While in the office, members of the group passed out leaflets denouncing the war in Vietnam, read a list of charges against the members of the local board and interfered with their efforts to make telephone calls for assistance. Gwyther and Morgan were convicted in Federal court of interfering with the administration of the Selective Service Act and in September 1969 each was sentenced to 2 years in prison.

ORGANIZED CRIME

The FBI made a substantial contribution to the Government's stepped-up drive against organized crime, as our investigations resulted in a record 319 convictions of hoodlum, gambling, and vice figures during the fiscal year 1969. This was an increase of 14 percent over the previous year's high of 281. Another 1,027 individuals were awaiting prosecution as of February 1, 1970, including the heads or ranking members of no less than seven of the some two dozen La Cosa Nostra "families" operating in the United States today. Taken in conjunction with the arrests of a number of major gang czars to date in fiscal year 1970, these accomplishments show the severity of the blows now being inflicted upon the Nation's underworld leadership.

This chart shows the convictions of organized crime and gambling figures since 1964, by fiscal years.

Mr. ROONEY. Without objection, we shall insert this chart at this point in the record. (The chart follows:)

Convictions of organized crime and gambling figures as result of FBI investigation

Fiscal years:

1964	64
1965	131
1966	142
1967	197
1968	281
1969	319

(NOTE.—As of February 1, 1970, a total of 1,027 other individuals were awaiting prosecution as compared with 330 and 675 at the close of fiscal years 1967 and 1968, respectively.)

Mr. HOOVER. Intensification of the FBI's drive against the organized criminal element is also evident in the number of racketeers and their associates under investigation which rose during the fiscal year from 6,070 to 7,480. Included are many of the some 3,000 members of La Cosa Nostra families operating in the United States today. Funds for the current year provide additional personnel for expansion of our thrust, particularly against loan-sharking, labor racketeering and illegal gambling including the "numbers racket."

Typical of the success being achieved under this drive was extensive and coordinated FBI probe which enabled a Federal grand jury for the southern district of New York to return indictments on July 22, 1969, against La Cosa Nostra leaders in three States, charging them with conspiring to arrange "kickbacks" to a Teamsters Union official in connection with a \$1 million building mortgage loan. Among the 13 hoodlums, union functionaries, and associates indicted were Sebastian John La Rocca, head of the Pittsburgh La Cosa Nostra "family"; Dominic Peter Corrado, who was described before a Senate subcommittee in 1963 as being one of the "administrators and heirs apparent" to Detroit La Cosa Nostra "Commission" member Joseph Zerilli; and James Plumeri, a "captain" in the New York City "family" of the late Thomas Luchese and reportedly a possible successor to Luchese.

Less than a month later, on August 20, 1969, another FBI investigation led to the indictment by a Federal grand jury in Boston of New England La Cosa Nostra "boss" Raymond Patriarca and seven other individuals for a 1968 gangland murder stemming from an interstate gambling operation. Patriarca is currently serving time in a Federal penitentiary on an earlier conviction involving similar charges, and underworld sources advise that the two prosecutions are severely crippling the financial structure of La Cosa Nostra in the New England area.

The mob received still another setback on October 23, 1969, when Gennaro Angiulo, who is reportedly running the Patriarca "family" during the absence of its leader, was arrested by FBI agents in connection with a \$48,000 armored car robbery at the Boston Veterans' Administration Hospital in July 1969.

In New York City, the late La Cosa Nostra "Commission" member Vito Genovese has not been replaced yet and his organization is being run by an "acting boss" and a crew of "captains." Two of these "captains" have been convicted in recent months as the result of FBI investigations, and two others are currently awaiting trial. On July 23 and 24, 1969, Sam Manarite, a "captain," and 10 of his associates were arrested in five States, breaking up one of the country's largest interstate operations in pornography and obscene literature.

On August 28, 1969, Angelo DeCarlo and three associates were arrested for demanding extortionate interest rates from a borrower. On January 28, 1970, DeCarlo and one of his confederates were found guilty in the U.S. District Court at Newark, N.J. The remaining two will be tried later.

On November 21, 1969, Anthony DiLorenzo, another "captain," was convicted of the interstate transportation of more than \$1 million worth of securities stolen from a New York City brokerage house and he was sentenced to 10 years in prison. Arrested earlier, on May 11, 1968, was still a fourth "captain," Peter DeFeo, who has been charged with violating the kickback provisions of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

Three other areas in which the underworld leadership has been particularly hard hit are Chicago, Buffalo, and Los Angeles. In Chicago, from which La Cosa Nostra "Commission" member Sam Giancana fled the country after serving a year in Federal custody for contempt, and his "underboss," Sam Battaglia, is presently incarcerated on antiracketeering charges, two of their top aides have now been arrested by the FBI. On February 7, 1969, John Philip Cerone and two underlings were arrested in connection with the interstate activities of a large-scale gambling organization, and on July 27, 1969, Felix Alderisio was arrested for violating the Federal Reserve Act through a scheme to swindle between \$80,000 and \$200,000 in fraudulent loans from an Illinois bank. He subsequently entered a plea of nolo contendere and was sentenced to serve 5 years concurrently with a 1965 conviction for extortion.

In Buffalo, a series of major blows was launched on November 26, 1968, with the arrest of La Cosa Nostra "Commission" member Stefano Magaddino and eight subordinates on charges of operating an interstate gambling empire centered in the western New York-southern Canada region. This was followed up 9 months later, on August 16, 1969, when a combined force of FBI agents and local authorities raided 20 gambling sites in the Niagara Falls-North Tonawanda area, arrested 24 persons (including seven on Federal charges), and seized some \$14,000 in funds belonging to a ring headed by two of Magaddino's top gambling aides.

Then, on September 6, 1969, Salvatore Pieri, who temporarily succeeded Magaddino as acting head of the Buffalo "family," was arrested along with two associates by Bureau agents in connection with the theft of more than \$200,000 worth of jewelry.

In Los Angeles, FBI investigations of Federal loan-sharking violations led to the July 9, 1969, conviction and incarceration of southern California La Cosa Nostra "boss" Nocolo Licata on contempt charges for refusing to testify before a Federal grand jury after being granted immunity from prosecution. Less than 2 months earlier, on May 13, 1969, information developed by the FBI helped lead to the conviction of Licata's "underboss," Joseph Charles Dippolito, on perjury charges arising out of a Federal liquor violation. As a result of this conviction, Dippolito has been sentenced to 10 years in prison.

An interesting sidelight of the Licata conviction was the manner in which it involved two new statutes enacted into law during 1968 to facilitate the war against organized crime. Licata was investigated under the loan-sharking provisions of the Truth in Lending Act—which saw its first successful prosecutions in early 1969; he was then granted immunity provided for under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 and subsequently jailed for refusing to testify.

Two other major La Cosa Nostra loan-sharking operations were broken up during November 1969, with the arrest of five hoodlums in the Buffalo, N.Y., area, following more than a year of intensive investigation, and the indictment in Chicago of 11 members of still another group. Both have been described as multimillion-dollar operations, and some 250 individuals have been identified as victims of the Chicago ring.

Among the other accomplishments recorded during fiscal year 1969 are:

(1) The February 4, 1969, arrest by FBI agents of Ned Bakes, reputedly a Chicago underworld "fixer" and "middleman," and the recovery of more than \$13 million worth of stolen stock certificates. He was subsequently convicted and on November 18, 1969, he was sentenced to 6 years in prison.

(2) The March 12, 1969, conviction of Carmine Lombardozzi, who has been publicly described as La Cosa Nostra's "Wall Street representative," for participating in the interstate transportation of a \$17,000 check stolen from a New York City brokerage house.

(3) The simultaneous arrests on April 10, 1969, of 22 persons involved in an interstate gambling operation centered in the northern Indiana area. Prior to the raids, FBI agents had penetrated the organization in an undercover capacity, identifying the principal members of the ring.

(4) The April 15, 1969, conviction of Boston mobster Vincent Teresa for his involvement in the theft from a New York City brokerage firm of \$750,000 worth of securities, portions of which were negotiated throughout the United States and Switzerland. In addition to receiving a 20-year sentence for this violation, Teresa is also charged with participating in another New York City brokeragehouse theft, this time involving some \$357,000 worth of securities.

(5) The coordinated July 3, 1969, gambling raids in Atlanta, Baltimore, Cleveland, Louisville, Miami, Newark, and Philadelphia, which resulted in the seizure of considerable money, gambling paraphernalia, and evidence pertaining to the interstate activities of major bookmaking figures operating out of those cities.

(6) The July 28, 1969, arrest of New York City La Cosa Nostra member Frank Lupo and two accomplices for a fraudulent bankruptcy operation in which it has been estimated that losses to the creditors will amount to approximately \$200,000.

(7) The July 29, 1969, arrest of notorious loan-shark and La Cosa Nostra associate, Arthur Tortorello, in connection with the theft of more than \$4 million worth of securities from a bank and three New York City brokerage houses.

(8) The combined August 9, 1969, raids by FBI agents and Indiana State Police on a casino-type operation in Evansville, Ind. As a result of the raid, 45 persons were arrested, including five on Federal charges. Among the items seized during the course of the raid were six loaded weapons, assorted gambling paraphernalia, and more than \$47,000 in cash and checks.

(9) The August 26, 1969, arrest in New York City of Harry Lightstone, General Counsel for the Pennsylvania Turnpike Authority, on charges of violating the Interstate Transportation in Aid of Racketeering statute. He is accused of having accepted a \$5,000 down payment on a \$25,000 bribe he demanded in order to secure a settlement on a \$939,000 claim lodged by a construction firm doing work for the Turnpike Authority.

(10) The September 19, 1969, arrest of eight individuals conducting what is believed to have been one of the largest bookmaking operations along the entire east coast with headquarters in New York City. Records obtained at the time of the arrests revealed that the ring, reportedly controlled by La Cosa Nostra, was handling some \$60 million a year in wagers.

(11) The November 25, 1969, raids—following 5 months of intensive investigative effort by FBI agents scattered throughout the State of Ohio—in which 51 search warrants were served on a group of bookmakers handling an estimated \$7,800,000 a year in wagers. Among the items seized during the raids were numerous betting records, over \$45,000 in cash, several pistols, a hand grenade, a gas grenade, blasting caps, and six cylinders containing high explosives. Fol-

lowing the raids, underworld sources advised that bookmaking had been virtually destroyed in the Cleveland area and seriously crippled elsewhere throughout the State.

(12) The December 6, 1969, simultaneous raids by FBI agents in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and California, in which 31 search warrants were served on various representatives of a large-scale numbers and bookmaking operation alleged to have been closely allied with the La Cosa Nostra leadership in the Philadelphia area. Seized by the agents were approximately \$3,000 worth of narcotics, a large volume of pornographic material, more than \$16,000 in cash, and gambling records indicating that the ring had been handling an estimated \$50 million a year in wagers.

(13) The December 16 and 17, 1969, roundup of Elizabeth N.J., La Cosa Nostra "boss" Samuel Rizzo DeCavalcante, one of his top lieutenants, and more than 50 other members of a widespread numbers ring all charged with violating interstate gambling laws. Records seized during the course of the arrests indicate that the ring had been handling in excess of \$20 million a year in wagers.

As indicated in the case of Joseph Dippolito, where information developed by the FBI helped convict the southern California La Cosa Nostra "underboss" on perjury charges arising out of a Federal liquor violation, our agents constantly remain alert to notify other Federal, State, and local agencies of material pertaining to violations outside the FBI's jurisdiction. As a result of this policy, we disseminated 305,545 items of criminal intelligence information to these other agencies during fiscal year 1969.

Indicative of the effectiveness of this dissemination is the fact that, during the past 3 years, the other agencies have utilized portions of this information in conducting some 2,300 raids, leading to the arrest of more than 12,000 organized crime and gambling figures and the seizure of nearly \$4 million worth of currency, contraband, and gambling paraphernalia found in the possession of these individuals.

Some typical examples which occurred in 1969 include the January 15 raid by the New York City Police on a La Cosa Nostra-backed casino operation estimated to have been handling more than \$3 million a year in wagers, and the arrest of 50 persons on local gambling charges; the July 16 arrest by New York City Police of the head of a La Cosa Nostra burglary ring and the recovery of more than \$100,000 in property stolen by the ring; and the July 17 raid by Buffalo, N.Y., Police on a La Cosa Nostra-controlled policy operation, which was handling an estimated \$1 million a year in wagers. With respect to this last raid, local authorities described it as the "most significant policy arrest in the history of western New York."

The utilization of court-approved electronic surveillances of carefully selected locations pursuant to the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 has produced excellent results such as could never have been produced without this authority.

In organized crime cases in which this legal evidence-gathering technique has been used, we have made more than 100 arrests and have conducted a large number of fruitful search warrant raids made possible based on information obtained through the coverage. Indictments will be forthcoming against a very substantial number of additional subjects based on gambling evidence seized and on intercepted communications. These installations have provided a keen insight into the awesome dimensions of major illegal gambling operations in this country from which La Cosa Nostra and other leading racket elements obtain their "working capital."

For example, the wiretap coverage of just one such operation revealed that those in control were handling millions of dollars per year principally in layoff action. In addition, these techniques have provided extremely valuable data regarding loan-sharking activities.

Stringent control is exercised over use of this most effective investigative technique. Each surveillance is individually approved by the Attorney General, and the surveillance order is issued by a Federal judge.

SURVEILLANCE TRANSCRIPTS

The U.S. Supreme Court in the case of Willie Israel Alderman and others, on March 10, 1969, ruled that transcripts of electronic surveillances must be given upon demand to defense attorneys although judges may forbid widespread disclosures therefrom. In line with this decision, the transcripts of electronic surveillances were made available to the defense in two New Jersey cases through the clerk of the court. Here the logs were available for review by the press.

In June 1969, FBI electronic surveillance logs and related materials were disclosed in Newark, N.J., preliminary to the trial of La Cosa Nostra "boss" Samuel Rizzo DeCavalcante in a case involving interstate transportation in aid of racketeering—extortion. In this case the defense attorney had asked to review the logs. The judge granted the request, and since the defense attorney had not requested a protective order, the logs were filed with the clerk of the court and reviewed by the press. The contents of the logs received widespread publicity both in the United States and abroad.

The logs revealed payoffs to police officials, the structure of La Cosa Nostra, and a multitude of crimes including gambling, robbery, arson, and murder.

In Newark in January 1970, in the extortionate credit transactions trial of Angelo "Gyp" DeCarlo, powerful caporegime in the Las Cosa Nostra "family" of the late Vito Genovese, the defense attorney requested to review the logs but requested that a protective order be placed on the logs. The judge granted the motion for the defense to review the logs but denied the request for the protective order. The logs were then furnished to the clerk of the court by the U.S. Attorney and there they were reviewed by the press. The contents of these logs have also received widespread publicity revealing details of crimes and corruption particularly in New Jersey.

That concludes my statement, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Sikes?

Mr. SIKES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CANE CUTTERS IN CUBA

Mr. Director, tell us something more about the cane cutters episode in Cuba. You told us about their organization, but what is their attitude when they come back to the United States? Have they learned anything which helps to straighten out their thinking?

Mr. HOOVER. The answer to your questions, I think, can be found in the fact that at the time of formation of the Venceremos Brigade the executive committee announced that brigade members, while in Cuba, in addition to cutting sugar cane, would also have the opportunity to discuss the Cuban revolution, the third world struggle, socialism, and "the movement" in the United States.

We have learned that brigade participants, when they return to the United States, are to be assigned to direct work in bringing about a revolution in this country. As I reported earlier, the first contingent just recently returned to the United States, and it is too early to measure the results of their training.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SIKES. You referred to the Neutrality

Act which causes our officials to seek to prevent organized activity against other countries, friendly or unfriendly. When was that act passed?

Mr. HOOVER. The Neutrality Act known as the Neutrality Act of 1939 was passed by Congress on November 4, 1939. This act repealed previous neutrality legislation. With the end of World War II most sections of the Neutrality Act of 1939 were rendered inoperative with the exception of the section regulating the control of munitions. Subsequently, in 1948, a provision was passed dealing with individuals organizing an expedition in the United States against a nation with which the United States is at peace. This statute, title 18, U.S. Code, section 960, was enacted on June 25, 1948.

Title 18, U.S. Code, section 960, is the one which anti-Castro Cuban exiles possibly violate in carrying out attack against Cuba.

Mr. SIKES. It is a most unusual situation when we know exactly what Communist countries are doing against us and all other democracies and we are prohibited by law from encouraging activities that might at least serve to balance the scales.

CRIME AND THE COURTS

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Director, there is a lot of concern today about organized crime and the fact they are the wholesalers of drugs and narcotics.

Mr. HOOVER. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS. If you had the full cooperation of the courts and if things were totally done as you would like to see them done, by what percentage could you reduce the take of organized crime in a 2-year period?

Mr. HOOVER. The "take" from organized crime could be reduced considerably under the conditions which you outline. One of the problems today is with some of the courts, both local and Federal. I have cited a number of instances where there has been an atrocious discharge of a defendant on his own recognizance or without any other restriction.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you think most of it is due to the fact that these people with criminal tendencies are released and are free to prey again or because there is less feeling on the part of the individual who might commit a crime that he will be punished for it, or is it a combination of both?

Mr. HOOVER. Both. I cited the case of the teenagers in Chicago who robbed wealthy homes on the North Side. They thought they would never be caught. They didn't come from impoverished families but were from upper middle-class families. They were callous and indifferent when they were brought in for arraignment.

Mr. ANDREWS. You mentioned communication line cost in connection with the National Crime Information Center, and you are asking for an additional \$380,000.

Mr. HOOVER. Yes.

THE POLICY OF THE MONARCH IS THE POLICY OF HIS CREDITORS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as American people experience ever-spiraling increases in the cost of living, they are voicing concern and demanding solutions. They do not accept the arm waving promises of massive expenditures of additional funds, and new spending pro-

grams as answers. They are becoming harder to fool because they are getting hurt in the pocketbook.

If basic economics teaches that the answer is curtailment of money quantity, then continued pumping of money into the economy can but escalate inflation. Fighting an effect by ignoring the cause accomplishes nothing.

The continued and unrestrained threat from credit, created out of thin air and based solely upon the psychological confidence of American people in private bankers must bear the responsibility of being the real cause of inflation.

Witness the recent activity where the President of the United States came to the aid of Wall Street stockbrokers.

Witness that because of the weekend announcement that the Treasury had lowered finance charges on Wall Street buying, the Federal Reserve is now shoring up the drain on the Treasury Department.

Rising prices on commodities, increased wages and earnings are not the cause of inflation as the people are being led to believe. Such a myth is the equivalent of saying wet streets and sidewalks are the cause of rain.

The American people must understand that the country's fiscal policies are not those of the President, nor of his party, but rather the policies of the Nation's creditors who have monopolized their control through the use and misuse of U.S. taxpayers' dollars and the financial security of our Nation.

There can be no answer to the money problems by a continued juggling of the balance sheets.

The only answer lies in a return to constitutional money as envisioned by the Founding Fathers of the U.S. Constitution.

For this reason, on April 21, I introduced H.R. 17140, as an answer to the money problem in the United States.

I include related news clippings:

[From the Washington Post, May 9, 1970]

FED RESCUES TREASURY FINANCING; BOND CLIMATE BETTER

(By Peter S. Nagan)

Gloom shrouded the bond and money markets during the first half of the past week, pushed certain interest rates back to their late-fall peaks, and threatened the Treasury with the near-failure of a major financing.

The Federal Reserve rode to the rescue with a pair of ball-out operations, in the nick of time. By the end of the week, yields had come down some—as prices rose—and the gloom had measurably lightened.

The Reserve System's assistance enabled the Treasury to skirt disaster and actually helped wind up the government's operation on a positive note.

This cliff-hanging story is still another by-product of the U.S. move into Cambodia. Bond traders and investors, already nervous about signs of a revival of the business boom, were disturbed by the possible escalation of the war in Vietnam. They were fearful of new strains on the economy, with new inflationary forces being added to pressures that already seemed out of control.

This sort of psychology leads investors to hold off buying new issues, and dealers to try to sell off their inventories. Prices are pushed down, which sends rates up.

The Cambodian jitters were at their worst

last week while the books were open for a big and complex Treasury financing—a two-part operation designed to refund some \$16.6 billion in maturing issues and to raise some cash as well.

Yields on outstanding issues had moved up another eighth of a point in the wake of President Nixon's speech of last Thursday. The rates being offered by the Treasury—set and locked in by a formal announcement a week ago Wednesday—seemed less attractive than at the time the financing terms were fixed.

Investors could no longer be counted on to sign up for the new issues in sufficient numbers to provide the government with the cash it needed. The unthinkable threatened: U.S. citizens would not lend their government the money it required.

That's when the Federal Reserve went into action. The cut in stock margin requirements gave the bond markets a lift. It showed that the government would act to head off the panic—that some in the market were fearing.

More importantly, though, the Fed also moved into the open market, buying some \$1.6 billion in outstanding Treasuries, a lot more than called for by normal money-market considerations. This reduced the floating supply, pushed up prices, lowered yields, provided funds for buying, and made the returns the Treasury was offering seem worthwhile again.

On Thursday, officials disclosed that the \$3.5 billion in cash the Treasury was raising—through offering a 7½ per cent, 18-month note priced at a discount to yield of 7.79 per cent—had been fully subscribed to, though just barely. Subscriptions actually totaled \$3.6 billion. (The Federal Reserve took another \$7 billion.)

Normally, such Treasury offerings are subscribed to twice, three times, or even five times over. In such cases, big investors are allotted only 20, 33, or 50 per cent of their subscriptions. In fact, they usually pad their orders, to be sure of getting what they want.

This time, the Treasury is granting 100 per cent allotments, for the first time in nearly a decade. Such high allotments are "most unusual," Under Secretary of the Treasury Paul Volcker concedes. "We didn't quite anticipate Cambodia," he said. Considering the market's weakness, officials do consider the financing a bust.

Some of the sour taste of these lackluster results was offset, though, by the better-than-expected results achieved in the other part of the Treasury's operation—the refunding of notes coming due May 15. Holders of these maturities were given the chance of subscribing to either a three-year note yielding 7.98 per cent or a six-year, nine-month issue paying 8 per cent. Only holders of the maturing issues could subscribe for these two.

Officials were expecting only 50 per cent or so of the \$4.9 billion held by private investors to be turned in for the new obligations. (The Federal Reserve and government trust accounts owned the rest.)

Instead, holders of more than 67 per cent—more than \$3.3 billion—elected to exchange. After paying off the \$1,520 million that were turned in for cash, the Treasury will have \$2 billion left over, from sale of the 18-month note, to meet its cash needs for the rest of this fiscal year.

All in all, the climate was considerably better as the week closed. The bond markets were also helped a little by postponement of some big corporate issues, by the President's promise to get the troops out of Cambodia by July 1, by unfounded but widespread rumors of a discount-rate cut, and by the jump in unemployment with its hint of a slowing economy and reduced credit demands.

[From the Washington Star, May 8, 1970]

FEDERAL RESERVE BUYING EASES TREASURY'S BORROWING CRISIS

(By Lee M. Cohn)

Distress in financial markets caused the near-failure of a Treasury borrowing operation this week.

The Treasury was saved from complete failure—which could have led to financial chaos—only by the Federal Reserve's emergency rescue efforts.

And there still is a risk that the close squeak may hit the money and bond markets hard.

When the Treasury has trouble borrowing, and dealers nearly refused to lend the Treasury all the money it needs to pay off maturing debts and finance the government until mid-June tax payments are collected.

When the Treasury was trouble borrowing, even at high interest rates, the financial system is not working properly.

Difficulties encountered by other borrowers recently have aroused some concern that the nation may be heading for a liquidity crisis—a disorderly financial condition in which credit would be virtually unavailable at any price.

To raise \$3.5 billion of cash, the Treasury on April 29 offered to sell the public 18-month notes paying interest at a rate of 7.79 percent a year.

JOLTED BY CAMBODIA

At the time of the offering, the terms were considered generous. But then the Cambodian crisis erupted and the money and bond markets—already weak—got a bad case of jitters.

Interest rates on debt securities already outstanding rose sharply, making the new notes less attractive by comparison.

In borrowing operations of this kind, subscriptions usually far exceed the amount offered and the Treasury sells big subscribers only a portion of the notes they request.

Knowing this, dealers, banks and big investors subscribe for more than they want.

In this financing, the Treasury said it would sell the full amount subscribed up to \$200,000, and would allot a percentage of larger subscriptions so that the total borrowed from the public would come to about \$3.5 billion.

Market experts were guessing early this week that the allotments would be in a range of 60 to 70 percent. That is someone subscribing for \$1 million of notes would be permitted to buy \$600,000 or \$700,000.

RESERVES STEPS IN

As market conditions deteriorated, the Federal Reserve became worried about the financing falling and intervened aggressively on Monday and Tuesday.

The Federal Reserve purchased large amounts of Treasury bills and other securities—perhaps \$1.5 billion or more, according to market estimates.

These purchases had the effect of pumping money into the financial system and pulling interest rates down. The purpose was to make the rate offered on the new notes more attractive, and to provide enough money to buy them.

Market sources reported that the Treasury pitched in by contacting dealers and banks to urge them to subscribe.

In another move possibly intended in part to assist the borrowing by giving financial markets a psychological lift, the Federal Reserve Tuesday reduced the margin requirement—the minimum cash down payment—for buying stocks from 80 to 65 percent.

All these efforts did strengthen the money and bond markets, and interest rates declined.

The improvement led market experts to

conclude that subscriptions would be larger than they had expected earlier. They revised their estimate of allotments to 50 percent from the earlier guess of 60 or 70 percent.

That is, the Treasury could sell big subscribers only half the notes they requested and still would raise \$3.5 billion.

Tuesday was the subscription date, and the Treasury announced the preliminary results late yesterday.

Instead of far exceeding the \$3.5 billion offered, as usually happens, subscriptions totaled only \$3.6 billion. Subscriptions will be allotted in full.

A quick search of the records indicated that the last time the Treasury allotted the full amount of subscriptions was in 1962.

Results of this week's financing indicated that, without the Federal Reserve's rescue, the Treasury would have been unable to borrow the \$3.5 billion needed from the public. The Treasury might have been compelled to borrow directly from the Federal Reserve.

Considering the weakness of markets, a Treasury official maintained, the borrowing operation should not be counted a failure.

"At least this covers it," he said, referring to the fact that the Treasury will raise \$3.5 billion as planned.

Apart from the potentially damaging effects on the market of such a close call, the full allotment could cause difficulties.

If a dealer wanted only \$500,000 to \$700,000 of the new notes but is compelled to buy \$1 million—the full amount of his subscription—he may be forced to sell other holdings or dump the new notes at sacrifice prices to raise the cash to pay the Treasury.

This would boost interest rates.

The Federal Reserve could help by pumping money into the financial system. However, such assistance—like the rescue efforts earlier this week—might undermine the Federal Reserve's objective of controlling growth of the money supply to combat inflation.

ACTS IN CRISES

In a showdown, the Federal Reserve can be expected to act decisively to avert a financial crisis, even if this requires a temporary lapse in the inflation fight.

Besides selling \$3.6 billion of the notes to the public, the Treasury said it will sell \$7 billion of them to Federal Reserve Banks and government trust accounts.

All or most of these notes will replace maturing notes held by the Federal Reserve Banks and the trust accounts.

The sale of 18-month notes for cash is part of a broader operation to replace \$16.6 billion of notes maturing May 15 (of which the public holds \$4.9 billion) and to raise additional cash.

In the other part of the financing—results of which were scheduled for announcement late today—the Treasury offered holders of the maturing notes the opportunity to exchange them for three-year notes paying 7.98 percent interest or 6½-year notes paying 8 percent.

The \$3.6 billion of 18-month notes are to pay off those who reject the "two longer notes, and to raise \$1 billion to \$2 billion of new cash.

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 26, 1970]
INTEREST RATES RISING AGAIN; CONFUSION OVER POLICY CITED

(By Lee M. Cohn)

Interest rates are rising sharply again, partly because "reforms" adopted by the Federal Reserve have confused financial markets.

Another big factor boosting rates, according to analysts, is widespread suspicion that the Nixon administration's campaign against inflation is weakening.

"The credibility gap has re-emerged," a high-ranking official admitted, because the administration has loosened anti-inflationary budget restraints.

BOND RATES RETURN

Rates on high-grade corporation bonds had declined about a half percentage point but have climbed back close to the 9 percent-plus peaks reached in December and January.

High-grade tax-exempt municipal bonds, which had dropped to about 6 percent, are rising toward 7 percent.

Most of the rate decline for Treasury notes and bonds has been erased, with rates now in the 7-8 percent range.

Analysts are deeply divided on the outlook for interest rates.

Some of them, especially in the administration, maintain that the current escalation of rates is an aberration resulting largely from misinterpretation of monetary and fiscal policies.

They predict rates soon will resume the decline that started last winter and was reversed several weeks ago.

But others warn that rates may rise to new peaks later this year.

If the pessimists are correct, the Republicans may face trouble in November's elections. The administration has been counting on gradual reduction of interest rates and easing of credit conditions to blunt the "tight money" issue.

Interest rates generally soared to the highest levels in more than a century in December and January.

The inflationary boom enlarged demand for credit while the Federal Reserve's anti-inflationary policies tightened the supply. Interest rates—the price of credit—rose as a consequence of the supply-demand squeeze.

Then the outlook brightened and rates started declining in February and March because of apparent shifts in the economy and in Federal Reserve policy.

The economy's slowdown strengthened hopes that inflation would abate and that demand for credit would be curtailed.

At the same time, evidence emerged that the Federal Reserve was relaxing its policies, making more money and credit available.

Moderation of monetary restraint was needed, the money managers concluded, to prevent the economy from sliding into a serious recession.

Some easing would be safe, they decided, because inflationary pressures were diminishing.

NIXON'S TIGHT BUDGET

President Nixon's submission of a tight budget projecting a small surplus was important in persuading the Federal Reserve that monetary policy could be relaxed without fueling a new surge of inflation.

Reduction of the bank prime rate—the minimum interest on loans to corporations—from 8½ to 8 percent on March 25 was viewed as confirmation that the trend of interest rates would be downward this year and probably beyond.

But the mood soon darkened again and market interest rates have risen sharply this month.

Forecasters are pulling back from predictions of declining rates on consumer loans, mortgages and business loans.

One reason for the reversal, according to analysts, is suspicion in financial markets that the Federal Reserve may be tightening monetary policy again instead of easing it further.

This confusion about policy results, ironically, from the methods used by the Federal Reserve to ease money and credit.

Traditionally, interest rates and conditions in short-term money markets have been the primary yardsticks of policy.

The money managers have concentrated, for example, on the federal funds rate—the interest charged on day-to-day loans between banks.

INFLUENCE ON CREDIT

Market operations by the Federal Reserve can raise and lower this and other money

rates. The theory is that these rates influence credit conditions generally, and ultimately the economy.

The level of these rates has been viewed by the Federal Reserve as the measure of ease or tightness in money and credit. The markets have watched rates for clues to monetary policy.

But the traditional methods and yardsticks have been criticized for years by some monetary theorists, notably Prof. Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago.

The critics contend that "monetary aggregates"—the money supply and the quantity of bank credit—are what really matter. Concentration on interest rates diverts the Federal Reserve from controlling money and credit, they argue.

Credit is eased when the money supply grows and tightened when the money supply contracts, regardless of whether the federal funds rate rises or falls, according to those theorists. Thus, they maintain, the Federal Reserve sometimes eases credit when it intends to tighten, and tightens when it means to ease.

BASIC THEORY SHIFT

In a basic shift disclosed officially April 15, the Federal Reserve's open market committee went a long way in January toward adopting "monetarist" theories.

The committee decided that "increased stress should be placed on the objective of achieving modest growth in the monetary aggregates, with about equal weight being given to bank credit and the money stock."

This was a decision to ease monetary policy slightly and there are indications that the committee eased further at a meeting in February. The Federal Reserve will report officially on the February meeting next month.

Potentially more significant in the long run was the decision to change the objectives of policy—and the yardstick for measuring ease or tightness—by concentrating more on monetary aggregates and less on interest rates.

The Federal Reserve has been trying to adjust the money supply and bank credit to moderate rates of increase consistent with gradual, less inflationary economic growth.

As market conditions have developed in recent weeks, these operations have resulted in rising interest rates for federal funds and other short-term credit. The central bank has stood by and let the rates rise.

UNCERTAINTY OVER "REFORM"

This "reform" of monetary techniques is a major source of market uncertainty about whether policy is easier or tighter.

By traditional standards, the rate increases would be signals of tightening policy.

The money supply and bank credit have been growing, but the markets are not accustomed yet to assessing policy by these standards.

Suspicion that the Federal Reserve may be tightening has undermined expectations of declining interest rates and more liberal credit availability. This new pessimism about the outlook has contributed to the escalation of rates.

Also boosting rates is skepticism about the administration's campaign against inflation.

Increased spending for the federal pay raise, public works and other programs threaten to wipe out the projected budget surplus, and there is concern that a deficit would be inflationary.

If a new surge of inflation erupts, the markets fear, the Federal Reserve will tighten policy, demand for credit will grow rapidly and lenders will hold back. Interest rates could rise above last winter's peaks.

Administration officials admit that confidence in the anti-inflationary campaign has been shaken, but they contend the market's apprehensions are exaggerated.

"All this talk about busting the budget is just wrong," an official said.

Spending increases have been relatively moderate, he said, and the administration is pressing for offsets, including a postal rate boost.

The administration still intends to balance the budget, he said.

"If we can keep the budget close to balance and if the Fed doesn't flood the country with money," he said, "we're going to edge back toward stability."

Once the markets realize that concern about a new inflationary boom is "misplaced," he predicted, interest rates will resume their gradual decline.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 26, 1970]

LATIN AMERICA DEVELOPMENT AID BOOSTED

(By Lewis Diuguid)

PUNTA DEL ESTE, URUGUAY, April 25.—The board of governors of the Inter-American Development Bank ended its 10th anniversary meeting here Friday with an agreement to increase lending capacity by half.

As the principal supplier of funds for the bank, the United States is to provide \$1.8 billion of the projected \$3.5 billion addition to capital by 1973.

President Nixon had allowed for such an outlay in the present submitted budget. Secretary of the Treasury David M. Kennedy, who is the U.S. governor on the 23-member board, expressed confidence here that Congress would appropriate the funds he obligated today.

The five day meeting at this sea resort, heavily-guarded against the possibility of an attack by the Tupamaro terrorists that beset the Punta area, featured the following developments:

Presentation of a two-year study by Argentine economist Raul Prebisch, called "Transformation and Development, the Great Task of Latin America." The report calls for a radical speedup of economic growth to reverse what it calls disastrous unemployment trends. Initial reactions to the 226-page report indicated that it would become a major document in Latin development.

First firm suggestions that the bank be moved from Washington to Buenos Aires or some other Latin site. Kennedy said he thought that from both the U.S. and Latin points of view, there were strong arguments for keeping it in Washington. President Nixon sent a message to the meeting saying he was "proud of our membership in the bank and its presence in our city."

A growing debate on the desirability of associating capital-rich countries outside the hemisphere with the bank. The United States is pushing hard for the idea, but is opposed by most of the Latin countries.

This opposition is ironic since most Latins have long complained of excessive dependence on the United States. But as one Uruguayan international expert put it, "the Europeans are too tough. Basically, it's easier to negotiate with the United States." A group was formed to study the issue.

The Prebisch report calls for an 8 per cent annual growth rate in Latin America, which Prebisch said would mean an income increase per capita of 42 per cent in this decade and 60 per cent in the next.

To do it, he calls for profound changes in agriculture, introduction of modern technology and encouragement of competition—a new emphasis for the well-known theoretician.

While Prebisch stresses the responsibilities of the Latin countries, he also calls for big injections of foreign capital—with the bank playing a key role.

The bank's capital is divided. Currently \$3.2 billion is in ordinary resources, used for relatively low interest long-term loans repayable in dollars or other sound currencies. An additional \$2 billion will be made available under this week's agreement, \$823

million from the United States and the rest from the 22 Latin American member countries.

The rest of the bank's active capital, \$2.3 billion, is in the Fund for Special Operations. Loans from this fund are repayable in the currency of the borrower.

Usually these loans are for projects that give no immediate return, such as schools, and for which commercial banks would not lend. This fund is to be increased by \$1.5 billion—\$1 billion of it to come from the United States.

Accompanying each bank governor were numerous aides that in total included 150 people. The U.S. delegation listed 19 people, including five congressmen. In addition, Kennedy's plane brought along 11 wives, at their expense, plus ten staff people.

The annual bank meeting has come to be a hemispheric gathering for matters beyond the bank itself. In all, 1,660 persons attended, among them 157 from the bank staff and 660 invited guests. The latter are mostly bankers who pay their way, attend sessions, and conduct their own business in the scattered tourist hotels. About 100 of the guests were from the U.S.

Among the official delegations, the U.S. was easily the largest. By a system of voting weighted to financial contribution, the United States is also the most powerful member. But several staff people and Latin delegates said that from the appearance Thursday of Kennedy to make his speech, they saw little of the Americans.

Also, accompanying Kennedy in the plane was a large Secret Service contingent. The embassy staff from Montevideo was here also. In all, the Americans filled a large apartment house at the tip of the narrow peninsula of Punta del Este.

On the seventh floor was a commissary selling Jack Daniel's whisky for \$4 a fifth; and even a money exchanger (at the official rate).

Punta del Este is out of season in the Southern Hemisphere autumn, and the town would have been deserted but for the bankers, police, troops and newsmen.

Uruguayan security at the meeting hall was tight, requiring name tags. Without one, said Kennedy, "a Secret Service fellow couldn't get in with me."

[From the Washington Post, May 9, 1970]

FORD, GENERAL MOTORS CUT WORKERS

(By Robert W. Irvin)

DETROIT, May 8.—Ford Motor Co. has eliminated the jobs of about 3,000 white collar workers this year in an effort to reduce expenses because of the business downturn.

The Ford announcement today came on the heels of a statement by General Motors that it is reviewing all salaried personnel rolls and within the next month will cut back some salaried jobs.

GM officials said they could not estimate how many workers would be laid off but that no flat percentage cutback was in the offing.

The GM cutback will be the first across-the-board lay off of salaried workers there since the 1958 recession. A Ford spokesman said the last white collar layoff of any consequence was following the UAW's two month strike in 1967 which drove the company briefly into the red.

As for the current cutback, a Ford spokesman said that from the first of the year through May 1 about 1,000 salaried employees have been laid off.

A spokesman said the company now has approximately 59,100 salaried employees in the U.S., or 3,000 fewer than at the start of the year.

Thus, while 1,000 have been laid off, the company has eliminated another 2,000 jobs by attrition. "During this period we have made an effort wherever possible not to re-

place employees who have left the company," a spokesman said, adding that more jobs would be eliminated in the weeks ahead in the same fashion.

However, both Ford and GM said they would continue to recruit on college campuses.

Ford also has indefinitely laid off about 11,000 hourly employees this year. In addition, 1,500 workers in Dallas lost their jobs when the company permanently closed an assembly plant there.

Chrysler said there had been no change in its previously announced salaried layoffs which totaled 2,500. The company has been recalling hourly workers and a spokesman said the number on indefinite lay off is down to 7,000.

American Motors said it has no plans to lay off any salaried workers and has been hiring workers in Wisconsin as it stepped up production of its new small car, the Gremlin.

In response to questions about its lay-off, General Motors said it "is currently reviewing salaried personnel in all divisions and staff activities. These reviews will result in the reduction of some salaried personnel based on the level of activity at each location."

Meanwhile, there was more evidence today that the auto industry is pulling out of a winter slump which caused sizable layoffs of workers in Detroit and throughout the nation. The industry added almost 75,000 cars to production schedules for May and June.

The production boosts mean that for the first time this year the industry will be building more cars than in the comparable period of 1969.

A GM spokesman said managers have been instructed to review their employment rolls to see how the work force can be reduced by attrition. Some workers have been sounded out on taking early retirement.

The spokesman said it wouldn't be known for about a month—or until mid-June—how much the work force would be reduced. The cutback will be felt in Canada as well as the U.S. "The same policy applies to both countries," a spokesman said.

GM has about 145,000 salaried workers in North America, plus 450,000 hourly workers. GM earlier this year laid off about 13,500 hourly workers when production schedules were trimmed because of falling sales.

Industry observers said the move was necessary because sales and earnings are down and costs are up at GM and at the other companies, too. The other companies also have been forced to lay off workers.

In the first four months this year, GM's domestic car sales are off 16 per cent in the same period, production was down 20.3 per cent.

Chrysler announced, meanwhile, it is calling back 450 laid-off workers at its Los Angeles assembly plant and will hire an additional 150 new workers there.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, May 10 is the traditional national holiday of the Rumanian people. On this day Rumanians throughout the world celebrate three events which symbolize the historic struggle that the Rumanian people have fought to obtain their national sovereignty and freedom.

On the 10th of May in 1866, Charles, Prince of Hohenzollern, was proclaimed the Prince of Rumania in Bucharest, and thus founded the first Rumanian dynasty. The second event occurred in 1877, when the Rumanian people declared their independence from the Ottoman Empire. The Rumanians joined forces with the Russian armies, and played a significant role in the defeat of the Turkish forces in the Russo-Turkish War. At the Berlin conference of 1878, the independence of Rumania was secured, although czarist Russia turned on her former ally at this conference and forced the secession of Bessarabia from Rumania. The third event occurred in 1881, when Charles I was crowned King of Rumania, and six decades of stable government followed.

In 1945 the era of Rumanians' true national sovereignty came to an end when the Soviet Union through the presence of its Red army forced the Rumanians to establish a Communist government that would be a satellite regime to the Kremlin. In recent years the Rumanian Government has made limited efforts to reassert its national sovereignty and independence from the dominance of Moscow. But the invasion of Czechoslovakia by Warsaw Pact forces in 1968 unfortunately implies that the possibility of this nationalistic movement in Rumania completely succeeding may be delayed. The true spirit of Rumania will eventually make it succeed.

The United States has certainly been blessed with an ideal geographic location in comparison to other unfortunate nations such as Rumania. With two broad oceans to protect us from foreign invasion, the United States was able to devote itself to the development of its national strength and freedom. As seen from the long periods that Rumania has been ruled under foreign domination and the numerous times that the Rumanian people have been forced to fight for their nation's sovereignty and their own individual freedom, it is clear that Rumania has not been as fortunate as America.

Therefore, on the 10th of May, Americans should not only pay tribute to the efforts of the Rumanian people to defend their freedom, but we should also consider how fortunate the United States has been, and the importance of our national independency, which we often take so lightly.

COMPLETING THE CRIME BILL

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent editorial broadcast by WMAL-TV spelling out the station's stand on the District of Columbia Omnibus Crime bill.

I am inserting the editorial in the RECORD for the benefit of those who did not hear it broadcast:

COMPLETING THE CRIME BILL

APRIL 9, 1970.

In previous editorials on the D.C. Crime Bill, we have supported pre-trial detention and opposed "no-knock" entry by police. In urging a House-Senate conference committee to speedy action, we add the following specific recommendations:

Fifteen-to-eighteen-year-olds who commit violent crimes should not be coddled as "youths," but treated as adults in keeping with their physical threat. This is made more imperative by last week's Supreme Court ruling that adult rules of evidence apply;

Wire-taps are urgently needed to combat narcotics and number racketeers, but will not affect law-abiding citizens;

Mandatory sentences, particularly for those using weapons, need to be imposed because the courts have not had the proper deterrent effect;

The Senate bill is preferable to the House bill in details of the new Superior Court set-up because it authorizes more judges and the funds to pay for them. In most other respects, we favor the House bill because it is tougher.

We hope conferees will speedily report out a compromise. Either version within the guidelines mentioned will make an effective and needed anti-crime bill.

SAVE OUR U.S. SPACE PROGRAM

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. As a Member of Congress, and member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, and Manned Space Flight Subcommittee, I have tried to do my part for the success of our NASA programs by studying and working hard to learn the necessary programs, and have adequate knowledge upon which to base substantial judgments and decisions.

I have gravely questioned the wisdom of reducing Apollo lunar flights to one flight a year, by postponing Apollo 14 flight launch to early calendar year 1971 from its present target date of December 3, 1970, and then delaying launch of Apollo 15 until after July 1, 1971. This will not save \$106 million and there is no doubt about it. This change of schedule of NASA will raise havoc with all NASA schedules, and scientific research and development programs.

My serious warning is that this is unfair to our U.S. astronauts, and will greatly increase their risks, and substantially reduce safety.

I include the following official NASA letter:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND
SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., May 11, 1970.

HON. JAMES G. FULTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: This is in response to your request for our appraisal of the impact of a reduction of \$106 million in FY 1971 R&D funding for NASA, as recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations. This reduction was recommended in the context of a suggestion that Apollo launches during FY 1971 be reduced from two to one.

Such a reduction in Apollo launches from two to one in FY 1971 by shifting the Apollo 14 launch to early calendar year 1971 and

delaying Apollo 15 until after FY 1971 would not result in significant cost savings to NASA during FY 1971. All of the hardware for Apollo 14, with the exception of the components to be modified because of the Apollo 13 accident, is at Cape Kennedy undergoing pre-launch checkout processing. The hardware for Apollo 15 has been completely fabricated and is either in test or storage preparatory to shipment to Cape Kennedy.

In view of the status of the hardware and since the operational elements of the Apollo program have already been sized down to a minimum level representing a basic capability, the only effect that would be achieved by this delay in schedule is the deferring of incremental costs associated with the actual launch, e.g., fuels and other consumables; overtime at the launch site, mission operation centers and tracking stations; repair of pad damage; mission peculiar documentation; and deployment of recovery forces.

The maximum cost of these activities is estimated to be from \$10 to \$20 million depending on actual scheduling.

Since the indicated reduction of \$106 million far exceeds the cost deferrals that might accrue during FY 1971 from the shift of the Apollo 14 launch date until FY 1971—and a decision has already been made to prepare for a launch of Apollo 14 no earlier than December 3, 1970, in order to utilize effectively the base-line capability and meet launch window requirements—actions would have to be taken to reduce or eliminate activities in Apollo and other NASA programs to accommodate the reduced funding.

NASA's budget for 1971 is over one-half billion dollars less than the current fiscal year—marking the fifth consecutive year of significant budget reductions. The FY 1971 budget level required NASA to take significant actions to reduce all major space activities (except space applications) including: the decision to close the Electronics Research Center (which, as you know, will now be transferred to DOT); the phase-down of the major Apollo test and production sites at Mississippi and Michoud; the suspension of the Saturn V launch vehicle production; the stretchout of the Apollo lunar missions to maximum intervals; the deferral of Skylab; the suspension of lunar flights during operations with Skylab; the deferral of the Applications Technology Satellites F and G; and the deferral of Viking Mars mission to 1975. In view of these actions, additional reductions of the magnitude recommended by the House Appropriations Committee would undoubtedly require NASA to take further actions of program delays or terminations.

In summary, a reduction of \$106 million in R&D cannot be accommodated by merely adjusting the Apollo launch scheduling; such a reduction would require NASA to examine all of its R&D programs with a view toward further delays and terminations.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE M. LOW,
Deputy Administrator.

ODD FELLOWS ANNUAL PILGRIMAGE

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I treasure my membership in the Independent Order of Odd Fellows and feel especially proud of the remarks by one of my con-

stituents when he addressed his fellow members at the annual pilgrimage to the Tomb of the Unknowns in Arlington National Cemetery, on May 3, 1970.

I wish to have reprinted in the RECORD the remarks made by my good friend, Mr. Donald R. Smith, sovereign grand master of the Sovereign Grand Lodge, on this occasion. However, before inserting Mr. Smith's remarks, I believe it appropriate to provide some background information on the pilgrimage which is excerpted from an article appearing in the 150th anniversary edition of the Official Organ of the Odd Fellows and authored by Mr. Max Solomon of the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Solomon is the present grand secretary and served as general chairman of the pilgrimage for several years.

Mr. Speaker, the first Odd Fellows pilgrimage to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington National Cemetery was held on June 17, 1934. It was a brainchild of Charles B. Lampe, then grand master of the District of Columbia. The purpose of the pilgrimage was not only to honor the Unknown Soldier and the country's war dead but also the members of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows who had made the supreme sacrifice in World War I.

Lodges from Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia participated in this first pilgrimage.

In 1935, invitations were sent to other jurisdictions in addition to those that participated in 1934, and members from New Jersey and Delaware were in attendance. In all, about 1,000 members of the order were present at the 1935 pilgrimage.

On July 7, 1940, then Grand Sire George S. Starrett presented to the Unknown Soldier, on behalf of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, the Grand Decoration of Chivalry, the highest decoration that can be bestowed upon an Odd Fellow. This jewel was received by the Department of the Army, and is prominently displayed in the Hall of Trophies. It is the only fraternal order so honored.

The first Sunday of May of each year has been designated for this annual Odd Fellow pilgrimage, and permission for this fixed date has been granted by the Department of the Army, which has charge of Arlington National Cemetery.

Mr. Speaker, this year 59 wreaths were laid on the Tomb of the Unknowns by representatives from jurisdictions all over the United States and Canada. I am honored to have the privilege of recording here the following address made by Mr. Donald R. Smith of Linden, Calif., sovereign grand master of the Sovereign Grand Lodge, IOOF:

ADDRESS OF DONALD R. SMITH

In the stillness of this hour, borne upon the wings of music and memory, we are mindful of the gigantic contributions made by those who gave their all for the preservation of peace and freedom for mankind.

Odd Fellowship teaches the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man which are the goals they fought for. We all look forward to the day when we will have peace, and

when their goals are a reality to all mankind.

All about us is life and beauty; nature smiles in the mocking pride of spring; scarce can we realize that a few feet beneath rests those men, known only to God, who represent all Americans who have given their lives in the defense of their Country and for the preservation of peace throughout the world.

More than one hundred years ago, May 30, 1868, Memorial Day was first celebrated nationally. The ceremony was held here in Arlington National Cemetery, across the Potomac River from our Nation's capital at Washington, D.C. That ceremony was ordered by General John A. Logan, Commander-in-Chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, the veterans' organization of that day. General Logan was a Union general, who felt that the young men who had given their lives to keep our nation whole and undivided should not be forgotten.

In 1868, only soldiers from the Civil War lay in Arlington Cemetery. Now thousands of white markers stretch throughout the cemetery, recording the final resting place of soldiers from World Wars I and II, the Korean War, and the war of Vietnam. "Let no neglect, no ravages of time, testify to the present or to the coming generations, that we have forgotten, as a people, the cost of a free and undivided Republic," were the orders of General Logan in 1868. More than one hundred years have passed, and Americans and all freedom-loving people of the world, still cherish the right and privilege of paying respect to those who fought and died that we might live in peace and freedom.

What a lesson is taught us here in Arlington; the hopes of youth; the ambitions of manhood; and the ties of brotherly love—all lie buried in this sacred soil. But bright in the Eternal Halls above, gleams the lamp of intelligence, and the hopes of free men everywhere, an underlying faith in the future of the faithful.

The United States of America has suffered and lost because of war and conflict, like many other nations throughout the world, but we have continued to strive for a better world with freedom and peace for all.

We are involved in a conflict in Vietnam at the present time, and as the international leader of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, I had the opportunity, under the auspices of Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, of seeing first-hand conditions that exist in this country in Southeast Asia. The desire of our men under arms, to have the support and encouragement of the American people is evident on so many fronts. It was so graphically pointed out to me in a recent letter sent home by a young Odd Fellow serving in the United States Army in Vietnam to his parents in Herman, Minnesota. Young Neal Blume told how the men in his company had collected money for the children of their captain, their commanding officer, who was killed in action in Vietnam. He continued his short letter by stating, "There are many GI's who wish the people of the United States would stand behind their President. You don't appreciate America until you see how the other half lives." He urged his support of the President, regardless of political party, and he stressed how much everyone over there loves America.

This only points out the great need for Americans, Canadians, and citizens of all other freedom-loving nations throughout the world, to support their leaders and those who are sacrificing so much. We have been given a great heritage, and it is up to you and me, the loyal and silent majority, to indicate our support and encouragement for those who are guiding the destinies of our respective nations.

"As silently fall the petals,
When the flowers their beauty shed,
So silently our loved ones are passing,
And we whisper—the dear ones are dead.
But their memory still remains with us
As forward each earnestly strives.
Their examples continue to guide us,
And their actions influence our lives."

REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD L. OTTINGER POINTS TO PERTINENCY OF NEW YORK TIMES EDITORIALS CONCERNING THE NATIONAL CRISIS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, as we debate the consequences of our recent ill-advised move into Cambodia and the deepening divisions between Americans not only on the campus but in the streets of our cities, we need to listen to the voices of reason, such as those of Tom Wicker and Anthony Lewis in May 7 editorials in the New York Times, which compellingly point the way that this Nation must travel before our national crisis reaches the point of no return.

Under unanimous consent I include the editorials in full so that these astute analyses may be read by my colleagues:

WHY ARE WE IN VIETNAM?

(By Anthony Lewis)

LONDON, May 8.—President Nixon's action in Cambodia has had at least one constructive effect: it has dramatized the flawed character, not to say illogic, of his declared plan to get the United States out of Vietnam.

As outlined in his address to the nation last Nov. 3, the plan had two objectives. One was gradually to withdraw American troops. The other was to achieve the political goal that the troops were there to secure—maintenance of the Thieu-Ky regime or some other non-Communist government in South Vietnam.

In short, the President seemed to have it in mind to pull American troops out and still "win." That was the significance of his repeated warnings against "defeat" and "humiliation."

INCONSISTENT GOALS

On the face of it, the two objectives were inconsistent. If we could not make the writ of the Thieu-Ky Government run with 500,000 American soldiers, how could we expect to secure that aim as we withdrew?

The Administration's answer, the key to the plan, was "Vietnamization": we would strengthen the forces of South Vietnam quickly enough to permit a reasonably prompt American withdrawal.

Possibly out of wishful thinking, most Americans assumed that Mr. Nixon was committed to the withdrawal part of the formula. If South Vietnam did not prove politically or militarily capable of taking up the withdrawing American's burden, she would have to compromise with the other side; in any case, we would go.

POLITICAL PRIORITY

But now, in the Cambodian affair, we see that the President still rates the securing of his political aims in South Vietnam over the objective of withdrawal. He had to send troops into Cambodia, it is explained, to

clear out the threat from there and make possible continuing withdrawals. In other words, we have to assure the Thieu-Ky Government's security before we withdraw. We, not the South Vietnamese themselves.

If American military action, in Cambodia or elsewhere, could finally guarantee a happy political future for South Vietnam, how simple life would be. But we know from five years of death and destruction that it is not like that. And so the Cambodian action brings us back to the old questions: Can American arms win a political victory? And at what cost?

A British politician has just addressed himself to those questions in a speech that President Nixon and other American conservatives ought to read. The Speaker was Enoch Powell, a right-wing figure in the Conservative party, an unsentimental man, a man utterly opposed to Communism.

"American military power," Mr. Powell said, "cannot secure any specific political result in Southeast Asia. This is a war in which the United States can win, if it wishes, every battle; but it is a war which the United States is bound to lose."

"I have no doubt that the United States forces can eliminate the Vietcong base which has so long flourished—of course it has—in Cambodia. But when the operation is over, the underlying facts of the situation reassert themselves like the tide washing out footmarks in the sand."

"The ultimate fact reasserts itself: the Americans do not live there; everyone knows that their presence is destined to be temporary; everyone knows the realities which will prevail over them."

Of course victory of a kind is available to the United States. The other day American forces went into a little Cambodian town called Snoul. They bombed it and burned it and then looted the few pathetic belongings left. A colonel said, "We had no choice." A soldier, looking at the body of a child killed by napalm, said, "I've seen worse, but I hate to see the kids get it."

WE MUST LEAVE SOMETIME

And that sort of victory, even if we are ready to pay the moral price for it, will still not secure Mr. Nixon's political objective. Some day, as Mr. Powell said, we shall have to go, and then the Vietnamese and the Cambodians will settle their own future. The North Vietnamese like to say that they have fought off foreign invaders for a thousand years, and they will be there long after the Americans are gone.

The longer we stay in Vietnam, the more painful and humiliating will be our eventual exit. "It is the futility of American policy," Enoch Powell said, "which constitutes its culpability." We can still bargain. But when the American Government at last strips away its illusions, it will adopt a policy with a single objective, overriding all others to get out of Vietnam.

IN THE NATION: THE DEAD AT KENT STATE (By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, May 6.—It was obtuse and heartless for President Nixon to say of the dead at Kent State only that "when dissent turns to violence it invites tragedy." It was indecent for Spiro Agnew to call this awful event "predictable and avoidable," then to go on with one of his standard denunciations of students, as if he and the President, pledged as they are to "bring us together," had not instead done as much as anyone to drive us into conflict. No one has less right than they to "murder the mankind" of these senseless deaths with "grave truths" about violence and dissent.

Mr. Agnew's sustained and inflammatory assault on some young Americans could have had no other purpose, and no other result, than to set generation against generation and class against class for the calculated

political purposes of the Nixon Administration. Mr. Nixon's blurted condemnation of "bums" on the campus is all the more culpable for apparently having been spontaneous and from the heart, a true revelation of his inmost feelings.

But there is more to it than the spirit of fear and vengeance and repression—that spirit exemplified by the use on a tense college campus of tired and frightened National Guardsmen with live rounds in their weapons and discretionary orders to return fire.

Even this piece of insanity might not have left the dead at Kent State had it not been for Mr. Nixon's monumental blunder in reversing the whole course of what he had said was his Vietnamese policy with the invasion of Cambodia and the reopening of the bombing of North Vietnam. That is real violence. And any President less swayed by generals, less awed by the myopic political headline of John Mitchell, less fixed in the outdated attitudes of cold war days, could not have failed to have foreseen that re-escalation would set off an explosion of anger and despair and bitterness—hence violence and counterviolence, rebellion and repression.

WHAT HAS BEEN GAINED?

It may be argued by those politicians and commentators as concerned as Mr. Nixon about manhood, humiliation and American vanity that, even had he known his people well enough to expect the reaction he is getting, he still would have had no choice but to act in the national interest, as he saw it. But none will be able to explain what interest is worth having pushed so many of the educated and concerned of a whole generation into hatred and mistrust of their own Government; and who can say how the future can be protected abroad if a nation must club and shoot its children in the streets and on the campus?

What, in fact, has re-escalation gained us? A chilly diplomatic reaction, for one thing, including quite possibly a setback to the nuclear arms limitation talks. For another, the most severe Congressional reaction in decades against the exercise of Presidential powers.

The Administration itself is divided and wounded at the top, with Mr. Nixon—like Lyndon Johnson only two years ago—suddenly unable or unwilling to travel among his own people. Secretary of State Rogers is shown either to know little of what is happening or to have minimal policy influence; Secretary of Defense Laird was apparently overruled and—worse—uninformed about what his own bombers were doing. Is it an accident that these two, with Robert Finch among the ablest men in the Administration, now join Mr. Finch in the kind of public embarrassment to which he had to become inured?

On the battlefield itself, no supreme Communist headquarters has been found, although its presence had been advertised as if it were Hitler's bunker. In fact, not many Communist troops of any kind have been found, according to reporters on the scene, although captured rice tonnage mounts daily and the body count is predictably inflated. Destruction is wholesale, of course, but mostly of Cambodian towns and farms, not of Vietcong or North Vietnamese soldiers.

BEGGING THE QUESTION

To cap this futility with absurdity, Mr. Nixon now pledges to let the invaders go no further into Cambodia than eighteen miles from the border, a guarantee which if honored makes the rest of that sizable country a real sanctuary easily reached; and he further promises to pull the troops out within eight weeks, a period that probably can be survived by an enemy that has been fighting for more than twenty years. These public restrictions beg the question what the invasion can accomplish.

Whatever the answer, the dead at Kent

State are far too high a price for it. Like the dead in Cambodia and Vietnam, they can be buried; but somehow the nation has to go on living with itself. Mr. Hickel's courageous letter to the President shows that even within the Administration, Mr. Nixon and Mr. Agnew have only made that harder to do.

RUMANIA'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, May 10, was marked by the Rumanian National Committee and by Americans of Rumanian descent, as Rumania's Independence Day. This day was celebrated by Rumanians as it marks three great events in the long and proud history of that now captive nation.

On May 10, 1866, the people of Rumania ended internal strife among native candidates to the throne by proclaiming Charles, Prince of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, as Prince of Rumania. Eleven years later on May 10, 1877, during the Russo-Turkish War, the principality of Rumania, until that time nominally a vassal of the Turks, proclaimed her independence by severing all connection with the Ottoman Empire. This independence had to be fought out on the battlefields, where the newly organized Rumanian Army, with Russia as ally, played an important role in the defeat of the Turkish forces. In 1878, the Congress of Berlin confirmed Rumania's independence.

Finally, on May 10, 1881, Charles I was crowned by the will of his people, as King of Rumania. This inaugurated a progressive, prosperous era which lasted over six decades, which was climaxed by national unity within the historic boundaries of Rumania following World War I.

It is ironic, Mr. Speaker, that Russia, which played such an important role in the independence of Rumania, should also cause the loss of that hard won independence. At the close of World War II, Rumania was occupied by Soviet armies, and as the case of other States in Eastern Europe, the process of communization was set into operation from the moment Soviet forces entered the country. Communist control over Rumania was sealed in 1946 when Soviet-style elections were held and the Rumanian People's Republic was declared.

Today, the people of Rumania live under Communist rule, and are no longer allowed to observe this 10th of May national holiday of independence. Indeed, they are now made to observe May 9, the anniversary of Soviet victory over their country.

Mr. Speaker, today I join with all Americans in recognition of Rumania's fight for freedom. I share with all others who cherish freedom, the hope that Rumania again will be free. I salute not only the history of a proud nation, but of a proud and independent people who in their long history, have many times known oppression, but whose spirit has never been broken, and who have always sought independence.

THE BATTLE FOR SNUOL: UNWORTHY OF AMERICA

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, some events bear such eloquent mute testimony to the folly of our policies in Southeast Asia that they require no comment. Standing alone they are an indictment of all we say we are trying to accomplish there. So the Washington Post felt in publishing the following UPI dispatch on the battle for Snuol; so I believe in placing this story in the RECORD for the sad contemplation of my colleagues and all Americans.

One bitter irony must be mentioned: that we have undertaken this policy of devastation in order that America shall not be "humiliated" in the eyes of the world. As we think of peoples throughout the world reading stories of the battle for Snuol, let us answer to ourselves honestly whether this is the way for America to avoid humiliation.

The article of May 7, 1970, referred to follows:

THE BATTLE FOR SNUOL: AN INSTANT EDITORIAL

"In cooperation with the armed forces of South Vietnam, attacks are being launched this week to clean out major enemy sanctuaries on the Cambodian-Vietnam border."—President Nixon, in his speech announcing the decision to invade Cambodia, May 1, 1970.

The following UPI dispatch from Cambodia is printed in this space not because we believe it to be so slanted that it amounts to editorializing but because we believe it to be a straightforward recounting of an event which by its nature, and without further adornment, is an editorial:

SNUOL, CAMBODIA.—American tanks today smashed through the smoldering ruins of this rubber plantation town leveled by massive air strikes. Their crews looted what remained.

The U.S. tankers had met heavy resistance from guerrilla defenders at the edge of the town Tuesday afternoon. They fired 90 mm guns into the buildings and warplanes finished the job with bombs and napalm.

Thus did Snuol become the first Cambodian town of significant size to be destroyed by American arms.

When the tanks and armored personnel carriers of the 2nd Squadron of the U.S. 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment moved into Snuol this morning, they were unopposed.

The North Vietnamese defenders had fled their freshly dug fighting holes. All that remained were the bodies of at least seven persons, four of them Cambodian civilians.

One of the victims was a horribly maimed little girl who lay with three other dead in an open area near a cluster of shops that had been leveled by the heavy fire.

The town had been abandoned by its estimated 2,000 residents. No one could tell if they left before or after the shooting started Tuesday. About a dozen came shuffling back into Snuol as the Americans swept through.

Military spokesmen in Saigon were saying 88 Communist troops had been killed in and around Snuol. There was no sign of the bodies in town.

The Americans said they suffered about a dozen wounded in their first pass at the town Tuesday.

Lt. Col. Graff Brookshire of Stone Moun-

tain, Ga., the squadron commander, was asked the tactical reason for the destruction of Snuol.

"We had no choice," said the cigar-smoking colonel. "We had to take it. This was a hub of North Vietnamese activity. Their supplies were run through here."

Brookshire's men plowed their tanks through a children's playground bordered by empty fighting holes.

As they passed the leveled shops, the GIs helped themselves to beer, cases of soft drinks, mirrors, suitcases, shoes, clocks and even a motorcycle they strapped onto a tank.

One shed standing after the air strikes was set afire after tankers looted it of small items, including cases of flashlight batteries.

The roof of a Roman Catholic church near the edge of Snuol took a direct hit but was one of the few structures left standing.

Cattle grazed peacefully within sight of the destroyed cluster of shops that only a day ago had covered an area the size of a city block.

Spec. 4 Ronald Brown of Detroit, Mich., shook his head when he saw the body of a child that apparently had been killed by a napalm strike.

"I've seen worse," the young tanker said. "But I hate to see kids get it."

There was no way to determine how many bodies had been dragged away before the Americans roared into Snuol.

The tankers moved through the town quickly. They broke locks on any buildings that had managed to withstand the bombardment.

Fighting holes dotted the entire area. Grenades were thrown into them as the tanks moved through the town and fanned out into adjacent areas in search of the guerrillas.

At one shop a GI spotted a display of sunglasses.

"Hey, man," yelled another. "Grab them shades."

Several GIs helped themselves to the glasses. One tossed a suitcase of shoes onto his tank.

LET US ALL COUNT TO 10

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, wise counsel taught many of us in our youth to stop and count to 10 before getting mad and resorting to violence or other drastic action. It seems to me that this would be good medicine right now in practically every corner of our Nation. And while counting, slowly, a prayer for peace—peace both here and in faraway lands—and for understanding—would be in order.

Obviously, what has happened in the streets and on the campuses of America is important. But let us not forget that what is happening in Indochina and the Middle East and everywhere else in this universe is important to America, to Americans, and indeed to every person living or yet to be born on this earth.

So let us all count to 10 slowly. Both those who would act precipitously and those who would react in like manner. Temperatures have been steadily climbing, and unless halted, there could be ominous results. I have faith and confidence that the essential leadership in and outside of government, from the White House on down, will be supplied

to take us through this crisis and out into the open air of reason once more.

Peaceful disagreement and nonviolent dissent have vital places in our national Government. Not only do they constitute a good, they are much to be desired and even necessary. Disagreement by reasonable and thought provoking opponents keeps a President, a Congressman, or a local official on his toes. I know that I have always welcomed it as do most other Members of Congress. The President has certainly shown his willingness to listen and understand opposing points of view. However, those that disagree and those that dissent owe no less a duty to try and understand.

This is no time for us to be partisan in our attitudes or to heed the false leadership of the professional agitators. Undoubtedly every citizen in our society deserves the right to have his position heard and considered. We should never tolerate repression of opinion in this country. But, make no mistake, the policy, domestic or foreign, of the United States of America cannot be decided in the streets.

Although there is general recognition that the present concern runs deeper than ever before, I happen to think the President's argument for hitting at the "Communist Pentagon" in Cambodia is plausible. The war has not ever been relegated only to South Vietnam, and to go into Cambodia with limited objectives and come out in a few short weeks just may be the first attainable goal that our Government has set in Indochina. The move should be considered in terms of whether it will facilitate or impede our schedule of withdrawal of forces.

Certainly, this is why the action was taken, Mr. Speaker, and I believe it has an excellent chance of succeeding.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LAW SCHOOL PETITIONS CONGRESS TO END THE WAR

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, one of the few encouraging results of President Nixon's policy in Southeast Asia is that it has created a new awareness of what disaster awaits America when the careful balance of powers among the branches of our National Government is destroyed. The Founders created a structure which was rugged enough to endure almost unchanged for two centuries, but which is delicate enough to reflect the least distortion in the system of checks and balances on the exercise of governmental power.

Many Americans in recent months have become aware that during the war in Indochina, we in Congress have lost a power which the framers of the Constitution clearly intended us—as that branch of Government closest and most responsive to the people—to exercise: the war power. It is gratifying to me that members of the legal community have made this constitutional crisis the cen-

tral focus of their concern about the President's policies in Southeast Asia. Last week members of the University of Chicago Law School community petitioned Congress to pass a joint resolution requiring withdrawal of all U.S. military forces from Cambodia within 30 days and from Southeast Asia within 8 months, and to deny appropriations for military operations in Southeast Asia after December 31, 1970.

I take great pride in placing that resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the study of my colleagues.

The document referred to follows:

The members of the University of Chicago Law School community, assembled on May 6, 1970, resolve as follows:

We as citizens and as students of the law are opposed to current United States policies in South East Asia for diverse reasons. Some believe this war is immoral; some are pacifists; some are convinced that the war subverts any rational foreign policy; some oppose the resulting perversion of constitutional separation of powers; some are concerned with the neglect of our national priorities; some believe it is another manifestation of American imperialist aggression; and we deplore the domestic violence and repression caused by these policies, as most recently and tragically illustrated by the killing of our brothers and sisters at Kent State University. However, as members of the legal community we feel impelled to address ourselves to the legal and constitutional issues raised by the war.

From its inception this war has been conducted in a manner wholly inconsistent with the separation of powers envisioned by the Constitution. Mr. Nixon's unilateral extension of the hostilities to Cambodia is the most recent and flagrant example of war by presidential fiat. While Article One of the Constitution clearly vests the power over war in the Congress of the United States, Mr. Nixon in the conduct of his Cambodian invasion and his entire South East Asian policy claims authority by virtue of his power as Commander-in-Chief and his inherent power over foreign affairs. No such power exists! Hamilton, writing in *Federalist* No. 69, said that the power of the Commander-in-Chief does not extend to the declaring of war "... which, by the Constitution (then) under consideration, would appertain to the legislature." Disregard of Congressional policy has led to the longest war in American history, fought without any express declaration of policy through representatives of the people.

It is unnecessary to catalogue the steps which have subverted our constitutional structure and brought us to this day of crisis. It is essential that Congress at this time reassert its power in order to avoid the total destruction of constitutional government as we know it.

We therefore urge you, the Members of Congress:

To pass a joint resolution requiring the withdrawal of all American military forces and material from Cambodia within thirty days and from South East Asia within eight months.

To deny any appropriations for military operations in South East Asia after December 31, 1970.

CONSUMERISM LAWS

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Air Con-

ditioning and Refrigeration Institution, I include in the RECORD an article which relates the adverse effect the proposed consumerism laws could have on establishment of the proper responsibilities between manufacturers and installers in attempting to provide protection for the consumer:

CONSUMERISM LAWS COULD AFFECT DEALER-CONTRACTORS

(By Frank J. Versagi)

ARLINGTON, VA.—If laws are passed which make central air conditioner and furnace manufacturers responsible for parts and labor involved in the service of field-installed systems—

(1) Manufacturers might be forced to become retailers, installers, and service contractors as a matter of protection, so they could exercise control over their products' application and installation.

(2) Thousands of small and large contractors, dealers, service establishments might be phased out of the market.

"Manufacturers, of course, do not want this to occur, nor do dealer-contractors," says L. N. Hunter, managing director of the trade association Air-Conditioning and Refrigeration Institute, "but if current proposals to make manufacturers of appliances responsible for the operation of those appliances were to be extended to field-erected heating and cooling systems, manufacturers do not see an alternative."

In a telephone interview with the NEWS, Hunter said that among the proposals made in the interest of consumerism are a number which would require that manufacturers of appliances be held responsible for both the parts and labor required to maintain and service those appliances during the warranty period—and even for an indefinite period beyond.

Members of ARI are concerned that there seems to be no distinct line of separation between "plug-in equipment and equipment which becomes part of a system."

The manufacturers' association labels as "unrealistic" any proposal which, for purposes of warranty, would classify heating and central cooling equipment in the same category as plug-in devices.

"Manufacturers of central equipment have no control over its installation or of the system of which it may become a part, and this is particularly true of residential installations," Hunter added.

In practical terms, ARI feels, field-erected systems are "manufactured" on the site by the contractor who assembles several components, only one of which is the cooling and/or heating unit.

Hunter pointed out that the typical residential system includes: cooling equipment, ductwork, controls, both automatic and manual, dampers and baffles, tubing.

"The electrical connections are much more complicated than simply plugging in an appliance," Hunter said. "They include connections to the outdoor condensing unit, the blower, and to controls which usually require transformers to reduce the voltages for some purposes."

Further, the ARI managing director said, "The newer total comfort systems might include humidifiers and electronic air cleaners, each of which requires separate electrical connections."

ARI is concerned that lawmakers be made aware that such field-erected systems as just described require some degree of engineering before installation can begin: heat gains and losses must be calculated; existing ductwork or grilles may have to be relocated or resized; equipment location must be determined.

In addition to the technological fact that manufacturers of air conditioners and furnaces do not really manufacture the heating-cooling system which finally results,

there is the marketing fact that "manufacturers of most of this equipment usually sell through distributors; the distributor resells the equipment to dealer/contractors."

"The manufacturer has no control over the competency of the contractor and, of course, the manufacturer cannot legally tell the distributors to whom they must sell the equipment."

ARI's position is, further, that because a field-erected system typically consists of units and components made by several manufacturers, it would be impossible to determine "which of the several manufacturers would have responsibility for its overall performance."

The association maintains that the ultimate system is really the "product" of the installing contractor and that any complaint of faulty operation should be handled by him.

ARI also makes the appliance-system distinction when service is discussed. "Most appliances—toasters, coffee-makers, television receivers—may be unplugged and taken to a service center. Larger appliances, such as dishwashers and room air conditioners, although they can be serviced on the job, are still essentially plug-in devices and are not part of a system."

"But field-engineered comfort systems cannot be unplugged and carried to someone's shop for service. They are an integral part of the building in which they are installed and they must be serviced on the job, just as they are built on the job."

The growth of central air conditioning, especially, has created the opportunity for thousands of independent installing and servicing contractors to participate in a dynamic industry; the unwise extension of some proposed consumer-protection laws would undercut that opportunity, manufacturers feel.

"The public is best served when we make the best products we know how and when the dealer-contractor designs and installs the best possible system and when we each assume the responsibility for our work," Hunter concluded.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Americans of Rumania descent celebrated May 10 as a triple anniversary of important events in the land of their origin. I would like to join them in commemorating the three significant May 10 dates that marked the milestones of Rumanian independence through the years.

On May 10, 1866, the Rumanian people launched their drive toward national self-assertion by proclaiming Charles, Prince of Hohenzolern of Prussia as the Bucharest Prince of Rumania. Dispelling internal strife between Native princes, the crowning of Charles marked the beginning of the rudimentary administrative, social, political and economic foundations of Rumanian life that were to result in national self-assertion on May 10, 1921, Rumania then declared itself free from the oppressive rule of the Ottoman Turks.

When Charles I, Alexander Ion Cuza was elected to the Rumanian throne, the domestic reforms that followed cleared the way for real liberties that brought

about fundamental changes in Rumanian life.

For more than six decades the Rumanian people prospered, enjoying national independence until Soviet occupation at the close of World War II stripped all vestiges of self-determination from their lives.

Although sovietization in Rumania has been harsh, Russia has nevertheless failed to knuckle the Rumanian spirit of independence under its boot of oppression.

Despite a government that is entirely monopolized by the Communist Party and oriented along traditional Communist lines, the Rumanian spirit asserted itself in 1967 when Rumania established full diplomatic relations with West Germany in direct defiance of the policies of the Soviet Union.

Determined not to serve the Soviet Union and her Soviet bloc neighbors as a source of raw materials at the expense of her industrial development, Rumania also established trade and diplomatic ties with Britain, France, and the United States as well. The efforts of the Soviet Union to impose a self-styled Eastern European Common Market caused a defiant Rumania to build a bridge to the West, opening her leaders to new vistas that may one day lead to the return of statehood in Rumania.

But, Mr. Speaker, as hopeful as these assertions of independence might be, I am constantly reminded that control of the people by an elite party few downward is not liberty or independence as we know it.

Whether or not the goal of national independence for Rumania and sister Nations in Eastern Europe will really be achieved will depend largely on the ability of freedom-loving people around the world to preserve the tenets of liberty against totalitarian aggression. The unique spirit of Rumanian independence will flourish if we, as Americans, continue to champion the hope and cause of freedom in the hearts of those who still live in bondage.

OUR COUNTRY'S MIGHT

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, a young lady from Michigan's Second District has written movingly of our national commitment to our boys who are sacrificing so much in Vietnam. Miss Maxine Collins of Plymouth, Mich., is the author of these thoughts and I include them at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

OUR COUNTRY'S MIGHT

The fighting men of Vietnam—
Are there words enough to praise?
I think there's nothing we can do
To repay their battle days.
At home we are serene and safe,
Their protection guards us well,
They man their guns to keep us free,
For them it's truly hell.

No matter what his job may be,
Each man stands just as tall,
He protects the country that he loves,
For it is his duty's call.

For most, they take it in their stride,
Others hold a passionate hate;
They feel injustice has been done,
A destiny of fate.

We all must know one soldier there,
Be he friend or be he foe,
Our thoughts don't segregate them now,
They're heroes, this we know.

Our gratitude we can't express,
Except in prayers we say:
"Dear Lord, we ask you bless these men,
And bring them home one day."

A DISCONTENTED WORLD

What's happened to this world of ours?
Has it totally gone mad?
It's not the way it use to be,
It's war-torn and it's sad.

Its people lack the dignity
That once had made it strong.
Why did its virtues slip this way?
Oh where did it go wrong?

Society must take the blame,
It's made us what we are.
There's no way we can change it now,
It's gone too fast, too far.

A person only lives "today",
And for himself alone,
He has no time for someone else,
And this he's plainly shown.

The demonstrations that go on,
And all the marches, too,
Don't serve a purpose one can see,
But harm they greatly do.

Why can't a peaceful world we be?
Why can't we harmonize?
I think perhaps will be too late,
When this we realize.

IN MEMORIAM

I've seen the fleeting clouds go by,
I've watched an eagle's flight,
I've felt the warmth of sunbeam rays,
I've known the stillness of the night.
I've chased the wind through fields of grain,
I've waded in a stream,
I've smelt the freshness of a rain,
I've wondered at the moon's bright beam.
I've cursed the day I could not walk
On power of my own,
For I've become much older now;
And tired I have grown.
I lived each day to greet anew,
Mother Nature at her best;
But now my love for her is past—
I've laid me down to rest.

**CALVO OF OHIO SEES STAMP IN 1970
FOR PYLE**

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, many Members of this body have expressed interest and support for the issuance of a stamp commemorating the late Ernie Pyle, distinguished World War II correspondent.

I submit to their review an article by Mr. Nunzio Calvo, of Cleveland, Ohio, describing the merits of such a commemorative stamp. Mr. Calvo, a long-time supporter of an Ernie Pyle commemorative stamp, should be commended for his determination in his almost one-man campaign for a Pyle stamp.

The Citizens Stamp Advisory Committee has the proposed commemorative stamp on its 1970 agenda for consideration. I urge their prompt and favorable consideration.

Mr. Calvo's article from the Stars and Stripes—the National Tribune follows:

[From the Stars and Stripes—the National Tribune, Apr. 9, 1970]

CALVO OF OHIO SEES STAMP IN 1970 FOR PYLE

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, one of the nation's largest veteran organizations, has announced its support of the proposal to issue a commemorative stamp for Ernie Pyle, beloved correspondent of World War II.

In all probability this results from the efforts of N. R. Calvo of Cleveland, Ohio who has been conducting a one-man campaign for the Pyle stamp for the last five years. He has written letters-to-the-editor, and letters to each U.S. senator and representative, requesting support of his proposal.

Several bills have been introduced in Congress for this purpose and the proposed stamp is now on the agenda for consideration by the Citizens Stamp Advisory Committee of the U.S. Post Office Department for the 1970 stamp program.

Calvo originally began with the idea of having the stamp issued by April 18, the 25th anniversary of the death of Ernie Pyle, who was killed by a Japanese sniper on the island of Shima, near Okinawa. It may now be too late to have April 18 as the first day of issue, but Calvo believes it may be possible for August 3, which would have been Pyle's 70th birthday anniversary.

HELPED GET PAY LIFT

Ernie Pyle was responsible for combat infantrymen and medics of World War II receiving \$10 extra a month in pay for the wearing of overseas bars on the left sleeve of uniforms. He was beloved by the men in combat and the people back home to whom he reported. Pyle was a humanitarian; and it is probable that because he was a simple man, he did not know how close he came to the heart of what is truly American. Perhaps it was like this: he liked people best, and people make a nation.

For these reasons, and because of a great personal admiration for one of America's most beloved personalities, N. R. Calvo is continuing his efforts to have a commemorative stamp issued honoring Ernie Pyle. He continues to ask support of former GIs who knew Pyle or served with him, as well as those "back home" to whom he reported, and other veteran organizations, to join him in this crusade by contacting the Citizens Stamp Advisory Committee asking for the issuance of the Pyle commemorative stamp.

"I personally think this is going to be the year," says Calvo, who serves as Commissioner of Soldiers Relief for Cuyahoga County in Cleveland. He is president of the Greater Cleveland Veterans Council, and commander of his local American Legion Post No. 74, as well as a life member of the VFW. Calvo believes that by issuing a stamp that commemorates Ernie Pyle, we would also be paying tribute to his fellow newsmen as well.

TAKE OFF YOUR CLOTHES AND END THE WAR

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, while the "unbiased," "impartial" communications

media tries to convince the people back home about the serious intellectual-level protest demonstration conducted in Washington last week, many here in Washington wonder why some of the "progressive" functions of the gathering have been intentionally overlooked.

The American people have been repeatedly told that this is the most intelligent generation and that all of the Nation's leaders and officials should listen to their ideals—identify with their lack of morals and yield to their "pot" dreams.

So, many in Washington were disillusioned to find that thousands of these students disrobed and many in complete nudity were swimming and frolic in the Reflecting Pool which runs from the Lincoln Memorial to the Washington Monument. From all accounts, they had such a good time that they missed many of the speeches by such "civil rights" leaders as David Dellinger and Coretta King.

To many Americans the Reflecting Pool has served different purposes—most tourists find it lovely to look at and stroll beside; the Poor People's demonstrators used it for a latrine; and now the students have found themselves an ole swimmin' hole.

The local shutterbugs and candid camera fans had a busman's holiday taking pictures of those student exhibitionists who the news media tell us are to be the intellectual leaders of tomorrow.

These are the same students who in various degrees of dress have been stalking the halls of Congress this past week to impress us with their easy solutions to the world's many problems. Now we find that free speech and free assembly have been elevated to a new dimension—the right of demonstrating in the nude. Can we anticipate in the near future that our courts will be barraged with new civil rights suits attacking indecency laws as being in violation of their rights not to wear clothes.

We here in Congress wonder what was proven by these young supposedly intellectuals coming to Washington to take off their clothes.

Just what effect does this relate to the war?

I submit the following articles:

[From the Washington Star, May 10, 1970]

MISCHIEF, RHETORIC AND FLESH IN THE SUN

(By Duncan Spencer)

The nation of youth, "Woodstock at Washington," as one youth put it, spread its tents and flags, splashed in the fountains of a lush, humid Washington, and drank in the glory of smooth flesh in the sun. Minds full of energetic mischief voiced desire to show the country one huge "NO" to war and death.

They gathered early yesterday at the Ellipse, mocking the government's last-minute decision to allow them there. Their Jeeps, Triumphs, Saabs, MGs, anything but the family wagon, lined the Mall, back windows proclaiming the name of their college, their membership in the elite of educated Americans.

Packed so close it was practically impossible to move, they found their own particular solace, a kind of communal joy that shut out the rest of the world. They sat quietly, politely, waiting for the word to come that it was time to move.

They sat and didn't listen to the leaders of the New Mobilization sound the weary rhetorical stories of the Panthers, the Chicago Seven, the repression, the continued war. They looked around and saw each other—it was a far more interesting sight.

They wandered, eventually, from the trampled area in front of the loudspeakers, where thousands had packed close as if there were music to be heard.

They chased frightened Coca-Cola men from their trucks and took the stainless steel drums and drank from them, thirsty and grinning, proud that they had stolen the stuff in broad daylight while the Park Police looked on through their impenetrable dark glasses.

But they waited in long lines, too. They helped older people through the crowd, they stood patiently for half an hour in the blazing, airless noon for a cup full of sticky cola or a chance at the water fountain.

Then someone snapped—either stuck his fist into the face of a food stand concessionaire, pushed over a box of buns, or dumped the mustard. In a frantic few moments of pure "trashing," the whole stand exploded. Hot dogs soared into the air, transformed by their shouts into "food for the people."

Later a lanky youth with no shirt carried a cloth bag at the trampled scene, taking up a collection for the "poor guy who ran the stand." The cash register was locked up by another, and handed to police for safekeeping.

Martha had driven down to Washington from Portland, Me., and she was too tired Friday night to talk and explain about the movement, and why she had driven so far in her Peugeot with friends. She said, "I just want to beat somebody."

But yesterday she was up early, and away to a church at 16th and Harvard Sts. NW, to become a marshal and keep order. "We want to show that we are a nation," she said.

"Violence," said one student from the University of Buffalo, "You'll see violence—this war's got to be brought home."

The youth stood and talked, bare chested and thin, telling anyone who would listen that overthrow was the only way to save a decent life. He wanted to sit in the street and make the police force him to move. He said he had thrown his first rock at Buffalo a week ago, and now there was no turning back.

The girl he argued with spoke for change within the system. They barked at each other. He was impatient and scornful. "You can see why I'm so hostile. Nothing works, nothing makes any difference, it doesn't matter what we do."

It may have been that sense of futility that gave the placid air to the gathering in the morning, and gave the fierce energy to the splashes of violence with the soft drink trucks and the unfortunate hot dog man. "I don't think there's going to be any schools open next fall," the Buffalo student said.

David Dellinger's high, piercing voice said: "This is not a safety valve—this is not a picnic in the park." Dellinger told them to take a new tack, to go back home and start in the house next door, the block, the township, the country, boycotting, striking, disrupting, until the machinery of the country can no longer function.

But at the reflecting pool in front of the Lincoln Memorial, where Dellinger's words couldn't be heard, the bodies of a thousand young people glistened in the sun. They whooped splashing water high in the air until it made a rainbow. "Everybody in, Everybody in," they shouted. Girls were naked, men threw their shorts into the air, floundering in circles like seals. More people drifted toward the sounds.

On the muddy banks, a group with two dozen kazoo hummed "Calissons go Rolling Along," while a swimmer, using a bright plastic traffic cone, drenched the crowd watching the girls.

They had set down on the grass to listen, as if there were music, but there was no music. They did not approach the White House, where a solid fence of dreary buses squatted nose to tail, not an inch between their bumpers, with the helmets of the Park Police gleaming behind them.

"I didn't think, a year ago, that I'd risk going to jail," one youth from the University of Maryland said. He was serious, resting near the pool where the howls of revelers sounded like the roar of mighty waters in the background.

"Nixon's said the same things over and over," he said, eyes on the fringe of trees, as if he were trying to remember something. "In the press conference there was only one good question—that was about the gap between the administration and the young, and he was trying to evade it. It was obvious he was just trying to cool things."

"If we have a successful revolution, it doesn't mean it will be a better society," he said. "I can teach people ideals, but I can't practice them myself."

But if one spoke of revolution, hundreds spoke of a grand juncture of a half-dozen issues that have found common ground among the young—the Panthers, the war, the schools, the draft, marijuana, inflation, the Justice Department, middle America. All these things are unpleasant to the college students at the Ellipse, joined into a feeling that the country is corrupt and the base of the corruption is dishonesty.

So on the Ellipse they were patient, placid and sometimes volatile. They were waiting to be cheered or angered, biding their time until the personal thing happened which would stir lazy blood on a hot day.

They were too full of sun, too full of each other's beauty to listen to anything else, and they lay with maps in their pockets, bail agency telephone numbers written on their wrists, waiting for each wave or ripple, a clap, a cheer, a chant, to sweep past and be thrown away in the vastness of the body of which they were a part.

The evening before, when Lafayette Park was open, the vanguard waited on their haunches in front of the White House. Most people paid passing deference to Brian McDonnell, the hunger striker who vows not to eat until U.S. troops leave Cambodia. He talked quietly about the coming day. "People should come as a real example of how they want to live," he said.

[From the Washington Post, May 10, 1970]

TELEVISION COVERAGE: INTENSE TO INDIFFERENT

(By Lawrence Laurent)

WTOP-TV (Channel 9) dominated yesterday's television coverage of the protest demonstration in Washington.

Domination resulted from dedication to nearly six hours of coverage, including three hours and seven minutes virtually without interruption, of the demonstration at the Ellipse.

Yesterday's coverage of Channels 4 and 9 was detailed and lengthy, in sharp contrast with the almost nonexistent live coverage of the Nov. 15 moratorium.

By the end of the long day and early evening (8:30 p.m.) coverage by Washington's four commercial VHF stations could be summarized this way: Channel 9's coverage was excellent; Channel 4's coverage was good; Channel 5's was routine, and Channel 7's was poor, with too little, too infrequently.

Channel 7's best offering was an ABC-TV News Special last night with Peter Jennings as anchor man. Repeatedly, Jennings stressed that confrontations between demonstrators and police were "minor."

Channel 9's live coverage was not without problems. At one point during the coverage at the Ellipse, sound had to be shut off. This came after one speaker shouted an obscene "F— Richard Nixon" and some of the crowd

took up the phrase in a chant. Anchormen Charles Crawford, at the Ellipse, and David French, at Broadcast House, apologized to the viewers.

Another problem was "about 600" protest telephone calls over a 37-minute delay of the beginning of a baseball telecast.

Channel 9 wound up its coverage by devoting most of a one-hour news program (6 to 7 p.m.) with a roundtable review of the day's events by six of its reporters and, with a fine one hour, national summation on a CBS News Special that was guided by Walter Cronkite.

Channel 4 hitchhiked onto the coverage of its parent NBC organization. The unflappable, wry Frank McGee, in New York, headed two special one-hour reports with good work in Washington from Sander Vanocur, Robert Goraliski, Richard Valeriani and Ron Nessen.

Channel 5 did not use live video pickups but did have hourly reports by John Goldsmith. He used still photographs with live, voice-only reports from Mike Buchanan.

[From the Washington Post, May 10, 1970]

WAR RALLY DRAWS NAMES IN THE NEWS

(By Michael Kernan)

Droppable names were plentiful on the podium at yesterday's antiwar rally, but quite a few also showed up in the audience if you knew where to look.

Republican Senators ——— and ——— were in the front row, for example, ——— in shirtsleeves and ——— bearing the heat in a dark suit.

Coretta Scott King, widow of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., briefly addressed the rally.

One of those who didn't make it was Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, the darling of the Nov. 15 Moratorium, which he attended as a private citizen.

The former director of Selective Service, contacted at his Bethesda home, said he had expected to be at a convention in Williamsburg. When it was cancelled, he decided to stay home.

"Obviously everybody hopes it will be peaceful," Hershey said. "I believe firmly in our form of government and that protest is very necessary. You have to follow the rules, though, or it'll turn into a riot."

"I don't think this thing will aid their purpose much, but as long as it's done legally, it's all right. I am entirely an optimist in these kids. Even the ones who are bad aren't as bad as they think."

One of Washington's most celebrated peace activists, Mrs. ———, wife of the Democratic senator from ———, flew to Detroit yesterday and missed the rally. Before leaving she said that, like all mothers, she was "worried about the kids getting hurt."

Two of her ——— children, the ones not in various schools around the country said they expected to be on hand for the rally however.

———, 20, who dropped out of the University of Michigan when he realized he was their only to avoid the draft, said he would "definitely" attend. His brother ———, 16, a student at Maret School here, was concerned that the least bit of violence could "set the whole thing on fire" but said that if the scene looked peaceful he would go.

The man who helped to keep Woodstock free of violence, Wesley A. Pomeroy, now a law enforcement consultant in Washington, was on the scene as part of former Attorney General Ramsey Clark's cadre of legal advisers. His two younger daughters Virginia, 17, and Vicky, 14, also attended.

One colorful group was a busload of actors led by Rip Torn and Viveca Lindfors, stars of "Dance of Death" at the Arena Stage. The actors said they tried to induce New York theaters to cancel their Saturday matinees and send other actors to join the Washington rally.

ISRAEL AND THE UNITED STATES IN THE LIGHT OF CAMBODIA

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, the people of Israel and their friends all over the world will celebrate the 22d anniversary of the founding of their republic. Twenty-two years ago from the ashes of a ravaged Europe and the determination of the survivors of a dark chapter of man's history a new nation was born and in another sense reborn. The Provisional Government of Israel proclaimed on that day the founding of a Jewish state. The dreams and the hopes and the perseverance of Jews all over the world was finally recognized.

Looking back on that day of joy and deliverance one can remember the feeling that the worst was over—that the major obstacles had been overcome. The time had come to turn from the conference table and the sword to the plow and the seed. In the years that have passed the Israelis have set an example for all through their industriousness, through their ability to make the desert flower and to develop the resources of their land.

But as time passed and the Arab nations of the Mideast maintained an implacable opposition to the State of Israel it became clear that the young nation could not abandon the sword. The kibbutz became synonymous with military alertness as well as agricultural development. The rifle rode the tractor with the driver. The fortified bunker in the settlement was the only guarantee against the random mortar or artillery shell fired in the night. Israel was forced to develop an effective and competent armed force to protect her borders from her Arab neighbors.

The effectiveness of Israel's Armed Forces is legend. In 1956 and again in 1967, Israelis struck quickly against those countries that it believed threatened the very fabric of her existence. The Israeli Army, Air Force, and Navy showed itself more than a match for the forces of the nations that opposed it. The U.N.-arranged truce on June 10, 1967, called a halt to the shooting on Israel's borders.

Today, however, there is no truce along many of Israel's borders. Nightly aircraft raids against Egypt's forces along the Suez Canal are necessary to keep Israel's casualties low. Strikes are mounted against Jordan in retaliation for the raids of Al Fatah terrorists against Israeli settlements. Israel now maintains a sizable army in being on the borders of the land captured during the 6-day war. And her economy is sorely strained to pay for the armaments that are now required.

Egypt's principal spokesman, Mohamed Heikal, says:

War is certain, not because we want it, but because it is inevitable. There is a large part of the Egyptian homeland under occupation and all our efforts to end such occupation by peaceful means have failed and we are

not expected to succeed. Therefore there will be war, with all its burdens, conditions and efforts.

President Nasser has said subsequently that the truce no longer exists and events have shown that to be the case.

The gravity of the present situation in the Mideast is seen most clearly in the presence of Russian pilots in Egyptian aircraft over central Egypt. This direct involvement of big power personnel in the Mideast conflict is fraught with the greatest danger. If Israeli meets Russian in the skies over Suez in all probability we will face a world war rather than a Mideast war, for the so-called big powers, Russia, England, France, and the United States have indicated that they will not condone a change in the basic territorial integrity of the nations in that area.

The United States has always made it clear that it stands behind the State of Israel. It was only 11 minutes after the announcement by the Provisional Government of the new nation that President Truman announced our de facto recognition of that country. And we have made it clear in the intervening years that we would not stand by and watch the dismemberment of this gallant people.

Our Nation, however, is going through a crisis. Our involvement in Vietnam and our latest excursion into Cambodia has split the American people as deeply as did our Civil War. Actions taken by President Nixon to, according to him, show other nations that we would stand by our commitment seem rather to show the indecision of American policy. The irresponsibility of his actions has encouraged what some fear may be a new isolationism—a drawing back from responsibilities in a world where many count on us for support. I believe this fear of a neo-isolationism is justified for more and more Americans are beginning to believe that restrictions must be placed on President Nixon's actions if we are to avoid foreign misadventures.

In this situation it is legitimate for Israelis and friends of Israel to ask, "What is the U.S. policy toward the Mideast?" We have a right to ask this question because President Nixon in recent months has failed to make clear our basic commitment to the territorial integrity of Israel and our willingness to back that commitment up with whatever support is needed. When the U.S.S.R. supplied SAM-S missiles to Egypt—the latest in anti-aircraft weaponry—there was no clear-cut statement from our Government that warned that we would not tolerate a change in the arms balance in the Mideast. There was no reiteration of the consequences of big power intervention in the area. I believe that this inaction was one of the factors that led the Russians to supply pilots to the Egyptian Air Force for the defense of central Egypt.

In the light of the Cambodian misadventure I believe that it is important that President Nixon restate our basic objectives of policy toward Israel and the countries of the Mideast. This is not an action that can wait some future uncertain date. It should be made now.

In the absence of such a statement to date, I would like to suggest some of the basic tenets of that policy. First, it should be clear that our policy is not an Arab policy or a Jewish policy.

As President Truman said:

It is an American policy because it (is) aimed at the peaceful solution of a world trouble spot. (And) It (is) American because it was based on the desire to see promises kept and human misery relieved.

As a truly democratic nation, as a nation fully committed to self-defense, as a nation that does not seek territorial aggrandizement, Israel has a legitimate call on our resources in times of danger.

The contrast between the Israelis and the South Vietnamese in these respects is so marked as to require little detail. Although there are policy differences of a genuine nature between Israelis, differences that Prime Minister Meir must recognize, there is also massive public support for the government. This is not the kind of support that the Thieu-Ky government can claim even in the areas of South Vietnam that it controls. Civil liberty is real in Israel; one has the freedom to say and to argue for one's position. This has not been the case in more than a decade in South Vietnam. Israel's Air Force and Army are the match for the forces of adjoining countries. There is no need for "Vietnamization" of the Israeli Army. There is a real question as to whether Vietnamization will ever succeed in South Vietnam. As a matter of fact the Russian-Egyptian relation is quite analogous to the United States-South Vietnam relation. I would imagine that the Russian high command in Moscow must get annoyed at the continuing destruction of the arms they supply to the Egyptians.

Second, the United States can back up Israel in those cases where another big power threatens to use its power to upset the arms balance in the area. We have in the past, and I assume we will in the future, not tolerate the threat of the use of nuclear power by Russia to force Israel to capitulate. If those who advocate high-risk policies in the Kremlin have any mistaken notions that the Mideast—and Israel in particular—can be turned into a cockpit for expansionist policies, they should be quickly disabused of this notion.

Third, the United States has a responsibility to see that the arms balance is maintained in the Mideast. I know I share with all Americans as well as Israelis a desire to see an end to the arms race in that area. Israel's expenditures for arms, in proportion to her national product, is a fearful burden for any nation to carry. Yet there is no alternative to maintaining the forces necessary to repulse any attack on her borders. Of particular importance in this respect is Israel's Air Force, the elite of her men under arms. Modern land warfare is dependent on airpower and none know this lesson better than the Israelis.

Israel has asked us for an additional 125 Phantom jet aircraft. She has done so because, among other reasons, the French Government has refused to deliver the Mirage fighters that Israel contracted for several years ago. Israel has

also done so because it does not produce a high-performance jet fighter bomber in her own factories. She has also requested them now, as I understand it, in order to make the necessary plans to man and include these aircraft in her inventory. I believe that the United States has waited unduly long in approving Israel's request for these aircraft. I would hope that President Nixon would promptly notify Israel that we will supply her with these aircraft.

Fourth, and perhaps most important, the United States looks to Israel for the mature and intelligent approach to problems of foreign policy that she has followed for so long. We believe that Israel seeks a peaceful resolution to the tensions in the Mideast and would live peacefully with her neighbors if at all possible. Defense Minister Dayan said last week:

We sincerely want a cease-fire, because it would end the war and open the corridor to some sort of arrangement.

And Prime Minister Meir has stressed many times that Israel does not have territorial intentions on its neighbors. What is called for in this grave hour is the most temperate use of imagination and power to find a peaceful solution to the rising conflict in the Mideast. Casualty lists of 30 or more men a week along Suez are proportionately much greater than our losses in Vietnam, if any man's death can be equated with another.

We look to Israel to follow a policy of enlightenment, perhaps along the lines that Dietrich Bonhoeffer, a martyr in Nazi Germany, described:

We must take our full share for the moulding of history, whether it be as victors or vanquished. It is only by refusing to allow any event to deprive us of our responsibility for history, because we know that is a responsibility laid upon us by God, that we shall achieve a relation to the events of history far more fruitful than criticism or opportunism.

... the ultimate question the man of responsibility asks is not, How can I extricate myself heroically from the affair? But, how is the coming generation to live? It is only in this way that fruitful solutions can arise...

If Israel continues to follow an enlightened policy it can have no fear that the United States will fall down on its commitments.

On this 22d anniversary of the founding of Israel I join Americans and Jews throughout the world in saluting the people of the young nation. I wish them every success for the future.

CENSUS BUREAU REGRETS ERROR IN QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 1970, I wrote to George Hay Brown, Director of the Bureau of the Census, to call his attention to a mistake in the text of the "Questionnaire Reference Book" for the 1970 census, which

included Mormons in the example of groups practicing polygamy. On March 20, 1970, I received a reply from Mr. Brown, apologizing for the error and assuring me that it would be corrected. Inasmuch as this issue was raised again last week, I include copies of my correspondence with the Census Bureau at this point:

MARCH 12, 1970.

Mr. GEORGE HAY BROWN,
Director, Bureau of the Census, Department
of Commerce, Suitland, Md.

DEAR MR. BROWN: We wish to call your attention to a mistake in the text of the Questionnaire Reference Book (D-520) published by your Bureau in connection with the 1970 census.

Page 8, paragraph 3 (Wife of Head), includes Mormons in the example of groups possibly having more than one wife. This is a factual mistake, as Mormons no longer practice polygamy. Such a statement in a government publication is misleading to the general public, offensive to the group involved, and certainly invalid. I'm sure the mistake was made inadvertently and without your personal knowledge, and I am sure you will take the necessary steps to correct this section of your publication.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

LAURENCE J. BURTON.

MAY 8, 1970.

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BURTON: I have your letter of March 12 concerning instructions that appear in the Questionnaire Reference Book for the 1970 census.

In earlier decennial censuses, the Bureau has found entries on the questionnaires which indicated that some men were enumerated as having more than one wife. The instruction in the manual to which you refer informs the enumerator about the proper procedure to follow in filling a questionnaire for a household of this type in his area. No statistics are ever published by the Bureau on the number of such households in the United States.

It was not appropriate for the instruction manual to make any reference to Mormons in this context, and we regret that it did. In a large and complex operation such as a decennial census, however, an occasional mistake of this kind does slip through.

Our staff has been alerted about the statement to which you refer and has been instructed to omit references to any particular group in corresponding sections of all manuals they prepare in the future.

Sincerely,

GEORGE H. BROWN,
Director, Bureau of the Census.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to insert in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues in the Congress the resolutions adopted by the Ohio Division of the Polish American Congress at its celebration May 3 of the 179th anniversary of Poland's Constitution:

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Whereas, the Ohio Division of the Polish American Congress is celebrating the 179th

Anniversary of Poland's Constitution on May 3, 1970 at the Pulaski Plaza, Cleveland, Ohio;

Whereas, the Constitution of May 3, 1791 expressed freedom, individualism, and democracy;

Whereas, this was a most significant event in Poland's history;

Whereas, these same freedoms do not exist in Poland, therefore

Be it resolved, that the Ohio Division of the Polish American Congress endorse the following principles to again restore freedom and individualism in Poland and to promote a positive program within the United States to stop the increase of lawlessness and violence in order to prevent the rise of dictatorship:

1. The U.S. should pursue a peaceful liberation policy to free Poland of Soviet Oppression.

2. The U.S. Government should expand and enliven our involvement with Poland in economic, cultural, and scientific exchange in a manner so as not to aid Soviet rulers of Poland.

3. The U.S. Government should recognize and support the Oder-Neisse Line as the permanent border of Poland.

4. To encourage President Richard Nixon to fulfill his pre-election campaign promises to place Poles in top federal positions. To date, the federal government is being critically criticized for its unwillingness in naming Americans of Polish descent to federal positions. Recently, the National Polish American Congress created a "Talent Bank" containing a list of qualified Polish Americans available for government services. Governmental leaders are encouraged to use the recommendations of the "Talent Bank."

5. To encourage the further involvement of Polish leaders in Polonia and community affairs and to censure those that discourage this positive involvement. Educators should not be denied their full citizenship rights.

6. To oppose demands by any group if guns and violence are used to attain their ends.

7. To oppose the busing of students. Busing will only increase the rising cost of education without increasing quality education. Without more money, busing can decrease the quality of education now being offered to all of the boys and girls.

Busing will also help to destroy stable ethnic neighborhoods. Ethnic groups are proud homeowners. They take pride in stable neighborhoods. Busing will only weaken these stable areas because students will lose their neighborhood identity if transported outside of their community. Neighborhood schools produce more stable communities in ethnic areas.

8. To continue to carefully review candidates for judges and to be critical of judges being too lenient with lawbreakers. Crime is rising. People are no longer safe on the streets or in their homes. Judges must stop being lenient. Law enforcement officials should not be treated as defendants in courts.

9. We the Americans of Polish descent, break a silence of a generation and elect to speak in the interest of promoting greater understanding between ethnic groups in a nation of many origin's, colors, and creeds. To this extent, we support the efforts of Congressman Roman Pucinski (Chicago) to establish an Ethnic Heritage Study Centers (H.R. 14910) in educational institutions which would develop curriculum and train teachers for the study of America's major identifiable ethnic groups.

10. We of Polish American heritage rededicate ourselves to "freedom under the law" and demand justice and fairness with respect to each man's public image. We, therefore, will aggressively oppose defamations of Poles through our Civic Alert Committee.

11. To declare to the Free World that the Ohio Division of the Polish American Congress is opposed to Communist oppression

and tyranny. To this extent, we loyally as Americans first support the Viet Nam War until an honorable peace is negotiated. We also support President Nixon on his Cambodia policy because it is only a part of the Vietnam conflict.

12. We commend Vice President Spiro Agnew for his dedicated efforts to restore "law and order with justice".

13. We commend Judge Hoffman of Chicago for his courageous decision against those desiring to create turmoil and chaos at the Chicago Democratic Convention.

14. We oppose the strategic plan recently unveiled by NATO to destroy with nuclear weapons part of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany as a deterrent or warning to Russia against aggression. This plan neither confirmed or denied by the U.S. State Department is diabolical, brutal and ill conceived. It is hard to believe that the U.S. would condone a plan that would destroy our friends as a warning to the enemy.

Aloysius Mazewski, national president of the Polish American Congress, should be commended and further encouraged to meet with the President and Secretary of State to reverse this inhumane plan.

15. Be it further resolved, that Aloysius Mazewski, national president, and Richard Jablonski, Ohio Division president, of the Polish American Congress be recognized and praised for their leadership in promoting Polonia aims and objectives by vigorously working to fulfill the rising role of Polonia in local, state, national, and international events.

16. To more strongly control, tighten, and regulate the sale of all forms of explosives.

17. To encourage Governor James A. Rhodes and the Ohio General Assembly to broaden and diversify the tax sources that support local school districts which will relieve the excessive burden of the small homeowner to finance local education. More state aid is necessary as a relief to local property owners. Property taxes alone can no longer support the rising needs of quality education.

Be it further resolved that the Ohio Division of the Polish American Congress endorse the aforementioned principles and hereby directs the Board of Officers to forward copies to interested persons.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE,
CASIMIR BIELEN, Chairman.
CHARLES C. JARVIS, Cochairman.
WALTER TOMASZEK, Cochairman.

DESTRUCTION OF GARNER VALLEY OPPOSED BY HEMET STUDENTS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the most encouraging signs these days is the ability of concerned citizens of all ages to bring about policies which will lead to improving our environment.

A specific case in point is the Garner Valley in California.

The Garner Valley lies along the scenic "Palms-to-Pines" Highway in Riverside County. The valley is surrounded by the San Bernardino National Forest, and the area is dominated by the beautiful San Jacinto Mountains.

Two years ago, Garner Valley land was sold to a private development company which then announced plans to build a large resort community.

Immediately, citizens in the area banded together to protest this development. Studies showed that the proposed new community could create a major smog trap which would kill many of the trees in the National forest; the water table would be dangerously lowered; the world's largest remaining herd of big-horn sheep would face extermination.

After careful study of the situation in Garner Valley, I felt that development of the resort community would create a serious ecological danger to both Garner Valley and the San Bernardino National Forest. Therefore, on April 13, I introduced H.R. 16919, a bill proposing that the private land in Garner Valley be purchased by the Government so that it could be added to the existing national forest.

At this point, it seems that the potential resort development has been blocked because of a zoning ruling by the Riverside County Supervisors. Certainly I believe that concerted citizen action rates as one of the key factors in the effective drive to halt this unneeded development, and as an example of the sentiments expressed in this controversy, I would like to insert into the RECORD a letter I recently received from a group of seventh grade students in Hemet, Calif., a town nearby Garner Valley.

These young people recognize the importance of preserving our precious national heritage. I congratulate them, and I encourage them to carry on these important struggles to attain environmental quality.

The letter follows:

HEMET, CALIF.,
April 17, 1970.

Congressman GEORGE E. BROWN,
Federal Building,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. BROWN: I, on behalf of my class would like to let you know of our deep concern against the Garner Valley Development taking place here in California. We have heard that one of our nation's largest herds of Bighorn sheep would be wiped out if this plan went through. Garner Valley is a natural triumph that we think should not be destroyed. If you can do anything about it, we ask that you would as you can see our cause. We would appreciate your efforts.

Very sincerely yours,

Peter A. Dewees, Patricia Scarborough,
Cindy Christensen, Thomas Walsh,
Mike Young, Iris Martinez, Ann Mari
Golish, Elvia Gomez, Jeanne Womack,
Grant Younglove, Maurice Steward,
Margaret Cervantes, Kathy Kathlow,
Maureen Boyd, Bonnie Ryman, Tom
Richardson.

HOW DOES RUMSFELD SEE OEO?

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it has been nearly a year since our former colleague Donald Rumsfeld became Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. During that year he has made many changes to restructure that agency into an effective and innovative arm of the executive branch.

There has been much speculation about the new Office of Economic Opportunity and its role in our Government. ABCD Action, the newsletter for the community action agency in Boston, has addressed itself to the new role of the agency. The article, "How Does Rumsfeld See OEO?" describes Don Rumsfeld's outlook and the role he sees for himself and the agency as advocates for the poor.

As Don Rumsfeld's first anniversary at the Office of Economic Opportunity approaches, I think it is appropriate to include this article in the RECORD:

HOW DOES RUMSFELD SEE OEO?

It should be obvious that a bright young Congressman from a safe district in Illinois would not have accepted the position of OEO Director unless he had an assurance that OEO could be continued and that its influence in the Executive Branch would be increased. He probably received both assurances. But within that context, the kind of OEO that will exist is likely to be very different from that which was established during 1964-69.

There are a number of forces shaping the new OEO and the role it will play. First, Rumsfeld's background and training as a politician shapes his approach and view. He is able to deal with conflict in a relatively effective fashion. He approaches conflict and questions directly and openly and, at least to date, has not talked out of both sides of his mouth. He is quite honest and open about saying that he does not have all the answers and he solicits and welcomes advice. It can be said that he sees himself in the midst of a great debate in the Administration with other members of the Cabinet with whom he deals and he is not yet totally sure of his own position, role or philosophy.

Second, he sees himself as having a leadership role in the Cabinet which extends far beyond OEO. OEO's responsibility had been measured by program dollars which are not likely to increase significantly. Rumsfeld's role then is as major strategist, evaluator, and program developer, and coordinator of the anti-poverty efforts of the entire Executive Branch. The research and evaluation function within OEO has a charter to range far beyond OEO programs and it is expected to conduct studies of the effectiveness of all programs being carried on by other agencies and departments, related to the elimination of poverty. Much of the new thinking about the design and redesign of program efforts within the Nixon Administration is likely to flow from OEO.

Third, Rumsfeld's experience as a member of the House Aeronautics and Space Committee is having a considerable impact on the way he organizes the agency and the way he will operate. Shortly after the flight of Apollo 11, Rumsfeld issued a statement calling for "Apollo-like" commitments to the problems of poverty and urging that the techniques which have made Apollo successful be applied to the elimination of poverty. The new appointees to key OEO positions are likely to include a number of people who have a background in the aerospace industry. OEO will be likely to seek the services of people who are described as "results oriented, hardware" men, program managers, cost effectiveness engineers, and similar people who, it is felt, will be more conscious of the design and use of funds and about evaluating the effectiveness of the use of those funds. They will be willing to operate on a somewhat more flexible and experimental basis. Rumsfeld acknowledges that the evaluation tools presently available are not adequate to significantly guide funding decisions but he is likely to press hard for the development of adequate tools. Anti-

poverty funds will be used in a much more scientific fashion and the testing of ideas will be on the basis of a much more carefully designed and controlled model or experiment than has been true in the past.

Fourth, Rumsfeld sees himself as the advocate of the interests of the poor at the Federal Cabinet table. He probably senses that few other members of the Cabinet understand or support citizen participation and that he alone will have to become its major advocate if it is to survive as a part of the Administration program. He recognizes the role of the neighborhood in the intergovernmental system, and he understands and accepts that more participation from society must be developed if society is to survive. Rumsfeld probably does not have a detailed philosophy to support this view, a very deep understanding of its impact and meaning at the local level, or a sense of different shapes and forms which citizen participation, self-determination and community control take. In the next several months, Rumsfeld will be seeking a detailed philosophy but his general philosophical support for participation is clear.

Finally, Rumsfeld is determined to improve political support for the anti-poverty program by eliminating any situation or activity which would give the program a partisan political image and by removing the kinds of labels which the program has acquired which make it appear to serve one group. He feels this will enable OEO to acquire a wide base of political support.

LOWERING THE FLAG TO A MOB

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, in New York City last week some mighty annoyed construction workers determined that the American flag was not to be lowered on demand of militants and it was not, despite the petulance of Mayor Lindsay. However, in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts no less than the Governor directed that the flag be lowered as a concession to a mob.

In this connection the lead editorial in the Boston Herald on May 6 is significant. It also affords cause of thoughtful concern:

[From the Boston Herald Traveler, May 8, 1970]

THE GOVERNOR AND THE FLAG

Gov. Francis Sargent exercised poor judgment on Tuesday, when he authorized the American flag to be lowered at the State House.

The Governor, we are certain, took the action with the best intentions. His rationale was that by lowering the flag he could avoid trouble and avert violence on Beacon Hill.

Nevertheless his action was foolish. It was, to quote the blunt term used by Rep. Richard W. Daly of Wellesley, "appeasement."

The Governor didn't have the flag lowered because he thought that was the right or honorable thing to do. Unlike the revolutionaries who were assembled on the State House lawn, he knows that the flag is not just a piece of cloth to be raised and lowered at the command of a mob.

And yet he authorized the flag to be lowered as a concession to that mob; he did it out of fear and intimidation.

This kind of thing, of course, is nothing new. Bigger and wiser men than Governor Sargent have tried to buy a little more time

or peace by giving in to the demands of the mob or submitting to a little blackmail. But there's no such thing as a little blackmail or appeasement. Feeding these insidious monsters always whets their appetite for more, as individuals and civilizations have learned, to their sorrow, throughout history.

More than 30 years ago, Britain's Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain thought that he could buy "peace in our time" by giving Adolf Hitler what he wanted at Munich. This week Governor Sargent may have thought that he could buy peace for an afternoon by giving a mob of 10,000 demonstrators what they wanted on Beacon Hill.

It didn't work with Hitler, and it won't work now.

WAGE DEMANDS COULD PRICE UNITED STATES OUT OF TRADE MARKET

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, as one who has long been concerned about foreign imports that threaten domestic industries, I was very much interested in the comments recently made by labor columnist Victor Riesel. Mr. Riesel makes particular mention of the steel import problem which has forced the American Bridge Division of U.S. Steel Corp. to shut down some facilities, and the Government—for the first time—to pay subsidies to 650 unemployed steelworkers under the "adjustment allowance" provisions of the Trade Expansion Act.

These provisions permit payments to unemployed steelworkers who can prove that they lost their jobs because of foreign competition. Most of these steel imports come from Japan and, because they are the closest market, the west coast and intermountain States have been forced to absorb the bulk of this steel. This situation has had a severe impact on the Geneva Works of U.S. Steel Corp., located near Provo in my congressional district, and it has resulted in widespread unemployment in that area.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for union leaders to heed Mr. Riesel's warning as it is the jobs of their members that are at stake.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES PRICING SELF OUT OF MARKET (By Victor Riesel)

WASHINGTON.—Those Marines fly too. And their pilots are wild about a tight little plane called the Harrier. It takes off vertically, picks up full speed and comes in for short landings. For tactical support it's a dream-flying gun ship. But it costs money.

At the moment, a congressional committee has approved the construction of 12 Harriers—in Britain. Then the word was that after the dozen the flying miracle must be produced in the U.S. Word is that McDonnell-Douglas has the contract.

During the hearing one globally renowned American specialist shrugged his famous shoulders and said, in effect, well let's build them in the U.S., but remember this will cost hundreds of millions of dollars more, for we pay our janitors and handy men more than the English pay a skilled "sub" (assistant) engineer.

There's your story. Were the swift construction of the Harrier not a federal case,

the American plant would have lost the order. The point is not that we overpay janitors or that we therefore overpay our skilled technicians. Point is that everybody working deserves a living wage and—as a now forgotten labor leader, Philip Murray, once said—a little more so there can be music in the home, carpets on the floor, pictures on the wall and more than bread on the table.

But somewhere down the production line this country is pricing itself out of the market—and out of hundreds of thousands of jobs.

Apparently a lot of working guys don't believe what goes up must come down. Well, look at the trucking rumble. Some of us have been trying to pencil out the cost of the National Master Freight (and cartage) Agreement. The conversation starts with the expert's admonition that "every penny costs \$10 million." Finally the word is that the wage-cash-fringe-pension-welfare cost-of-living package will cost some \$5,000 per man over the three-year contract. And the final estimate is about \$3 billion more—and this is for some 450,000 van drivers. And there are more huge trucking contracts to come.

"You ask where will the money come from," sighed one weary negotiator, "well we don't know. We just argue and sign when it looks like everything will stop. Then we pray and look around. It's that way everywhere in the land, in every industry. Looks like nothing can stop it."

Then someone adds that when you finally "cost" out the full agreement at the end of the contract in 1973 the tab will run close to four, perhaps, five billion dollars.

And then we come upon the auto industry and the United Auto Workers' massive convention. The delegates are militant. About 40 per cent are young—with less than five or six years seniority in the plants. But they want front-end cash—that is, a big raise in the first year of the new contract to be negotiated in September. They don't appear to react to reports of heavy auto industry unemployment or word that the workless are concentrated in Detroit. Or that beginning in 1978, America for the first time is importing more cars than it exports.

And Walter Reuther, wily veteran negotiator, knows he has problems. So he talks of his \$120 million strike fund—and of negotiating not with today's recession as a base but tomorrow's prosperity. He—and brother Victor—of all people know the dangers of imports. But the tumult goes on.

It's the fashion. The big steel union, led by the quiet man, I. W. (Abe) Abel, is sailing an unsteady ship through a howling economic storm between Scylla and Charybdis. Already foreign imports have hit American Bridge Division of the U.S. Steel Corp. which has had to shut some facilities. Virtually no one has reported this—but the government has begun paying subsidies to 650 steelworkers laid off because of foreign compe-

tion. This is the first time such checks have gone out from a special fund created by Congress under the Trade Expansion Act. These are called "adjustment allowance payments" to workers who can prove they lost their jobs because of foreign competition.

This money spouting from the special fund pays each man 65 per cent of the average weekly manufacturing wage or the worker's average week—for a full year and perhaps for a year and a half.

This is just a warning. Like a sharp pain in the stomach. Yet in conference after conference these months, rank-and-file leaders of the United Steelworkers pound the table for heavy demands on the steel industry next year.

Meanwhile there are reports of sharp job losses in factories making electronics, shoes, glass, pottery, textiles, shirts, men's suits and women's dresses—everything including pianos. Few realize that some 60 per cent of black and white TV sets and 17 per cent of color TV sets sold in the U.S. were made abroad. Virtually all transistors are produced abroad.

No one is asking anyone to cut back to the rice bowl to compete with the 15 cent-an-hour Hong Kong rate. But demands for wage increase ranging from \$100 to \$240 a week—and I mean increases—soon will price this nation right off the earth. We'll have to take to the storm cellars or those moon rockets.

SENATE—Tuesday, May 12, 1970

The Senate met in executive session at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord of the nations, sovereign ruler of all men, we would have this world to be Thy kingdom, and Thine alone. Forgive us all that obstructs Thy reign in our hearts and our doing Thy will. Whatever our color or tongue or power or faith we are all Thy children. We ask not for the easy way out of our muddles, nor for the bolt from the sky to strike down the unrighteous—but for a higher wisdom sought and wrought by strenuous effort, stern discipline, and ample patience, that the way to permanent peace and universal good will may be found. Help us to share with other nations our best, lest they share with us their worst. So order our efforts this day according to that righteousness which exalts a nation.

In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 11, 1970, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized

CXVI—948—Part 11

to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I understand that we are in executive session. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of nominations on the calendar, beginning with New Reports.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. ARMY

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. NAVY

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before I make a request to consider the nominations en bloc, may I say that I am impressed with the fact that the new Chief of Operations, Vice Adm. Elmo R. Zumwalt, Jr., who is about to be confirmed by the Senate, is only 49 years old.

I do not know Admiral Zumwalt, but I am delighted that age is given reduced consideration in this particular instance and, I would hope, in other instances, so that younger officers of proven ability can be given the opportunity to assume added responsibilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these Navy nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. William K. Jones and Maj. Gen. Raymond G. Davis, U.S. Marine Corps, to be lieutenant generals.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK, IN THE AIR FORCE, IN THE ARMY, AND IN THE MARINE CORPS

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force, in the Army, and in the Marine Corps, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.